"Babeş-Bolyai" University

Faculty of Letter

Doctoral School "Linguistic and Literary Studies"

Cluj-Napoca

Ph.D. Thesis

Cognitive semantics and the emergence of elocutional studies

Summary

Scientific advisor

Prof. univ. dr. Mircea Borcilă

Doctoral student

Elena Carmen Faur

Cluj-Napoca
2013

Summary

Contents

Key words: integral semantics, cognitive semantics, cognitive semiotics, cognitive science, designational semantics, linguistics of speaking, grammar of enunciation, elocutional competence, designation, meaning proper, designational metasemy, conceptual metaphor, image schema, creativity, semanticity, invariance principle, knowledge of things, linguistic knowledge, context, universe of discourse.

Our work approaches two main directions of semantics, which, starting with the sixth decade of the last century, have claimed, each in its own perspective, the achievment of a „cognitive turn" in human sciences. These directions are cognitive semantics and integral linguistics. The main purpose of our work was to plead in favour of a possible relevant contribution of the cognitive semantics orientation to the development of integral semantics, more precisely, in the domain of elocutional competence and in the perspective of laying the foundations of the designational semantics studies of expressive speaking.

The thesis has attempted to bring a modest contribution to the emergence of these studies, by giving a real value to the concepts of "image schema" and "conceptual metaphor", which have been firstly developed within cognitive semantics.

Hereinafter we resume the main ideas of the work, by presenting in chapters our inquiring demarche.

0. Introduction: Integral linguistics and cognitive semantics

In the introductory section we have formed the main scope of the work by integrating three important „arguments", on which our endeavour is based. The first argument for the valorization of the scientific inovations from the Lakovian cognitive semantics has been related to the Coserian "project" of founding the linguistics as an *integral* science of language. In achieving this type of science, the Romanian linguist has elaborated a conceptual framework of great disclosure, meant to offer a total comprehension of the real object and a "unitary" base for the integration of multiple perspectives on the phenomenon of language. The objective of our work is firstly sustained by the aim of "conceptual unification" of linguistics, initially assumed by Coseriu "project". Secondly, it can be achieved only by „reinterperting" the concepts of cognitive semantics, in the theoretical and conceptual perspective of integral linguistics.

The second argument regards the need of developing the elocutional studies within the integral linguistic movement. We have underlined, in this context, the fact that the distinction between the three levels of semantic content (designation, meaning proper and sense) and that between the categories and the functions of designation and meaning proper have been the starting point in promoting an elocutional linguistics and its main domain, designational semantics. A development of this domain, by thorough study of „the contribution of knowledge of things in the activity of speaking", more precisely, in the act of designation, was necessary and was aknowledged by the Romanian linguist.

The third argument concerns the conceptual attitude of E. Coseriu towards cognitive semantics. In some important studies, the Romanian linguist attests the compatibility of principle of cognitive semantics with his project of a "skeuological linguistics" or of things. However, he undelines the necessity of rethinking this „cognitive" direction on a linguistic ground or in a conception based on the meaning proper, drawing attention on the paradox of a "semantics" confined previous to knowledge through language.

The most significant step in the direction of approaching „cognitive semantics" was set by the Romanian scientist in his critical study regarding the "prototypes theory" (v. Coseriu, 1990/2000). His first suggestion of approaching the two directions was in general reticently seen in the cognitive field of research, as well as in the "camp" of direct successors of E. Coseriu. Whithin the integralist studies, initiated at Cluj, it has been attempted still, starting 1997, a corelation of the two semantic directions, which would follow exactly the suggestions offered by E. Coseriu in his fundamental study that we mentioned before. At the end of the introductive chapter we thus made reference to the fact that a rigorous examination of cognitive semantics in the conceptual perspective of linguistic integralism has been promoted firstly in the scientific context in which our work as well sets.

We have underlined the fact that the more recent developments of "embodiment theory", of „primary experiences" and of "neuronal connections", recorded in the last two decades within the American cognitive semantics – ulterior to its fondational works (Lakoff 1987, Johnson 1987) and subsequent to the essential reference of E. Coseriu to these (1990/2000) –, has led us to appeal to the alternative movement in cognitive science, developed in the north-European space, more exactly within the Cognitive Semiotics Centre in Lund. The newer perspective, offered by this movement suggests a rethinking of the main concepts of cognitive semantics on a new theoretical basis, much more firmly grounded in Husserelian phenomenology and thus closer to the integralist conception.

1. Chapter I: In search of the integrative framework

In this chapter we have proceeded to an incursion in the cognitive movement as a whole and have „searched" of the best perspective in order to integrate cognitive semantics in the direction of elocutional studies, shaped by integral linguistics.Thus we have outlined, in the chapter *Three generations of cognitive science*, as coherent as possible, a sketch of the „generations" that have passed through the „cognitive" paradigm, in their attempt of explaining knowledge and the cognitive processes of the human mind. From this first reception we observed that, in present times, it is attested, in the literature, the existence of three „generations" of „cognitive science". They have been characterized, in this section, in relationship to few essential parameters, respectively according to the specific way in which every explanatory model conceives the „mind" and the human knowledge.

The characteristic of the first „generation" (known as "cognitivism", whose debut is traceable to the 1950s) is the understanding of the "mind as a digital computer", which processes the information as symbols. "The knowledge" and "the meaning proper" are, in this framework, completely dissociated from the "subjective experience" and the human "embodiment", and the cognitive processes are reduced, in essence, to the purely "computational" dimension of mental activity. To synthesize, this conception (1) proposes a "disembodied", "amodal" and formal perspective of the mind; (2) considers that the relationship of "unconscious" cognitive processes with the field of "conscious" and the language rests entirely outside the sphere of interest and the explanatory possibilities of science.

The next "generation" is formed as a reaction to the previous solution and it focuses on the articulation of human knowledge by the interaction, as part of this process, between brain/mind, body and world. Initially adopting a narrow phenomenological platform in the study of human cognition, cognitive semantics – "the mainstream cognitive science" that raises in 1980 and is represented by G. Lakoff and M. Johnson – tries to recuperate the "subjective experience" and the cognitive role that it has, in the process of knowledge, the interaction of the human being with the world. The most important ganes of this orientation can be synthesised thusly: (1) the (re)discovery of the imaginative-intuitive nature of human knowledge, which has lead to imposing a "paradigm of imaginative rationality" in human sciences and (2) the reestablishment of the inherently semantic dimension of knowledge and of its "embodied" character. Nonetheless, the problem of the relationship between the unconscious processes, on the one hand, and conscience and language, on the other hand, is, even in

this case, impossible to solve and will only become more acute with the emergence of the version of the "embodiment theory" proposed by G. Lakoff and M. Johnson (1999).

Unlike the first two "generations" – where the language serves no cognitive role at all -, the third "generation" brings about a significant increase in the interest for the cognitive dimension of language and its contribution to the functioning of the human mind. This more recent direction, developed mainly in the north-European world, is purpoted to rethink the conceptual foundations of the cognitive science, on the strenght of the concepts of "intersubjectivity", "conscience", "representation" and "linguistic sign". The functional autonomy of language is thus for the first time aknowledged in the framework of the research whitin cognitive science as well. This fact opens the door, today, to a much more fruitful dialogue of cognitive science with other investigational traditions, developed in the European world, including with the integral linguistics.

Such a dialogue is possible yet only on unitary conceptual grounds, which should enable a coherent correlation of the three "generations" in cognitive sciences and their relation to the integral science of the language. It has been observed that the objective of cognitive science, as a whole, and, in particular, of each of the three "generations", was the development of a "unified" theory of human knowledge. The solutions offered by each generation, however, led to the elaboration of very different disciplinary frameworks which proved insufficient to account for the fundamental function of language.

The debate on this crucial aspect has finally compeled us to change the conceptual framework of the cognitive sciences. This conclusion has become necessary mainly because the perspectives offered by the "cognitive paradigm" have proven far too wide in their ambition to carry out the "total science" as an "unification" or, more precisely, an integration of the sciences of culture in the epistemological framework of the sciences of nature.

From the need to establish the conceptual thresholds which should enable the ontological and epistemological confinements imposed by the "nature of the objectual domain" (Borcila 2006: 43), it has been opted in the last section of chapter one for the *Conceptual framework of the integralism* and it has been considered to be the unitary basis of the *integrated sciences of culture.* The main point in the argumentation in this chapter is the fundamental distinction noted by E. Coşeriu (1988: 64) between the two levels of "linguistic competence", taken "as a whole": the biological level and the cultural level. According to the way in which each of the three "generations" relates to the cultural level – seen, in the new perspective, as having priority over the biological level –, the necessity of

rethinking the three conceptions developed by cognitive science in relation with the "significative function" of the language has been argued for.

2. CHAPTER II: The semantic matrix of integral linguistics

Setting the conceptual framework of integral linguistics as the the basis for the integration of the humanistic sciences has imposed afterwards the need for a presentation of the epistemological premises of the research in the first section of chapter II of our work, entitled *The epistemological basis of integral semantics.* In this way the "significative function" of the language (the authentic object of linguistics as a "science of culture") has been determined to be constitutive and fundamental for the activity of the human mind. Its definition has been achieved by means of three characteristics ("universals"), proposed by E. Coşeriu, namely *creativity, semanticity and alterity.* In this manner a common sense, very wide, in accordance with which the category of the "cognitive" may constitute, in a legitimal manner, a point of convergency of integral semantics with the cognitive science has also been established. The common point of the two orientations is that of the man "contacting" the world. The differences of interpretation have been described according to the medium in which the two "cognitive" orientations set the knowledge: the *conceptual*, an emergent level of the mind preceeding language is the specific medium for the *semantic* and *semiotic* approaches in cognitive science; on the other hand, the *activity of speaking* is specific to integral semantics.

An important aspect discussed in the context of defining the dimension of linguistic creativity has been the metaphoric creativity. E. Coşeriu places, from the very beginning, the metaphor within the significative function of the language – a function essentially distinctive – and orients the "metaphoric creation" towards the achievement of the same finality as the language: the finality of establishing shared semantic entities, in order to structure human experience. The presentation of the Coserian perspective on the "metaphoric creation in language" in this section is important, for the work as a whole, as the first form of approaching the term of "conceptual metaphor" of cognitive semantics (disscused in the final chapter of the thesis). Thus the major differencies between the two orientations in the understanding the metaphor have already cristalised from this moment on and far more coherently, even without an explicit reference to the alternative approach: if for integral semantics the primary medium of manifestation of the metaphor is speaking, cognitive semantics approaches this phenomenon as belonging to the conceptual level of the mind too.

The second subchapter, *The place of designational semantics in Coseriu's conception of the levels of language*, is meant to describe the manifestation of the significative function of language in the three levels of linguistic competence. The importance of the Coserian distinctions between the types of semantic content employed in instituting significative contents for each of the three levels under consideration has been highlighted in this context: designation, meaning proper, and sense. In order to establish the specific of the elocutional linguistics and of its correlated semantic domain we have started from a succinct presentation of the three types of autonomous linguistics (elocutional, idiomatic or historic and textual), identified by E. Coşeriu on the basis of of the dissociated semantic strata.

A large part of this subchapter has been devoted to problems of approaching the universal competence or "technique" of speaking, which represents the "actual object" of elocutional linguistics and the primordial sphere of interest of this work. Since, at first sight, this level of language seems to engulf a heterogenous category of phenomena, we have attempted first to discover the unity of the investigational field which comes under the elocutional competence. The unity of these phenomena was appreciated mostly on the stratum of semantic content of *designation,* in relation to which both the elocutional linguistics as an autonomous field of the science of language and the status of this type of (not just theoretical, but also applicative) linguistics are justified.

In the process of legitimizing the linguistics of speaking, the problem of the extralinguistic knowledge (pre-verbal or semantic, i.e. dependent on the linguistic knowledge) has been treated both by the permanent confrontation with the results of current research in cognitive linguistics and by the constant definition of our position towards this orientation. Against the background of the current debate between the two movements the conclusion that the Coserian perspective, which considers linguistics, as a whole, as *semantic* (for it relies on linguistic knowledge), is the only means of explaining the nature of extralinguistic knowledge (which is "semantic" and not "pre-verbal") has been reached. On the other hand, taking into account the specific content of the universal level, designation, the domain corresponding to this significational stratum – that of designational semantics, for which designation acts as a structuring principle –, has been circumscribed.

The explanation of the status of elocutional linguistics from a Coserian point of view, as a theoretical and applicative discipline at the same time, has also been achieved by relating to the strata of semantic content. Elocutional linguistics is, fistly, a *theoretical linguistics* where the linguistic categories are defined as universal possibilities of the language. Secondly, the representative

discipline, by excellence, for the universal level, the "grammar of speaking" (v. Coşeriu 1955/1967) and its amphibious nature have allowed us to notice the "descriptive" aspect of speaking as well. On one hand, the "grammar of speaking" has to be seen as a theoretical discipline for it has the task of *defining* the "functions", the "instruments" (both "verbal" and "extraverbal") and the specific "operations" of speaking on the universal level. In this sense it is a *preliminary theory* for the other two types of linguistics. On the other hand, it is also a *descriptive discipline*, for it also has the role of *describing* these "functions", "instruments" and "operations"in their concrete functioning. Moreover, this type of grammar has to be situated at the universal level of speaking, as the non-linguistic possibilities – i.e. the knowledge of the things, of the contexts, of the universe of discourse – targets the aspects of speaking, which can be studied *only in relation to the act of designation* (and, consequently, to the semantic content specific to this level).

In the next section, titled the *Elocutional Competence*, we have focused closely on the *description of the* semantic *content* corresponding to this competence. The study of the competence at the universal level is comprised of: (1) a general theory of elocutional knowledge, wherein E. Coşeriu has distinguished between: (a) the knowledge of the principles of thought; (b) the capacity of interpreting the functions of particular languages, (c) the knowledge of things; and (2) the grammar of speaking. The third central component of the universal technique of speaking, which was sketched by the Romanian linguist only in very broad terms, is the "expressive" speaking, built on the principle of metaphoric creation. As a central echelon of the elocutional competence, it was necessary that this aspect be investigated in depth. A priority development of the theory of expressive speaking, on the "theoretical basis" of integral linguistics, has been undertaken by the scientific advisor of this thesis as part of the integralist studies at Cluj-Napoca.

The interpretation of the Coserian conception, proposed by Zlatev, has offered us the chance to refer, throughout this chapter, to the position of the Romanian linguist compared to the cognitivist position. The examples by means of which we have interpreted the role of knowledge the principles of thought in establishing the norms of congruence of speaking have been helpful in specifying, in parallel, the intuitive character of the norms of thought, *which apply in speaking*, as well as those of speaking itself: thus, both appear "undetermined" in relation with the apophantic logics or with the rational-conceptual thought.

If, in the case of the knowledge of the principles of thought we have taken the approach of facts which are inconsistent with the norms of congruent speaking, in the case of interpreting the

functions of particular languages we have started from positive elements. The outlined essential aspects have targeted the specific semantic content of the universal level, i.e. the designation, in relation to which we has mentioned and explained the distinctions used by E. Coşeriu between the "functions of language" (or "idiomatic"), together with the respective categories of meaning proper and those of designation. It is also by means of dissociations between the strata of significational content and in the perspective of the act of designation that we have mentioned the distinction between the synonimy on the level of historical languages and the "cognitive synonymy" on the universal level (i.e. distinct meanings proper, from an idiomatic point of view, which are equivalent in designation), as well as between polysemy and "designational polyvalence" (i.e. utterances with the same meaning proper, from an idiomatic point of view, which are equivalent in designation).

The third component of the elocutional competence, the knowledge of things, is central to the study of the universal technique of speaking, for it appears in any act of speaking and in the interpretation of the congruence of any utterance. We have illustrated this component through numerous examples, which have demonstrated, on the one hand, that the relation of our acts of speaking to the human experience in the world, to our representations of things and to the normal mode in which we act and behave (in certain situations) is a constant dimension of the linguistic activity at the universal level. On the other hand, we have emphasized the idea that this dimesnion cannot be explained by the semantics of particular languages; in contrast, it has to be interpreted as belonging to the domain of the designational semantics, for this type of knowledge based on the experience with things is involved in the orientation of our utterances towards the world.

The subchapter titled *The enunciative speaking and its operations* presents the functioning of the elocutional competence in its enunciative dimension. It has been argued here that the central place given by E. Coşeriu to the "grammar of speaking" on this level is justified by the special content of the proposed term: if "grammar" means operations which put in relation the linguistic meanings, and by "speaking" is individualized the level of language corresponding to the domain of designational semantics, then the grammar of speaking treats the referencial orientation of the linguistic meanings, by using them for certain operations, in order to make the reference, with our utterances, to the world. Furthermore we have tried to explain the content of the term "grammar of speaking", by referring to a succint characterization, from a Coserian viewpoint, of its own instruments and operations, as well as to their specific role in this type of grammar, in opposition to their current understanding in the grammar of historical languages.

The enunciative speaking from the perspective of E. Coşeriu (1956/1967) presupposes the determination of the linguistic meanings by successive operations, whereby a virtual unitary meaning is oriented towards a certain designate. It has been highlighted, in the succinct presentation, that, despite the development of only a single aspect of enunciative speaking, the essencial contribution of the Romanian linguist lies, especially, in assuming his model of nominal determination as a universal model, by which certain designative-cognitive finalities are achieved through "complex operations of 'reciprocal determination of universals'" (Borcilă 2003). There was not our intent to give a detailed account of the determining operations or some special illustration of them. We have mostly insisted on the subclasification proposed by E. Coşeriu for these operations: (1) operations which do not limit "the designative possibilities of the sign", but which only orient it towards the "domain of objects" (actualization and discrimination) and (2) operations which restrict these possibilities by orienting the sign either towards "a certain aspect" of the denoted, or towards its "identification" (delimitation and identification). We have taken this subclasification as a starting point in explaining, in this part of the work as well, the differencies in approach between integral semantics, on one hand, and cognitive linguistics and analytical semantics, on the other. It has, thus, been noticed that in current linguistics there is a strong tendency to mix the meaning proper with its contextual variants. It is this perspective of the operations of determination and, especially, of actualization, from which we have highlighted the advantages which may derive from the Coserian distinction between the two types of linguistic meaning, the meaning proper and the contextual meaning. We have also noticed that the latter is already based on the movement from the virtuality of the meaning proper towards its actualization (the first Coserian operation), involved by the act of designation. From this point of view, one has considered that the alternative orientations in current linguistics approach, mostly, phenomena specific to the universal level of language from Coserian matrix and that, in their framework of these orientations, the meaning proper is considered only in its designative dimension, in which it appears loaded with other features which add, in speaking, to the virtual content of the sign.

The next section of chapter II of this work, *Circumstances of speaking*, with its subsections, *Contexts of speaking* and *Universe of discours*e, is focused on the "circumstances" of speaking. E. Coşeriu identifies four circumstances - the situation, the region, the context (idiomatic, verbal, extraverbal) and the universe of discourse (of the current experience in the world, of science, of fantasy and of faith) – and considers them contextualisations of speaking, which "participate" "in a constant manner" in determination of the signs. As far as the extraverbal context is concerned, it has

been internally divided by the Romanian linguist in: (a) physical, (b) empirical, (c) natural, (d) practical, (e) historical and (f) cultural.

Some of these circumstances, such as the situation, the region or (the idiomatic and verbal) context relies on "linguistic possibilities" while others rely only on "non-linguistic possibilities". Two observations have asserted themselves, mainly, as vital in relation with the Coserian concept of "circumstance". First of all, the extralinguistic circumstances should not be seen as pre-linguistic, configured previous to the act of speaking; secondly, they can not be approached but in relation with speaking, being exclusively created by the act of speaking. Following the indications of M. Borcilă (2002) regarding the concept of "universe of discourse", we have separated the "extralinguistic context" from the "universe of discourse" according to the criterion of belonging or not belonging to the act od designation. Thus unlike the extraverbal contexts, which belong to the act of designation (in the sense that the denotatum can be individualized as a "thing" only in relation with one of the contexts), the universe of discourse fufills a much more basic role, that of "background" for the acts of speaking. The type of universe of discourse which constitutes the background of the act of designation in ordinary speaking – which is the focus of our thesis – is that of the current experience in the world, in which "all the contexts of speaking spontanousely constitute themselves into a "world" of reference of speaking" (Borcilă 2002: 55). In accordance with the observations and modifications of this concept in 2002 study by E. Coşeriu, this universe of discourse must be understood as one of the four fundamental ways of human knowledge.

The empiric extraverbal context (which depends, mostly on "the knowledge of things") and the natural one have been considered the frameworks of maximum interest in this thesis. The latter constitutes the assembly of the "possible empirical contexts", articulating, in this manner, a global cognitive model based on which one interprets normal speaking designationally.

The last section of the second chapter, *Expressive speaking: its specific, the levels of semantic structuring and the metasemic operations* treats the last component of the universal technique of speaking. At the same time, this sequence ensures the opening and the possibility of reinterpretation of the two fundamental cognitive concepts presented in the subsequent chapter. The aspect which elicited attention, here, was the "change of perspective" proposed by E. Coşeriu, in the beginning of the 1950s in the interpretation of "expressive" speaking (Coseriu 1952/1967). We have adopted as starting point the bühlerian model discussed by E. Coşeriu himself in order to delineate from the vision which persists in traditional research on the expressivity *in* language. It has been pointed out, in

this manner, that unlike Bühler's interpretation of the functions of language, E. Coşeriu places "expressivity" next to "representation", as essential dimensions of the semic content or of the meaning proper. In the new Coserian perspective, the "representation" is already imbricated and impossible to separate from the cognitive dimension of the sign, much in the same way affectivity and emotivity, traditionally considered to be forms of expressivity *through* language, become immanent dimensions of semantic creativity in general. The term "expressive speaking" thus acquires a new meaning: it no longer relates to the creation of some finality at the *level of the expression of the linguistic sign*, but rather to the capture of a dimension of the *creation of new contents in language*. The Romanian linguist admits that the maximum form of this creativity, rightifully belongs to "expressive" speaking and most often manifests itself by "metaphoric creation". Based on the proposed argumentation, an attempt was made to highlight the new "non-rhetoric" or "cognitive" perspective in which E. Coseriu, in his study, dealt with and wrote about the the language specific "metaphoric knowledge" (Coseriu 1952/1967).

In the second part of this section we have succinctly presented the more recent elaborations of the Coserian theory of metaphor done by the Centre for integralist studies of Cluj-Napoca. Due to the fact that expressive speaking forms the most part of our speaking, where the the emotive-affective and imaginative aspects constitute its finality, expressive speaking has been considered, in the Cluj-Napoca Programme, to be the central echelon of designational semantics. The development of the minimal theoretical nucleus and the recorded progress, from the perspective of the theoretical framework elaborated by E. Coseriu, for the study of the designational metaphor, have been highlighted by the conceptual dissociation of the three semantic levels of speaking and by metasemic operations, proposed by the scientific advisor of the thesis. The distinction between the three levels (significational, representational and skeuological) has been made "under the guidance of E. Coşeriu" and has attempted to valorize the more recent scientific acquisitions of metaphorology. In this manner, the possibility of including and valorization of cognitive semantics' concepts of "image schema" and "metaphoric concept" in integral semantics has, in principle, taken shape. The semantic levels presented here are crucial for the description of the metasemic process as a process of trans-domain "determination" of the universals (which in the designation of an "object" is no longer achieved by direct determination, but indirectly, via the image-schematic and affective perspective brought about by another "object"). The three metasemic operations which "spontaneously" create, both a verbal expression and a new content of thought for the metasemic designation of an "inedit"

"perceptual aspect", were called: *diasemy, endosemy and episemy*. The proposed elaboration of metasemic creativity helped thus clarifying aspects of metasemy which were only implicitly approximated in the coșerian conception. Firstly, it could be demonstrated that the fundamental dimension of metasemy in relationship to semy (or primary meanings proper) is constituted by the "increase of cognitive content". A second important aspect highlighted the fact that by metasemy a "semantic leap" in relation to the primordial semic entities, encompassed by this process is also achieved. Last but not least, it was thus possible to determine the fact that the metaphoric process is oriented towards the *semantic specification* of some concrete aspects of experience and, therefore, that the functional metasemic principle enriches and give a nuance to "our ordinary experience" in the world.

CHAPTER III: Cognitive semantics' fundamental concepts in integral perspective

In this chapter we have attempt to reinterpret the fundamental concepts of "image schema" and "conceptual metaphor", initially presented in Lakovian cognitive semantics.

The first section entitled "*Image schema" and its relationship to the meaning proper* tries to recapture the "image schema" concept's originary pattern and to find a common ground with Coserian conception (*"Image schema" and its originary pattern)*. After indicating the originary Kantian source of M. Johnson's schematism, we focused on its reinterpretation from the viewpoint of the actual setting of "experiential semantics". Concerning the definition of the *intuitive, spontaneous and nonpropositional character* of "image schema", we considered it to be both, an innovative element in relationship to its initial model and the stumbling block of cognitive semantics' theory. The grounding of the concept in the Kantian schematism allows M. Johnson to distinguish between the images produced through the schema and the "rich" mental images. In contrast to the latter, image schema exists at an intermediary level between abstract and concrete images and constitutes experiential patterns, having the role of internally structuring the "rich mental images". It is conceived thus as a gestalt and dynamic structure, that emerges in human sensible experience in the world that gives, already at the pre-conceptual level, "meaningful order and organization" of it. The most problematic aspect of image schema's definition in experientialist semantics is thought to be its assigned essential feature of constituting *unifying, meaningful pattern of experience*. We have taken therefore into consideration and criticized M. Johnson's assumptions that image-schematic structures, elaborated at conceptual level, are the "bedrocks" for language as well as his explanation, based on

this assumption, of semantic creativity. Finally, we have found that the bias of M. Johnson's conception consists in his proposed development of Kantian concept. In the second part of this section we have adopted, accordingly, the Humboldtian interpretation of schematism assumed in integral semantics. Along with the outline of integral solution to the problem of the schematism – which reckon the *synthesis* of the "sensible data" as being realised *within the word* –, and proceeding to a critical comparison of both integral and experientialist solutions, we have established the following: the image schemas neither can be seen as unifying structures of experience, nor might the concept become "stable" or "conventional" – even supposing we would accept M. Johnson's claim that image schemas get "fixed" by permeating the structure of our concepts (fact that would also assign them a certain "stability"). The latter is achieved, as first explained by Humboldt, only "*in* and *through the sound*". We have demonstrated in this way that the aim of explaining semantic creativity is, under these circumstances, also impossible to be solved within experientialist semantics.

In the second subchapter devoted to image schema, *Sign, image, word. The function of image schema*, we have tried to establish the role of image schema in the activity of speaking. We have referred here to the most important problems encountered by cognitive semantics when the transition from the pre-conceptual to conceptual level and from the conceptual to linguistic level is taken into account; the problems have been approached, mainly, in the light of the strong criticism of the third "generation" of cognitive science. We have proved that the image schemas, proposed in cognitive semantics, have to be understood as "psychological" or "mental" phenomena and, inevitably, as "private". As a consequence, we have also emphasized the need to reinterpret the schemas as pertaining to the linguistic level. The reinterpretation has been proposed from the integral semantics' perspective. The role assigned within cognitive semantics to the schema has been compared with the one assigned in Coserian semantics to "the word" (which is ranged in a middle cross-zone, between sign and image, but, in the spirit of Humboldtian anticipation, much closer to image than to sign). The integral semantics' solution has been found to be a better alternative to the experientialist concept of schematism. On the other hand, the integral semantics has also envisaged a specific place where these schemata and the image-schematic structures of conceptual contents can be given a real value. Within Coserius semantics, which is based on the linguistic knowledge, their role is thus restricted to the act of designation. The schemata function here as "idealized cognitive models" (in the sense recuperated from Lakoff 1987), and their contribution is situated at the level of "knowledge of things" (skeuological level). In this context we have also noticed that the most important function of these

schemata to the metasemic knowledge consist in that they help us specify that the image engaged at skeuological level is not a "rich image", but a "gestalt structure", "associated to the meaning proper" and organizing perceptions in coherent "wholes" of experience.

The second section of chapter III, *Conceptual metaphor and metasemy*, has focused on the conceptual metaphor and its connected problems. The first step towards the 'reception' of the concept has been made in the first subchapter, *Conceptual metaphor in 'cognitive' semantics*, where we challenged the status of these metaphors, namely their cognitive and creative dimension. We have shown from the very beginning the importance ascribed by cognitive semantics to the "non-rhetorical" dimension in conceptualizing metaphor as well. The understanding of the metaphorical knowledge module as creation of new semantic contents – and one of our usual means in ordinary speaking – constituted the common broad sense in which "the theory of conceptual metaphor" could be correlated with integral metasemic conception. We have tried to reconsider the "conceptual metaphor" notion firstly in its originary cognitive framework, both from the perspective of "sociocultural embeddedness" of the conceptual metaphor and in accord to the third "generation" of cognitive science. These recent perspectives have highlighted the need to re-evaluate certain fundamental notions of cognitive semantics – especially the term of "embodiment" –, which lay at the very core of G. Lakoff and M. Johnson's theory of metaphor. In this context, we have stressed on the cognitive semiotics' main idea concerning the impossibility of gaining any substantial progress in researching metaphor on the initially assumed theoretical grounds in cognitive semantics. In convergence with this recent movement in cognitive science, we have emphasized the need for rethinking the metaphor in a new, appropriate theoretical framework, i.e. in rapport to the development of notions such as "subjectivity", "conscious" and, in particular, from the viewpoint of the specificity of "linguistic sign"'. Against this background, we have attempted afterwards to reconsider conceptual metaphor in the integral linguistics perspective. Thus, conceptual metaphor has been thought as pertaining to the *linguistic* level, and reinterpreted in relationship to the finality of metasemic process, as *creation of metasemic designational contents in the activity of speaking*. We considered this solution the best that can be given in order to recapture the creative dimension of metaphor as well: it could not be explained within cognitive semantics' "theory of conceptual metaphor" neither by the functional principle of "mapping" between experiential domains or by the principle of "projection" of image-schematic structure from a source domain to a target domain.

In the last two subchapters we have discussed another concept developed in cognitive science, namely the "invariance principle". Firstly, we have argued that the principle introduces a double "constraint" on metaphor: (1) of preserving "the structure of generic level of the target" in the mapping of "image" from the source domain to the target domain; (2) of imposing a "guiding role" on the metaphoric process from source to target. As a result of our argumentation we have concluded that this principle can be maintained neither in G.Lakoff's strong version, nor in the moderate version, proposed by M. Turner. The principle has been rejected on the ground that it denies both the cognitive and the creative character of metaphor. Secondly, we have questioned the claim of an "empirical hypothesis" assigned to the invariance principle and demonstrated that this principle seems to be necessary in cognitive semantics in order to impose a "theory of embodied cognition": herein, the invariance principle becomes a theoretical construct, by means of which this approach intends to explain the straightforward continuous movement from perception to language, where the only variation consists in different degrees of abstractness involved in the process.

The "guiding role" of metaphoric process, attributed by G. Lakoff and M. Turner (1989) to the invariance principle, has been the focus of the last subchapter of the work, entitled *"Guiding role" or „spontaneity" in metasemy*. The role rests with the invariance principle and it is as a result of the systematic elaboration of the "Great Chain of Being" model – which is took over from philosophy and reinterpreted as a model of image-schematic provenance within cognitive semantics.

"Source" and "target" notions could be accepted in integral semantics only to the extent that they have been discharged both of the presuppositions concerning the "guiding role" of the metasemic process and of the "constraint" of not violating the "target image". Reinterpreted in integral perspective, conceptual metaphor presupposes thus an "intuitive" "unitary, spontaneous and immediate" "knowledge" (Coseriu 1952/1967), *since it is of the same nature as the meaning proper itself*. From this perspective, the creation of metasemic and primary meanings have been seen as "free activities of imagination" and, as such, they are "spontaneous" and could not be "guided" by and are not reducible to the "experience in the world" or its primordial structures.

4. Conclusions and perspectives

In this section we have tried to draw the whole picture of the thesis and the coherence of the proposed argumentation. We have also specified, in this context, that our research constitutes only a part of a broader project, whose aim is to contribute – through the integration of the innovation

proposed in the Lakovian semanitics – to the systematic launch of the studies on "elocutional knowledge" (within the broader framework of the development of a "skeuological" linguistics).

The investigational demarche has given us the opportunity to indicate the specific place within integral semantic where one can also exploit and situate other concepts of cognitive semantics, which could bring an important advance to the development of the Coserian notion of "knowledge of things". When presented the Coserian "extralinguistic contexts", we have emphasized the fact that "the global cognitive model", articulated by "the natural context" could be interpreted as simetrical to G. Lakoff and M. Turner (1989) model of the "Great Chain of Being". The model developed in the Lakovian semantics is considered to be built upon our experience in the world and assembles, in an hierarchical and implicational organisation, experientially and image-schematically motivated domains of Being. The capital difference between the mentioned orientations consists in the fact that "Great Chain of Being" comprises an *ascendent* scale of "kind of beings", defined by their "essential properties" and their specific "behaviour", which presupposes the existence of a more systematized, but, at the same time, more "constraining" notion of what it is meant by E. Coseriu through the "knowledge of things" (see Coşeriu 1988; also Borcilă 2003a). The integration of this model within Coserian semantics, through which a more articulated theory of the domains of things of the metaphoric process could be gained, represents the second part of the broader project whereof this work is also a consistent part. In the attainment of this project, the reinterpretation of the fundamental concepts developed within cognitive semantics on a semantic unitary basis has constituted a first necessary requirement.

It should also be hightlighted the broader theoretical-historic perspective of our scientific demarche proposed in this work. Although, apparently, it is situated in the avant-garde of the linguistic movements in the contemporary moment, our research only renews and tries to follow a significative objective already laid down in the first half of the last century within the "linguistic school of Cluj": that of researching the "linguistic imagination", in the first place "the image" and "the metaphor", as crucial dimensions of "the essential symbolisme of the language" and of the "linguistic thinking" *.These dimensions became today accessible to a systematic exploration only within the conceptual framework elaborate by the linguistic integralism and, as we tried to argue along our thesis, through the valorization of certain important contributions of cognitive semantics.

---

* Puşcariu (1940). See also Borcilă 2002b. If we succeeded to realize, through our work, a first modest step towards acomplishing this objective, than its author, in her ten years struggle, will be fully rewarded.

BIBLIOGRAFIE

Almela, M. (2012), [Recenzie la] Martínez del Castillo, Jesús, *Las relaciones lenguaje-pensamiento o el problema del logos*, Madrid, Biblioteca Nueva, 2010, în *RSEL*, 42 (1), p. 199-223.

Barcelona, A. (2002), *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads. A cognitive perspective*, Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Blank, A. (1999), Why do new meaning occur? A cognitive typology of the motivations for lexical semantic change, în A. Blank, P. Koch (ed.), *Historical semantics and cognition*, Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 61-90.

Borcilă, M. (1987), Contribuții la elaborarea unei tipologii a textelor poetice, în *Studii şi cercetări lingvistice*, XXXVIII, nr. 3, p. 185–196.

Borcilă, M. (1988), Eugenio Coseriu şi orizonturile lingvisticii, în *Echinox*, nr. 5, p. 5.

Borcilă, M. (1991), Semiotică şi poetică. Perspective de reintegrare, în *Limbă şi literatură*, nr. 3 / 4, p. 229-236.

Borcilă, M. (1994), Semantica textului şi perspectiva poeticii, în *Limbă şi literatură*, vol.II, p. 33-38.

Borcilă, M. (1995), Soarele, lacrima Domnului, în*G. I. Tohăneanu 70*. Volum omagial la 70 de ani, Timişoara: Editura Amphora, p. 95-102.

Borcilă, M. (1997a), Între Blaga şi Coşeriu. De la metaforica limbajului la o poetică a culturii, în *Revista de filosofie*, XLIV, nr. 1-2, p. 147-163.

Borcilă, M. (1997b), The metaphoric model in poetic texts, în J. Péntek, (ed.), *Text şi stil, Text and Syle, Szöveg és stílus*, Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară, p 97-104.

Borcilă, M. (1997c), Marele lanț al ființei. O problemă de principiu în poetica antropologică, în *Limbă şi Literatură*, nr. 2, p.13–20.

Borcilă, M. (1999), [Recenzie] la Marian, Rodica, *„Lumile”Luceafărului*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Remus, 1999, 500p., în *Dacoromania*, Serie nouă (III-IV), 1998-1999, p. 277-280.

Borcilă, M. (1988/2000), Eugenio Coseriu and the New Horizons of Linguistics, în *Transylvanian Review*, vol. IX, No. 1 (Spring 2000), p. 90-102.

Borcilă, M. (2001a), Început de drum în studiile integraliste, în *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai. Philologia*, an XLVI, nr. 4, p. 3-14.

Borcilă, M. (2001b), Eugeniu Coşeriu, în *Limbă şi literatură*, nr. 4, p. 5-11.

Borcilă, M. (2001c), Eugeniu Coseriu, fondator al lingvisticii ca ştiinţă a culturii, în *Limba română*, Chişinău, XI, nr. 4-8, p. 48-55.

Borcilă, M. (2001d), Eugeniu Coşeriu şi bazele ştiinţelor culturii, în *Revista de lingvistică şi ştiinţă literară*, nr.184-198, p. 37-47.

Borcilă, M. (2001e), [Cuvânt de laudatio la Academia Moldovei], Chişinău.

Borcilă, M. (2001f), A cognitive challenge to mythopoetics, în E. Popescu, V. Rus (eds.), *Un hermeneut modern. In honorem Michaelis Nasta*, Cluj, Editura Clusium, p. 97–102.

Borcilă, M. (2001g), Poetica eminesciană în perspectiva transdisciplinarităţii, în *Aurora*, nr. 12, p. 70-77.

Borcilă, M. (2002a), Univers de discurs, în *Dicţionar conceptual al lingvisticii integrale*, Cluj-Napoca, Universitatea "Babeş-Bolyai", CNCSIS, p. 53-55.

Borcilă, M. (2002b), Sextil Puşcariu – un mare precursor al lingvisticii integrale, în A. Greive, I. Taloş, I. Mării, N. Mocanu (ed.), *Întâlnire între filologi români şi germani. Actele colocviului de la Cluj-Napoca, 24-26 mai 2002. Deutsche und rumänische Philologen in der Begegnung. Akten des gleichnamigen Kolloquiums in Cluj-Napoca von 24-26. Mai 2002*, Cluj-Napoca, Clusium, p. 66-79.

Borcilă, M. (2003a), Lingvistica integrală şi fundamentele metaforologiei, în *Dacoromania*, Serie nouă, VII-VIII, 2002-2003, Cluj-Napoca, p. 47-77.

Borcilă, M. (2003b), Blaga şi Coşeriu. O conjuncţie pentru eternitate, în *Tribuna*, nr. 17, p. 1-4.

Borcilă, M. (2006), Despre contextul actual şi perspectivele integralismului, în *Limba română*, an XVI, nr. 1-3, p. 43-49.

Borcilă, M. (2011), Resurecţia mitului în studiile integraliste, în *Caietele de la Putna: Fertilitatea mitului*, 4, IV, Mănăstirea Putna: Editura Nicodim Caligraful, p. 158-167.

Borcilă, M. (2013a), Bringing Coseriu Home. Reflections on the Fate of his Legacy in our Changing World, în E. Bojoga, O. Boc, D-C. Vîlcu (eds.), *Coseriu: Perspectives contemporaines. Tome 2*, Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană.

Borcilă, M. (2013b), Probleme de lingvistică integrală, Universitatea "Babeş-Bolyai", Cluj-Napoca (Prelegeri masterale).

Borcilă, M. (2013c), Paradigme contemporane în cercetarea lingvistică, Universitatea "Babeş-Bolyai", Cluj-Napoca (Prelegeri doctorale).

Borcilă, M. (2013d), Deschideri în şi către integralismul lingvistic. Prelegere prezentată la *Atelierul pluridisciplinar "Eugeniu Coseriu şi lingvistica secolului XXI", Cluj-Napoca, 1-12 iulie 2013*.

Bologna, M. P. (2003), "Au-dèla de l'arbitraire du signe": Iconicità e metáfora nell''architettura' della lingua, în V. Orioles (ed.), *Supplemento a Plurilinguismo. Contatti di lingue e culture. Studi in memoria di Eugenio Coseriu*, 10, Università degli Studi di Undine, Centro internazionale sul plurilinguismo.

Bota, C. (2007), Le langage comme *energeia* et comme médiation. Comunicare susținută la *Colloque "Coseriu: réceptions contemporaines", Aix-en- Provence, 17-19 septembre 2007.*

Bota, C. (2011a), Is Coseriu's Framework a "Cognitive" One? Comments on Jordan Zlatev's Article "From Cognitive to Integral Linguistics and Back Again", în *Intellectica: Cognitive Linguistics: a Critical Exploration*, nr. 56, p. 315-319.

Bota, C. (2011b), Origine et développement du concept d'*univers de discours*. Comunicare la *IIIe Colloque international Eugenio Coseriu*, *lingüista entre dos siglos, Universidad de Almería, 5-7 octobre 2011.*

Bota, C. (2012), Eugenio Coseriu et le potentiel épistémologique de l'energeia langagière, în *Energeia*, IV, p. 32-48 (http://www.romling.uni-tuebingen.de/energeia /zeitschrift/2012/eugenio-coseriu-et-le-potenciel-epistemologique.html).

Bucă, M., Evseev, I. (1976), *Probleme de semasiologie*, Timişoara: Editura Facla.

Buttinelli, A. (2013), Dalla linguistica della parola alla linguistica del parlare. Ipotesi di una confronto tra Coseriu e Pagliaro, în E. Bojoga, O. Boc, D-C. Vîlcu (eds.), *Coseriu: Perspectives contemporaines. Tome 1*, Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, p. 57-64.

Coseriu, E. (1952/1985), La creación metaforica en el lenguaje, in E. Coşeriu, *El hombre y su lenguaje. Estudios de teoría y metodología lingüistica*, Madrid: Editorial Gredos, p. 66-102.

Coseriu, E. (1952/1967), Sistema, norma y habla, în E. Coseriu, *Teoría del lenguaje y lingüística general. Cinco estudios*, Madrid: Editorial Gredos, p. 11-113.

Coseriu, E. (1954/1967), Forma y sustancia en los sonidos del lenguaje, in E. Coseriu, *Teoría del lenguaje y lingüística general. Cinco estudios*, Madrid: Editorial Gredos, p. 115-234.

Coseriu, E. (1955/1967), Determinación y entorno, în E. Coseriu, *Teoría del lenguaje y lingüística general*. *Cinco estudios*, Madrid: Editorial Gredos, p. 282-323.

Coseriu, E. (1956/1967), *Teoría del lenguaje y lingüística general. Cinco estudios*, Madrid: Editorial Gredos.

Coşeriu, E. (1958/1997), *Sincronie, diacronie şi istorie*. Versiune în limba română de Nicolae Saramandu, Bucureşti: Editura Enciclopedică.

Coseriu, E. (1967/ 2009), Limbajul şi înţelegerea existenţială a omului actual, în E. Coşeriu, *Omul şi limbajul său*. Antologie, argument şi note de Dorel Fânaru, Iaşi: Editura Universităţii "Al. I. Cuza", p. 135-160.

Coseriu, E. (1969/2009), Semantica, forma interioară a limbajului şi structura profundă, în E. Coşeriu, *Omul şi limbajul său*. Antologie, argument şi note de Dorel Fânaru, Iaşi: Editura Universităţii "Al. I. Cuza", p. 282-293.

Coseriu, E. (1971/1985), La 'situación' en la lingüística, în E. Coseriu, *El hombre y su lenguaje, Estudios de teoría y metodología lingüística*, Madrid: Editorial Gredos, p. 240-256.

Coseriu, E. (1972/1985), Sobre el desarrollo de la lingüística, în E. Coseriu, *El hombre y su lenguaje, Estudios de teoría y metodología lingüística*, Madrid: Editorial Gredos, p. 257-266.

Coseriu, E. (1972a), *Die Geschichte der Sprachphilosophie von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart. Eine Übersicht, Teil II: Von Leibniz bis Rousseau*, Tübingen: G. Narr Verlag.

Coseriu, E. (1972b), Sobre las categorías verbales ('partes de la oracion'), în *Revista de lingüística aplicada* (Concepción – Chile), X, p. 7-25.

Coseriu, E. (1976/1985), Lo erróneo y lo acertado en la teoría de la traducción, în E. Coseriu, *El hombre y su lenguaje, Estudios de teoría y metodología lingüística*, Madrid: Editorial Gredos, p. 214-239.

Coş eriu, E. (1976/2001), L'étude fonctionnelle du vocabulaire. Précis de lexématique, în E. Coşeriu, *L'homme et son langage*, Louvain—Paris—Sterling, Virginia : Editions Peeters, p. 333-352.

Coseriu, E. (1976/ 2009), Logica limbajului şi logica gramaticii, în E. Coşeriu, *Omul şi limbajul său. Studii de filozofie a limbajului, teorie a limbii şi lingvistică generală*. Antologie, argument, note, bibliografie şi indici de Dorel Fînaru, Iaşi: Editura Universităţii « Alexandru Ioan Cuza », p. 255-281.

Coseriu, E. (1977/1985), *El hombre y su lenguaje, Estudios de teoría y metodología lingüística*, Madrid: Editorial Gredos.

Coşeriu, E. (1977/1991), Significado y designación a la luz de la semántica estructural, în E. Coseriu, *Principios de semántica estructural*, Madrid: Editorial Gredos, p. 185-209.

Coseriu, E. (1977/2001), L'homme et son langage, in E. Coseriu, *L'homme et son langage*, Louvain – Paris – Sterling : Edition Peeters, Virginia, p. 31-69.

Coseriu, E. (1978/1987a), Los universales lingüísticos (y los otros), în E. Coseriu, *Gramática, semántica, universales. Estudio de lingüística funcional*, Madrid: Editorial Gredos, p. 148-205.

Coseriu, E. (1978/1987b), *Gramática, semántica, universales. Estudio de lingüística funcional*, Madrid: Editorial Gredos.

Coseriu, E. (1979/1988), Humboldt und die moderne Sprachwissenschaft, în J. Albrect, J. Lüdke, H. Thun (Hrsg.), *Energeia und Ergon. Sprachliche Variation – Sprachgeschichte – Sprachtypologie, Studia in honorem Eugenio Coseriu. Band I: Schriften von Eugenio Coseriu (1965-1987)*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, p. 3-11.

Coseriu, E. (1981), *Textlinguistik. Eine Einführung*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Coşeriu, E. (1973/2000), *Lecţii de lingvistică generală*. Trad. din spaniolă de Eugenia Bojoga, Chişinău: Editura Arc.

Coseriu, E.(1981), *Textlinguistik. Eine Einführung*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Coseriu, E. (1982/2009), Dincolo de structuralism, în E. Coşeriu, *Omul şi limbajul său. Studii de filozofie a limbajului, teorie a limbii şi lingvistică generală*. Antologie, argument, note, bibliografie şi indici de Dorel Fînaru, Iaşi : Editura Universităţii « Alexandru Ioan Cuza », p. 294-300.

Coseriu, E. (1985), Linguistic competence: What is it really?, in *The Modern Language Review* LXXX, p. XXV-XXXV.

Coseriu, E. (1987), Bedeutung, Bezeichnung und sprachliche Kategorien, în *Sprachwissenschaft*, XII, p. 1-23.

Coseriu, E. (1995), Von den 'universali fantastici', în J. Trabant (ed.), *Vico und die Zeichen. Akten des von der Freien Universität Berlin, der Volkswagenstiftung und dem Istituto per gli Studi Filosofici (Neapel) veranstalteten internationalen Kolloquiums (Berlin, 23.–25. September 1993)*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, p. 73-80.

Coseriu, E. (1988), *Sprachkompetenz. Grundzüge der Theorie des Sprechens*, Tübingen: Franke Verlag.

Coseriu, E. (1990/2000), Structural semantics and „cognitive" semantics, în *Logos and Language* (Tübingen), Vol. I, No. 1, pp. 19-42 (translation by K. Willems and T. Leuschner).

Coseriu, E. (1977/1991), Para una semántica diacrónica estructural, în *Principios de semántica estructural*, Madrid: Editorial Gredos, p. 11-86.

Coseriu, E. (1992a), *Strukturelle und kognitive Semantik*. Vorlesung WS 1989-1990, Nachschrift von Ulrike Maier und Heinrich Weber. Unveröffentliches Manuskript. Universität Tübingen: Tübingen.

Coseriu, E. (1992b), *Die deutsche Sprachphilosophie von Herder bis Humboldt*, Teil I-II, Vorlesung WS 1985/1986, Nachschrift von Heinrich Weber. Unveröffentliches Manuskript. Universität Tübingen: Tübingen.

Coşeriu, E. (1992c), Principiile lingvisticii ca ştiinţă a culturii, în *Studia Universitatis „Babeş-Bolyai". Philologia*, XXXVII, nr. 1-2, p. 5-12.

Coseriu, E. (1992/1993), Semn, simbol, cuvânt, în *Analele ştiinţifice ale Universităţii Al. I. Cuza din Iaşi*, seria Lingvistică, Tomul XXXIX, p. 5-22.

Coseriu, E. (1994), *Wilhelm von Humboldt. Die deutsche Sprachphilosophie von Herder bis Humboldt*, Teil III, Vorlesung WS 1988/1989, Nachschrift von Christian Dern und Heinrich Weber. Unveröffentliches Manuskript. Universität Tübingen: Tübingen.

Coşeriu, E. (1996a), *Lingvistica integrală*. Interviu realizat de N. Saramandu, Bucureşti: Editura Fundaţiei Culturale Române.

Coşeriu, E.(1996b), *Fiinţă şi limbaj*. Interviu realizat de Lucian Lazăr, în *Echinox*, XXXVII, nr. 9-10-11, p. 3-6.

Coseriu, E. (1997/2009), Estetica lui Blaga în perspectivă europeană, în M. Borcilă, I. Petraş, H. Bădescu, *Meridian Lucian Blaga în lumină 9*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Casa Cărţii de Ştiinţă, p. 355-360.

Coşeriu, E. (1999/*în curs apariţie*), Locul lingvisticii integrale în lingvistica actuală, în M. Borcilă (ed.), *E. Coşeriu, Principiile lingvisticii ca ştiinţă a culturii*, Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană.

Coseriu, E. (2000a), Prolusione. Orationis fundamenta: La preghiera come testo, în Giuseppe de Gennaro S.I. (ed.), *I quattro universi di discurso. Atti del Congresso Internazionale „Orationis Millennium", L'Aquila, 24-30 giugno 2000*, Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, p. 24-47.

Coseriu, E. (2000b), Bilancio provvisorio. I quattro universi di discurso, in Giuseppe de Gennaro S.I. (ed.), *I quattro universi di discurso. Atti del Congresso Internazionale „Orationis Millennium", L'Aquila, 24-30 giugno 2000*, Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, p. 524-532.

Coseriu, E. (2001a), Le langage: diacriticón tes ousías. Dix thèses à propos de l'essence du langage et du signifié, în D. Keller, J. P. Durafour, J. F. P. Bonnot, R. Stock (eds.), *Percevoir: Monde et langage. Invariance et variabilité du sens vécu*, Hayen : Mardaga, p. 79-83.

Coseriu, E. (2001b), *L'homme et son langage*, Louvain—Paris—Sterling, Virginia : Editions Peeters.

Coşeriu, E. (2002), Filozofia limbajului, în *FD*, XX-XXI, Bucureşti, 2001-2002, p. 65-140.

Coseriu, E. (2003/2011), *Istoria filosofiei limbajului de la începuturi până la Rousseau*. Versiune românească şi indice de Eugen Munteanu şi Mădălina Ungureanu. Cu o prefaţă la ediţia românească de E. Munteanu, Bucureşti : Editura Humanitas.

Coseriu, E. (2006), *Orationis fundamenta*. La plegaria como texto, în E. Coseriu şi O. Loureda Lamas, *Lenguaje y discurso*, Pamplona: Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, p. 61-84.

Crăciunescu, P. (2000), *Eminescu: Paradisul infernal şi transcosmologia*. Prefaţă de B. Nicolescu, Iaşi: Editura Junimea.

Crăciunescu, P. (2004), Postfaţă la *Ion Barbu – Cosmologia "Jocului secund"*, Bucureşti: Editura Univers Enciclopedic.

Crăciunescu, P. (2008), Integralismul şi lumea sensului, în *Convorbiri literare*, CXLIV, nr. 2, p. 113-114.

Cuenca, M. J., Hilferty, J. (1999), *Introducción a la lingüística cognitiva*, Barcelona: Editorial Ariel.

Daddesio, T. (1995), *On Minds and Symbol: The Relevance of Cognitive Science for Semiotics*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dan-Terian, S. (2010), *Semantica textemelor româneşti. Abordare în perspectivă integralistă*, Cluj-Napoca: Universitatea "Babeş-Bolyai" (teză de doctorat).

Dănilă, E. (2006), Probleme de sinonimie morfologică în limba română, în *Philologica Jassyensia*, an II, nr. 2, p. 17-24.

De Cuypere, Ludovic (2008), *Limiting the iconic. From the metatheoretical foundations to the creative possibilities of iconicity in language*, Iconicity in language and literature 6, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

De Oliviera R. P., Bittencourt, R. de S. (2008), An interview with Mark Johnson and Tim Rohrer: From neurons to sociocultural situatedness, în R. M. Frank, R. Driven, T. Ziemke, E. Bernardez (eds.), *Body, language and mind*, Vol. 2: *Sociocultural situatedness*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 21-52.

Di Cesare, D. (1988), Die aristotelische Herkunft der Begriffe érgon und enérgeia in Wilhelm von Humboldts Sprachphilosophie, în J. Albrect, J. Lüdke, H. Thun (Hrsg.), *Energeia und Ergon. Sprachliche Variation – Sprachgeschichte – Sprachtypologie, Studia in honorem Eugenio Coseriu. Band II: Das sprachtheoretische Denken Eugenio Coserius in der Diskussion (1)*, Tübingen: G. Narr Verlag, p. 29-46.

Di Cesare, D. (1998), Einleitung, în W. von Humboldt, *Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluß auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts*, Paderborn, München, Wien, Zürich: Ferdinand Schöningh Verlag, p. 11-128.

Dietrich, W. (2012), Por una semántica diacrónica estructural y cognitiva, în J. Martínez del Castillo (ed.), *Eugenio Coseriu (1921-2012) en los comienzos del siglo XXI. Vol. II* , Málaga: Universidad de Málaga, p. 39-56.

Dodge, E., Lakoff G. (2005), Image schemas: From linguistic analysis to neural grounding, în B. Hampe (ed.), *From Perception to Meaning: Image Schemas in Cognitive Linguistics*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 57-91.

Eco, U. (1997/2002), *Kant şi ornitorincul*, Constanţa: Editura Pontica.

Faur, E. (2013), The Conceptual Metaphor in Integral Semantics, în E. Bojoga, O. Boc, D.-C. Vîlcu (eds.), *Coseriu: Perspectives contemporaines. Tome 2*, Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană.

Faur, E. (în curs de apariţie), Integral Semantics and Conceptual Metaphor. Rethinking Conceptual Metaphor within an Integral Semantics Framework, în *Cognitive Semiotics*, vol. V, nr.1.

Formigari, L. (1994), *La sémiotique empiriste face au kantisme*, Liège : Mardaga.

Frank, R. M. (2008), Introduction: Sociocultural situatedness, în R. M. Frank, R. Driven, T. Ziemke, E. Bernardez (eds.), *Body, language and mind*, Vol. 2: *Sociocultural situatedness*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 1-18.

Frank, R. M., Driven, R., Ziemke, T., Bernardez, E. (2008), *Body, language and mind*. *Vol. 2: Sociocultural situatedness*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Froese, T., Di Paulo, E. A. (2011), The enactive approach. Theoretical sketches from cell to society, în *Pragmatics and Cognition*, 19 (1), p. 1-36.

Gallagher, S. (2005), *How the Body Shapes the Mind*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gallagher, S., Sørensen, J. B. (2006), Experimenting with phenomenology, în *Consciousness and Cognition*, 15 (1), p. 119-134.

Gallese V., Lakoff, G. (2005), The brain concepts: The role of the sensory-motor system in conceptual knowledge, în *Cognitive Neuropsychology,* 22, pp. 445-479.

Geeraerts, D. (2010), *Theories of lexical semantics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Geeraerts, D., Cuyckens, H. (2007), Introducing Cognitive Linguistics, în D. Geeraerts, H. Cuyckens (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 3-21.

Gibbs, R. W .Jr. (1994), *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language and Understanding*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gibbs, R. W. Jr. (1999), Taking metaphor out of our heads and putting it into the cultural world, în R. W. Jr. Gibbs, G. Steen (eds.), *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, p.145-166.

Gibbs, R. W. Jr. (2003), Embodied experience and linguistic meaning, în *Brain and Language*, 84, p. 1-15

Haser, V. (2005), *Metaphor, Metonymy, and Experientialist Philosophy. Challenging Cognitive Semantics*, Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hampe, B. (2005), Introduction, în B. Hampe (ed.), *From Perception to Meaning: Image Schemas in Cognitive Linguistics*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 1-14.

Hampe, B. (2005), *From Perception to Meaning: Image Schemas in Cognitive Linguistics*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Harder, P. (2007), Cognitive Linguistics and Philosophy, în D. Geeraerts, H. Cuyckens (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook in Cognitive Linguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 1241-1265.

Humboldt, W. von (1835/1998), *Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluß auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts*. Hrsg. D. Di Cesare, Paderborn , München , Wien, Zürich: Ferdinand Schöningh Verlag.

Ikegami, T., Zlatev, J. (2007), From non-representational cognition to language, în T. Ziemke, J. Zlatev, R. Frank (eds.), *Body, Language and Mind. Vol 1: Embodiment*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 241-283.

Itkonen, E. (2003), *What is Language? A Study in the Philosophy of Linguistics*, Turku, Turku University Press.

Itkonen, E. (2006), Three Fallacies that Recur in Linguistic Argumentation, în T. Haukioja (ed.), *Papers on Language Theory*, University of Turku: Publications in General Linguisitics, 10.

Itkonen, E. (2008), Concerning the Role of Consciousness in Linguistics, în *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 15, nr. 6, p. 15-33.

Itkonen, E. (2009), The True Nature of Typological Linguistics, în J. Zlatev, M. Andren, M. J. Falck, C. Lundmark (eds.), *Studies in Language and Cognition*, Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, p. 19-30.

Itkonen, E. (2011), On Coseriu's legacy, în *Energeia*, III, p. 1-29 (http://www.romling.uni-tuebingen.de/energeia/zeitschrift/2011/on-coserius-legacy.html).

Jäkel, O. (2002), Hypotheses Revisited: The Cognitive Theory of Metaphor Applied to Religious Texts, www.*metaphorik.de / 02/2002*.

Johnson, M. (1981), Introduction: Metaphor in the Philosophical Tradition, în M. Johnson (ed.), *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, p. 3-47.

Johnson, M. (1987), *The Body in the Mind. The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination and Reason,* Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, M., Lakoff, G. (2002), Why cognitive linguistics requires embodied realism, in *Cognitive linguistics*, 13: 3, p. 245-263.

Kabatek, J. (2000), Einheitlichkeit der Bedeutung, Designat und Integrale Linguistic, în *Lingüística romana et indiana. Festschrift fur Wolf Dietrich zum 60. Geburtstag*, Tübingen: G. Narr Verlag, p. 189-205.

Kabatek, J. (2012), Intuición y empirismo, în J. Martínez del Castillo (ed.), *Eugenio Coseriu (1921-2012) en los comienzos del siglo XXI. Vol. I*, Málaga: Universidad de Málaga, p. 99-116.

Kabatek, J., Murguía, A. (1997), "*Die Sachen sagen wie sie sind…" Eugenio Coseriu im Gespräch*, Tübingen: Günter Narr Verlag.

Kimmel, M. (2005), Culture regained: situated and compound image schemas, în B. Hampe (ed.), *From Perception to Meaning: Image Schemas in Cognitive Linguistics*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 285-312.

Kimmel, M. (2008), Properties of cultural embodiment: Lessons from the anthropology of the body, în R. M. Frank, R. Driven, T. Ziemke, E. Bernardez (eds.), *Body, language and mind*, *Vol. 2: Sociocultural situatedness*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 77-108.

Kull, K. (2009), Vegetative, Animal and Cultural Semiosis: the semiotic threshold zones, în *Cognitive Semiotics: Anthroposemiotic vs. Biosemiotic*, nr. 4, p. 8-27.

Laca, B. (1984), La semántica de prototipos. ¿Hacia una lingüística de las cosas?, în *Relaciones* (Montevideo), I, p. 9-10.

Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (1980/2003), *Metaphors we live by*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (1981), Conceptual Metaphor in Everyday Language, în în M. Johnson (ed.), *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, p. 286-325.

Lakoff, G. (1987), *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind,* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., Turner, M. (1989), *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (1999), *Philosophy in the Flesh. The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought,* New York: Basic Books.

Lakoff, G. (1990), The invariance hypothesis: is abstract reason based on image schemas?, în *Cognitive linguistics* , an I (1990), nr.1, p. 39-74.

Lakoff, G. (1993), The contemporary theory of metaphor, în A. Ortony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 205-251.

Lakoff, G. (2008), The Neural Theory of Metaphor, în R. Gibbs (ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 17-39.

Lakoff, G, Nuñez, R. (2000), *Where Mathematics Comes From: How the Embodied Mind Brings Mathematics Into Being*, New York: Basic Books.

Langacker, R. W. (1987), *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. I: Theoretical Prerequisites*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, R. W. (1991), *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. II: Descriptive Application*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Laplace, C. (1994), *Théorie du langage et théorie de la traduction: les concepts – clef de trois auteurs: Kade (Leipzig), Coseriu (Tübingen), Selskovitch (Paris)*, Paris : Didier Érudition.

Lazăr, L. (2001), Dimensiunea istorică a limbajului în lingvistica integrală, în *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai. Philologia*, an XLVI, nr. 4, p. 15-34.

Lazăr, L. (2007), Limbaj şi semnificaţie: distincţia „*semantic* vs. *real*" în lingvistica integrală (II), în *Limba română*, XVII, nr. 7-9.

Lazăr, L. (2002), Părţile vorbirii, în *Dicţionar conceptual al lingvisticii integrale* Cluj-Napoca, Universitatea "Babeş-Bolyai", CNCSIS, p. 45-46.

Loureda Lamas, O. (2006), Fundamentos de una lingüística del texto real y funcional, în E. Coseriu, O. Loureda Lamas, *Lenguaje y discurso*, Pamplona: Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, p. 127-152.

Lovejoy, A. O. (1936/1997), *Marele Lanţ al Fiinţei. Istoria ideii de plenitudine de la Platon la Schelling*, Bucureşti: Humanitas.

Marian, R. (1999), *Lumile Luceafărului (o reinterpretare a poemului eminescian)*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Remus.

Marian, R. (2003), Hermeneutica sensului. Eminescu şi Blaga, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Casa Cărţii de Ştiinţă.

Martínez del Castillo, J. (2003), La teoría del hablar, una teoría del conocimiento, în *Odisea*, nr. 3, p. 131-154.

Martínez del Castillo, J. (2008), *La lingüística cognitiva. Análisis y revisión*, Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.

Martínez del Castillo, J. (2010), *Las relaciones lenguaje-pensamiento o el problema del logos*, Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.

Martínez del Castillo, J. (2011), *Sobre las categorías*, Buenos Aires: Deauno.Com.

Martínez del Castillo, J. (2013), El problema del *logos*: cuestiones epistemológicas, în E. Bojoga, O. Boc, D-C. Vîlcu (eds.), *Coseriu: Perspectives contemporaines. Tome 1*, Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, p. 65-84.

Müller, C. (2008), *Metaphors dead and alive, sleeping and walking. A dynamic view*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Munteanu, R. (2012), Elemente de poetică simbolic-mitică în romanul contemporan românesc, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Accent.

Nagy, M. (2013), De la translinguistique des textes et des œuvres d'Emile Benveniste à la linguistique du sens d'Eugenio Coseriu, în E. Bojoga, O. Boc, D.-C. Vîlcu (eds.), *Coseriu: Perspectives contemporaines. Tome 1*, Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, p. 181-192.

Nicolescu, B., Cazenave, M. (1994), *L'Homme, la science et la nature – Regards transdisciplinaires*, Paris : Le Mail, col. Science et Conscience.

Nicolescu, B. (2007), *Transdisciplinaritatea : Manifest*. Traducere din limba franceză de H. M. Vasilescu, Iaşi : Editura Junimea.

Oancea, I. (1998), *Semiostilistica*, Timişoara: Editura Excelsior.

Oancea, I (1992), Tipologie textuală şi figurativitate: o strategie poetică dominantă în poezia română a secolului al XIX-lea, în *Semiotică şi poetică*, V, p. 146-162.

Oancea, I., Obrocea, N. (2013), Le Centre d'étude integralistes de Cluj. Quelques repères, în E. Bojoga, O. Boc, D.-C. Vîlcu (eds.), *Coseriu: Perspectives contemporaines. Tome 1*, Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, p. 193-206.

Pop, L. (2001), Espaces discursifs et prédication, în S. Leroy, A. Nowakowska, Praxiling (eds.), *Actes du Colloque Aspects de la prédication*, Montpellier III : Université Paul Valéry, p. 47-73.

Pop, L, (2004), Ionesco et le principe métonymique, în *Cahiers Ionesco*, II (Thalia, Cluj-Napoca), p. 8-13.

Popescu, L. (1991), *Semantik der Redeakte*, Tübingen: Universität Tübingen (teză de doctorat).

Puşcariu, S. (1940), *Limba română*, *Vol I: Privire generală*, Bucureşti.

Rakova, M. (2002), The philosophy of embodied realism: A high price to pay? în *Cognitive Linguistics*, 13-3, pp. 215-245.

Rakova, M. (2003), *The Extent of the Literal. Metaphor, Polysemy and Theory of Concepts*, London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Santibáñez Sáenz, F. (1999), Constraints on Metaphor: Some Notes on the Role of the Invariance Principle in Metaphoric Mappings, în *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada*, nr. 13, p. 177-187.

Semino, E. (2008), *Metaphor in Discourse*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sinha, C. (1999), Grounding, mapping and acts of meaning, în T. Janssen, G. Redeker (eds.), *Cognitive Linguistics: Foundations, Scope and Methodology*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 223-255.

Sinha, C. (2007), Cognitive linguistics, psychology and cognitive science, în D. Geeraerts, H. Cuyckens (eds.) *Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, p 1266-1294.

Sinha, C., Rodríguez, C. (2008), Language and the signifying object: from convention to imagination, în J. Zlatev, T. Racine, C. Sinha, E. Itkonen (eds.), *The Shared Mind: Perspectives on Intersubjectivity*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, p. 357-378.

Sonesson, G. (2001) <u>From Semiosis to Ecology. On the theory of iconicity and its consequences for the ontology of the Lifeworld</u>, în *VISIO* (*Cultural cognition and space cognition*, Quinn, Andrew (ed.))*, 6 (2), p. 85-110.

Sonesson, G. (2006), The meaning of meaning in biology and cognitive science, în *Sign System Studies*, 34 (1), p. 135-214.

Sonesson, G. (2007), From the meaning of embodiment to the embodiment of meaning: A study in phenomenological semiotics, în T. Ziemke, J. Zlatev, R. Frank (eds.), *Body, Language and Mind*. *Vol 1: Embodiment*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sonesson, G. (2009), The View from Husserl's Lectern. Considerations on the Role of Phenomenology in Cognitive Semiotics, în *Cybernetics and Human Knowing*, vol. 16, nr. 3-4, p. 25-66.

Stockwell, P. (1999), The inflexibility of invariance, în *Language and literature*, vol 8, nr. 2, p. 125-142.

Ştefănescu, M. (2007), *Lumile posibile şi sensul textelor literare. De la Leibniz la Robinson Crusoe*, Cluj-Napoca: Casa Cărţii de Ştiinţă.

Taylor, J. R. (1999), Cognitive Semantics and structural semantics, in A. Blank, P. Koch (eds.), *Historical Semantics and Cognition*, Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Tămâianu, E. (2001), *Fundamentele tipologiei textuale. O abordare în lumina lingvisticii integrale*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Clusium.

Thompson, E. (2007), *Mind in Life. Biology, Phenomenology, and the Science of Mind*, Cambridge-Massachusetts-London-England: The Belknap Harvard University Press.

Tomasello, M. (1999), *The cultural origins of human cognition*, Cambridge—London: The Harvard University Press.

Tomoioagă, A. M. (2013a), La métaphore dans l'activité de parler, în *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai. Philologia*, an LVIII, nr. 2, p. 201-214.

Tomoioagă, A. M. (2013b), La traduction des métaphores du langage quotidien, în *Atelier de traduction*, nr. 19, p. 77-95.

Trabant, J. (1990), *Traditionen Humboldts*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Trabant, J. (1992), *Humboldt ou le sens de langage*, Liege: Mardaga.

Turner, M. (1990), Aspects of Invariance Hypothesis, in *Cognitive Linguistics*, an I (1990), nr.2, p.247-255.

Turner, M. (1992), Language is a virus, în *Poetics today*, vol. 13, nr. 4, p. 725-736.

Turner, M. (1993), An image-schematic constraint on metaphor, în R. Geiger, B. Rudzka-Ostyn (eds.), *Conceptualizations and Mental Processing in Language*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 291-306.

Van der Gucht, F., Willems, K., De Cuypere, L. (2007), The iconicity of embodied meaning. Polysemy of spatial prepositions in the cognitive framework, în *Language science*, 29, p. 733-754.

Varela, F. J., Thompson, E. T., Rosch, E. (1991), *The Embodied Mind. Cognitive Science and Human Experience*, Cambridge-Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Violi, P. (2008), Beyond the body: Toward a full embodied semiosis, în R. Frank, R. Driven, T. Ziemke, E. Bernardez (eds.), *Body, language and mind. Vol. 2: Sociocultural situatedness*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 53-77.

Vîlcu, C. (2001), Eugeniu Coseriu şi « răsturnarea lingvistică », în *Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai. Philologia*, XLVI, nr. 4, p 117-127.

Vîlcu, Cornel (2002), Designaţie, în *Dicţionar conceptual al lingvisticii integrale*, Cluj-Napoca, Universitatea "Babeş-Bolyai", CNCSIS, p. 43-44.

Vîlcu, Cornel (2010), *Orizontul problematic al integralismului. Integralism şi fenomenologie.Volumul I*, Cluj-Napoca: Argonaut & Scriptor.

Vîlcu, Dina, (2013), *Întemeierea teoretică a lingvisticii în integralism şi generativism. Abordare comparativă de ansamblu cu aplicare la problematica determinării*, Cluj-Napoca: Universitatea "Babeş-Bolyai" (teză de doctorat).

Willems, K. (2003), Eugenio Coseriu (1921-2002). Versuch einer Würdigung, în *Leuvense Bijdragen*, 92, p. 1-25.

Willems, K. (2011), Meaning and interpretation: The semiotic similarities and differences between Cognitive Grammar and European structural linguistics, în *Semiotica*, 185, 1/4, p.1-50.

Yu, N. (2008a) The relationship between metaphor, body and culture, în R. Frank, R. Driven, T. Ziemke, E. Bernardez (eds.), *Body, language and mind. Vol. 2: Sociocultural situatedness*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 378-408.

Yu, N. (2008b), Metaphor from body and culture, în R. W. Gibbs (ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 247-261.

Zahavi, D. (2001), Beyond Empathy: Phenomenological Approaches to Intersubjectivity, în *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 8 (5-7), p. 151-167.

Zahavi, D. (2003), *Husserl's Phenomenology*, Standford, CA: Standford University Press.

Zahavi, D. (2004), Phenomenology and the project of naturalization, în *Phenomenology and the cognitive science*, 3, p. 331-347.

Zahavi, D. (2009), [Recenzie la] Thompson, Evan. *Mind in Life. Biology, Phenomenology, and the Science of Mind*, Cambridge-Massachusetts-London-England: Harvard University Press, 2007, 568 p., în *Husserl Studies*, 25, p. 159-168.

Zahavi, D., Gallagher, S. (2008), *The Phenomenological Mind: An Introduction to Philosophy of Mind and Cognitive Science*, London: Routledge.

Ziemke, T., Zlatev, J., R. Frank (2007), *Body, Language and Mind. Vol 1: Embodiment*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Zinken, J. (2007), Discourse metaphors: The link between figurative and habitual analogies, în *Cognitive Linguistics*, 18 (3), p. 445-465.

Zinken, J., Hellsten, I., Nerlich, B. (2008), Discourse metaphor, în R. M. Frank, R. Driven, T. Ziemke, E. Bernardez (eds.), *Body, language and mind. Vol. 2: Sociocultural situatedness*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 363-386.

Zlatev, J. (2003), Meaning = Life (+ Culture). An outline of a unified biocultural theory of Meaning, în *Evolution of Communication,* 4/2, p. 253-296.

Zlatev, J. (2005), What's in a schema? Bodily mimesis and the grounding of language, în B. Hampe (ed.), *From Perception to Meaning: Image Schemas in Cognitive Linguistics*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 313-343.

Zlatev, J. (2007), Language, embodiment and mimesis, în T. Ziemke, J. Zlatev, R. Frank (eds.) *Body, Language and Mind. Vol. 1: Embodiment*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 297-337.

Zlatev, J. (2008a), The dependence of language of consciousness, în *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 15, nr. 6, p. 34-62.

Zlatev, J. (2008b), The co-evolution of intersubjectivity and bodily mimesis, în J. Zlatev, T. Racine, C. Sinha, E. Itkonen (eds.), *The Shared Mind: Perspectives on Intersubjectivity*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Zlatev, J., Racine, T., Sinha, C., Itkonen, E. (2008a), Intersubjectivity. What makes us human?, în J. Zlatev, T. Racine, C. Sinha, E. Itkonen (eds.), *The Shared Mind: Perspectives on Intersubjectivity*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, p. 1-14.

Zlatev, J., Racine, T., Sinha, C., Itkonen, E. (2008b), *The Shared Mind: Perspectives on Intersubjectivity*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Zlatev, J. (2009a), The Semiotic Hierarchy: Life, Consciousness, Signs and Language, în *Cognitive Semiotics. Special Issue on Anthroposemiotics vs. Biosemiotics*, vol. 4, p. 170-201.

Zlatev, J. (2009b), Levels of Meaning, Embodiment and Communication, în *Cybernetics and Human Knowing*, vol. 14, nr. 3-4, p. 149-174.

Zlatev, J. (2010), Phenomenology and Cognitive Linguistics, în D. Schmicking, S. Gallagher (eds.), *Handbook of Phenomenology and Cognitive Sciences*, Dordrecht - New York: Springer, p. 415-446.

Zlatev, J. (2011a), From Cognitive to Integral Linguistics. Learning from Coseriu's Matrix, în *Intellectica: Cognitive Linguistics: a Critical Exploration*, 2011, nr. 56, p. 125-147.

Zlatev, J. (2011b), What is cognitive semiotics? în *Semiotix: A Global Information Bulletin,* XN-6.

Zlatev, J. (2012a), Cognitive semiotics: An emerging field for the transdisciplinary study of meaning, în *Public Journal of Semiotics*, IV (1).

Zlatev, J. (2012b), Cognitive Semiotics, în Semiotics Encyclopedia Online, http://www.semioticon.com/seo/C/cogsem.html#