

Until now we were talking about two different domains of semantic change. First we discussed how metaphorization and metonymization are the two prominent or the most primary mechanisms that help to bring semantic change.

(Refer Slide Time: 02:00)

Page 30, Table



DEMONSTRATIVES					IDENTITIVES	
'1'	'2'	'3'	anaphoric	'self'	'same'	
CL	HIC	ISTE	ILLE	IS	IPSE	IDEM
VL	ISTE	IPSE	ILLE	*MET-IPS-IMUM		



And in this connection we did talk about the development of demonstratives and how the meaning has changed. And then we compared the languages like Latin and we did observe the semantic change of the demonstratives from classical Latin to the colloquial Latin or as it is mentioned in the book vulgar Latin.

We see that at least the second person demonstrative, the meaning had changed in the vulgar Latin. In the classical Latin the phrase iste which used to be the second person demonstrative has become the first person demonstrative in the vulgar Latin or in the colloquial Latin. Similar is the case with the reflexive self which is ipse in classical Latin, sometimes it becomes a second person demonstrative or it can also be the first person singular as far as the identities are concerned.

So, these sort of changes you can check that, look at the table ones and then find out whether you understand these concepts well or not.

(Refer Slide Time: 03:03)

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 identitive "self"),
 - "self" by **met-ips-imum*
 - "self" identity marker
 - ipse* reinforced by *met* (emphasizing identity, cf. "personally")
 - imum* (the superlative),

Harris (1978: 69)



But for sure if you check what was the meaning of the words like *hic* and *iste* and *ille* or *ipse* in classical Latin and how it has changed over the period of time.

(Refer Slide Time: 03:16)

Child vs. adult acquisition in semantic change



- Bio-program Hypothesis - In the absence of generation-to-generation transmission of language, children would innovate specific semantic and syntactic structures.
- e.g. highly constrained combinations of Tense– Aspect–Modality, and distinctions between specific and non-specific indefinites.
- SPACE > TIME, TEMPORAL > CONDITIONAL

1970s research on child language acquisition
↳ Semantics (CLA), order of semantic change
↳ Change in the historical data

e.g. Hawaiian Creole
grammar
Coded str. } Innovative



Besides this kind of change, we discussed was at the diachrony level. We saw how languages from one form to the other form, the changes have been recorded or the development has been done. So, besides the diachronic development, we can also have a look at the synchronic development. In the synchronic development we have to find out the difference or the process

or the trace that involves or the track that involves child versus adult acquisition. Language acquisition at the child acquisition level and at the adult acquisition level what sort of semantic changes does it. And in this connection I would like to highlight that there has been a considerable debate about the innovation or the innovative attitude of either the children or the adults as far as the changes in the natural language is concerned. Some people would argue that the children are more innovative, they are more creative, and on the other hand some other people would argue that the adults are more innovative and more creative.

Talking about the innovation or talking about the innovative spirit, we can claim that, I am not sure whether we can claim, but at least the contention here is that there has been a considerable credit which should go to the adults. And why it should go to the adults? Because when the children are trying to acquire any language, when they are trying to identify the usage of a particular language, they find it out or they definitely look for the different forms which are available in the language.

And these forms, the available forms of a particular word that has been used by an adult. Maybe I will give you an example, the child who says goed, the past tense of go should be went, but a child like a lot of native English speaking children use the term go plus -ed as goed or comed or putted or kepted. So, these kind of forms, obviously shows that the children are very creative and they can apply the rules. So, existing rules which are there in the brain, but at the same time they get to know from the discourse itself that go plus -ed instead of getting the goed form it actually becomes went.

How the child gets to know about the past tense of go is went? From the discourse, from the linguistic environment itself and that has been done by an adult or that has been used by an adult. So, that is why who is more innovative? That is a question which is the part of an ongoing debate all the time. If we look at generative linguistics as I have mentioned a bit of formal like discourse would deal with both the formal and the functional aspect of the language especially when we are talking about language change, we need to find out the change in the grammar or you can kind of set the coded structure because children learn language or they acquire language and whatever imperfection that the child's language has

that gets corrected automatically without any specific intervention rather from the linguistic environment itself, the child gets to know that this particular form has to be used in this way.

If you study a bit of Hawaiian creole especially if you look at the generation to generation transmission of language, there has been a particular hypothesis which is known as bioprogram hypothesis. This is what I will focus on to understand the semantic change, in child versus versus adult acquisition in semantics.

The bioprogram hypothesis would say that or would mention that there is a claim going by this hypothesis that there has been evidence from the development of at least one language that is I forgot to mention it in the slide, so I am going to write it over here. This is the example here comes from Hawaiian Creole is that there is an absence of generation to generation transmission of language. In such cases when there is an absence of generation to generation transmission of language, children would innovate, specific, semantic and syntactic structure. This is a very important statement.

So, how does language get transmitted? How does the transmission of language happen? In most of the cases it happens from generation to generation. Children hear a particular language spoken in the family, then they try to speak, then the reading and writing these are the more complex skills which come later, but for our purpose we would basically focus on speaking or the spoken aspect of language. So, in such cases, when there is an absence of generation to generation transmission of language, what would the children do? The children would try to innovate, specific, semantic and syntactic structures. So, that brings the change in the grammar; that brings the change in the structure. What kind of structure? The coded structure.

So, two things are important here, one is grammar and then the other one is the coded structure. These two things the children become innovative because of the lack of transmission of language from one generation to the other, as far as child language acquisition is concerned. As a result what happens? We got to know that there is a bioprogram hypothesis which would help us to understand the semantic change and following the bioprogram hypothesis we can say that in the absence of generation to generation transmission of language, children would innovate specific semantic and syntactic structures.

As an example we can have highly constrained combinations of tense, aspect, and mood and distinctions between specific and nonspecific indefinites.

So, when you look at the indefinite article, English as to indefinite articles a and an; and then as far as tense, aspect, modality is concerned, we have various kinds of moods, we have various kinds of aspect perfective and imperfective or we call it progressive, then we have also tense present, past, and future. So, all these kinds of changes that happen at the level of semantics, this change can be codified through the child language acquisition or by looking at the absence of generation to generation transmission of language, how children change or how the children bring a semantic change of certain kind of parts of speech or certain kind of linguistic component.

It could be either the TAM marking on the verb or it can be the use of definite or indefinite articles. Just remember this, there is something called let me just rephrase and summarize. There is something called bioprogram hypothesis. And what happens in the bioprogram hypothesis? There has been an insufficient input as far as generation to generation language transmission is concerned. So, in such cases what the children do, the children become more innovative. And because of the innovative spirit of the children they come up with certain semantic and syntactic structures which were not available in that language before. Did you get it?

So, language X and the number of speakers have become quite low and there has not been sufficient input as far as the generation to generation transfer is concerned. As a result, what the children innovated certain or specific semantic and syntactic structures. Because of this innovation as far as the syntactic and semantic structures are concerned, there has been a change in the grammar. And there has been a change in the semantics of certain verbs or semantics of certain linguistic items.

Once as an example you can find out at least in the Hawaiian Creole where a highly constrained combination of tense, aspect, modality would be found in a language like Hawaiian creole. Same is the case with the distinction between the specific and nonspecific indefinites has also been very rigid as far as these creoles are concerned.

This kind of a claim can be made if we believe in the bioprogram hypothesis. Why is such kind of rigidity or such kind of constraint happened in child's language acquisition process? Because of the insufficient availability of inputs and that has been the result of the generation to generation lack of transmission of language.

In this connection I would like to highlight one more phenomenon which would help us to understand the semantic change. So, what is it? In the child language acquisition research in the 1970s, there was a suggestion or there it was repeatedly suggested that there were matches between language acquisition of semantics, development of semantics in creolization and in the order of semantic change in the historical data; so, three things. So, this 1970 research would say, research on child language acquisition I will write it over here. Child language acquisition.

What happens there, the idea or the concern here is that in this this research suggests that there is a match between three things. First semantics, what semantics? Child language let me write CLA, Child Language Acquisition semantics, that is the first thing. Second thing, you would have the order of semantic change and third would be change in the historical data. So, these are the things, these 3 things you can actually find a match between or among these three semantics of child language acquisition, order of semantic change, and the change in the historical data. One such example is given here to look at the spatial or temporal data that we have.

So, for example, across conceptualized structures like space is always higher than time and temporal phrases are always higher than the conditional or the temporal phrases are always hierarchically higher than the conditional phrases. So, did you understand the space higher than or bigger than time, temporal higher than or bigger than conditional sentences or conditional phrases. This development, this is a crosslinguistic semantic typological development.

When you look at child language acquisition, you will always find that this kind of a relation can be drawn. Space higher than time, temporal is higher than conditional. So, temporal would be related to time, the time relating phrases and conditional would be phrases like if or

whether,. So, the conditional sentences or the conditional phrases the child acquires later and the temporal phrases come much prior or much before than the conditional phrases.

Similar is the case when you relate it with the spatial and then the time-related thing. Spatial instances or the spatial phrases change their meaning or they come to the children quite earlier than the time-related ones and that triggers a lot of semantic changes.

This data comes from the Hawaiian creole examples. However, more recently this assumption has been called into question from many sources, a lot of researchers have been critiquing this and why this particular hypothesis. I am still talking about the bioprogram hypothesis. So, why has this particular hypothesis been criticized? What has been the drawback, what has been the shortcomings that this particular hypothesis has? The first thing is that this particular hypothesis has been largely exploded because it has shown that creoles may be developed by adults.

By default a lot of focus has been on the adult acquisition because we are talking about a creole. What is a creole? A creole is a developed form of a pidgin. When you say pidgin and creole and if you call something a creole, who has developed a pidgin into a creole? It is definitely not the children, rather the adults. Because of this development or the process of creolization or through the process of pidginization, we realize that it is the adults who have been given a lot of importance in the entire language or semantic change process or the semantic development process.

Even at a synchronic domain, let us not go into the classical or the modern difference, just within a synchrony of time or at the synchronic domain when we see creolization happens and when a particular language or when a particular creole gets developed from a pidgin; obviously, the credit goes to the adult speakers. Because of the adult speakers' contribution we see the adults as the innovative, are the most innovators in that sense or the innovative creators.

So, the concern here is that because of this creole or or the statement here is that the bioprogram hypothesis has been largely exploded because it has been shown that the creoles maybe developed by adults which has been extremely exploded, that means, criticized.

One of the biggest criticisms that the bioprogram hypothesis faces is that it is giving a lot of importance to adults, because the adults are considered to be more innovative in the process of creolization. So, that means, the effort of the child language acquisition has been undermined and that is the reason why a lot of linguists would criticize a concept like bioprogram hypothesis.

If we look at the examples like Hawaiian creole, it is both ways; both the child language acquisition process and adult acquisition process play an equally important role for the development of a language.

(Refer Slide Time: 20:37)

Child vs. adult acquisition in semantic change

- "common sense reasoning" or "abduction": The basic idea is that "[a]bduction 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

AD/R → Addressee/Reader
SP/W → Speaker/Writer

Abduction
Observed result → Invoking law → Inferring something



We cannot just give credit to one domain like one side of it rather we have to focus on both the angles.

With this information about the bioprogram hypothesis, I would lead you through different reasoning strategies of learning. So, what are the different strategies involved during the process of learning a language? I think I have to rephrase what I was talking about a while ago. It seems to me bioprogram hypothesis has been hugely criticized by a lot of researchers, and one of the primary reasons of the criticism that it receives is that it emphasizes a lot on the innovativeness of the adult. Let us look at this in the statement that I just made.

The bioprogram hypothesis has been largely exploded because it has been shown that creoles may be developed by adults, but spread and accelerated by children. The concern here is that who has been given more importance, who has been given more privilege? It is children. So, the concern here is that it has been developed by the adults, but it has been spread and created by children. Why? Bioprogram hypothesis would suggest that because of the absence of generation to generation transmission of language, the children innovate the sentence structures as well as the semantic interpretation.

But the story is a little different. The adult seemed to be more innovative. So, considering the bioprogram hypothesis is focusing a lot on the contribution of children, there this has been considered as one of its weakest perspectives. Then at least the two different kinds of creoles like Surinam and Ceramic in creole show that there has not been enough shortage of generation to generation transmission of language.

A lot of adults actually contributed to the development of creoles. If we undermine the creative spirit or the innovative nature or the innovative ability of the adults, such kind of a hypothesis needs to be reconsidered or we should not accept it blindly considering the child language acquisition is an extremely creative process.

So, even for the development of creoles, we would give importance to the child language acquisition, not really, we are not going to do that. We will say that yes, even the adults have enough contribution for the development of a particular language and for the semantic changes that it brings. So, with this information, let us move to the process or the technique or the strategy that is involved in child language acquisition as well as the adult language acquisition which brings a lot of semantic change.

For this I would bring two terms as mentioned in this book. There are two things, one is common sense reasoning and the other, which is also known as an abduction. Abduction or common sense reasoning are primarily discussed in Anderson(1973), Antilla(1992). They have extensively worked on this theory. So, what is the basic idea of these two things? Look at this common sense reasoning or we can also call it abduction. So, what happens in this process a lot of the most important or or the most important thing to understand the basic idea is that this abduction proceeds from an observed result.

First the speech community speaker has to observe the result. Through the process of abduction, the very first thing happens is the observation of result, second invoking of a law and third, drawing the inference something which may be the case; so three things. One is observation, the second thing that we have is observe, invoke and then the third thing is that infer these are the three things that we need to remember when we were talking about abduction or common sense reasoning.

So, this is the basic idea. First, this abduction proceeds from the observed result, second it invokes a law and third, it infers that something might have been the case, which is why the language has been like this. So, for example, when a language learner observes various kinds of verbal activities, let us say you are trying to learn different vocabulary related to verbs. Then you have to look at the action verbs action-oriented phrases. So, when a language learner observes various kinds of verbal activities, she constructs them as an output of the linguistic system, and further she uses the general principles as an entailment or the construal of invited references.

So, three things; first the language learner observes; observes all kinds of verbal activities, second constructs them as an output of the linguistic system; constructs them as an output of grammar. Once the learner observes everything, she gets to construct certain things as an output of grammar. And finally, what is the third thing that she does? She uses the general principles for the construal of invited references That is why, it has been said say no more than you must and mean more thereby, so that means, you have to say exactly the words that you need, if you speak less than that, the meaning might be unclear.

Say no more than you must, whatever you want to whatever minimum number of words must be used, please use that; do not make it more wordy, but do use a lot of pragmatic interlocutors or the pragmatic markers and the pragmatic signs for which within that speech limit or within that limited set of linguistic inputs, you can actually communicate more. Such kind of a thing can be hypothesized in relation to innovation. So, what is that innovation and change hypothesis that would state such a statement? The hypothesis is that innovation and change does not occur primarily in the process of perception and acquisition, but rather in the process of strategic choice.

So, when you talk about innovation, innovation is not really occurring or innovation is not really happening in the process of perception or acquisition. During the language acquisition process you do not innovate; during the perception process you do not innovate. So, when does innovation happen? Innovation happens in the process of strategic choice. You have to choose things strategically and that strategic choice would be a part of the speaker/writer. So, that would be on the part of the speaker or the writer, that is what it is written SP/W, and the interactional negotiation with the AD, AD means the addressee or reader and so, that will be the interaction with the AD or the reader. So, let us say writer and reader or addressee or speaker.

Let us try to summarize what we have learned so far. The first thing that we understood, there is a particular strategy involved in child language or adult language acquisition as far as semantic changes are concerned and that is known as common sense reasoning or abduction. What is abduction? We understood that the basic idea in abduction is that it proceeds from the observed result, invokes a law and then infer something may be the case.

The example that we have given is let us consider a learner learning a language. So, when a learner learns a language, you generally consider it or the learner tries to observe all kinds of linguistic usage and of the different kinds of linguistic phenomena. So, the observing happens at the linguistic environmental level, after the observation is done what the learner does, she tries to catch as much of output as possible from the linguistic system which is the grammar. So, that is the invoking a law. So, she tries to find out the principle behind it.

And finally, once she gets to know that this is the grammatical system that they have, then she uses it, these principles she uses in the discourse. That is how this abduction process happens in the domain of language acquisition. And, what is the hypothesis that linguists have considered so far, is that, in such process in the entire process of observation or observing, invoking and inferring, the innovation or the semantic change that we are talking about when the meaning of a word changes it does not lie at the process of perception or acquisition. No, rather it lies the communication or the negotiation between the speaker and the hearer, the reader or the writer.

Both the speaker and the hearer have to be innovative to grab maximum information from the statement that has been said. So, during the acquisition process the innovation or the innovative components are not visible, rather they are visible on the part of the speaker or the writer and the interactional negotiation between the addressee or the receiver. Did I make sense? Could you understand? That means, the concern here is that the innovation is not a part of the acquisition process rather innovation is the part of the negotiation process or the interactional process. Negotiation between who and who; negotiation or interaction between the speaker and the hearer or the addressee or like the speaker in the addressee or the writer or the reader; so, writer reader or speaker hearer.

When you talk about innovation, that means, this is the domain where all the innovation or innovative aspect comes into existence. Now, it is up to you to decide who is going to be more innovative, whether it is the child or the adult. There has been a couple of justifications, one justification comes from the textual data where the writer appears to explore new uses. That is not the work of a child, that is basically an adult who is trying to find out or trying to become more creative in the writing domain. So, a lot of importance in bioprogram in this hypothesis or abduction hypothesis if I can say has been given to the adults.

So, the addressee has to in the process of negotiation where the innovation comes into existence, the addressee or the reader has to recognize this and has to process the speech or the writing at the best intersubjective, like they have to interpret it in the best possible method, in the best possible way. So, this intersubjectification results eventually in a lot of pragmatic functions, politeness marking hedging. These are different things I am not going to go into this, but it is primarily the addressee or the reader he has to be more creative, more innovative to grab maximum information from a limited set of linguistic principles or limited set of linguistic inputs.

Because remember the statement say no more than you must and mean more thereby. So, speak limited number of words, but try to mean as much as possible. So, who is creative here? The person who is acquiring it or the person who is a party to the interaction process? It is definitely the party who has been in the interaction or the negotiation process. The innovation does not lie at the acquisition level, rather it lies at the communication,

interactional and negotiation level, ok. So, that is how we need to remember when we were talking about semantic change.

Keywords: bioprogram hypothesis, creole, pidgin, coded structure, specific and nonspecific indefinites, temporal phrase conditional phrase, child versus adult language acquisition, innovation, negotiation process