

What “Cognitive Typology” can Reveal about East Asian Languages: Based on Cross- Linguistic and Applied Linguistic Data

Kaoru Horie

Nagoya University

East Asia (EA) hosts languages like Japanese, Korean, and Mandarin Chinese, that exhibit intriguing cross-linguistic structural variation (e.g. word order, morphological typological profile, honorification etc.) as well as commonality (e.g. lexicons with Sino-origin due to language contact). Cognitive Linguistics (CL) as an analytical framework has been applied successfully to these individual languages, as featured in this ICLC meeting (see also Horie 2000 & Horie and Sato 2001 for some earlier attempts). However, few systematic attempts have been made to uncover the similarities and differences between these languages in terms of their “cognitive underpinnings” (or cognitive styles), i.e. those factors pertaining to the native speakers’ construal of a state-of-affairs which arguably motivate the shape and use of grammatical-lexical resources employed in these languages as well the range of pragmatic functions served and disambiguated contextually.

In my talk I will first introduce, with some historical background, “(Applied) Cognitive Typology”, an analytical framework which aims at uncovering a possible correlation between the structural typological features of a language and its native speakers’ socio-cultural cognition (e.g. construal, inference, enrichment) as manifested in their language use. By combining insights of CL and those of Linguistic Typology, (Applied) Cognitive Typology addresses the following research questions:

- (I) How do languages of different typological profiles differ in terms of cognitive underpinnings (or cognitive styles) ?
- (II) How do cross-linguistically differential cognitive underpinnings of languages affect their native speaker’s L1 and L2 acquisition processes?

I will then introduce three (Applied) Cognitive Typological case studies which I have conducted with my collaborators Prashant Pardeshi, Luming Wang, and Ryan Spring. These case studies respectively explore differential cognitive underpinnings of EA (and other) languages from different angles by combining insights from CL and Linguistic Typology:

- (A) Passive Constructions in Japanese, Korean, Mandarin Chinese, English and some other Asian languages (cf. Pardeshi, Li, and Horie 2007; Horie 2007)

Based on cross-linguistic parallel corpus comparisons and a questionnaire survey, this case study (i) examines whether and to what extent languages employ passive constructions when they encode an event in which a

speaker is on the receiving end of another's action, and (ii) argues that subjectivity is a crucial factor in accounting for the cross-linguistic variation found.

(B) Noun-modifying Constructions in Japanese, Korean, and Mandarin Chinese, English and some other Asian languages (cf. Wang, Horie, and Pardeshi 2009; Horie, in press).

Based on a cross-linguistic parallel corpus comparison as well as a questionnaire survey, this case study (i) examines the range of functional domains over which a noun-modifying construction (including, but not limited to relative clause interpretation) is put to use, and (ii) finds that languages differ with respect to the extent of pragmatic enrichment (Ariel 2008) exercised in arriving at a pragmatically plausible interpretation.

(C) The L2 Acquisition of Motion Verbs of a Satellite-Framed Language (English) by Native Speakers of a Verb-Framed Language (Japanese) and an Equipollently-Framed Language (Mandarin Chinese) (cf. Horie and Ryan 2011)

Based on a cross-linguistic applied linguistic analysis of the acquisition process of English motion verbs by Japanese and Mandarin Chinese native speakers, this case study examines the extent to which languages of different 'framing' typological profiles facilitate their native speakers' acquisition of L2 when different from their L1.

In the early 2000s, collaboration between CL and Linguistic Typology was actively pursued, culminating in a series of important works, most notably, Croft (2001) (see also Talmy 2000, Kemmer 2003, Slobin 2004, Ikegami 2005). In 2000, the first international conference on "Cognitive Typology" was held in Antwerp, Belgium, featuring keynote speeches by Melissa Bowerman, Bill Croft, Suzanne Kemmer, and Chris Sinha. Unfortunately, the collaboration between these two disciplines hasn't seemed to advance much beyond the initial zeal, unlike, for instance, that between CL and Corpus Linguistics (Gries and Stefanowitsch 2006).

In view of recent growing interest in CL in EA countries, I would like to emphasize that there is much need for an analytical framework of (Applied) Cognitive Typology which addresses research questions such as (I) and (II). EA languages have different structural typological profiles (e.g. agglutinative & isolating morphology; case-marking by particles & word order instead of inflection; presence of subject- and addressee-honorification; ideographic & syllabary-based writing systems etc.) when contrasted with European languages, which have been a primary target of CL analysis. More importantly, EA languages are known to show a variety of semantic-pragmatic phenomena which arguably represent different "fashions of speaking" (Sapir 1912) and deserve serious CL attention, e.g. Situation Focus (instead of Person Focus) (Hinds 1986), Subjectivity-Prominence (Ikegami 2005), Topic Prominence (instead of Subject-Prominence), Argument Ellipsis, and

Preference for a Nominal-oriented Structure (Horie, in press). I hope that the fields of CL will be further enriched by (Applied) Cognitive Typological studies in typologically diverse languages including, but not limited to, EA languages.

References

- Ariel, Mira. 2008. *Pragmatics and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Croft, William. 2001. *Radical Construction Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gries, Stefan Th., and Anatol Stefanowitsch (ed.). 2006. *Corpora in Cognitive Linguistics. Corpus-Based Approaches to Syntax and Lexis*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Hinds, John. 1986. *Situation vs. Person Focus*. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.
- Horie, Kaoru (ed.). 2000. *Complementation: Cognitive and Functional Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Horie, Kaoru. 2007. Subjectification and Intersubjectification in Japanese: A Comparative-Typological Perspective. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*. 8.2, 311-323.
- Horie, Kaoru. In press. Versatility of Nominalizations: Where Japanese and Korean Contrast. In: Yap, Foong Ha et al. (eds.), *Nominalization: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*, Vol.2, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 473-496
- Horie, Kaoru, and Sato, Shigeru (eds.) 2001. *Cognitive-Functional Linguistics in an East Asian Context*. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.
- Horie, Kaoru, and Spring Ryan. ms. Applied Cognitive Typology: A Study of the L2 Acquisition of A Satellite-Framed Language by Native Speakers of Mandarin Chinese and Japanese.
- Ikegami, Yoshihiko. 2005. Indices of a 'Subjectivity-Prominent' Language: Between Cognitive Linguistics and Linguistic Typology. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 3, 132-164.
- Kemmer, Susanne. 2003. Human Cognition and the Elaboration of Events. In: Tomasello, Michael. (ed.) 2003. *The New Psychology of Language*. Vol. 2. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 89-118.
- Prashant, Pardeshi, Qing-Mei Li, and Kaoru Horie. 2007. Being on the Receiving End: A Tour into Linguistic Variation. In: Matsumoto, Yoshiko et al. (eds.), *Diversity in Language: Perspectives and Implications*. Stanford, CA: CSLI, 131-166.
- Sapir, Edward. 1921. *Language*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Slobin, Dan I. 2004. The Many Ways to Search for a Frog. Linguistic Typology and Expressions of Motion Events. In: Stromqvist, Sven, and Ludoth Verhoeven (eds.) *Relating Events in Narrative. Typological and Contextual Perspectives*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 219-257.
- Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Towards a Cognitive Semantics*. 2vols. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wang, Luming, Kaoru Horie, and Prashant Pardeshi. 2009. Toward a Functional Typology of Noun Modifying Constructions in Japanese and Chinese: A Corpus-Based Account. In: Inagaki Shunji et al. (eds.) *Studies in Language Sciences* 8. Tokyo: Kurosio publishers, 213-228.