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                 *Frames and modality: the case of obligation* | Room 1.33      |
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                 *Les banlieues explosent: metaphors as framing devices in the French suburban crisis coverage* | Room 1.33      |
| 12:30-13:00   | Dominik Lukes (East Anglia)      ।  
                 *Frame negotiation: from discourse strategies to conceptual structures* | Room 1.33      |
| 13:00-14:00   | Lunch                            | Room 4.07      |
| 14:00-14:30   | Katherine Hrisunopulo            ।  
                 *From case frames to higher-order structures in the meaning of the grammatical auxiliary: The case of future will* | Room 1.33      |
| 14:30-15:00   | Hilde Hanegreefs (Lessius/Leuven)  
                 *Where frame semantics meets construction grammar: the case of Spanish* *escrutar*  
                 and *escudriñar* (‘to scrutinize’) | Room 1.33      |
| 15:00-15:30   | Heidi Verplaetse (Lessius/Leuven)  
                 *You want to be careful: a constructional blend as the sole emerging modal, or shifting frames?* | Room 1.33      |
| 15:30-16:00   | Josef Ruppenhofer & Laura A. Michaelis (Universität des Saarlandes/Colorado at Boulder)  
                 *Frames predict null-complement interpretations* | Room 1.33      |
| 16:00-16:30   | Coffee break                    | Room 4.07      |
| 16:30-17:30   | **Keynote lecture 2** Mirjam Fried  
                 (Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague)  
                 *Constructions and frames as interpretive clues* | Room 1.33      |
| 19:00         | Conference dinner               | Horta – Grand Café – Hopland 2 – 2000 Antwerp |

*A 10 minute walk from Lessius  
> Lessius turn right > Nationalestraat turn left (direction of the cathedral) > at Groenplaats turn right Schoenmarkt  
> continue Meirbrug > continue Meir (main pedestrian street)  
> about 300 m > turn right Wapper > cross Schuttershofstraat  
> Horta right at the corner  
should you lose your way, look and ask for Rubenshuis (Ruben’s House)*
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When the Lexicon Isn’t Enough: Meaning Structures in FrameNet and the Constructicon

Hans C. Boas
University of Texas at Austin (USA)
hcb@mail.utexas.edu

Levin (1993) claims that, for the most part, syntactic subcategorization can be predicted from the meaning of verbs. Following this line of research, a number of other analyses use class membership to explain a verb’s range of argument realization, most notably projectionist approaches (e.g., Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1998, Levin and Rappaport Hovav 2005) and constructional approaches (e.g., Goldberg 1995, 2002).

This paper argues that the ways in which verb classes and grammatical constructions have traditionally been defined should be reconsidered, because they do not always yield the types of predictions about argument realization in a range of grammatical constructions. The argument will move along these lines: First, I give an overview of how verb classes are used in different frameworks to determine a verb’s ability to occur in argument alternations. Second, I discuss some general problems with the concept of semantic verb classes in these approaches. Third, I argue that an alternative way of defining verb classes more precisely necessitates the incorporation of frame semantic descriptions (Fillmore 1982, Boas 2006/2008). Adopting Snell-Hornby’s (1983) notion of verb descriptivity I propose that more fine-grained verb classes allow us to identify those aspects of verb meaning that are grammatically relevant. Next, I offer a number of steps for incorporating such information in FrameNet annotations (Fillmore et al. 2003), thereby extending FrameNet coverage to also include descriptions of grammatical constructions. Finally, I present an outline of how to account for parallels between verbal meanings and constructional meanings in an extended version of FrameNet, also know as the “Constructicon” (Fillmore 2008).


CONSTRUCTIONS AND FRAMES AS INTERPRETIVE CLUES
Mirjam Fried
Academy of Sciences, Prague (Czech Republic)
fried@uej.cas.cz

As has been increasingly acknowledged in grammaticalization research, the dynamic and gradient nature of linguistic structure calls for an approach that can treat grammatical knowledge as the result of a gradual conventionalization of patterns of understanding, in which morpho-semantic structure, syntactic function, communicative function, and lexical meaning form an integrated whole (i.e., constructions in the sense of Construction Grammar). However, the nature and details of the integration and its manifestations in the emergence of new linguistic structure have remained largely unaddressed. The central concern of this talk is to draw attention to this neglected dimension of constructional analyses, by examining the role of constructions and frames as sources of interpretive clues in spontaneous discourse. In particular, I will show that the emergence of certain discourse-sensitive grammatical patterns can be systematically captured by appealing to an intricate interaction between fairly abstract constructional meanings based on metonymic transfer, lexical meanings of words (‘semantic’ frames), and particular discourse-pragmatic functions (‘discourse’ frames, understood as pragmatically grounded schematizations of communicative and discourse-structure conventions). It is the knowledge of all three dimensions that aids speakers in their interpretive tasks. The theoretical issues will be demonstrated on a subset of discourse-functional and modal uses of the word *jestli* ‘if/whether’ in conversational Czech, as attested in the Czech National Corpus.

DISCOURSE PATTERNS AS FRAMES
Jan-Ola Östman
University of Helsinki (Finland)
Jan-ola.ostman@helsinki.fi

I take the notion of Frame to be the central concept in a theory of understanding, and I see Frame Semantics as a complement of equal status (as a sister theory) to Construction Grammar, where – in turn – the notion of Construction is the central concept. I see both Construction Grammar and Frame Semantics as applicable not only to “sentence-level” phenomena, but to discourse more generally.

In my presentation I want to address the question of how we understand a piece of discourse in relation to frames. I want to explore the possibility of seeing the function of a piece of discourse as interpretable (i.e. understandable) in relation to socio-cognitively structured frames of experiences, beliefs, or practices. Such frames can be explicated as abstract discourse patterns that we make use of as resources for communication.

PUPIL: CAN I HAVE A PAIR OF SCISSORS, SIR?
TEACHER: PARLE FRANÇAIS.
PUPIL: BUT IT’S NOT NINE O’CLOCK YET, SIR.
Stef Slembrouck
University of Ghent (Belgium)
stef.slembrouck@ugent.be

In this paper, I will concentrate on the notion of “frame” and its attendant concepts of “frame layers”, “key” and “footing”. I will begin by suggesting a particular scope for frame analysis founded in the interactional imperatives of “co-presence”. For this, I will draw on data instances which exemplify the full extent to which frame analysis invites an interactional perspective which locates firmly aspects of language use and social experience in both a spatio-temporal and a behavioural context.

In the second part of my presentation I will argue that the (re)discovery of a richer reading of Goffman’s programme is by no means accidental: the notion of “frame” puts spatial analysis in the foreground and this harmonizes well with recent work on the constituents of multilingual practice in the context of globalization and contemporary migration. I will seek to demonstrate that analyses of multilingual encounters can be enriched considerably by frame analysis, while the very insights obtained in this way also invite one in some respects to move “beyond” Goffman’s programme towards a realistic sociology of language contact in late Modernity.
PAPER PRESENTATIONS

FRAMES, LEADERSHIP, AND MANAGING MEANING
Jonathan Clifton
University of Lille (France)
jonathan.clifton@hotmail.fr

To paraphrase Goffman (1974: 14), framing is about rendering what would otherwise be a meaningless event into something that is meaningful. Social constructionist-oriented researchers from the field of organizational studies (notably, Fairhurst and Sarr 1996) have linked the ability to frame events in a convincing way to notions of leadership. From this perspective, leaders are those who gain most influence in the process of framing events and so emerge as managers of meaning. However, despite this observation, there have been few studies that seek to provide a fine-grained analysis of the doing of leadership in terms of gaining most influence in the process of framing an event. Using discourse psychology (Potter 1996) as a research methodology and audio-taped data of naturally-occurring interaction taken from a meeting in a British government organization that manages cultural events, this paper seeks to provide a turn-by-turn analysis of the process of doing leadership through framing. More specifically, this paper analyses the in situ negotiation of competing frames that were used to assess the political suitability of a film about chemical weapons in Iraq and asylum seeker dispersal programs which was due to be screened on the eve of the US-led invasion of Iraq in 2003. Findings from this paper indicate how leadership is not the possession of any one participant in a meeting but is a fluid social process in which, amongst other things, the frames used to assess events are negotiated. Further, results demonstrate how, contrary to popular notions of individual heroic leaders, leadership can be a shared phenomenon. This paper also explicates how leadership is not necessarily commensurate with hierarchy and how it can be challenged through the deployment of different frames. Finally, the paper also looks at how leadership is achieved through acquiescence to the deployment of more convincing frames and thus it offers insights into ‘followership’ which is the often forgotten reverse side of leadership.

The Framing Function of Spanish *ya*

Nicole Delbecque

University of Leuven (Belgium)

nicole.delbecque@arts.kuleuven.be

The aim is to offer a unitary explanation of the meaning and uses of the Spanish marker *ya*. This particle alternately translates as ‘already’, ‘o.k.’, ‘well’, ‘now’, ‘yeah’, or nothing. The existing descriptions are fragmentary and lack explanatory power (e.g. García Fernández 1999, Garrido Medina 1992, Girón Alconchel 1991, Kovacci 1999, Ocampo & Ocampo 2000, Resano 2000, Martín Zorraquino & Portolés Lázaro 1999).

Unlike the usual deictic markers, *ya* does not situate events, relations, entities or attributes by mapping them onto an objective socio-physical or temporal axis. It rather gives them a dynamic orientation by mapping them onto a programmatic base, often a cyclic one. While making the sequence it punctuates stand out against the surrounding ones, it at the same time converts it into a stage within a larger action or event chain. Beyond its anchoring function as grounding predication (cf. Langacker 1987, 1991, 2000), *ya* puts into play a programmatic base, conceived of as a conceptual frame. It is therefore best analyzed as a meta-linguistic focus marker that influences the conceptualization of the underlying base: it acknowledges progression within a process conceived of as globally oriented.

Either as autonomous utterance or as part of a larger one (e.g. *Ya nos vamos ‘We’re about to leave now’*), *ya* punctuates the flow of discourse to make it more dynamic and more coherent altogether. Its interaction with the surrounding speech elements and contextual factors, e.g. intonation, event structure, discourse topic, setting, idealized cognitive models (ICMs), etc., makes it difficult to sort out what its proper contribution is. My hypothesis, however, is that there is a common denominator to the array of apparently quite different uses. To account for it, the notion of framing (cf. Goffman 1974, Fillmore 1985) has to be added to the profile/base distinction (cf. Langacker 2003). The most representative uses will be commented upon in the light of the definition of *ya* as dynamic framing device. It will be shown that without *ya* the context ceases to evoke progression on a programmatic base.

In oral speech, *ya* is typically used to frame perception and propositional attitude predicates. In written language, it contributes to the framing of discourse structure at various levels of organization, especially when it comes to reflect the intertwining of parallel scenarios. The subjective perspective manifested by *ya* primarily relates to the course of time – the universal programmatic base *par excellence* -; however, it also expresses more sophisticated time managing capacities and the specific mental ability of bridging gaps in linguistic representation. This will be illustrated by means of examples drawn from the literary texts mentioned below.

**References**


Literary sources:
MARTÍN GAITE, Carmen (199) Cuéntame, Espasa Calpe, Madrid.
FRAMES AND MODALITY: THE CASE OF OBLIGATION  
Gregory Furmaniak  
Université Paris Sorbonne-Nouvelle (France)  
furmaniak.gregory@neuf.fr

The aim of this paper is to demonstrate the applicability of the notion of frame in the semantic treatment of modality, and more particularly, of obligation. Semantic descriptions of this notion (cf. Tregidgo 1982, Perkins 1984) are often incomplete in that they fail to include certain components which are essential to the understanding of utterances expressing obligation.  
Talmy 2000 and Radden & Dirven 2007 provide the most complete semantic description of this modal category. They do so by appealing more or less directly to the notion of frame. Although these works are clearly on the right track, we claim that the descriptions they propose are still defective. In particular, they leave out one essential semantic component of the Obligation frame, namely, the Agonist’s expected acceptance to comply.

Relying on (i) the literature on modality, (ii) an ontological analysis of obligation and (iii) a detailed examination of linguistic data (which give access to ICMs; cf. Langacker 1987), we propose that the Obligation frame (or script, as it unfolds in time) contains the following elements:

(a) The deontic source (who lays the obligation on the agonist)  
(b) The agonist (who is obliged to act)  
(c) The obligatory event  
(d) The deontic source’s desire that the event (as well as other intermediary events) be realized  
(e) The source’s (and cognizer’s) expectation that the agonist will comply  
1. The purpose of obligation (You must go to bed, or else you’ll be tired = in order not to be tired)  
(f) The obliging event (the psychosocial event of exerting pressure on the agonist)  
(g) The agonist’s initial unwillingness to comply  
(h) The agonist’s acceptance to act  
(i) The resulting action  
(j) The resulting state

Apart from (a) and (b) which denote the participants in the Obligation script, every item here corresponds to some kind of event, mostly mental events. This makes it difficult to pin down the structure of the frame and to formalize it. Indeed, at least three phases may be distinguished: (i) pre-modal, from (d) to (f), (ii) modal, (g) and (h) and (iii) post-modal, from (i) to (k). Note however that (iii) is only potential (although expected) and is not required for the obliging event to actually take place.

To formalize this complex script, we shall use the concept of causative chain. We shall eventually put this model to the test by applying it to the various deontic uses of English modal must as in:

(1) You must go to bed now!  
(2) In France, people must carry their ID all the time.  
(3) The candidate must be over 18.  
(4) Why must you have done that?

Our conclusion will be that the script we have proposed satisfactorily accounts for those uses which correspond to the profiling of – and focalizing on – different parts of the frame. The role of perspective will also be emphasized.


— — —. (to be published) « Cognitive Semantics : an Overview » in Maienborn et al. (eds.) Handbook of Semantics. Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter.


While originally only applied to lexemes (frames of semantic knowledge), frame semantics has been expanded to grammatical constructions and has more or less been integrated into construction grammar.

In the study of the semantic field of visual perception I have come across a large variety of lexemes used to denote visual sensations and acts, which can all be ‘framed’ in a different way, evoking different conceptualizations of active and passive perception. Escutar and escudriñar (‘to scrutinize’) is one such pair of verbs that, although traditionally seen as synonyms, can be differentiated on the basis of a number of semantic and syntactic features. While Spanish dictionaries and even the database ADESSE (similar to the Spanish FrameNet) fail to account for the differences between these two less frequent verbs of visual perception, I will show that, in spite of their etymological relation, escutar and escudriñar function as two sides of the same coin. More specifically, an in depth corpus analysis will show that escutar and escudriñar entail a difference in point of view that can be captured by the “objective” vs. “subjective” contrast in the sense of “depending on the object, as opposed to the subject”.

By stating that escutar has an objective point of view, whereas escudriñar expresses a subjective point of view, I mean that the act of escutar concentrates on and is determined by the object of perception that limits the physical boundaries of perception. Escudriñar, on the contrary, highlights the subject of perception, i.e. the observer. This observer interprets his/her visual input and imposes his/her view on the object of perception.

The general concepts of ‘objectivity’ and ‘subjectivity’ encompass more specific perceptual modalities, which can be situated at four levels: (i) the presence vs. absence of expectations; (ii) direct vs. indirect access to the object of perception; (ii) the immanence vs. transcendence of the gaze; and (iv) the attitude of the subject of perception.

A detailed lexico-constructional analysis of the corpus will discuss the contextual elements, such as the type of direct object or the presence of adjuncts or subordinate clauses, etc. that helped me reveal the meaningful differences between escutar and escudriñar.

On a larger scale, this study is to be situated within the framework of Cognitive Grammar. Unlike traditional grammar, Cognitive Grammar claims that semantics is not to be studied separately from the other components of language (e.g. syntax, morphology, pragmatics). Instead, cognitivists emphasize the link between form and meaning, i.e. they start from the premise that lexi-co-semantic properties can be induced from syntactic behavior.


Corpus: CREA, Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual; http://www.rae.es

Electronic databases:
ADESSE: https://webs.uvigo.es/adesse
THE IMAGES OF GOD AND MAN IN INTERACTION: POSITIONING AND DEGREE OF EXPLICITATION IN SPANISH AND DUTCH BIBLICAL TRANSLATIONS OF PSALMS

Joni Heirbaut
University of Leuven (Belgium)
joni.heirbaut@arts.kuleuven.be

By means of a comparative study, we want to examine how the images of God and man are established in function of one another, in a selection of two types of Old-Testament Psalms, in modern Spanish and Dutch Bible translations. The POSITIONING and the DEGREE OF EXPLICITATION of the participants ‘God’ and ‘Man’ will be analyzed in function of a series of syntactic, semantic and discourse parameters. These parameters will allow us to find out (i) which frames (cfr. for example FrameNet, cfr. FILLMORE et al. 2003) are evoked, (ii) how the images of God and man are profiled therein and (iii) how the different languages, translations and types of psalms involved can account for fluctuations in the profile differences.

The study can be considered innovative in various respects: (i) by the comparison of Bible translations in two languages, (ii) the priority given to linguistic parameters and (iii) the focus on the participants ‘God’ and ‘Man’. So far, studies of the chosen texts have been situated mainly in the domains of theology and hermeneutics and secondly in the domains of literary studies, historiological and sociological studies, text critique and philology (cfr. among others: VON RAD 1978, CRENSHAW 1981, 2001, ALONSO-SCHÖKEL & SICRE DIAZ 1982, ALONSO-SCHÖKEL & CARNITI 1993, TÁBET 2007).

Firstly, we will identify the (nuclear and peripheral) constituents that refer to the participants ‘God’ and ‘Man’ within the totality of the valency realizations (cfr. GARCÍA-MIGUEL 2007, VATER 2003, ÁGEL 1995) of the verbal clause constructions contained in the corpus. Secondly, the DISTRIBUTION of their syntactic positions will be established, focusing on the relative FREQUENCY of the forms referring to the two participants. Thirdly, the LEXICAL EXPRESSIONS of the participants will be encoded, as well as the SEMANTIC ROLES (cfr. DELBECQUE et al. 2002; HALLIDAY & MAITTHIESSEN 2004; LANGACKER 1987) they fulfill and the DISCOURSE ROLES of addressee and addressee they take on in the interaction (cfr. JAKOBSON 1971).

The corpus consists of three salmos de suplicación individual, psalms of individual supplication, (Psalms 18, 27, 51; 86 verses) and three salmos de confianza, psalms of trust, (Psalms 23, 62, 91; 35 verses) (cfr. TÁBET 2007: 106-115). Central to these psalms is the direct communication between 'God' and 'Man' and the expression of a high degree of confidentiality. The choice of two modern translations of the Bible per language (Spanish: Biblia de Jerusalén (1998) and Dios Habla Hoy (2002); Dutch: the Willibrordbijbel (1995) and De Nieuwe Bijbelvertaling (2004)), based on the source texts, makes it possible to conduct the study in a synchronic perspective and from an intra- and interlingual point of view. For each language, we turn to a frequently used translation within mainly catholic circles and to a recent, interconfessional translation that conforms to the Guidelines for Interconfessional Cooperation in Translating the Bible (Rome, 1987).

The hypothesis to be tested is that ‘Man’ will more easily be found in the position of object and associated with the roles of ‘patient’ and ‘addressee’, whereas ‘God’ will rather take on the subject position and the roles of ‘agent’ and ‘addressee’. The latter will be profiled throughout a larger and more varied set of descriptive and direct expressions; the former however will be represented in a rather limited and indirect way. Beyond the overall tendencies, which are expected to be similar from one subcorpus to the other, statistical fluctuations may arise. The latter are to be accounted for by invoking the differences between the languages, the translations and the selected psalm types.


Case frames as content structures underlying lexical meanings of verbs (Fillmore 1968) have received considerable attention in the literature on auxiliation. Such frames (in a number of cases reinterpreted in terms of event or propositional schemas) are taken as starting points for the development of auxiliaries' temporal, aspectual, modal and epistemic meanings (Heine 1993; Heine, Kuteva 2002; Kuteva 2001). This supposition, however, is not entirely unproblematic with some uses of grammatical auxiliaries, for instance, future will in the following examples: (1) I hope the situation will improve (vs. improves); (2) Oil will float (vs. floats) on water. The volition schema 'X wants Y' which, according to Heine (1993: 31, 35), bears directly on the use of will as an auxiliary could hardly fully motivate the verb's occurrence in either (1) or (2).

The present paper aims to reveal those facets in the meanings of grammatical auxiliaries which are correlated with, rather than directly derived from, respective lexical verbs' case frames and which could account for uses of auxiliaries in cases like (1) and (2). To this end, the paper considers auxiliaries' functional properties at higher levels of semantic organization, namely, (i) indication of schematic process (Langacker 1990: 83 - 85) at the level of finite clause; (ii) (a potential for) indication of viewpoint (Simpson 1993) at the level of utterance. With reference to these properties there are grounds to suppose that though desemanticization of case frames is an important parameter in auxiliation (Heine, Miyashita 2008), this parameter is closely related to a higher-level semantic process, namely, an auxiliary's strengthening as a clausal head (with processual implications) and as a marker of viewpoint (or perspective) in the utterance.

In what follows, the paper substantiates the formulated supposition, focusing on the auxiliary will and using a corpus of 250 examples extracted from English literary texts. It is suggested that, semantically, the addition of will to the infinitival complement brings about, in a relatively discrete fashion, the connotation of the following: (a) schematic volition schema (or frame); (b) conceptualizer's presence (indicated due to subjectification in the sense of Langacker (2000, ch. 10)); (c) schematic process; (d) experiential perspective on the infinitival event. Further analysis reveals that connotations (c) and (d), presenting higher-order structures in the meaning of will, play a communicatively dominating role in utterances like (1) and (2) respectively. The paper discusses how the higher-order connotations correlate with the other ones to produce, firstly, the sense that the subject's referent is being dynamically oriented towards the infinitival event in (1), and, secondly, -generic and/or habitual senses (with both will and would) in cases like (2). It is also shown how the analyzed connotations of will relate to the verb's epistemic value which, as suggested in Brisard (1997), is that of prediction (or projection) on the basis of given premises.

Results of the proposed study carry implications for a comprehensive account of semantic changes in auxiliation which involve, at the outset, an interplay of case frames and higher-level semantic structures.


One of the points of convergence for most cognitively-minded treatments of language today seems to be the concept of "frame". It appears in cognitive linguistics as well as other branches of language study in a variety of guises. Fillmore first used it to investigate the semantics of lexical items which was later extended by Lakoff into the concept of Idealized Cognitive Models. Some aspects of frames appear in the idea of "domain" as used by the conceptual metaphor theory. Frame-like constructs also come up in theories of online processing of language. In that case, they are referred to as 'mental models', 'spaces', or 'scenarios'. Although probably the most complete treatment of the phenomenon was given by Lakoff (1987) under the label of Idealized Cognitive Models, the term "frame" has received much attention in both more recent theorizing and popular treatments. I prefer to use 'frame' because of the similarities it allows us to observe with other areas of linguistics that have so far stayed out of the cognitive-linguistic fold. The term itself was first introduced by the ethnomethodologist Erving Goffman in 1975 and it has remained popular ever since in fields such as conversation analysis (Tannen 1993) and anthropology (Strauss and Quinn 1997). In particular, conversation analysis, and discourse analysis in general, have much to offer to the cognitive linguistic enterprise with their emphasis on longer stretches of language than simply the phrase or sentence which are the mainstays of most, though by no means all, cognitive linguistic investigations at present.

Conceptual frames have been studied in all possible contexts from phonology or morphology to syntax or semantics. However, most of these studies have been concerned with the unconscious processing of frames both online and off-line (i.e. long-term entrenchment within the conceptual system). While that is of course of immense and immediate interests to cognitive science, it has led us to neglect some of the more overt aspects of frames can in daily discourse. Frames are not merely some lexeme-like constructs stored within the brain, they are actively negotiated in the course of meaning creation, which after all is the cornerstone of language processing as viewed through the spectacles of cognitive linguistics. Frame negotiation is not a simple process, and neither does it subject itself to a unified analysis. On one hand, it could be said to be a type of conceptual integration, however, these processes are not well enough understood to be able to shed light on the phenomenon without insights from fields dealing with the pragmatic context of speech. But viewing frame negotiation simply as a pragmatic discourse strategy is not sufficient, either. Only a combination of these approaches can bring satisfactory results.

In this paper, I will demonstrate how frame negotiation occurs in both public and private discourse on a variety of examples. I will then show what cognitive and discursive processes are involved in frame negotiation and how their study can elucidate some issues faced by blending theory and construction grammar on the one hand, and political applications of frame analysis, on the other. Moreover, I will present the claim that frame negotiation is more common than it might appear at first glance. In fact, it is possible that our account of conceptual structures can only be complete if we take the negotiation of frames of reference into consideration. As an added bonus, this approach will serve to bring cognitive linguistics closer with discourse analysis (cf. attempts by Werth 1999, Langacker 2001) which is likely to be as beneficial as its encounters with cognitive psychology and ethnography.
Through an analysis of the metaphors that were used in the French written press during the ‘suburban riots’ of 2005, this paper aims to offer a linguistic contribution to studies that examine the French media’s representations of the suburbs, their inhabitants, and their problems (cf. a.o. Boyer & Lochard, 1998; Peralva & Macé, 2002; Djordjević, 2007). The research is based on a corpus consisting of all the crisis-related articles that were published in four French newspapers (Le Figaro, Le Monde, Libération et L’Humanité), in the period of October-November 2005.

Ever since Lakoff and Johnson (1980) introduced their Conceptual Metaphor Theory, metaphors have been seen as important framing devices (cf. a.o. Lakoff, 2004; Chilton, 2004; Van Gorp, 2006): as metaphor involves constructing one conceptual domain in terms of another, the choice of the latter (or source domain) affects how the former (or target domain) is represented. As Lakoff and Johnson (1980) put it, by evoking certain frames, metaphors ‘highlight’ some aspects of the target domain, while ‘hiding’ others. Indeed, a journalist that frames the suburban riots in terms of a ‘contagious disease’ (cf. (1)) makes a particular image of the rioters available to the reader.

(1) *Emeutes : Paris se protège de la contagion.* (‘Riots: Paris is protecting itself against the contagion.’) (Le Figaro, 12 November 2005)

On the one hand, this paper will show that, in line with the findings of Conceptual Metaphor Theory, the notion of ‘framing’ is useful for analyzing metaphors as well as for indicating their constructive force, as is already illustrated by example (1). Indeed, as my data will show, journalists often frame the same events differently by using different metaphors, thus offering a different representation of the same facts to the readers. On the other hand, however, this paper will defend the idea that an analysis of metaphors in terms of frames does not always suffice and needs to be complemented. Following a recent strand in metaphor studies that shows an increasing awareness of the importance of studying metaphors as linguistic and discursive phenomena (cf. Cameron, 2003; Charteris-Black, 2004; Semino, 2008) and inspired by Barsalou’s (1983) notion of *ad hoc concepts* and its recent use in Relevance Theory (Wilson & Carston, 2006), I will claim that a pragmatic and context-oriented metaphor approach has to be adopted to account for the nuances and emotive/evaluative associations metaphors are able to convey, since the (linguistic and extra-linguistic) context of the metaphorical expression often leads to the exploitation of different nuances of the suggested frame. More specifically, this paper will show how the four studied newspapers, though often making use of the same frames (via metaphors of war, fire, epidemics,…), generally offer a different view on the crisis, thus indicating the important nuancing role the co- and context have for the interpretation of metaphors.

In sum, by investigating figurative language in media discourse, this paper illustrates how a multi-disciplinary analytical perspective, combining elements of a pragmatic-based theory with useful elements of Conceptual Metaphor Theory, may contribute to the understanding of the complex nature of metaphor in discourse.

Lakoff, George, 2004, *Don’t think of an elephant! Know your values and frame the debate*, Vermont, Chelsea Green Publishing.
In this paper collocation extraction is focused as instrumental to frame description. Repetitiveness in word co-selection and co-occurrence is seen as factual evidence of what is typical and routine in language use and makes it possible to investigate the frames evoked by individuals and shared by their linguistic community.

Under this perspective reference is made to Firthian and Neofirthian approach on the one hand and to Minsky’s and Fillmore’s studies on the other to note the common elements that can be identified in the collocation description and in frame elements identification.

In Firth’s contextual meaning theory, the term collocation is systematically introduced to denote recurrent or “habitual” word combinations where words are “mutually expectant and mutually prehended”. It is emphasised the role of contextual relations in the constitution of a word meaning.

Minsky is referred to for his description of the notion of frames as associated to stereotyped situations. According to Minsky, the “top levels of a frame are fixed and represent things that are always true about the supposed situation”. At the lower levels the structure of frames may be well represented in terms of terminals, fillers and default values. Default values are described as loosely attached to their terminals. They can be replaced by new items that “fit better” the new situation.

In Fillmore’s approach the epistemic links that connect a term with a set of beliefs are structured by a general knowledge frame that serves as a set of default assumptions for the term understanding. Frame core elements are seen as normal, “persisting” part of a frame. They coexist with optional, non-persisting elements. Frames are described as frameworks of concepts or terms which are linked together as a system and give structure or coherence on aspects of human experience. They contribute to define the role concepts evoked by linguistic forms to which they are conventionally associated and constitute the underlying, implicit, conceptual structures invoked by individuals.

A word’s meaning is understood with reference to a structured background of experience, beliefs or practices which are made accessible through culturally shared cognitive schemata. A common ground can be found in the elements occurring in the description of collocations, on the one hand, and in the characterizing aspects of frame description, on the other. Conventionality, repetitiveness, and shared experience seem to result as common characterizing aspects.

To illustrate these views some case studies are presented considering some concordances in a synchronic corpus of written Italian – CORIS/CODIS, a120-million word reference corpus – and in a diachronic one – DiaCORIS. Both i) words with little or no semantic ambiguity; and ii) polysemous words with a high degree of semantic ambiguity structure will be examined.

Interestingly, the polysemy of the word is disambiguated by the representation of its collocates. Their constellation contributes to distinguish its different meanings and to pair a word with just one of its meanings. Collocates result to pave the way to capture the links connecting lexical units and the frames they evoke. In Fillmore’s terms, lexical units are distinguished and identified.
Frames Predict Null-Complement Interpretations
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When and why do speakers leave semantic roles unspoken? Since Fillmore's seminal 1986 work on lexically licensed null complements in English, scholars have turned increasingly toward single-factor explanations, in particular, recoverability of the unstated argument (Resnik 1993, Goldberg 2006) and Aktionsart of the licensing verb (Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998, Wright & Levin 2000). But these explanations are undermined by the very idiosyncrasies that Fillmore emphasized: lexical differences (nearly synonymous predicators like eat and devour differentially allow omission of the theme argument), interpretive differences (e.g., I know Ø has an anaphoric null argument while I was eating Ø an existential one) and effects of constructional context (e.g., verbs that disallow null complements when interpreted episodically allow them in generic/habitual contexts: She impresses Ø every time).

The nonuniformity of null complementation (NC) phenomena suggests that gaining predictive power in this domain requires a suite of narrow-scope generalizations. Using data from the British National Corpus (BNC), we suggest one such generalization, based on the frame-semantic categories of NC-licensing predicators: if two or more verbs belong to the same FrameNet frame (in terms of Johnson et al. 2002) and license the omission of a particular frame element (FE), the interpretation type of the omitted FE is the same for all such predicators. For example, among lexical units in the Arriving frame (e.g., approach, arrive, come, enter, return), some allow omission of the Goal FE, under anaphoric interpretation (1), while others (e.g. reach, get) do not (2). However, no lexical unit allows omission of the Goal under existential interpretation (3):

(1) We arrived (in Sydney) at eight in the morning.
(2) Our last stop before we reached *(Sydney) was Canberra.
(3) #A: Bill just told me he arrived. B: Oh where? A: I don’t know, somewhere.

We demonstrate both the robustness of this implicational regularity and the motivated nature of exceptions. As an example of the later, consider the Quitting (a job) frame, expressed by verbs like resign and step down. These verbs omit the Employer FE under anaphoric interpretation (as in, e.g., I quit). The verb retire, however, omits the Employer FE only under an existential interpretation, as in, e.g., My dad will retire soon. We account for the exceptional behavior of retire by proposing that it, unlike other lexical units in the Quitting frame, entails that the Employee has undergone a permanent status change: s/he is no longer in the labor market. Crucially, we note, this focus on the current status of a participant (rather than on the precipitating event) also motivates the following omission, licensed by the existential perfect construction (Goldberg 2005): This lion has killed Ø before. By having killed, the lion has acquired the status of dangerous animal. Thus, the resultant state entailment, whether constructional or lexical, overrides the interpretive bias imposed by membership in a particular FrameNet frame.

We argue that our frame-level generalization is preferable to single-factor explanations based on lexical aspect or selectional restrictions, while capturing the regularities that motivate such analyses: lexical units that share a frame also tend to share selectional restrictions and Aktionsart class. At the same time, the frame-based generalization avoids the over- and undergeneralizations that result from tying the NC affordance to a single semantic/pragmatic feature. For example, as shown by Ruppenhofer (2005), the verb devein combines with just one second argument (shrimp), which, despite its manifest recoverability, is not omissible: *They deveined all night. Thus, one cannot equate an argument’s predictability with omissibility, as per Resnik. We propose instead that the behavior of devein follows from its membership in the removal frame, which prohibits null instantiation of the source argument. In sum, just as Sullivan (2007) demonstrates that frames constrain the metaphorical interpretations of the lexical units in them, we suggest that a predicator’s frame membership determines much of its combinatoric and interpretive behavior.
MODELLING INSTRUMENTAL ROLES IN CAUSAL USING EVENTS: A CONCEPTUAL STUDY ON TITLES OF MEDICAL JOURNALS

Paul Sambre & Cornelia Wermuth
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TOPIC – This paper provides a detailed description of the instrumental role in conceptualized events which cause states to transform or inchoative events to occur as in FrameNet (Ruppenhofer et al. 2006) or perform actions as in WordNet 3.0. In cognitive grammar (Langacker 2008) instrumentals are considered part of a causal process (Talmy 2000), an idea which is to be integrated in FrameNet’s description of causation as a cause-effect event or state-of-affairs an actor is a participant in on the one hand, and, on the other, in the using scenario as an action leading to a purpose. In this respect, we integrate descriptive cognitive linguistics (Nuopponen 2008) into FrameNet and look for ontological modelling applications.

THEME – Medical journal titles are discursive subgenres in which medical doctors retrieve treatment methods for diseases. These titles reflect causal chains by linking treatments and their effect(s) on patient states. We analyze instrumentals in titles of medical journals concerning different subdisciplines, like microsurgery, cardiology or dermatology.

CORPUS – In this paper, we extend our analysis to 150 specialized English titles taking into consideration the subdiscipline variation mentioned before. Particular attention goes to part-of-speech variation and syntactic patterns for instrumentals. Our corpus-based approach deals with authentic expert language.

RESULTS – We provide patterns for instrumentality in causality, which raise three issues.

1. Instrumentality is distributed over different entity classes (Schalley 2007) beyond the exclusive prepositional syntagms assumed by case grammar or Wordnet (Fellbaum 1998).
2. Instrumental subtypes are linked to the ontology of particular medical subdisciplines, with their respective treatment typologies.

This analysis offers a twofold advantage.

1. On the descriptive level, instrumental relations can be related to conceptual causal templates for linking one or more correlated simultaneous or subsequent medical treatments to medical solutions.
2. On the theoretical level, we try to integrate FrameNet’s characterization of “causation” and “using” in terms of a “purpose” in terms of language for general purpose by means of Langacker’s action chains as applied to expert language.

Author. forthcoming.
“YES, WE CAN” – FRAMING POLITICAL DISCOURSE IN TERMS OF ‘CHANGE’.
A CORPUS-BASED APPROACH TO THE ANALYSIS OF THE ‘CHANGE’ FRAME IN
AMERICAN PRESIDENTIAL DISCOURSE.
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As frame conceptions stand for a variety of ideas on knowledge representation or information processing, they have been accommodated within diverse disciplines. For instance, frame semantics is regarded as an integral part of cognitive linguistics (e.g. Geeraerts 2006, Evans/Green 2006), particularly due to its relevance to the cognitive-linguistic tenet of encyclopaedic meaning, i.e. the system of knowledge that underlies linguistic meaning. These ‘cognitive’ frames are understood as “coherent packages of knowledge that surround a category” (Radden/Dirven 2007: 9f.), which are activated once a linguistic unit is used.

However categories do not only relate to frames but also to conceptual domains. The terminological and conceptual distinction between frames and domains is anything but straightforward due to the considerable overlap between them, especially when examining cognitively complex domains (Taylor 2005). Thus the stipulation of frame-domain interactions provides a valid framework according to which phenomena such as category extension through conceptual shifts can be accounted for. The multiple meanings of linguistic categories regularly present a challenge to the study of discourse meaning. The global patterns of knowledge activated by frames in the interpretation of discourse are complemented and/or aided by the linguistic structure of the discourse itself. As concepts are deployed by discourse, their actual construal occurs at the level of discourse processing. A case in point is Talmy’s (2000) proposal of a lexicon-grammar continuum that structures what he refers to as the cognitive representation of a given concept, i.e. the “experiential complex” that a sentence or portion of discourse evokes in the discourse participant (cf. Talmy ibid. 21f.). Whereas semantic structure provides rich, detailed knowledge about a situation or event, the grammatical structure attributes structural properties to that situation or event.

Knowledge structures in frames are typically stored in an idealized form, abstracting away from less prototypical instantiations. As a result, the knowledge incorporated by frames rests on deeply entrenched cultural beliefs and practices. Therefore the notion of frame lends itself to the study of political ideologies. Drawing on van Dijk’s (1998) conception of ideology, this paper explores the ideological knowledge structures evoked by and stored in the frame of ‘change’ in (contemporary) American presidential discourse. The analysis of the ideological knowledge structures of the ‘change’ frame, will illustrate the impact of framing on the construction of both local and global meaning in discourse, i.e. the textual and discursive components of the ‘change’ frame.

Combining the analytical tools of cognitive semantics and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), this study will reveal the cognitive mechanisms of how discourse is endowed with meaning. The analysis makes use of both quantitative and qualitative methods and is based on a non-annotated corpus of 132,026 words, compiled from all Presidential Inaugural Addresses to date. Thus it offers an unprecedented diachronic perspective on the framing of ‘change’, which in fact will be shown to look back on a long tradition in American presidential discourse. More specifically, it will demonstrate that the concept of ‘change’ is framed by both American political parties, albeit to different ends and means.

Politics and media in Belgium are split up along linguistic borders. The two main communities (Dutch-speaking and French-speaking) not only have their own substate government but also fully separate political parties and separate media. Federal politicians though have to represent the whole country and they appear or are referred to in the Dutch-speaking as well as in the French-speaking media. However, when the country was submerged in a difficult and tough government formation which lasted for months after the federal elections in June 2007, it became clear that the image of ‘the other’ on both sides of the linguistic boundary was significantly disrupted.

The objective of our presentation is to sketch the way politicians and political parties were represented in interviews in the Belgian press in the first six months of the formation period. As the so-called ‘quality press’ is likely to pay the most attention to political news coverage, we have limited our bilingual data samples to a selection of newspapers and weekly magazines which are generally considered to be quality publications, i.e. De Standaard, De Morgen and Knack for the Dutch-speaking side and Le Soir, La Libre Belgique and Le Vif/L’Express for the French-speaking part of the country. From these publications, we have collected all interviews in the period June-December 2007 with two politicians who are generally considered to be moderate (Yves Leterme of the Dutch-speaking Christian-democrat party and Didier Reynders of the French-speaking liberal party) and two politicians who represent outspokenly radical parties (Bart De Wever for the Dutch-speaking side and Olivier Maingain for the French-speaking).

The interviews will be analyzed along three different lines. In the first part a lexical analysis inspired by critical discourse analysis (Wodak 1999, Clark 1992) scrutinizes the way in which the politician represents himself, his party and other politicians and parties. As in written discourse the interview is the most direct way to collect the politician’s authentic sayings, this analysis will allow us to reconstruct the image the politicians want to convey.

But as shown in Clayman and Heritage (2002), also the interviewer plays an important role in the representation which is being given in an interview. The structure of the interview is determined by the topic choices and the questions of the journalist. Interviews in the written press are examples of mediated discourse. The final text of an interview is a construction of the journalist, even if s/he tries to reproduce the original words of the interviewee exactly. A second part of the analysis will therefore focus on the interviewer’s role.

A third and final part of the analysis will integrate the results of the first two parts in a framing analysis (Entman 1993, Van Gorp 2005) of how these interviews represent the Belgian political situation and how they render ideologically determined visions as plausible as possible. We expect that in bipolar contrasts such as the North vs. the South of the country, members of opposite groups tend to revert to clichés or caricatures when representing ‘the other’.


Framing Metaphorical Frames in Terminology and Specialised Translation: The Case of Harmful Algal Bloom
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Topic Relevance
Frames are applicable to the conceptual representation of specialised knowledge domains (cf. Faber et al. 2005, 2006, 2007). In a frame-based terminology, the conceptual structure underlying a domain is described by means of a prototypical, dynamic, process-oriented frame which provides a comprehensive description and understanding of specialised concepts.

For example, the specialised domain event of environmental engineering is dynamic because it is conceptualised as a constellation of interrelated processes. It is also prototypical because it has been configured on the basis of a number of generic, conceptual macro-categories, namely PROCESS, AGENT, PATIENT, and RESULT, as well as others such as INSTRUMENT, DISCIPLINE, etc. (see appendix). These interrelated generic categories act as templates for the rest of the concepts in the domain, as well as for the conceptual subframes. Moreover, these categories highlight the multidimensional nature of specialised concepts, which is a key aspect for their full description (Bowker 1997; Bowker and Meyer 1993).

Originality, Objectives, and Data
The frame-based model of terminology has been applied to the description of both non-metaphorical concepts (e.g. groyne and dredge) and metaphorical concepts (e.g. beach nourishment) in the domain of environmental engineering. However, metaphorical concepts have not as yet been analysed as concepts that result from the superimposition of a source frame onto a target frame or as the result of conceptual mapping operations—a basic premise of contemporary cognitivist theories of metaphor.

Consequently, this paper proposes an analysis of the metaphorical concept harmful algal bloom (HAB) which is consistent with the tenets of both the frame-based model of terminology and the experientialist view of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff 1993; Lakoff and Johnson 1999).

A corpus of texts is used to analyse the contexts of the term. Context provides information about a term’s meaning and use (Pearson 1998: 191), and helps to retrieve data about definitional features and explicit relations between semantically related concepts (L’Homme et al. 1999: 32-33). This information is thus necessary to account for the concept HAB.

Results
The concept HAB belongs to the domain of marine biology, and therefore, to the domain of environmental engineering as well. This paper shows that an HAB can be regarded as a process which emerges from the overlapping of two dynamic frames, and which is defined in terms of the specialised event frame. This paper also specifies the mapping relations between the two dynamic sub-frames which give rise to the metaphorical concept HAB.

Multidimensionality involves using both hierarchical and non-hierarchical relations (Faber et al. 2007: 40–41). As metaphor entails non-hierarchical relations (i.e. same-level relations between two distinct domains of experience), so multidimensionality becomes an essential aspect to account for the concept HAB. In this regard, this paper shows how the conceptual categories that define this metaphorical concept reflect its multidimensionality within the specialised event frame.

This approach facilitates knowledge acquisition, and enables text users to fully understand specialised metaphorical concepts through scenes, which are the conceptual images of frames (Fillmore 1977). As such, it is a very useful instrument for efficient translation (Kussmaul 1995).
FOOTING SHIFTS AND BREAKING FRAMES IN INTERPRETED DOCTOR-PATIENT INTERACTIONS
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Institutional interactions in multilingual situations often make use of interpreters. We typically see two participation frameworks (Goffman 1981) emerging in such interactions, and the interpreter is the only one with access to both frameworks. The participants in the interaction often consider the interpreter as a 'linguistic parrot' (Davidson 2002: 1275), who only functions as a translator and has no impact on the meaning or the interaction as such. However, as has been observed by Wadensjö (1992) and Davidson (2000) for instance, interpreters can also be considered as gatekeepers and as participants in an interaction.

This study focuses on interpreted conversations and takes an interactional approach, thus critically looking at the different conversational roles of the interpreter. The data that are being studied consist of four interpreted doctor-patient interactions (Russian-Dutch) that were recorded in 2008 in a Flemish hospital. I will especially look into the way the interpreter shifts perspective or footing within and between the translations. Within the context of media-interviews, such shifts in footing have been described as typical ways to remain neutral, particularly when controversial viewpoints are being voiced (Clayman 1992). This reasoning also holds for the interpreted interactions, for instance when the interpreter is translating an utterance that does not match the 'voice of medicine' (Bolden 2000). Such important shifts in footing can lead to frame switches. Furthermore, these can also emerge through byplay (Goffman 1974), which can go unnoticed for the third party because of the multilingual situation. As such, the institutional frame of the doctor-patient conversation can change to that of an ordinary conversation (between doctor and interpreter) or to a different institutional frame of a conversation about the patient's permit of residence (between patient and interpreter).

Towards a Simplifying Model for Sustainable Food Production.

A Frame-Based Empirical Analysis
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In this talk we report on an empirical inquiry into frame-based communication, with a specific focus on the public issue of sustainable food production. As part of a larger joint American and European project (commissioned by the FrameWorks Institute, the Kellogg Foundation and the King Baudouin Foundation, see Aubrun & Grady 2006; Aubrun, Brown & Grady 2006, 2007), we investigated the effect of the use of so-called Simplifying Models (SMs). SMs can be defined as concise and user-friendly conceptual explanations of complex issues, rooted in familiar frame-based knowledge. Strategically chosen frames have proven useful in grasping various abstract topics (including global warming, economic leadership, healthcare insurance, etc.) and successful in helping such topics enter into the public debate.

In order to test the impact of simplifying models on the conceptualization of and communication on sustainable food production, we gathered data by means of a large-scale telephone survey experiment. Informants (n = 354) were presented with a short text about sustainable food, and were consequently asked a number of questions probing their understanding of the issue. The statistical analysis of our data (using regression analysis) suggests that communication to lay people about abstract, technical issues such as sustainable food production is significantly influenced by the frames the communication is associated with: the semantic make-up of the Simplifying Models used leaves traces in the way informants acquire and conceptualize new information.

Next to the statistical analysis of the conceptual impact of SMs, we performed a detailed semantic analysis of informants’ answers to the survey questions. We argue that the cognitive effects of the Simplifying Models can at least partly be explained by referring to Talmy’s Force Dynamic schemes, which describe the interaction of entities with reference to force (see e.g. Talmy 2000, ch. 7). The different construals – in Force Dynamic terms – of the factors that contribute to the (un)sustainability of food production methods yield different answers from informants when they are asked to reproduce the sample paragraph, or to suggest solutions to current food production problems. This study sheds light on the way public communication about technical issues can effectively be organised, in order to make sure that the intended message is conveyed. On the theoretical side, extensions to Force Dynamics are proposed, taking up some of the suggestions in Talmy (2000:46ff.).

Linguistic research has only recently taken a serious interest in phraseology and this is mainly the merit of corpus linguistics (Gries 2008). However, the outcomes of 20 years of—largely corpus-based—phraseological research all point to the same conclusion: “what the field needs is some clear indication from researchers of the criteria used to identify multi-word units” (Granger & Paquot 2008: 45). In other words, phraseological research has now come to the point where it has to face the fact that it is still lacking a workable definition of a phraseological unit—if not a uniform methodology—, and that in order to make progress in this area a broader linguistic approach is needed. The main problem of the mere corpus-based approach, apart from the obvious limitations of the number one used criterion, i.e. frequency, seems to be that it uses a definition that is too restrictive. As a result, a whole range of syntagmatic sequences which seem completely natural and therefore apparently uninteresting, need to be analysed in order to capture the real nature of ‘bound’ collocations. From the ongoing phraseological point of view, the more a unit is opaque, semantically uncompositional, syntactically unnatural, lexically restricted, etc., the more it is to be considered phraseological. Nevertheless, the analyses based on these criteria always leave researchers with the uncomfortable feeling that a whole category of syntagmatic sequences whose combination structure and possibilities on the one hand seem too natural to be commented on, but on the other cannot be found in dictionaries nor grammars, remain this way undiscovered. This is all the more the case in an LSP-context. Specialised discourse is indeed characterised by the vast presence of syntactematic terms which are often composed of such a large number of elements that they resemble a phrase rather than a term. Technical terms seem to have a ‘predilection’ for combining with certain general words to the detriment of their synonyms, but, unless you are a specialist in the field, these apparently free combinations are not so ‘natural’ to be identified or made (Vangehuchten 2005). Given the highly collocational nature of LSP, the present paper wishes to examine to what extent Frame semantics can make a contribution to this issue. The starting point will be the study of the collocations of the three most frequent terms in a corpus of Spanish entrepreneurial discourse (Vangehuchten 2007). These collocations will be compared with the information present for these same terms in the Spanish FrameNet (2008), as they will be with their corresponding content in REDES (2004), the first corpus-based combinatory dictionary of Spanish that uses conceptual frames as the main criterion for the selection of collocations. According to its director Bosque (2004: CXXV), REDES can be considered as a supplement to FrameNet. Although its authors claim that all collocational information “is derivable by searches or reports based on the information entered into the database by other means”, it is not yet equipped with a specific feature for retrieving collocational information (Ruppenhofer, Baker & Fillmore 2002: 368).
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The paper proposed here considers the interpretation of the emerging modal verbs want to and wanna for the expression of advice. This construction has gained increasing frequency particularly in the second half of the previous century. As such it has been said to contribute to polysemy in the verb form want, a relevant aspect of grammaticalization according to Krug (2000). However, rather than mere polysemy, Desagulier (2005a) describes this usage as an innovative constructional blend in the tradition of Construction Grammar, inspired by Fauconnier and Turner (1996). Desagulier (2005a) considers the use of want to and wanna for the expression of advice as a blend which has been constructed out of two entrances (espaces d'entrée). These are the monotransitive use of want to for the expression of volition (e.g. I want to go) on the one hand, and the ditransitive use for the expression of obligation (e.g. I want you to go). Neither of these entrance forms are considered as modal auxiliaries by Desagulier: the former on account of its volitional semantics, the latter on account of the formal conditions which block contraction. Only the form/function blend which results from these two constructions is considered to be modal by the author, on account of the deontic semantics and the possible contraction to wanna.

This paper challenges the exclusion of the volitional component in want to/wanna from a modal auxiliary interpretation both in its unidimensional use (I want to go) as well as in the pragmatic use for advice. On a theoretical level, it is argued that the semantic concept of volition may be integrated in the utterances of advice in terms of projected volition (Aarts and Aarts 1995) or in terms of wanting as a force dynamic experience which extends to the interlocutor as a mental extrapolation (Langacker 2006).

Projecting a volitional state implies a frame shift in the interactional analysis. The general shift is that from a semantic to a pragmatic frame. But the data also show interesting instances of more specific on-line re-analysis in interaction when the utterance of advice is followed by a question tag. The interpretative possibilities of these findings will be discussed. But first, the form/function pair of want to/wanna for advice as the sole emerging modal usage (cf. above) will be checked in terms of frequency findings for patterns of use with want to/wanna in the informal data from the spoken demographic component of the British National Corpus. Frequency plays an important role in grammaticalization, and hence in the discussion of modal membership.

In addition to findings from the British National Corpus, innovative uses also emerge from the internet. One pattern which has emerged challenges the exclusion of the ditransitive usage of want to as a modal auxiliary on account of its blocking conditions for contraction (cf. above), and shows a surprising example of language change.


Corpus:
Oxford University Computing Services / BNC Consortium
http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk

Electronic Database: http://framenet.icsi.berkeley.edu/
Meaning and the equivalents in Malay-English dictionary: 
An application of Frame Semantics and the FrameNet
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A literature review of bilingual dictionary research in Malaysia has shown that most researchers are only focusing on the problems of equivalents recorded in the dictionary. What is lacking is the real linguistic analysis of the discrimination of meaning of the source language entry and then the findings of the target language equivalents. This paper is looking at the problems that arise in the discrimination of meanings of two Malay-English dictionaries, and the translation of the entry into English. The analysis adopts the methods of frame semantics in describing the Malay verb entry, assessing the different senses of meaning through the frames that are available. The theoretical framework of Frame Semantics has successfully helped the writer to reorganize the meaning of the Malay transitive verb ‘memberi’ (translation in English ‘give’) from the different frames evoked by the entry. Meanwhile, the information of the lexical units (LU) provided by the frames available, for example the LUs from the frame of GIVING in the FrameNet has contributed to a list of English equivalents that can be used in the Malay-English dictionary entry. The Malay entry is analysed based on the 5 million words DBP-UKM Malay corpus while all the English equivalents are sourced from the FrameNet and English dictionaries. The analysis of the entry “memberi”, a Malay transitive verb or “give” is presented in this paper as well as the selection of equivalents that are appropriate based on each different meanings.
In the generative paradigm, anaphora are usually explained by means of highly abstract rules governing co-referential integrations (confer, e.g., Reinhart 2006). Cognitivelinguistic approaches, however, have stressed that rather general cognitive mechanisms apply (e.g., instantiation, schematization, focussing, figure-ground alignment) and that cognitive domains or frames play a major role. From this point of view, both the acquisition of the competence to establish linguistic co-reference as well as the involved on-line operations follow schema-based conceptualization patterns (e.g. van Hoek 2007; Matthews/Lieven/Tomasello submitted).

In this talk, following a frame-semantic framework (Ziem 2008), I will shift the focus on bridging anaphora which are particularly interesting phenomena within the lexicon/grammar continuum. There are, however, only a few in-depth studies in the field of cognitive linguistics. Schwarz (2000: 98-117) comes to the conclusion that four “types of activation” need to be distinguished in order to cope with the complexity of bridging anaphora. She argues that such co-references are either (i) schema-based, (ii) inference-based, (iii) meronymy-based, or (iv) grounded by verb-semantic roles. Yet, this approach presupposes not only that different cognitive mechanisms are involved, but also that they are mentally processed in different ways.

Presenting selected results of both theoretical and corpus-based studies, I will argue that understanding bridging anaphora generally relies on schema-based processes. It is thus neither necessary nor psychologically plausible to presume different cognitive schemas and mechanisms. I will introduce a frame-theoretical approach drawing back to a slightly modified and extended version of the early pioneer work of Marvin Minsky (1975) and Charles Fillmore (1977). The unified approach I will put forward considers the fundamental role of default values in the conceptualization of anaphora. Minsky suggests that the structure of frames may be well described in terms of (i) slots and instances of slots, namely (ii) fillers and (iii) default values. Default values are presupposed elements in the sense that a speaker/writer may presuppose them and a hearer/reader, in turn, may infer them (Lönneker 2003). One central claim is that conceptualizing bridging anaphora essentially entails co-referring default values of at least two evoked frames.
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