IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)
Volume 22, Issue 4, Ver. III (April. 2017) PP 44-48
e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845.
www.iosrjournals.org

The role of Construal, Gesture and Encyclopaedic Knowledge in linking language with cognition

Mustafa Khalid Saleh Al-Rawi
MA English Language and Applied Linguistics (ELAL)
Assistant Lecturer at the department of English Language Cihan University – Sulaimanyah –Iraq

Abstract: The aim of this paper is to briefly discuss the relationship between language and cognition and provide some examples of three aspects: construal, gesture, and encyclopaedic knowledge with reference to the effects of social factors. It is important to understand the relationship between language and cognition and to know which of them is dominant on the other and also the role of social factors in regard to this relationship.

Key words: *Construal, Gesture, Encyclopaedic Knowledge, language and cognition, Cultural aspects*

I. INTRODUCTION

Languageandcognitionarementalfacilities.Languageis‘themethodofhumancommunication,eitherspoken orwritten,consistingoftheuseofwordsinastructuredandconventionalway’(OxforddictionaryofEnglish,2005)andco gnitionis‘thementalactionorprocessofacquiringknowledgeandunderstandingthroughthought,experience,andthese nses’(OxforddictionaryofEnglish,2005).Fromthesegeneraldefinitions,onemayimplythatthereisarelationbetweenth em.Languageandcognitionmightbeintentlylinked,thoughlinguistshavecontroversialdisagreementaboutthenatureof thatrelationship.Therearethreesignificantviewpointsconsideringthisrelationship:languageisindependentfromcogni tionanddevelopsseparately,cognitionhasaninfluenceonbothlanguageanditsdevelopments,andlanguagecontrolsand hasprominentinfluenceonthedevelopmentofthought(cognition).Thefirstviewisthatof NoamChomskyandhisfellow whoclaimthatlanguageabilitiesarerelatedtoamentalorganandseparatedfromothercognitionprocessesinthehumanbr ain.Hearguedthatchildrenarebornwith‘languageacquisitiondevice’(universalgrammar)(Harris,2003).However,co gnitivelinguistspointedoutthatlanguageabilitiesarenotseparatedfromothercognitionprocessesbecausetheyfoundtha tthereisarelationbetweenlanguageandcognitionandthe‘autonomous’positionoflanguageinthebrainisnotexisted(Litt lemore,2009).Thereisanimportantcontroversyamongpsycholinguistsandlinguistsinregardtotheotherviewsofthelan guagecognitionrelationship;theirdebateiswhethertheabilitytospeakcontrolstheabilitytothinkorviceversa.Accordin gtoSapirwhorfhypothesis,theabilitytospeakcontrolstheabilitytothinkasintheirfamousexample‘snow’i.e.languages hapeshowpeopleseetheworld.Othercognitivelinguistsmaythinkthatitisthecognitionwhichcontrolsthelanguage,fori nstance:LakoffandLangackerhaveindicatedthatwithoutreferringto‘nonlinguisticconcepts’onemightnotunderstand whethersentencesaresyntacticallyrightorwrongandalsotheyhavefocusontheincorporationofhumancognitionproces sesintolinguistics(Harris,2003).Inotherwords,languageiscontrolledbycognitionandlanguageisa‘usagebased’(Littl emore,2009),so,incontrasttoChomsky’sview,bothviewsemphasisedthatlanguageisbasedonfunctionandthisfunctioni slinkedtocognitiveprocesses.Itisimportanttounderstandtherelationshipbetweenlanguageandcognitionandtoknoww hichofthemisdominantontheotherandalsotheroleofsocialfactorsinregardtothisrelationship.Thisessaywillbrieflydis cusstherelationshipbetweenlanguageandcognitionandprovidesomeexamplesofthreeaspects:construal,gesture,and encyclopaedic knowledge with reference to the effects of social factors.

II. CONSTRUAL

Cognitivelinguistspointout,thattherearеanumberofwaysinwhichaspecificsituationcanbe‘construed’,andt hisnumberdependsondifferentconceptualizations,therefore,ifasituationisencodedintwodifferentways,itmaybeinter pretedindifferentwayseither.IncontrasttoChomskyangenerativegrammar,whichconsiderthiscaseofencodingasadif ferenceinthe‘form’ofthesituation(sentence)andnotthe‘substance’,cognitivelinguistswouldarguethatthechangeofen codingisofformaswellassubstance(meaning)(Lee2001).Althoughcertainsituationscanbeencodedindifferentways,t herearesituationsthatmaynotbeencodedindifferentwaysbutonlyaspecificwayofencodingwouldbeappropriate,there forethisisasignthatthechangeisnotonlyintheform,butalsointhemeaning(Ibid,2001).AccordingtoPiaget(1952citedin Lee,2001),childrenatfirststagesstarttounderstandtheworldthrough‘sensorimotorknowledge’ofspacei.e.atthefirststa gesoftheircognitiondevelopment,theytendtomakeaspatialrelationshipwiththesurroundingbeforetheactualuseofwo rds.Asforlanguagerelationtospace,itisrathercomplexandthiscomplexityisasignificantevidenceoftherelationshipbet weenlanguageandcognition.Theconcentrationofthisaspectwillbeonspaceconstruals.Lee(2001)andTaylor(2002)sh owedtheeffectoflocativeprepositionsinconstruingmeaningandtherelationshipbetween ‘trajectory’and‘landmark’.Humancognitionprocesses,throughthelogicoftheworld,makeanindividualconstruemean

ingbeyondthemeaningoftheactualsituation,forexample:Herkovits(1986citedinLee,2001)'*thecrack/theflowers/the waterinthevase'*althoughtheyhavethesamelandmark,therelationshipsbetweenthetrajectoryandlandmarkarecomplete lydifferent.Thecrack(trajectory)mightbeexistedinspecificpartofthevase(landmark)surface.Fortheflowers,onlypa rtofthemareactuallyinthelandmark(therootandmaybepartoftheblade)incontrarytothewaterwhichmustbefullycontai nedinthelandmark'threedimensional'otherwiseitwillbefallen.Ifonecouldimaginethatthecapacityofthecontainerisle ssthantheamountofwater,thewaterdropsonthesecondlandmark(tableorfloor)whichisalsothelandmarkofitsfirstland mark(vase),sothewaterinthiscontexthastwolandmarks,but,cognitively,itmaybehardlyaccepted(secondandmark(ta ble/floor)needsdrying).Asforthevase,accordingtothewater,itislandmarkbutaccordingtothesecondlandmark(table/fl oor)itistrajectoryTherelationshipbetweentrajectoryandlandmarkisnotrandom;pragmatically,landmarkislandmarkb ecauseofitsfunctionaswellasthetrajectory,andthisfunctionisanintegralpartinunderstandingwhichiswhich(Lee,2001),itissomehowsimilartotherelationshipbetweenbackgroundandforeground.In"elaborativehierarchies"(Langacker,2 008:56)itisthesituationwhichconsidersthefocusoftheconstruali.e.thesituationwouldrecallabackgroundknowledge(dependingonphysicalworldexperience)whichisthebaseofunderstandingthissituation,thereforethebackgroundknow ledgeandtheforeground(situation)frametheconstruedbackground.Inaddition,thelinkbetweenforegroundandbackgr oundiscalled"compositionalpath"(becausethislinkcomposesthemeaning)andthempliedmeaningisnotconstruedbyo nlythebackgroundknowledgebutwithitscorrelationtocompositionalbath(Ibid,2008:61).Althoughtheforegroundwo uldactivatenonspecifiedbackgroundknowledge,thereareanumberoflimitationsinconsideringthebackgroundLangac ker(2008)andKovecses,(2006)indicatedthattherearetwoscopesinregardtothebackground:'maximalscope'and'imm ediatescope'forinstance:theword*knuckle*,itsscopeofmentalconstrualis*finger*,whichistheimmediatescope,thatactiva tes*hand*whichinturnactivates*arm*anditactivates*body*,(whichisthemaximalscope);itisahierarchicalrelationso,itishar dlyacceptedtodroponefromthischainas:*armfingerorhandknuckle*.Thereisalways'primaryfocus'(trajectory)and'sec ondaryfocus'(landmark),andasmentionaboveconsideredbytheirfunction,however,Langackeranswersthequestion*w hereisthetable?*With*thetableisbelowthelamp*,accordingtothecontext,thisanswerwouldnotbeacceptedifthelampiso nthetable,becauseaccordingtothefunction,thetableisthesupported(container)anditwouldbethelandmark,butifthela mpisonthewall/ceiling,thetablethenwouldbethetrajectory(Langacker,2008;Kovecses,2006;UngererandSchmid,20 06).Asfortheculturerole,therelationshipbetweenlanguageuseandculturepracticeisshowninSlobin's'thinkingforspe aking'theory"weencounterthecontentsofthemindinaspecialwaywhentheyarebeingaccessedforuse"(GentnerandGo ldinMeadow,2003:158).Hisstudiesshowedtheinfluenceofthemindinlanguageuseandthisinfluencewoulddifferaccor dingtothelanguage,hedividedlanguagesinto'satellite-framedandverb-framedlanguages'(GentnerandGoldin-Meadow,2003;NiemeierandDirven,2000).Thisclassificationisaccordingtohowlanguageisusedanditsexposuretover bsofmotionaswellasitsculturalaspects.Pinker(1994citedinGentnerandGoldinMeadow,2003)claimedthatSapirwhor fhypothesisis'wrong'andlanguagesdonotshapepeople'sthinking,however,numerousstudieshaveshownthatthereisa strongrelationshipbetweenlanguageandthoughtsandtheyarguethatinanyutterancethereceiverwouldobtainanumber ofcharacteristicsandthenformthemaccordingtothecontext,backgroundand culturalknowledge(GentnerandGoldin-Meadow,2003;Littlemore,2009;NiemeierandDirven,2000).Therefore,thoughtsstronglyappeartobeshapedbylangu ageuse;itisdemonstratedthatsatelliteframedlanguageshavemorefrequentmentalaccesstoverbsofmotionthanverbfra medlanguagesandalsothehabitualattentiontomannerinsatelliteframedlanguagesismoreobvious(GoldinMeadow,20 03;Littlemore,2009).Itisworthsayingthatcultureplaysasignificantroleinregardinglanguageusebecausethroughcultu ralaspects,forinstance:satelliteframedlanguagechildrenarelearningtoidentifysignificantnuancesofmannerandverbf ramedlanguagechildrenarelearningbroadtypesofmannerlanguagecanbedevelopedandthisdevelopmentwouldleadt oastrongerrelationwith thoughts, so the access to mental conceptualisation would be widened.

III. Gesture

Anotheraspectoftherelationshipbetweenlanguageandcognitionincommunicationistheuseofgesture.AsMc Neill(1992citedinlittlemore,2009; Sueyoshi,andHardison,2005)pointsout,therearefourfunctionsofgestures:'iconic ','metaphoric','beat'and'deicticanothersignificantfunctionwasprovided:"toprovideevidenceof,andawayofunpack ingconceptualblending"(Parril,andSweetser,2004citedinLittlemore,2009:136).Gestureisaconnectoroflanguagetot hought,itwouldbebeneficialforsecondlanguage(L2)learningandinteractionbecausegestureis'coexpressive'withspe echi.e.gestureandspeechprobablyworktogethertoobtainthesametarget(Littlemore2009).Therefore,L2learnerstendt ousemoregestureswhilespeakingtheirL2thanwhenspeakingintheirfirstlanguages(L1)(Ibid,2009;Gullberg,2008).It mightbemoreadvantageoustohavetwoinputsthanonlyonewhilelearningL2i.e.simultaneousinputsareaccessedbyL2l earners:hearingtheteachers'speech(listeninginput)asthefirstinputcombinedwiththeteachers'gesturalmovements(vi sualinput)mayservebetterunderstandingthanifoneinput(listeninginput)isinvolved.Sime(2008citedinLittlemore,20 09)showedthatlearnerspreferteacherswhousemoregesture;'excellent'teachersaretheoneswhosemorelikelytousege sturesthanothers.InAddition,psychologicallyandcognitively,teachers(speakersgenerally)couldalsobenefitfromthei rowngesture.Theirgesturalmovements:seemtoplayasignificantrolein"conceptualizingandplanning"(Littlemore,20 09:134),so,theirgesturesappeartohaveaconsiderableincreaseaccordingtothecomplexityofthemessage;althoughgest ureandspeechare"synchronous",gesturetendstoarrangethemessageforthespeakerandthelistenersaswell(Kendon,20 04citedinLittlemore,2009:134),andmayprovidetosomeextentselfesteemandconfidencedueto,culturally,thefactthat peoplejudgementissomehowpositivetowardsthe'moregestureusers'Astheroleofgesturetowards L2learningmention

edabove,GoldinMeadow(1999citedinSueyoshi,andHardison,2005:662)describedgestureasa"tool"forcommunicationandalsofor"thinkingforspeaking".Ontheonehandthistoolmayextendthescopeof(learners'/viewers')understandingbeyondtheactualspeechforinstance:agestureusedtodescribeacertaininformation,learners(viewers),mayactivateapragmaticmeaningorevenactivateanoutcontextreferencethathelpunderstandingthatinformation.Ontheotherhand,itmaybbreviatethatscopeorinsomecasesthereisnoscopeatall(Sueyoshi,andHardison,2005).Theunderstandingscopeofthattoolmightnotdependonthetool(gesture)itself,but on its viewer(perceiver),neglecting the role that the performerofthatgestureplays,therearenumberoffactorsthatinfluencetheperceivers'understandingofgesture:"proficiencylevel""linguisticandculturalexperience",languageexposure,andalsothetypeoftheperceivers'languagei.e.Slobin'ssatellite/verbframedlanguagecategorisations(Ibid,2005:689).AresearchhastakenEnglishL2learners(children)whoseL1isSpanishincomparisonwithEnglishnativespeakingchildrenasanexampleofdemonstratingthefactorsthatinfluencegestureunderstanding(Mohan,andHelmer,1988citedinSueyoshi,andHardison,2005)Theresearchhasshownthattheirlevelofproficiencyisinadequate.Proficiencylevelwouldbeinfluencedbylinguisticandculturalexperience,languageexposureaswellasthepointthatSpanishisaverb-framedlanguageandEnglishisasatellite-framedone,soEnglishwould have more access to verbs ofmotionwhichprivilegedtheunderstandingofgesture.Sueyoshi,andHardison,(2005)pointedouttheimportanceofgestureinL2learning,consideringitas anintegralpartofL2learners'comprehensiondevelopment.

Thereareanumberoftheoriesthatidentifytherolegestureplaystoassistspeakersintheirspeech.Anumberoftheoriesshowthatgestureisan"auxiliarysystemtospeech"(Kendon2004citedinGullberg,2008:280).Othertheoriessuggestthatgestureandspeechareequal co-workers and gesturecarries a significantimportanceinspeech(Gullberg,2008).However, itispossiblethataspeechisperformedwithoutanygestureandfullyunderstood;althoughgestureisanauxiliarysystemtobothspeakersandperceivers,thespeakers,evenifthey arecompetentenoughwhilespeakinganddonotneedgesturalassistant,appeartousemoregestureiftheirperceiversareincompetent.Gullberg(2008:280)claimedthat"[g]esturesonlyoccurwhenaspeakerexperiencesawordfindingproblemtohelpactivatelexicalentries".However,speakerstendtousemoregestureconsciouslynottosupporttheirspeechbuttohelptheirlisteners(perceivers)understandingtheinformation.Therefore,theyseemtoconcretisetheabstracti.e.usegestureswithspeech.Cognitively,childrenstarttocommunicatewithmovementsbeforetheiractualspeech,sotheyuseandunderstandgesturesbeforeutterances,thenwhentheyuseutterances,certaingestureswouldactivatetheunderstandingofcertainutterancesbecauseoftheevokingof"sensorimotorexperience",evenmore,listeners(perceivers)mayunderstandwhatspeakerswanttosay,fromsimultaneousgestureandspeech,beforeactualutterance(Littlemore,2009;Gullberg,2008291)Socialfactors(culture)playasignificantroleregardinggesture. McNeill(1992citedinLittlemore,2009)foundoutthattherearean umberofdifferencesbetweenlanguagesregardingthetypesofgesturesused.Therelationshipbetweengestureandspeechisnotthesameinalllanguages,forinstance:Italianspeakers'useofgestureistofocuson"referentialcontent"comparedwithYaddishlanguagegestureswhichfocuson"logicalstructure"(Efron,1972citedinLittlemore,2009:138).Therefore,understandingacertaingesturewouldbeinfluencedbyindividual'sculturalandsocialclassdifferences(Pennycook,1985citedinSueyoshi,andHardison,2005).Tellier(2006citedinGullberg,2008)arguedthatusingiconicgestureswith(English)speechwouldmakethespeechunderstandable(forFrenchchildren)evenifthatspeechisinadifferentunknownlanguage.IfEnglishandFrenchareusingtypicallythesamegesturesforthesamesituation,thenitispossibleforFrenchchildrentounderstandthestoryfromitsgesture.However,itmightbenotpossiblebecausedifferenceingroups,classesandculturewouldsignificantlyaffecttheproductionofgestures;nevertheless,anumberofgesturesaregenerallyused.Inaddition,Ekmanandriesen(1969citedinAllen,1995)definitionofemblematicgestureimpliedthatthisgestureisverballyunderstoodifitis'wellknown'bythegroups,andtheirclassandcultureHowever,whilelearningalanguage,notalltypesofemblematicgesturesareuseful,asAllen(1995:527)suggested,"theinclusionofgesturesintheencodingenvironmentprovideanelaboratedcontext,thuscausingagreaterdepthofprocessing andamoredurablemental representation".Itispossibletosuggestthat,ifthegestureusedisaccessedpreviouslybythelearner,otherwiseitwouldaffecttheinformationunderstanding(Littlemore,2009).

IV. ENCYCLOPAEDICKNOWLEDGE

Thefinalaspectoftherelationshipbetweenlanguageandcognitioninthisessayistheencyclopaedic Knowledge.Itmeanstheinformationthatexistsinpeople'smindswhichestablishes"alargeinventoryofstructuredknowledge"(EvansandGreen,2006citedinLittlemore,2009:71).Specificsetsofthisstoredinformationwouldbeactivatedbyspecificwordsandwordcombinationstocreateatypeoflinkageandthislinkagetendstoexpandthe'denotative'meaningtoincludeallthestored'connotative'informationcorrelatingwiththatwordsandwordcombinations(Littlemore,2009).Therelationsbetweenwords/wordcombinationsandstoredinformationwouldstronglyconnect'linguisticknowledge'to'worldknowledge'and'semanticknowledge'to'pragmaticknowledge'(EvansandGreen,2006Littlemore,2009).Thisconnectionwouldextendthelexicalmeaningstoincludeallthepossiblerelatedmeaningsinspecificsituationandthatwouldbedifferentfrompersontopersonaccordingtotheirexperienceorexposuretothelanguage.Astheypointedout,itisdifficultorcomplicatedtomeasureallthe relatedmeaningstoaspecificword,MearaandWolter(2004)arguedthatconcentratingonL2learners''networkknowledge',whichisthewordsrelationsconstruedinlearners'minds,wouldbemorebeneficialforteachersandresearchersinstudyingtheserelations.Anumberoflinguisticstudieshavesupportedtheideaofnetworkknowledgeandhowitisconstrued,forinstance:HaastrupandHenrikson(2000)pointoutthat"[v]iewingandstudyingL2vocabularyknowledgeasanintegratednetworkismuchmorerealisticthanviewingandstudyingitasalistofunrelatedwords

(Littlemore2009:72)Langacker'stheoryofdomainmatrixhasshownthatthemeaningofacertainwordisdependingonth econceptualisationknowledgeofthiswordinacertaincontext(Taylor2002;EvansandGreen,2006).Hearguedthatthe'd omainbasedknowledge'playsasignificantroleinhowwordsareused.Whenusingawordinspecificcontext,althoughdo mainorcentralknowledgeofthatwordisneeded,thisdomaincouldbeconsideredasan'objectified'meaning,becauseind ividualsaredifferentregardingtotheirknowledgeandconsideringwhatisspecificallythecentralmeaning;anumberofdo mainsareconceptuallyintrinsic(semanticdomains),whereasothers,whicharemorecomplex,areconceptuallyextrinsic (pragmaticoronlyunderstoodinthecontext)(Taylor,2002).Langackerdividedtheencyclopaedicnetworkintofourtype s:'thegenerictospecific','theintrinsictoextrinsic''theconventionaltonon-conventional'and'thecharacteristictonon-characteristic'(EvansandGreen,2006;Littlemore,2009).Thesetypesofnetworkcreateflexibilityinregardtothesemant icmeaningofthedomain;so,theactivationofdifferentdomainmeaningsdependsonthedifferentusesofwords,forexamp le:*theyoungmanplayedthepiano/theyoungmanliftedthepiano*,thedomainoftheword*piano*isdifferentinthesesentenc es,thefirstonemeansa'musicalinstrument'whiletheothermeansan'object'andTaylorassociatetheword*heavy*withit(Greenspan,1986citedinTaylor,2002:443).Theassociationofthewordheavymightbedifferentaccordingtothecontexti .e.ifthe*piano*isarealone,thenitisveryheavyforonepersontolift,butifthatpianowasatoyormaybeasmallmodelorevenifi tisasmallrealpiano,itwouldbenotheavy.Thepointis,certaincontextwillmakeaccesstocertainmeaningofawordanddes cribeit.However,thatflexibilityinselectingthedomainmeaningwouldhave,tocertainextent,itslimits;anumberofconce ptualdomainsarenotpossibleinspecificcontextsasin:*tellmeastory/*abook*,itispossibleinthefirstbutitishardlyaccepte dinthesecond,because,logically,bookislong,cannotbememorized(*tell*wouldbeassociatedwithmemorizationandima gination)andalsoittakesareallylongtime(Taylor,2002:446)Theroleofthedomainmeaningdoesnotseemtoexcludeori gnorethesemantic(lexical)eaningofawordasclaimedbelow:fullyspecifiedpreassembledwordmeaningsdonotexist,b utareselectedandformedfromencyclopaedicknowledge(…)Cognitivelinguistsdonotupholdameaningfuldistinction betweensemanticsandpragmatics,becausewordmeaningsalwaysafunctionofcontext(pragmaticmeaning)(Evansand Green,2006:221)However,thelexicalmeaningappearstobeanintegralpartindecidingthecontextualmeaning.Figurati vely,itisthegatebywhichthedomainaccessesthrough;thedomain(network,encyclopaedic,andcontextualknowledge) wouldbebasedonthesemantic(lexical)meaning,so,'fullyspecifiedpreassembled'semanticmeanings'doexist',butthe reareplentyoffactorsthatchangethefocusfromthesemanticmeaningtowardsanothermeaning(domain),whichassocia teswiththesemanticoneinonewayoranother,tocreateanetworkofknowledge.Inaddition,cognitivelinguistsadvocatet hedistinctionbetweensemanticsandpragmatics,but,thefocusintherecentstudiestendstobeontherelationshipbetweent hem,becausethestudyoflanguageisusagebased(functional)(Littlemore,2009)InL2learning,encyclopaedicknowledg eplaysasignificantrole,becauseithelpsthelearners:developingtheirvocabularyandwordassociations,developingtheir mentallinguisticrelations,accessingtheimplied(pragmatic)meaning,promotingtheirnetworkofknowledge,expandin gtheirframingsystemthoroughly,andevolvingtheirexposuretotheL2andbythattheywillalsobedevelopedculturally.A tfirststagesofL2learning,theL2encyclopaedicknowledgetendstodependmostlyontheL1encyclopaedicknowledge"p arasiticalrelationship",buttthetwowouldbeseparatedaftertheimprovementofproficiencylevel(Ibid,2009:87).Inaddit ion,networkknowledgehelpsunderstandingthemeaningofwordcombinationsforinstance:'adjectivenounmbination' *thebluepenisnotblue*,thishastwomeanings,eitherthecolourofthepenisblueandtheoutsideisnotortheotherwayaround, thatwouldbedecidedthroughthecontext(Taylor,2002).Anotherextrinsicknowledgeexample(whichispersonal)thefir stinterlocutorreceivedamessagefromthesecondandittells"I'minthegreenroom"thiscombinationdoesnotactivateonl ytheadjectivenounrelation,but,thefirstinterlocutorunderstoodthatthesecondisstudyinginthe'mainlibrary',whichhas colouredrooms,thirdfloor,sectionB'andprobablyotherthingswouldalsobeactivatedas,thesecondinterlocutorhadcho senthissectionbecauseitcontainshis/herbooksandifitisnot,thenfirstinterlocutorwouldthinkthatmaybebecauseallseat saretakeninhis/hersectionandsoon.Theactivatoroftheswholesituationistheadjectivegreen;itispartofthesemantic(lexi cal)meaningwhichisthe'librarysection'anditisunderstoodbecausethereisamutualculturalandcontextualunderstandi ngbetweeninterlocutors.Therefore,culture,especiallyinextrinsicknowledge,isaverysignificantaspectinconsideringt hedomainofthenetworkandtheflexibilityanddynamicityofthe encyclopaedic knowledge (Littlemore,2009).

V. CONCLUSION

Inconclusion,cognitivelinguisticshasshownthattherearestrongrelationsbetweenlanguageandcognition,an dtherearenumerousstudiestoevidencethat.Theaspectsdiscussedabovearеindicationsofthelanguagecognitionrelatio nship,andtheculturalroleinthisrelation.Itappearstobeobviousthatcognitionisthedominantandthecontrollerofthelang uageunderstanding.Inconstrual,humanmindactivatesanumberofrelatedthoughtsfromacertainsituation(utterance),t henthemindformsthesuitablerepresentationofthatutteranceaccordingtothecontextandculturalknowledge,asifthemi ndislikeabinocularthatfocusesatthemostimportant(functional)part.Whereasingesture,therelationisdifferent,themin dforms(consciously/subconsciously)gesturalmovementswithspeechtohelpboththespeakerandtheperceiver.Finally ,theencyclopaedicknowledgeexpandsthementalscopeandhelpsimprovingtheconstrualaspect.Inalloftheseaspects,a ndgenerally, in language-cognition relationship, there is a considerable influence by cultural aspects.

REFERENCES

[1] Allen,L.Q.(1995)Theeffectofemblematicgesturesonthedevelopmentandaccessofmentalrepresentationsof French expressions,*ModernLanguageJournal*79(4): 521–9.

[2] Evans,V.andGreen,M.(2006)*CognitiveLinguisticsAnintroduction*,EdinburghEdinburghUniversityPress (eds.)(2003)*LanguageinMind:AdvancedinStudyofLanguageandThought*,Cambridge:theMITPress.

[3] Gullberg,M.(2008)Gesturesandsecondlanguageacquisition,InP.Robinson,andN.Ellis,(eds.)*HandbookofCognitiveLinguisticsandSecondLanguageAcquisition*, London:Routledge.

[4] Harris,C.L.(2003)Languageandcognition,*EncyclopaediaofCognitiveScience*London:MacMillan.(00559)P P. 1-6 http://www.bu.edu/psych/charris/papers/Encyclopedia.pdfAccessedatthe 20thofNovember2016.

[5] Kovecses,Z.(2006)*Language,Mind,andCulture:apracticalintroduction*,Oxford: OxfordUniversityPress.

[6] Langacker,R.W.(2008)*CognitiveGrammar:Abasicintroduction*,Oxford:Oxford UniversityPress.

[7] Lee,D.(2001)*CognitiveLinguistics:AnIntroduction*,Oxford:OxfordUniversity Press.

[8] Littlemore,J.(2009)*Applyingcognitivelinguisticstosecondlanguagelearningandteaching*,London:Palgrave Macmillan.

[9] Meara,P. M.andWolter, B. (2004)Beyondvocabularydepth,InD.Albrechtsen,K.

[10] Haastrup,andB.Henriksen,(eds.)*Writingandvocabularyinforeignlanguageacquisition*,Copenhagen:Museu mTusculanumPress.

[11] Niemeier,S.andDirven,R.(eds.)(2000)*EvidenceforLinguisticRelativity*, Amsterdam:John BenjaminsB.V.