

Дружинин Андрей Сергеевич

**КОГНИТИВНО-ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИОННЫЙ АНАЛИЗ СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИХ ИНВАРИАНТОВ
ГРАММАТИЧЕСКИХ КОНСТРУКЦИЙ "PRESENT SIMPLE" И "PRESENT PROGRESSIVE"**

Теория языковых прототипов как непроемных значений лексем и грамматических форм является перспективным вектором семантических исследований в рамках когнитивной лингвистики. В данной статье представлены результаты прототипического анализа грамматических конструкций "present simple" и "present progressive" на его когнитивно-интерпретационном этапе. В частности, на основе усредненного системно-языкового семантического инварианта автор описывает конкретные ситуативные смыслы 16 различных примеров анализируемых грамматических конструкций на материале англоязычного дискурса.

Адрес статьи: www.gramota.net/materials/2/2016/10-2/27.html

Источник

Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики

Тамбов: Грамота, 2016. № 10(64): в 3-х ч. Ч. 2. С. 91-93. ISSN 1997-2911.

Адрес журнала: www.gramota.net/editions/2.html

Содержание данного номера журнала: www.gramota.net/materials/2/2016/10-2/

© Издательство "Грамота"

Информация о возможности публикации статей в журнале размещена на Интернет сайте издательства: www.gramota.net

Вопросы, связанные с публикациями научных материалов, редакция просит направлять на адрес: phil@gramota.net

УДК 81-119

The theory of language prototypes as semantic primitives of lexemes and grammatical forms seems to be a viable method of semantic research within cognitive linguistics today. The article presents the results of the prototype analysis of 'present simple' and 'present progressive' grammatical constructions at the stage of cognitive interpretation. In particular, on the basis of the averaged language-as-a-system semantic invariant the author describes concrete discourse meanings of the 16 different examples of the grammatical forms under analysis.

Key words and phrases: grammatical prototype; prototype semantics; semantic invariant; cognitive interpretation; tense-aspect verb forms; present simple grammatical form; present progressive grammatical form.

Druzhinin Andrey Sergeevich, Ph. D. in Philology
MGIMO University
andrey.druzhinin.89@mail.ru

COGNITIVE INTERPRETATION ANALYSIS OF SEMANTIC INVARIANTS OF 'PRESENT SIMPLE' AND 'PRESENT PROGRESSIVE' GRAMMATICAL CONSTRUCTIONS

Ever since Maturana's famous *Biology of Cognition* was first published, more and more scholars have been recognizing the rationality and importance of subject-oriented approach to language seeking ways to reconsider how language functions and should be construed. In this respect there have developed and gained ground many branches of cognitive linguistics with prototype semantics among them, the methodology of which offers a new perspective on the interpretation of lexical items as well as grammatical constructions and seems to be a viable alternative to the traditional paradigm both for scientific and teaching purposes [1; 2; 4; 7]. Not only does it provide an insight into the natural cognitive processes in the native speaker's mind, which reflect the way he/she conceives the outer world and accumulates experience, but also helps simplify the explanatory instruments of English-as-a-second-language instruction at large (see [1; 3, c. 4]). With that in mind, an attempt was undertaken to formulate a language-as-a-system semantic invariant of the Present Simple (PS) (1) and Present Progressive (PP) (2) tense-aspect verb forms as (1) **a present action understood generally on the basis of its main objective characteristics which are actual in the present, and known to or accepted by an unidentified number of the members of the given community;** (2) **a present action perceived immediately by and affecting a concrete subject due to the subject's specific actual psychological state of mind** [5, c. 93].

In this article, we will try to put this semantic description to test and analyse how it can be traced in different (more and less "close" to the prototype) speech realisations, i.e. discourse examples of the PS and PP constructions. To this end, we will address not only the Corpus of the English language, but also some grammar guidebooks which traditionally label these or those situations of usage as normal (rule-based) and non-normal (exceptions). According to the model of central tendency, prototype is the abstract average of all the instances, a set of relevant features which could never be encountered all together but are supposed to be found in particular combinations [8, c. 163]; therefore, the discourse meaning of all the examples (instances) under analysis will be construed with the help of the underlined semantic components of the prototype pattern which this very discourse meaning presumably "brings to the fore" in a given situation of speech. Thus, Charts 1 and 2 illustrate the interpretation of the PS and PP constructions respectively:

Chart 1.

Cognitive Interpretation of PS Constructions

Example	Actualisation of semantic invariant	Comments
1. One <i>lives</i> and <i>learns</i> [6, c. 4].	One's living and learning + is generally objective.	An English saying reflects a universally known truth.
2. The Volga <i>flows</i> into the Caspian Sea [9].	The Volga's flowing into the Caspian Sea + is objectively known.	Such a statement describes an objective truth which is common knowledge among people.
3. I <i>sleep</i> here. My father <i>sleeps</i> in his study [6, c. 4].	My sleeping here and my father's sleeping in his study + is known and accepted in this community.	The speaker refers to the tradition or rule observed in his/her family.
4. Looking back, <i>does it surprise</i> you that she left [10]?	Looking back, + is the general surprise objective to you + that she left?	The speaker foregrounds the main, general characteristics of the action which make it possible to grasp the mere fact of its occurrence at present. In such situations (with feelings expressed by the verbs <i>shock</i> , <i>surprise</i> , <i>amaze</i> , etc.) we usually understand that the action of emotive impact happens on the basis of its abstracted notional features, there is no special need to emphasize sensual perception.

Example	Actualisation of semantic invariant	Comments
5. “But you can’t jaunt off-line. I only just found you, I can’t let you go.” “Jaunt off-line,” she says, and purses her lips. “You <i>talk</i> like Steven.” [9]	Your talking + is generally understood in this community + like Steven’s.	The speaker analytically infers this by drawing parallels and comparisons in his/her mind; therefore, the action is described on the basis of the speaker’s understanding rather than visual perception.
6. And I just remember this – this young voice saying, I <i>give</i> up, I <i>give</i> up, I <i>give</i> up, we’re sorry, but, you know, please don’t kill me [9].	My giving up + is objective and actual in the present.	It is the main objective characteristic of the action (the fact of losing) that is relevant to the speaker in this situation, i.e. he/she declares himself/herself a loser at present. There is no reference to one’s subjective experience and psychological state of mind affected by the immediate action of giving up.
7. The next train <i>leaves</i> at 5 [6, c. 4].	The next train’s leaving at 5 + is known in this community.	The timetable under which the train is due to arrive and leave is publicly known, that is why the speaker refers to common knowledge. Interestingly, the use of the present tense in this example can be easily explained by the subject’s perceiving the action as part of the <i>presently</i> existing, valid schedule.
8. Where <i>do</i> we <i>go</i> from here [6, c. 5]?	Where (to what place) from here is our going + understood in this community?	Pragmatically, the speaker asks for instruction as to where he/she should go, which means he/she clarifies the presently existing knowledge regarding directions.

Chart 2.

Cognitive Interpretation of PP Constructions

Example	Actualisation of semantic invariant	Comments
1. Look! The car <i>is driving</i> by [9].	I see + the car in the middle ¹ of driving by.	The speaker is identified with the observer visually perceiving the action.
2. In fiscal year 2014, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement deported 315,943 people who were in the country without legal permission. “You <i>are</i> always <i>thinking</i> about that in the back of your mind,” Garcia said [9].	Thinking about that in the back of your mind always + affects your psychological state.	In such situations (with the adverbs <i>always</i> and <i>constantly</i>) reference is made to the observer’s subjective psychological experience of being continuously affected by the action as distinct from the PS usage indicating the objective characteristics of the action.
3. My mom always comments on what <i>I’m wearing</i> [10].	My mom always comments on what + she immediately sees me wearing.	While the first action is represented as an objective fact, the second one is described from the observer’s (mother’s) perspective, whose subjective visual perception is highly relevant (she criticizes what she sees, what she is affected by).
4. Don’t call us at 5. At this time we <i>are</i> usually <i>having</i> dinner [9].	At this time we are usually + in the middle of having dinner.	In spite of the characteristic of usualness and repeatedness, the described action does not represent an objective occurrence and common knowledge in a certain society, it is viewed by the speaker differently: the action is observed by and somehow supposed to affect a concrete subject whose figure is relevant in this situation (someone who is going to call the speaker at 5).
5. Tom <i>is picking</i> me up at 7 o’clock tonight [6, c. 8].	Tom’s picking me up at 7 o’clock tonight + immediately affects my state of mind.	Technically, the situation does not refer to the speaker’s literal present and is traditionally viewed as a reference to the future. Indeed, in this situation we seem to be dealing with the same present action, but which is perceived by the observer indirectly (metaphorically, i.e. as if now, at this point of time). The speaker’s state of mind is being affected by Tom’s picking him/her up tonight in such a way that the speaker <i>is presently preparing</i> for this action, <i>waiting</i> for it, etc., thus changing his/her behavior in his/her immediate present.

¹ We would presume that the sense of immediate observation can be effectively conveyed by the added semantic insertion ‘*in the middle of*’ indicating immediacy as such.

Example	Actualisation of semantic invariant	Comments
6. <i>I am not staying</i> here overnight. People who go into the hospital never come out [9]!	My not staying here overnight is + my immediate psychological state of mind .	The statement is pragmatically interpreted as the speaker's personal blunt refusal, which is easily explained by his/her affected psychological state of mind.
7. "Good morning," Mr. Brann said, and moved in a lanky shuffle along the aisle. "What <i>are you hearing</i> in town about Burdick's attempts to get into Congress [9]?"	What immediately affects you (your state of mind) + while hearing in town about ...?	These 'marginal' situations of usage exemplify the speakers' simple choice to present the states of being able to hear and understand as something active and changing personally and subjectively experienced in the present. In other words, the sentences may be rephrased as 'What news is coming / what news are you receiving / what new things are you learning?' and 'I'm not feeling / behaving / talking like I understand you'.
8. "Because, Hassan, information is only as reliable as the question that creates it." "Mister Graves, <i>I am not understanding you</i> " [9].	My not understanding you + immediately affects me (my state of mind) .	

Thus, the third stage of semantic prototype analysis carried out here in the form of cognitive interpretation on the basis of discourse examples shows the practical feasibility of the suggested theory of 'grammatical prototype' as the invariant meaning of a grammatical construction abstractly, schematically existing in the mind of a language and making it possible for the language user to most optimally convey to their interlocutor their own vision of a particular fragment of the environment. In speech, it appears to be realized in a diversity of its discourse variants which actualize it more or less comprehensively depending on the typicality of a situation.

References

1. Дружинин А. С. Английский перфект: понять и объяснить // Иностранные языки в школе. 2016. № 2. С. 49-53.
2. Дружинин А. С. К био-когнитивному осмыслению грамматики // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. Тамбов: Грамота, 2016. № 8 (62). Ч. 1. С. 110-112.
3. Дружинин А. С. Когнитивный подход к объяснению грамматики английского языка (на примере форм present perfect) // Интерактивный научно-методический журнал «Сообщество учителей английского языка». 2015. Т. 8. № 8-1.
4. Дружинин А. С. О статусе сослагательного наклонения в свете когнитивной лингвистики // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. Тамбов: Грамота, 2012. № 2 (13). С. 62-65.
5. Дружинин А. С. Прототипический анализ грамматических форм "present simple" и "present progressive" // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. Тамбов: Грамота, 2016. № 9 (63). Ч. 2. С. 91-93.
6. Крылова И. П. Сборник упражнений по грамматике английского языка. М.: Книжный дом Университет, 2007. 419 с.
7. Новиков Д. Н. Когнитивно-прагматические аспекты современной англистики и общего языкознания: материалы к спецкурсу. М.: МГИМО-Университет, 2007. 134 с.
8. Солсо Р. Когнитивная психология. СПб.: Питер, 2006. 589 с.
9. *Corpus of Contemporary American English* [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://corpus.byu.edu/coca/> (дата обращения: 31.08.2016).
10. *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* [Электронный ресурс]. URL: www.ldoceonline.com (дата обращения: 31.08.2016).

КОГНИТИВНО-ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИОННЫЙ АНАЛИЗ СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИХ ИНВАРИАНТОВ ГРАММАТИЧЕСКИХ КОНСТРУКЦИЙ «PRESENT SIMPLE» И «PRESENT PROGRESSIVE»

Дружинин Андрей Сергеевич, к. филол. н.

Московский государственный институт международных отношений (Университет) МИД России
andrey.druzhinin.89@mail.ru

Теория языковых прототипов как производных значений лексем и грамматических форм является перспективным вектором семантических исследований в рамках когнитивной лингвистики. В данной статье представлены результаты прототипического анализа грамматических конструкций «present simple» и «present progressive» на его когнитивно-интерпретационном этапе. В частности, на основе усредненного системно-языкового семантического инварианта автор описывает конкретные ситуативные смыслы 16 различных примеров анализируемых грамматических конструкций на материале англоязычного дискурса.

Ключевые слова и фразы: грамматический прототип; прототипическая семантика; семантический инвариант; видо-временные глагольные формы; когнитивная интерпретация; грамматическая форма «present simple»; грамматическая форма «present progressive».