

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research



Misan University
College of Education
English Department
Morning Studies



A Comparison between Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics

Graduation research submitted to
the Council of the College of Education-English Department
as an implementation of the requirements for obtaining a Bachelor's degree of
English language

by

Sakina Abd Al-Wahid Abd Al-Karim

Supervised by

Asst.Inst .Athraa Ali Husein

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

﴿وَمِنْ آيَاتِهِ خَلْقُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَاخْتِلَافُ أَلْسِنَتِكُمْ

وَأَلْوَانِكُمْ إِنَّ فِي ذَلِكَ لَآيَاتٍ لِّلْعَالَمِينَ﴾

﴿"And among His signs is the creation of the heavens and the earth,
and the diversity of your languages and your colors. Surely in that are
signs for people of knowledge"﴾

صدق الله العلي العظيم

(سورة الروم، الآية 22)

Dedication

To the owner of the great credit, the owner of a fragrant biography and enlightened thought, To the person who first took credit for getting me here And my obtaining a higher fucation (my beloved father) may God prolong his life For the one who put me on the path of life, for the one whose supplication was the secret of my success (Dear mom) To my sisters and brother, my supporter and supporter to veryone who literally taught me To all my teachers who did not hesitate to help me, and special thanks to my friends who helped me.

Acknowledgements

The search would not have been possible without the victory of God and the support of many people. We are especially grateful to express our gratitude to our supervisor, **Asst.Inst .Athraa Ali Husein** for her guidance and continued assistance.

Would also like to thank our family for supporting us during this time. Finally, we are grateful to our friends for their assistance and during the time this research was written.

Table of Contents

Dedication.....	III
Acknowledgements	IV
Table of Contents.....	V
Introduction	6
Chapter One.....	7
1.1 Linguistics	7
1.2 A Glance on Cognitive Linguistics	9
1.3 Essentials of Cognitive	10
1.4 Linguistics Pioneers	11
Chapter Two	13
2.1 Functional linguistics	13
2.2 Pioneers Functional Linguistics	15
2.3 Main Difference between Cognitive Grammar and Functional Grammar.....	17
Conclusion	20
References.....	21

Introduction

In The current research paper sheds light with A Comparison between Cognitive Linguistics and Functional Linguistics n consists of two parts when part one deals with Hallidean systemic functional theory adopts the paradigmatic axis as its point of departure. SFL is also “functional” because it considers language to have evolved under to pressure of the particular functions that the language system has to serve. Functions are therefore taken to have left their mark on the structure and organization of language at all levels which is said to be achieved via metafunctions. part two deals with Cognition is not just ‘in the head’; it extends well beyond the skull and the skin. Non-Cartesian Cognitive Science views cognition as being embodied, environmentally embedded, enacted, encultured, and so cially distributed. The Douglas Fir Group (2016) likewise recognizes languages grated phenomena. Language is the quintessence of distributed cognition. Language cognition is shared across naturally occurring, culturally constituted, communicative activities. Usage affects learning and it affects languages, too. These are essential components of a theory of language cognition. This article summarizes these developments within cognitive science before considering implications for language research and teaching, especially as these concern usage-based language learning and cognition in sec ond language and multilingual contexts.

Chapter One

1.1 Linguistics

Linguistics is defined as the scientific study of language .It is the systematic study of the elements of language and the principles governing their combination and organization. Linguistics provides for a rigorous experimentation with the elements or aspects of language that are actually in use by the speech community. It is based on observation and the data collected thereby from the users of the language, a scientific analysis is made by the investigator and at the end of it he comes out with a satisfactory explanation relating to his field of study. This sort of systematic study of language has rendered the traditional method language study outmoded or unfit for any theorization (Sreekumar, 2011: 20).

Linguistics is the scientific study of language. As an academic discipline, the development of this subject has been relatively recent and rapid. Linguistics studies sounds, words, phrases, and meanings. It has the following subfields: phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics. Phonetics refers to the production and perception of speech sounds. Phonology refers to the organization, distribution, and function of speech sounds. Morphology refers to the structure of words and smaller meaning units. Semantics refers to the meaning of words, sentences or utterances. Syntax refers to the structure of phrases, clauses, and sentences (ibid).

Every human knows at least one language, whether spoken or written. Linguistics is the scientific study of language or it is the science of language involving sounds, words, and grammatical rules. The words of a language are finite, but sentences are not. It is the creative aspect that distinguishes human language

from animal language which is naturally stimulus responsive. In addition, linguistics is the scientific and systematic study of human language. It analyzed a system that simultaneously combines form, meaning, and context time. Linguistics is involved in almost every part of human communication. Studying linguistics is about expanding insight into one of the most central aspects of human beings. People can communicate through language. By studying linguistics, people will be able to know how the language works, how the language is used, and how the languages are changed and saved. There are three subfields of linguistics study. They are theoretical linguistics, descriptive linguistics, and applied linguistics. The studies circumscribed to theoretical linguistics are most concerned with developing models of linguistic knowledge. Then, the studies restricted to descriptive linguistics deal with the objective analysis and description of how languages are spoken by people in their speech communities. Last, the studies limited to applied linguistics deal with identifying, investigating, and offering solutions to language-related real-life problems (Rata 2013: 16).

1.2 A Glance on Cognitive Linguistics

Cognitive linguistics is a modern school of linguistic thought and practice. It is concerned with investigating the relationship between human language, the mind, and socio-physical experience. It originally emerged in the 1970s and arose out of dissatisfaction with formal approaches to language which were dominant, at that time, in the disciplines of linguistics and philosophy. While its origins were, in part, philosophical in nature, cognitive linguistics has always been strongly influenced by theories and findings from the other cognitive sciences as they emerged during the 1960s and 1970s, particularly cognitive psychology. Finally, the neural underpinnings of language and cognition have had a longstanding influence on the character and content of cognitive linguistic theories, from early work on how visual biology constrains color term systems to more recent work under the rubric of the Neural Theory of Language. In recent years, cognitive linguistic theories have become sufficiently sophisticated and detailed to begin making predictions that are testable using the broad range of converging methods from the cognitive sciences (Evans, 2012: 129).

In linguistics, the term “cognitive” is not unequivocal, for it applies to radically different conceptions of language, thought and the interface between the two. On the one hand, we have the enduring tradition that originated with Chomsky’s *Syntactic Structures* (1957) and that comprises “all approaches in which natural language is studied as a mental phenomenon”. When referring to this tradition, “cognitive” is never capitalized. On the other hand, we find the more recent, usage-based models of language and language acquisition of which Cognitive Linguistics with a capital C is a representative. Both traditions tend to overemphasize their differences, which, as we will see further on, may be quite sharp at times. Linguistics departments, academic journals and linguistics

conferences too seem to reflect this binary opposition. Some Cognitive linguists remind us, however, that “the Cognitive Linguistics enterprise” as Geeraerts (2006, p. 21) names it, owes much to Chomsky in the first place. Before the advent of Generative Linguistics the field had indeed been dominated by decades of structuralist linguistic inquiry and behavioral psychology, both of which considered language as a self-contained phenomenon. According to structuralist views, linguistic structure could be described analytically and methodically. Language was simply “out there”, and the job of the linguist was to describe it as thoroughly as possible. Chomsky (1986) single-handedly triggered a cognitivist revolution when he redefined linguistics as “the study of the system of knowledge of language attained and internally represented in the mind/brain”. Or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that Chomsky helped the pendulum shift back to mentalism, because structuralism was itself a reaction to the classical view that the structure of language reflected the structure of thought. In sum, GL initiated a shift in the study of language from “E-language” (i.e., an individual’s use of language) to “I-language” (i.e., an individual’s internalized knowledge of language) or from “performance” to “competence” as Chomsky (1965) phrased it. This in turn opened new avenues for other theories, like CL, that were interested in investigating the interface between language and mind (Geeraerts, 2006: 24).

1.3 Essentials of Cognitive

Cognition is not just ‘in the head’; it extends well beyond the skull and the skin. Non-Cartesian Cognitive Science views cognition as being embodied, environmentally embedded, enacted, encultured, and so cially distributed. The Douglas Fir Group (2016) likewise recognizes languages as emergent, social, inte

grated phenomena. Language is the quintessence of distributed cognition. Language cognition is shared across naturally occurring, culturally constituted, communicative activities. Usage affects learning and it affects languages, too. These are essential components of a theory of language cognition. This article summarizes these developments within cognitive science before considering implications for language research and teaching, especially as these concern usage-based language learning and cognition in second language and multilingual contexts.

Cognitive psychology is the scientific study of mind and of mental functions such as learning, memory, attention, perception, reasoning, motor control, skill, language, and conceptual development. Its founding goals are to determine how the mind represents the world and how it uses these representations in thinking. In the beginnings of the ‘Cognitive Revolution,’ the brain was viewed as a computational system, and researchers developed models of information processing and successively refined them using the experimental method.

Embodied cognition is the recognition that much of cognition is shaped by this body we inhabit—by aspects of the entire body including the motor system, the perceptual system, bodily interactions with the environment (situatedness), and by the assumptions about the world that become built into the structure of the organism as a result of repeated experience (Wilson & Foglia, 2017: 231).

1.4 Linguistics Pioneers

There are many pioneers in linguistics who have contributed to the development of the field. Some of them are: Ferdinand de Saussure (1857 - 1913): He is considered the father of modern linguistics and the founder of structuralism. He introduced the

concept of linguistic signs, composed of a signifier and a signified, and the distinction between synchronic and diachronic analysis . Roman Jakobson (1896 - 1982): He was a prominent figure in the Prague School of linguistics and a pioneer of phonology. He proposed the concept of distinctive features, which are the smallest units of sound that can distinguish meaning in a language. Edward Sapir (1884 - 1939): He was an influential American linguist and anthropologist who studied Native American languages and cultures. He formulated the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, which states that the structure of a language influences the way its speakers think and perceive reality. Paul Grice (1913 - 1988): He was a British philosopher and linguist who developed the theory of conversational implicature, which explains how speakers communicate more than what they literally say by following certain cooperative principles and maxims. Noam Chomsky (1928): He is one of the most influential and controversial linguists of the 20th and 21st centuries. He revolutionized the field of generative grammar, which aims to describe the innate rules and principles that govern human language. He also proposed the concept of universal grammar, which is a set of common features shared by all languages. Eve Clark (1942): She is a leading researcher in the field of first language acquisition, which studies how children learn their native language. She has investigated various aspects of language development, such as word learning, morphology, syntax, pragmatics, and discourse. Steven Pinker (1954): He is a Canadian-American cognitive psychologist and popular science writer who has written extensively about language, mind, and human nature. He has defended the idea that language is an innate and evolved faculty of the human brain and that it reflects our cognitive abilities and limitations (Langdon, 1969: 530-574).

Chapter Two

2.1 Functional linguistics

M. A. K. Halliday states that language as social semiotic is the social interpretation of language and meaning (Edward Arnold, 1978). According to Richard, the definition of systemic functional linguistic is the study of the relationship between language and its functions in social settings. In SFL, there are strata make up the linguistic system: meaning (semantics), sound (phonology), and wording or lexicogrammar (syntax, morphology, and lexis). SFL treats grammar as a meaning-making resource and insists on the interrelation of form and meaning. Halliday in a certain sense “liberated” the dimension of choice from structure and made it the central organizing dimension of this theory. Hallidean systemic functional theory adopts the paradigmatic axis as its point of departure. SFL is also “functional” because it considers language to have evolved under to pressure of the particular functions that the language system has to serve. Functions are therefore taken to have left their mark on the structure and organization of language at all levels which is said to be achieved via metafunctions. However, metafunctions are particular to systemic functional linguistics. Language in the perspective of social-semiotic has three principles, namely: language always occurs as a text whether it is spoken or written; language is used to express meaning; language is functional, it reflects the attitudes, opinions, and the ideology of the users (Halliday, 1985a). Meaning in SFL is known as “metafunctions”. The metafunctions of language are: to understand the environment (ideational meaning); to act on the others in it (interpersonal meaning); to breathe relevance into the other two (textual meaning) (Almurashi, 2016: 80).

The reflection of the attitudes, opinions, and values of the users will be clearly seen through the register system blow.

2.1.1. Text and Context

“A text is a unit of language in use” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976: 1). A text can be regarded as the basic unit of meaning in language to semantic structure. As a text, language is always surrounded by its environment or its context. Context is simply “other text that accompanies the text” or “text that is with” (Halliday & Hasan, 1985: 5). The context here refers to the context of culture and context of situation. There are three components in context situation: the field of discourse, the tenor of discourse, and the mode of discourse.

2.1.2. Register

Halliday states that a register is a semantic concept. It is a configuration of meanings that are typically associated with particular situational configuration of field, mode, and tenor. In other words, register is used to refer to “the semiotic systems constituted by the contextual variables field, tenor, and mode”. (Martin, 1992: 502).

2.1.3. Lexicogrammar

Lexicogrammar refers to words in grammatical structure, its macrofunctions: “the meaning they organize, the system they use and the forms which their option take”. The three macrofunctions are ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings. Ideational meaning expresses cognitive meaning. This drawn on the systems and networks of transitivity which conveys the user’s experience of the external and internal experiences (Bell, 1991: 120).

The interpersonal meaning expresses speech functional meaning by drawing on the systems and networks of MOOD. The function of it is to create sentences which carry the cognitive and logical content of propositions and display the speaker's relationship with others to whom the message are being addressed (Bell, 1991: 121). In lexicogrammar, the interpersonal meaning is realized in mood system and modality system. The function of the mood system is to structure sentences which count as speech acts which facilitate social exchanges (Ibid, p. 134).

2.2 Pioneers Functional Linguistics

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is an approach to language developed largely by M.A.K. Halliday and his followers during the 1960s in the United Kingdom, and later in Australia (O'Donnell 2012, p. 1). SFL is built on previous works of some influential linguists such as Bronislaw Malinowski and J.R. Firth. Bronislaw Malinowski was a polish anthropologist who did most of his works based in England (O'Donnell 2012, p. 5). The second linguist is J.R. Firth who established linguistics as a discipline in Britain. He developed Malinowski's theory about the centrality of the context of situation and applied it through his linguistic model. In addition, he developed an approach to phonology called 'prosodic phonology', which enables phonological features to be shared over successive phonemes rather than each phoneme having its own unique features (O'Donnell 2012, p. 6). Nowadays, the SFL approach is used world-wide, especially in language education, and for a number of purposes like discourse analysis. It has continued to be closely associated with sociology even when a good number of linguistic theories deal with language in the form of mental practice. The Halliday's

tradition, as an illustration, is more interested in the manner by which language is utilised in social settings so as to attain a specific target. SFL, with regards to data, does not tackle the manner of language representation or process in the human brain, but would rather try to see discourses produced in the form of written or oral language and what is contained in the texts that are produced. Because of the concern of SFL with the use of language, great importance is placed on the function of language, such as what language is used for, rather than what language structure is all about and the manner by which it is composed (O'Donnell, 2012: 2).

Halliday's functional tradition and Bloomfield's structural tradition. The structural theory was featured by Leonard Bloomfield, who developed the structural linguistics in the United States during the 1930s and 1940s. However, Halliday insisted that the central concern of linguistics should be the study of the language through meaning, which was different from the dominant Bloomfield approach in American linguistics. Bloomfield rejected the possibility that linguistics analyzes meaning. He was fully convinced of the need for linguists to study oral language in lieu of studying written documents. The documents, for example, do not fully represent a spoken language due to the fact that language undergoes changes over time and what something means today might have meant a different thing altogether in the past (Eggins, 2000: 309).

2.3 Main Difference between Cognitive Grammar and Functional Grammar

Different linguists tried to form different frameworks about how cognitive abilities construct human languages. Their formation sometimes is the same and sometimes different. Any construction that cognitive linguists want to use in their process must follow two vital commitments. One is generalisation commitment, and the other is cognitive commitment (Evan, 2006: 27). According to the generalisation commitment, several aspects of human language are derived from some definite and same cognitive principles. Cognitive linguists look for this same cognitive principle, evaluate the established decisions and, if necessary, correct it. This tries to analyse how cognitive principles create human language skills. Cognitive linguists illustrated that the several events of phonetics, phonology and phraseology etc., can be arranged in categories, and for every language, by categorisation, linguistics events can scientifically be analysed. Besides categorisation, another cognitive principle; is a metaphor (Croft & Cruse, 2004: 194).

While cognitive linguists wish to explain any human language, the descriptions are subdivided into two categories. Since meaning is the centre of cognitive linguistics, linguists offer cognitive semantics before the composition of grammar (Evan, 2006: 48-49). Cognitive economics presents the real situation and analyses the actual conceptualisation. Composing economics, they will be influenced in creating the grammar. All the grammar created or created by cognitive linguists is to be identified as the cognitive model of grammar. Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar has been divided into two groups regarding the differences in the design of grammatical knowledge. One is cognitive grammar, and the other is construction grammar. In constructive grammar, according to the

principle of categorising grammatical knowledge, only one mechanism is formed by the construction, and human language expression can be narrated through the constructive description (Croft & Cruse, 2004: 266-278).

On the other hand, under the head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Langacker proposed a well-furnished type of grammar, ‘cognitive grammar’. This grammar explains how a sentence will be constructed, following which cognition and process are outlined. Here, for grammatical knowledge, more than one assistance from the construction mechanism is taken. These two branches of grammar first describe the characteristics of the grammatical knowledge of humans (Langacker, 2008: 183).

The main objective of any grammarian is to describe grammatical cognition scientifically. In cognitive grammar, the central role of human language is signalling (Evan, 2006: 476). This signalling process happens following grammatical rules. The smallest element of grammar is the symbolic unit. In this article, we are using the term ‘symbolic sphere’ allegorically. Symbolic units are unembodied. In a symbolic sphere, any idea is formed relating to two poles. One is the phonological pole, and another is the semantic pole. The semantic pole presents the meaning of the phone in the phonological pole. These two poles create a symbolic sphere by getting mixed. A symbolic sphere suggests the existence of an idea of language concept in the human mind. For example, in the symbolic sphere by which the linguistic meaning of the word “book” is disclosed, in the English language, for this idea, the phonological pole will take its place, and the semantic pole will present the meaning of the book. Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar mainly advises that the interrelation of these two poles is the internal issue of the symbolic sphere. The term ‘internal’ is significant. Any sound chronology will not have any linguistic meaning without its meaning agents. Only when the two poles

become a predicament of each other the symbolic sphere is created. By the term 'internal', the head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar sketches the meaning as a central language element. Any sound phonology can not be a part of grammar without its meaning. So it implies that head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar supports the phonological and semantic poles (Evan, 2006: 477).

The human mind has individual symbolic spheres for each idea in the universe. Ideas like 'book', 'constitution", and 'ant' are linguistically expressed through the symbolic sphere. Hundreds of thousands of symbolic spheres are not disorganised in the human mind. If those spheres were not in a formed shape, formulas might be necessary. Those formulas are grammatical, which would fail to maintain linguistic cognition because those formulas are only computational. The formulas are not representatives of human cognitive ability. When any symbolic sphere comes to the human mind, it uses the human cognitive ability to be formed. Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar describes each symbolic sphere in such a way that to form any speech, no assistance from the formula is necessary; however, it describes how those symbolic spheres use cognitive ability to form speeches (Evan, 2006: 476).

Conclusion

Cognitive linguistics is a branch of linguistics. Based on the theory of the second generation of cognitive science and experiential philosophy, it was born on the basis of opposing the transformational generative grammar of mainstream linguistics and began to take shape from the late 1980s to the 1990s. Cognitive linguistics involves artificial intelligence, linguistics, psychology, systems theory, and other disciplines. Aiming at the innate view held by generative linguistics, it proposes that the creation, learning and application of language must be explained through human cognition, because cognitive ability is the foundation of human knowledge.

Cognitive Linguistics is closely related to psycholinguistics and systemic functional linguistics. It is based on cognitive science, and the research of cognitive linguistics is to use cognitive psychology and linguistic theory to study the relationship between representation, concept, and language structure. Psycholinguistics is based on psychology, it involves language memory, phonological perception, language learning, and so on. Compared with Systemic Functional Linguistics, Cognitive Linguistics focuses more on the internal factors of the speaker, that is, the psychological mechanism and the generation and exchange of meaning in the cognitive process. Systemic Functional Linguistics focuses on the social communication of language, and studies language from the social function and use situation of language.

References

- Aitchson .J (1999) *Linguistics, Teach yourself*, Library of Congress : London.
- Bell, R. T. 1991. *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. London: Longman.
- Croft, William, and D. Alan Cruse. *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Eggins, S. (2000). *An Introduction to Systemic-Functional Linguistics*. London: Continuum.
- Evans, Vyvyan. "Cognitive linguistics." *Wiley interdisciplinary reviews: cognitive science* 3.2 (2012): 129-141.
- Evans, Vyvyan. *Cognitive linguistics*. Edinburgh University Press, 2006.
- Geeraerts, Dirk (2006) *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. A collection of twelve seminal articles by leading figures in cognitive linguistics.
- Halliday, M. A. K and Ruqaiya, Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Langacker, Ronald W. "Cognitive Grammar-A Basic Introduction-: Oxford University Press." New York (2008).
- Langdon, Margaret, and Yakov Malkiel. "History and histories of linguistics." *Romance Philology* 22.4 (1969): 530-574.
- Martin, J.R., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., & Painter, C. 1997. *Working with Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.

Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. *Psychological Review*, 84, 231–259.

O'Donnell, M. (2012). Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics for Discourse Analysis. *Language, Function and Cognition*, pp. 1-8.

Rata, G., 2013. *Linguistic Studies of Human Language*, Athens: Athens Institute for Education and Research.

Sri. Sreekumar. P.(2011) *LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS*, S.V. College of Advanced Studies Cheruvannur, Calicut.