



Wednesday, June 25th, 14:30-15:00, room 101

Rafał Augustyn

Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin

## **Emotional (extra) dimension of meaning construction process**

**Keywords:** meaning construction, lexical representation, conceptual representation, conceptual blending, emotions

Cognitive linguistics holds that meaning is something that speakers get from both linguistic and non-linguistic inputs, relying on contextual and background knowledge (cf. Coulson 2001, Langacker 2008). Nevertheless, so far only little attention has been given to the emotions encoded in the cognitive models of mental representations on the basis of which speakers construe meanings.

With this in mind, we argue that one cannot satisfactorily account for the meaning construction process unless (i) Evans's (2009) *Lexical Concepts and Cognitive Models* theory, focusing on the analysis of the lexical representation of linguistic utterances, is envisioned, (ii) Fauconnier and Turner's (2002) *Conceptual Integration Theory* together with the revised model of conceptual blending proposed by Brandt (2013), which account for different domains of the conceptualiser's knowledge representation, are adopted and (iii) Langacker's (2008) theory of the *Current Discourse Space (CDS)*, which emphasises the role of speaker-hearer dynamic interaction in discourse, is applied in the meaning construction analysis.

The paper claims that in order to fully grasp novel coinages including, for instance, English quasi-medical terms such as *solastalgia* and *sorenositis*, denoting 'homesickness while still at home' and 'nasal pain and irritation' respectively, or the Polish example *testoza* ('test-induced psychosis'), the cognitively adequate meaning analysis should also take reference to the emotional dimension of the context of a given expression's usage, as emotions, following Prinz (2004), can be conceived of as *embodied appraisals*. Although an emotional charge associated with a particular concept may vary substantially from speaker to speaker, it nevertheless plays a substantial role in the discourse-mediation of the expression's actual meaning, and through cognitive entrenchment may also become an integral part of the mental representation underlying a given concept.

### **References**

1. Brandt, L. 2013. *The Communicative Mind: A Linguistic Exploration of Conceptual Integration and Meaning Construction*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
2. Coulson S. 2001. *Semantic Leaps. Frame-shifting and Conceptual Blending in Meaning Construction*. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, Sao Paulo: Cambridge University Press.
3. Evans, V. 2009. *How Words Mean: Lexical Concepts, Cognitive Models and Meaning Construction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.



**UMCS**  
WYDZIAŁ FILOZOFII I SOCJOLOGII

LANGUAGE  
CULTURE  
AND  
MIND VI



4. Fauconnier, G., Turner, M. 2002. *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books.
5. Langacker, R.W. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar. A Basic Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
6. Prinz, J.J. 2004. *The Gut Feelings. A Perceptual Theory of Emotion*. New York: Oxford University Press.