

Appreciating Linguistics: A typological approach
Dr. Anindita Sahoo
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences
Indian Institute of Technology, Madras


Lecture – 45
Semantic Typology Part – 2

Hello everyone, welcome to this session of our NPTEL course Appreciating Linguistics: A typological approach.


(Refer Slide Time: 00:24)

Metaphorization

- Metaphorization- an analogical principle that involves conceptualizing one element of a conceptual structure C_a in terms of an element of another conceptual structure C_b .
- ^{temporal 'while'} During the time that" > concessive 'while' "although,"
- grasp "seize" > "understand"
(in terms of a projection or leap across domains)



C_a - Conceptual structure 1
 C_b - Conceptual structure 2
Spatial?
Temporal?
'While'



(Conceptual structure projection)

Let us begin the discussion with metaphorization. If I ask you the question, what have you understood, I just said that metonymization is related to the meaning of the neighbouring things, and metaphorization is going to deal with those resemblers or you can say the lookalikes. Then you are going to call it metaphorization.

But if I ask you a definition centric answer as far as metaphorization is concerned, you should remember metaphorization is an analogical principle that involves conceptualizing one element of conceptual structure C_a in terms of an element of another conceptual structure C_b . I assume it is going to be difficult for you if I do not explain. So, let me explain it for you. One is C_a , the other one is C_b .

What is C a? C a is conceptual structure 1, and C b is conceptual structure 2. One is C a; the other one is C b. And what we are going to do? We are going to do the analogy between these two, C a and C b. This kind of analogy some elements of C a and some elements of C b, there is an analogical principle or we can actually find out a certain kind of analogy between these two. And this process of identification of analogies and then using it in the discourse is going to be known as metaphORIZATION. Is it clear to you now?

Now, you read the formal definition and I hope you are going to understand it. So, what is metaphORIZATION? An analogical principle, remember the term analogy, that means, you have to find out some similarity between two things. And what kind of a principle is it? What does it involve? It involves conceptualizing one element of conceptual structure C a. So, C a is conceptual structure ; C b is conceptual structure 2.

So, what are we doing through the technique or through the mechanism of metaphORIZATION? We are trying to involve one element of C a in terms of another element of C b. So, these two elements from C a and C b, they have a lot of overlapping analogy or overlapping similarity, so that is how we are trying to understand semantic change in the terms of semantic typology.

Now, let us look at an example here. The example given over here would be this is I have not mentioned the reference here. This is primarily Switzer (1990). So, what kind of an example do we get from here? Maybe before I go into this derivation or this discussion, I need to write a couple of things about spatial and temporal relations, we are trying to understand metaphORIZATION as a process.

In this case, obviously, there is an analogical principle involved. And when it is an analogical principle that I am talking about, it is going to be the comparison between two conceptual structures C a and C b. There are certain elements in C a which are similar to C b. Because of the similarity between the two domains, we would have a metaphORIZATION or metaphorical relation being established. So, in this connection, I would like you to understand the meaning of while. While as a lexical item or while as a word it has a temporal relation and it also has a concessive relation.

Look at the data here, temporarily or time wise, while means what? What do you think what should be the meaning of while? While means during that time. When I say I met my friend

while I was going to school, in this case while means during the time that I was going to school, so that kind of a meaning. While meaning enduring that kind of a phrase it is going to be a part of the temporal relation or the temporal sign that while has; so, temporarily while means this.

On the other hand, the semantic change is also happening. If you approach it from a typological understanding, what is the semantic change happening? Besides the temporal meaning of while, while also has a concessive meaning and the concessive while means although. The example I would give let us say I offered him the pen while he did not take it. So, although I offered him a pen, he did not really take it. That means, I did offer, but at the same time he did not take that. The semantic change from one domain the temporal while to the concessive while is an interesting phenomenon to study that is one example.

The other example is the meaning of grasp. When you say grasp, the default meaning of grasp is to seize. That means, to get something under control, to seize something, to stop something or to have something under your control. This grasp can also be extended if you remember I was talking about overextension.

This can be extended to another meaning that means, understand it was difficult for me to grasp the concepts of semantics. If this is the statement, it was difficult for me to grasp the concepts of semantics, here grasp means understand. So, in terms of projection or leap across domain, this is an example of how a particular meaning has been projected in one domain in a different way, the other domain in another way.

So, grasp with the meaning seizes has a different domain, and grasp with the meaning of understand, goes to another domain. The interpretations are going to be different across domains; so, grasp meaning seize versus grasp meaning understand. Similarly, the temporal while which means during the time, and concessive while which means understand. This kind of semantic change seems to be a crosslinguistic process. So, this particular thing seems to be a crosslinguistic process.

It is very likely are going to find this crosslinguistic process in most of the world's languages as far as metaphorization is concerned. Is it clear could you understand? So, if I summarize it or if I put it in a summarized fashion, when I say metaphorization, this is primarily an

analogical principle. And this analogical principle deals with C a and C b. C a stands for conceptual structure 1; C b stands for conceptual structure 2.

Through the mechanism of metaphORIZATION when the meaning gets changed, some components or some elements of conceptual structure have some analogy with the conceptual structure b or C b. This relation between C a or the analogical relation or the analogy between C a and C b of certain components or certain elements that triggers the semantic change.

The examples that we have here is while as a temporal while and then we have while as the concessive while; grasp with the meaning seize and grasp with the meaning understand. In both the examples, the domains are different, and in terms of projection of meaning, these leaps or these jumps from one domain to the other. So that is how we understood metaphORIZATION as a process.



(Refer Slide Time: 09:58)

Metonymization

- Metonym(ization) → the poor relation of metaphor(ization)
- Traditional examples tend to be limited to phenomena such as
 - contiguity or association of an overtly accessible sort, e.g. part-whole, cause-effect (Gibbs 1993),
 - often in physical space, e.g. *cheek* "jaw bone" > "fleshy part above jaw-bone";
 - part for whole, e.g. *keel* for *ship*;
 - ellipsis, e.g. *a Hockney*, for *a painting by Hockney*,
 - Fr. *Place de Gre've* "square where strikers met" > *gre've* "strike."
- metonym(ization): a conceptual phenomenon

Part-Whole

(Ullmann 1964)



Now, let us move to metonymization. Metonymization, in contrast with metaphORIZATION, this is considered to be the poor relation of metaphORIZATION. That means, when you talk about the traditional examples, there seems to be a very limited phenomena which can be associated with metonymization, eventually it goes back to metaphORIZATION actually. But we have to find out the distinctness that metonymization involves.

Following Ullmann(1964)'s work maybe I will just write the reference here. So, this is Ullmann, please read this work a bit more carefully (1964). If you follow this work you would realize that metonymization should also be understood as a conceptual phenomenon. Just like we did for metaphorization. For metonymization also we need to understand it as a conceptual phenomenon. So, we should come out of the idea that t this is in poor relation with metaphorization Do not have a preconceived bias to understand metaphorization and metallization.

Both have their distinct features and both have equal strength to help the researcher to understand the semantic change. Let us see what metonymization is. Much like metaphorization, metonymization is also a conceptual phenomenon, wnd what happens in metonymization, we generally think about some hypotheses, and we try to find out if such a kind of a hypothesis is going to be tested true through the process.

But before that let us try to understand what kind of examples we can study to know more about metaphorization. Here are a few traditional examples to understand this phenomenon. Remember metaphorization is always in a part-whole relation; partonomy, if you remember taxonomy and partonomy. Part-whole relation would be a part of metonymization either you call it part-whole relation or you can call it cause-effect relation.

Let us take the first example as cheek. Cheek means the jaw bone. This jaw bone is a part of your fleshy part above the jaw bone. So, if this is your jaw bone, the entire fleshy area would be a bigger set and inside that bigger set of the entire fleshy part you have the jaw bone, so that is called the cheek.

So, to understand the meaning of cheek, you have to find out the part-whole relation in the human face. Similar is the case with keel. Keel means ship. But in case of keel and ship there would be a part-whole relation. And hockney, which is primarily when you say hockney, that means, you are not referring to the person hockney who has painted this rather you are talking about the product.

Metonymically hockney could be the name of a person, but instead of focusing on the person you are focusing on the product. These are a few traditional examples which should help you to understand what metonymization is.

(Refer Slide Time: 14:02)

Page 30, Table



DEMONSTRATIVES				IDENTITIVES		
1	*2*	*3*	anaphoric	"self"	"same"	
CL	HIC	ISTE	ILLE	IS	IPSE	IDEM
VL	ISTE	IPSE	ILLE		"MET-IPSI-MUM"	



Now since we saw that there could be a lot of overlapping between metaphorization and metonymization in the terms of the conceptual structure that they are, let us try to identify a certain phenomenon related to demonstratives to understand this more. Let us look at the table given here. Here we are going to talk about the conceptual metonymy and how it needs to be expanded to account for subjectification.

Subjectification is one linguistic phenomenon, and then we can always think about some features or some words which can help us to understand the subjectification of a particular language. For this we have consider the example of classic Latin and author would say vulgar Latin. I do not know why Harris(1978) has used the word vulgar, but probably it is the colloquial Latin.

Let us see how the meaning had changed following the metaphorization or metonymization approach. We will try to understand, but I think it is going to be more in the metonymic change. That means, the statement is that metaphorization is considered to be a part of your

metonymic change. For that matter, let us look at the example of certain demonstratives and identities in classical Latin versus vulgar Latin.

Look at the data given over here in the table. We have the first person demonstratives. again look at the heading here it is the identity. So, demonstrative first person, second person, third person and this is the anaphoric use, then this means self and same. So, this is when you look at the first person, these are the words; and in the identities these are the words. So, what does this table tell us?

(Refer Slide Time: 16:26)

Arrange the Data by Vulgar Latin and Classical Latin

- A striking example of subjectification is the shift in demonstrative pronouns that occurred in Vulgar Latin.
- Classical Latin:
 - hic* "this near me; close to first person,"
 - iste* "that near you; close to second person,"
 - ille* "that of some other person; close to third person."
 - ipse* "self," *idem* "same."
- Colloquial Latin:
 - iste* (formerly the second person demonstrative),
 - ipse* (formerly the identificative "self"),
 - "self" by **met-ips-imum*
 - "self" identity marker
 - ipse* reinforced by *met* (emphasizing identity, cf. "personally")
 - imum* (the superlative).



Let us do a kind of analysis here. I think I have written here in the next slide. I am going to explain the next slide and then you go back and check it in the table. So, what are we going to study here? We are going to study or we have been discussing semantic change following the two major mechanisms; one mechanism is metaphorization, the other one is metonymization.

We have to check whether this kind of change from classical Latin to the vulgar Latin or to the colloquial Latin, do you think there have been some kind of changes involved and whether it is in the metaphorical domain or in the metonym domain. Let us look at this. The study here is based on the subjectification in that shift in the demonstrative pronouns that occurred in vulgar Latin.

So, the demonstrative pronouns, how the meaning had changed and how the representation had changed the way it used to be in the classical Latin. So, these are the words classical Latin you see near me close to the first person there is a word; close to the second person there is another word; that for some other person close to the third person, so that is the like the three, 1, 2, 3 if you remember, check the data.

The first is *h i c*, then it is *i s t e*, then it is *i l l e*. So, *h i c* would be the first person demonstrative; *iste* would be the second person demonstrative; *ille* is going to be the third person demonstrative and *ipse* is going to be the reflexive or the self. But in case of colloquial Latin what has become *iste* here? The meaning of *iste* has changed. The meaning of *iste* has become first person demonstrative, look at the table CL stands for classical Latin VL stands for vulgar Latin.

The second person demonstrative *iste* in classical Latin has become the first person demonstrative and *ipse* which used to be self the reflexive, it has become second person demonstrative as well as it has also gone to the identitive domain. So, the meaning of *iste*, and *ipse*, has changed tremendously from classical Latin to vulgar Latin or to colloquial Latin.

This kind of a change, though here we just have the data from Latin, we can always get some other language data, and this is considered to be a crosslinguistic feature. The shift in the change of the demonstrative meaning or the science of demonstrative it has been one of the most commonly found typological changes at the semantic level.

That means, the concern here is that the the semantic typology would tell you this kind of a change from the world's classical ones to the colloquial ones or vice versa generally from the past to the present this change gets triggered by a lot of factors, but one of the major things or one of the most important things for you to remember is that these sort of changes are crosslinguistic in nature.

This has not happened just to Latin, but it has happened to many other world's languages. This is just just one set of data and you can always get a lot of examples in different

languages how metonymization has become an important mechanism for the change of the semantic meaning.

(Refer Slide Time: 20:48)

Child vs. adult acquisition in semantic change



- “common sense reasoning” or “abduction” : The basic idea is that “abduction proceeds from an observed result, invokes a law, and infers that something may be the case.”
- “Say no more than you must and mean more thereby,”
- Hypothesis: Innovation and change does not occur primarily in the process of perception and acquisition, but rather in the process of strategic choice- making on the part of SP/W and interactional negotiation with AD/R

SP= Speaker ; W= writer
AD= Addressee ; R= receiver

Abduction
Observed result → *Invoking law* → *Inferring something*



So, with this information I would like to move to a bit of language change or semantic change from the acquisition perspective. The primary set of discussion involves the diachronic discussions. It is going to be from the developmental discussion perspective. In most of the cases when you look at language typology and language change, that happens in two primary domains, in fact, three, but in most of the cases what I have done I have clubbed acquisition and use together.

But otherwise it will be a historical perspective, acquisition centric perspective and then the use centric perspective. When you say historical, you are mainly targeting the difference how the language has changed in the recent times from the classical to the contemporary ones or to the colloquial ones. Acquisition centric how the child versus adult acquisition happens in the domain of semantic change, and how they use it in the discourse. The next few minutes, I am going to focus on the semantic change at the child language acquisition centric manner.

Since we are talking about semantic typology and how the semantic changes happen in case of let us say development centric discussion and diachronic centric discussion. We just had some information related to how the meaning of demonstratives have changed over time

through the data from Latin, classical Latin versus vulgar Latin. Now, we will try to find out how the semantic changes happen through acquisition. The concern here is that the child language acquisition and adult sort of language acquisition these are the two distinct and different parameters, and there has been a considerable debate which is going on who actually innovates, it is the children or the adults, who is more creative, who is more innovative as far as language acquisition is concerned?

So, whose acquisition would be a better tool or whose acquisition process would be a better tool to understand language change, in particular the change in the grammar or the coded structure. When I say language change, I am here talking about or I am focusing on the structure of it, the grammatical change, the coded structural change. Whether the children who acquire language again perfectly or imperfectly I am not going to go into it, but then there are two different ways for two different categories for the children or child language acquisition, the structure is different; for the adult language acquisition, the structure is going to be different.

But, what is the common thing about it as far as semantics is concerned, as far as semantic typology is concerned? What we are going to study is that it has two different categories, one is the common sense reasoning, and then the second one is the abduction. Abduction sounds a little weird, but then we have to find out how it works in a language acquisition centric typological discussion. So, what is it? As far as the innovation is concerned or as far as the creativity is concerned, the children are definitely creative absolutely, no doubt about it.

But the creativity in case of child language acquisition and the innovation in relation to the child language acquisition is going to be a little different from the adult language learning or language acquisition whatever you can say. So, if you follow Slobin(1994), he would say children come to discover pragmatic extensions of grammatical forms. Children try to learn it or try to acquire it from a pragmatic perspective. The children discovered the grammatical forms through the pragmatic extensions, through the way it has been used in the discourse.

They do not really focus on the grammatical structure of it, but a lot of adult learners would approach it from the grammatical structural extension centric sort of domain. So, in that sense when you see the children try to or they discover the pragmatic extension of grammatical

forms, we would not call it innovation, because it has already been there in the system rather these extensions are innovated diachronically by older speakers.

So, here when you approach innovation, you have to think about or you have to talk about the older speakers, because they have used it in the discourse. And, since they have used it in the discourse, the children try to understand it or they get to discover it through the pragmatic extension. And this pragmatic extension has been already done by the elders or by the older speakers. And considering this argument we must say that the children acquire them through a prolonged developmental process of conversational interfering.

So, the children are going to acquire it through the conversation, but who has done the conversation? Who has been innovative here? So, the question here is for sure the children have done it, but then this conversation that the children have done so far that has been there in the discourse like before and it has been done by the older speakers. And these older speakers help the children to discover let us say the pragmatic extension of certain grammatical forms, so that is why Slobin would say that it is the elders or it is the adults who are more innovative than the children.

It is the adults who contribute a lot in the process of semantic change. This semantic change can be understood by identifying the pragmatic extension of the grammatical forms. So, then when I told you to think about two terms, one is common sense reasoning, and then the second is abduction. My concern here is to identify what is the basic idea that abduction comes from. Abduction as an idea comes from an observed result which invokes a law and infers that something may be the case.

There are three things when you talk about abduction, in this case abduction is linguistic abduction. This will have an observed result, then invoking a law, and finally inferring something. So, these are the three things that abduction would deal with. That is why the next statement is very important. What is it? It says say no more than you must and mean more thereby. That means, you should say less, but convey more.

Look at the statement carefully. Considering the basic idea is that abduction proceeds from an observed result, it invokes a law and it infers that something may be the case keeping that in

mind you have to use the heuristics like this. And what is that? Say no more than you must; unnecessarily do not deploy a lot of lexical items or a lot of phrases, do not do that.

So, first point, if you cut the sentence into two parts, then only you can understand. The first part says say no more than you must; just say the limited number of things, do not go beyond that. But what do you say you must mean more. Say less, but mean more. How can it happen? It can happen by the association of the pragmatic tools. The output of the linguistic system with minimum number of words, it should be accompanied with a lot of pragmatic inferences which is why the entire semantics of your phrase or the entire meaning discourse is going to be complete.

Now that means, semantic changes happen, and it happens naturally, you cannot stop it. If you approach it from a language acquisition perspective, you have to find out how a child acquires certain phrases, and how the semantic change can be understood through the process of language acquisition. Two things are working here, one is the common sense reasoning or you can call it abduction also.

So, that means, what happens in case of abduction? What is being abducted here? Abduction here means you have to proceed from an observed result what is happening in the linguistic environment, then you have to invoke a law; that means, you have to build a principle.

And third you have to infer that something might be the case that is what is the essence of it. So, that is why when you speak, you speak what you must, nothing more than that. And through your speech, the meaning should be more comprehensive, the meaning should be more inclusive and how it will be? Because of the deployment of pragmatic markers. These pragmatic markers eventually lead to semantic change. So, how the semantic change happens as far as the developmental part is concerned for a child?

So, in case of child language acquisition, when the development happens at the language level, we have to find out how the semantics-pragmatics interface works to understand the typological pattern or to understand the crosslinguistic typological pattern. So, from here onwards though I would talk about semantic typology, I would bring in a bit of pragmatics typology also right as far as the usage of the language is concerned.

Until now we have discussed how the semantic change happens diachronically by giving you the examples of classical Latin and colloquial Latin. But now we are going to see through a few examples I am not going to make it extremely comprehensive. We will see how the interface of semantics and pragmatics typology works.

The deployment of certain pragmatics markers might help a child to acquire language, and through the process of acquisition, this is also a kind of language development how the meaning gets changed. And this change would be a part of the semantic change that I have been talking about. The typology of semantic change would involve a lot of pragmatic discussion also. So, the next two units or the running unit which is semantic typology and then the next unit pragmatic typology, you would find a lot of overlapping discussions in the due course of time.

Thank you. We will talk more about semantic typology in the next session.

Keywords: conceptual structure, analogical principle, temporal relation, concessive relation, overextension, part-whole relation, subjectification, demonstratives, identitives, reflexives, abduction, pragmatic extension