Review of: "Violent inclusion of oxymora: An argument for a cultural-cognitive linguistics"

Nelly Tincheva[1]

1 Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper addresses the issue of how cultural-cognitive linguistics could – and should – evolve in the future. In this respect, in my view, the paper succeeds in its tabling of an original proposal which lays emphasis on the need for a truly context-sensitive cultural-cognitive linguistic approach.

The author supports his main argument by providing analysis of the conceptual incongruity underlying what he terms 'an oxymoronic complex'. The specific oxymoronic complex tackled in the paper represents a conceptual region centered around BORDER, which also covers a number of related concepts and cognitive mechanisms such as conceptual metaphor and conceptual metonymy. What I would like to underline in this respect is the importance of two key aspects in the author's understanding of his object of investigation: a 'careful consideration of the socio-political and cultural context' (p. 14) against which oxymora are explored and, above all, the author's focus on the dynamic nature of one's very understanding of a contextually-used oxymoron. I can but laud such an attempt at bridging the gap between what is generally known as social cognition and individual cognition.

The stepping stone for the paper is Głaz's (2002) model of analysis, which involves three domains of special research attention:

1. exploring the semantic potential of a linguistic unit (by which the author means the whole meaning potential, or the totality of senses, a lexical unit could possibly activate)

2. exploring the linguistic unit's semantic relations to other 'relevant regions in conceptual space' (p. 5)

3. exploring the 'contextual modulations' across the linguistic unit's uses.

Drawing on a dataset of actual uses of *inclusive border* and of *violent inclusion*, the paper proceeds by classifying those two oxymora in terms of Shen's (1987) direct - indirect dichotomy. Here I support the author's analysis of where Shen's methodology falls short and would also add two further problematic issues that seem to hamper a more in-depth understanding of the very phenomenon of oxymoronic use through Shen's analysis only. The first issue concerns the expedience of discussing an indirect oxymoron as necessarily related to a whole expression frame rather than to a single item frame: I believe both options need to be seen as available. The second issue concerns the arbitrariness in a researcher's deciding which expression frame precisely to use as a reference frame.

The paper then proceeds to amalgamate analysis of oxymora with analyses of conceptual metonymy, which to me

is the most fruitful part of the paper. Indeed, without conceptual-metonymy-related notions such as PERSPECTIVE, HIGHLIGHTING, SCOPE-VARIATION, etc., it would be hard to explain existing differences among various senses of BORDER, and, more precisely, between senses which perspectivize BORDER as either an *exclusive* LINE or as an *inclusive* SPACE. It would be even harder to explain the preferred or the dis-preferred, 'unequal status' (p. 3), of those different senses.

In this respect, I could only remind the reader of Langacker's (2008) work on BOUNDEDNESS, and of Lakoff and Johnson's discussion of the metaphorization of UNITS through image-schematic transfer from CONTAINER. I might also suggest a future incorporation of research on cognitive FRAMES and SCENARIOS (e.g. Musolff, 2006, 2022) into research on oxymora as, to me, the very issue of what 'conceptual incongruity' is seems dependent on the degree of conventionality of socially- and culturally-accepted FRAMES and SCENARIOS. Such suggestions, clearly, concern future research as they would require too much to fit within the BOUNDARIES of the present paper.

In brief, I again express my belief that the author of the article has found an under-researched niche of significant yielding potential and that placing the linguistic phenomenon of oxymoron against the background of studies on conceptual metaphtonymy seems a theoretically sound choice, which is well-supported in the article.

I also commend this paper as a much-needed call for 'a full-fledged *cultural-cognitive linguistics*' and not 'a cultural linguistics that is *also* cognitive, nor a cognitive linguistics that takes culture into account' (p. 15). I understand this as the author's insisting on a systematic and consistent integration of socio-cultural cognition analysis with individual cognitive processing analysis, and I fully support such a view.

References:

Głaz, Adam. 2002. The Dynamics of Meaning. Explorations in the Conceptual Domain of EARTH. Lublin: Maria Curie-Skłodowska University Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. 2008. Cognitive Grammar: A basic introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shen, Yeshavahu. 1987. On the structure and understanding of poetic oxymoron. Poetics Today 8(1): 105–122.