

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| 1. Record Nr. | UNINA9910459998103321 |
| Titolo | Theory and data in cognitive linguistics / / edited by Nikolas Gisborne, Willem Hollmann |
| Pubbl/distr/stampa | Amsterdam, Netherlands ; ; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania : , : John Benjamins Publishing Company, , 2014 ©2014 |
| ISBN | 90-272-6960-2 |
| Descrizione fisica | 1 online resource (268 p.) |
| Collana | Benjamins Current Topics, , 1874-0081 ; ; Volume 67 |
| Disciplina | 415 |
| Soggetti | Cognitive grammar - Data processing Semantics - Data processing Electronic books. |
| Lingua di pubblicazione | Inglese |
| Formato | Materiale a stampa |
| Livello bibliografico | Monografia |
| Note generali | Description based upon print version of record. |
| Nota di bibliografia | Includes bibliographical references at the end of each chapters and index. |
| Nota di contenuto | Theory and Data in Cognitive Linguistics; Editorial page; Title page; LCC data; Table of contents; Theory and data in cognitive linguistics; Gries; Barðdal et al.; Patten; Trousdale; Gisborne; Cristofaro; Hollmann; Matlock et al.; References; Frequencies, probabilities, and association measures in usage-/exemplar-based linguistics; 1. Introduction; 2. Constructional analysis: A brief overview; 2.1 Perspective 1: CA and its goals; 2.2 Perspective 2: CA and its mathematics/computation; 2.3 Perspective 3: CA and its results, interpretation, and motivation; 3. Bybee's points of critique 3.1 Perspective 1: CA and its goals 3.2 Perspective 2: CA and its mathematics/computation; 3.3 Perspective 3: CA and its results, interpretation, and motivation; 3.3.1 The perceived lack of semantics; 3.3.2 The perceived lacks of semantics and discriminatory power; 3.3.3 The absence of cognitive mechanisms underlying CA; 4. Clarifications, repudiations, and responses; 4.1 Perspective 1: CA and its goals; 4.2 Perspective 2: CA and its mathematics/computation; 4.2.1 The issue of the corpus size; 4.2.2 The distribution of pFYE; 4.3 Perspective 3: CA and its results, interpretation, and motivation 4.3.1 The perceived lacks of semantics 4.3.2 The perceived lacks of |

semantics and discriminatory power; 4.3.3 The absence of cognitive mechanisms underlying CA; 5. Towards a new empirical perspective and its theoretical implications; 5.1 A cline of co-occurrence complexity and its motivations/implications; 5.1.1 Approach 1: Raw frequencies/percentages; 5.1.2 Approach 2: Association measures; 5.1.3 Approach 3: Full cross-tabulation; 5.1.4 Approach 4: Dispersion of (co-)occurrence; 5.2 Why CA works at all and a brief excursus on Zipf
 5.3 Towards a refined usage-/exemplar-based definition of construction 5.4 Conclusion; References; Reconstructing constructional semantics; 1. Introduction; 2. The Dative Subject Construction; 3. Reconstructing semantics; 4. Comparison of the semantics of the Dative Subject Construction in Old Norse-Icelandic, Archaic/Classical Latin, Ancient Greek, Old Russian, and Old Lithuanian; 5. A reconstruction of the semantics of the Dative Subject Construction in Indo-European; 6. Special characteristics of the Indo-European Dative Subject Construction in the typological landscape; 7. Summary
 References Appendix: Narrowly-circumscribed lexical semantic verb classes; The historical development of the it-cleft; 1. Introduction 1; 2. Theoretical assumptions; 2.1 Language structure; 2.2 Language change; 2.3 Interim summary; 3. The object of study; 3.1 An expletive account of it-clefts; 3.2 An extraposition account of it-clefts; 4. Sorting the data; 4.1 Ball's (1991) it-cleft origin story; 4.2 Patten's (forthcoming) it-cleft origin story; 4.3 Handling the OE hit-cleft; 5. Interpreting the data; 5.1 The diachronic development of the English it-cleft
 5.2 Ball (1994) and the mergers of the English it-cleft

Sommario/riassunto

How do people describe events they have witnessed? What role does linguistic aspect play in this process? To provide answers to these questions, we conducted an experiment on aspectual framing. In our task, people were asked to view videotaped vehicular accidents and to describe what happened (perfective framing) or what was happening (imperfective framing). Our analyses of speech and gesture in retellings show that the form of aspect used in the question differentially influenced the way people conceptualized and described actions. Questions framed with imperfective aspect resulted in more mo
