

J. Nortier, *Dutch-Moroccan Arabic code switching*. Dordrecht, Foris Publications, 1990.

## **BLIND and DEAF: Towards a lexical typology<sup>9</sup>**

Olga Vinogradova and Egor Kashkin

(National Research University Higher School of Economics; V. V. Vinogradov Russian Language Institute of RAS)

Our talk deals with the lexical typology of words that refer to being unable to see or hear something (BLIND, DEAF). We take into consideration both their literal and figurative meanings. No vast cross-linguistic studies of this domain have been conducted so far. However, it lies at the crossroads of two important theoretical fields. The first one deals with the morpho-syntactic and semantic typology of caritive adjectives (i.e. those describing absence of a feature, see Zimmer 1964; Tolstaya 2008; Tagabileva et al. 2013; Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Miestamo 2015). The second one is linked to how the sensory lexicon is organized (Viberg 1983; Sweetser 1991; Maslova 2004 Majid, Levinson 2011; Rakhilina et al. 2012; San Roque et al. 2015; Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2015), at the same time focusing not on the lexicalization of different senses but on their metaphors.

We adopt the frame-based approach to lexical typology (Rakhilina, Reznikova 2013, 2016, see also Koptjevskaja-Tamm et al. 2015), clustering the lexemes and the extralinguistic situations they refer to with the help of the collocational analysis. Our sample includes 12 languages at the moment (Russian, Polish, English, German, French, Estonian, Moksha, Nenets, Tatar, Chinese, Hebrew, Khmer). The main data source is a typological questionnaire filled in by native speakers. Some material was gathered in dictionaries and observed in corpora.

The meanings in question can be primary and can be expressed with primary lexemes, but sometimes such adjectives can be either morphological caritives, like Nenets *səws'i* 'blind' (lit.: eyeless), or semantic derivatives from other meanings, e.g. Estonian *pime* 'dark'.

The main dichotomies within literal meanings are the ability/inability to collocate with sense organs or with special objects for the blind/deaf, the extent of the feature (full inability to see/hear or low vision/hearing) and its permanent/temporary character (e.g. Nenets *xas'i* 'deaf' impossible in contexts like *Why do we go temporarily deaf when yawning?*)

The metaphors of both BLIND and DEAF refer to something closed or hidden, cf. Russian *gluxaja st'ena* (lit.: deaf wall) with its English equivalent *blind wall*. Interestingly, they overlap with the metaphors of DUMB, a domain adjacent to DEAF. Both DEAF and BLIND metaphorically describe unwillingness to pay attention to

---

<sup>9</sup> The work of O. Vinogradova has been implemented in the framework of the Basic Research Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (a Research Team Project Competition, project № 16-05-0057). The work of E. Kashkin has been supported by Russian Fund for the Humanities, grant № 14-04-00476.

something (*deaf to appeals, blind to faults*). However, BLIND here productively develops a much wider range of metaphors with a shade of something overwhelming (*blind love, hatred, faith, desire, passion, rage, obedience*), or sometimes expresses incompetence (Chinese *jìshù máng* ‘incompetent in technology, lit.: technology-blind’). As regards other specific extensions of both domains, DEAF when describing sounds shows two cross-linguistically opposite directions: a low sound (Russian *gluxoj zvuk*) vs. a very loud sound (Khmer *səmle:ŋ thlɔŋ* about voice). BLIND, on the other hand, refers to something faint (German *blinder Spiegel* ‘tarnished mirror’), accidental (French *fortune aveugle* ‘blind fortune’), or false (German *blinder Alarm* ‘false alert’).

Overall, the visual concept of BLIND develops metaphors more productively than the auditory concept of DEAF, which seems to support the claim that visual perception has a linguistic primacy over the other perception types (Viberg 1983; San Roque et al. 2015).

Some of the shifts we have observed lose the transparent semantic connection to visual perception and sometimes undergo constructional changes, see *blind* as adverbial modifier in *blind drunk* or as intensifier with negative polarity items (*a blind bit of notice/ difference/attention/interest*). These data contribute to studies of complex semantic shifts involving morpho-syntactic alternations, cf. Rakhilina et al. 2010; Reznikova et al. 2012.

## References

- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. (ed.). 2015. *Linguistics of temperature*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria, Miestamo, Matti. 2015. Antonyms and derivational negation: a pilot study of cross-linguistic variation. In *ALT 2015 (11<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Association for linguistic typology)*. Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA. Abstract booklet. P. 85-86, <http://www.unm.edu/~alt2015/abstractbooklet.pdf> (accessed on 12.01.2016)
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria, Rakhilina, Ekaterina, Vanhove, Martine. 2015. The semantics of lexical typology. In N. Riemer (ed.). *The Routledge Handbook of Semantics*. Routledge, 434–454.
- Majid, Asifa, Levinson, Stephen (eds.). 2011. *The senses in language and culture*. [Special Issue]. *Senses and Society* 6(1), 2011.
- Maslova, Elena. 2004. A universal constraint on the sensory lexicon, or when ‘hear’ can mean ‘see’? In A. P. Volodin (ed.), *Tipologičeskie obosnovanija v grammatike: k 70-letiju professora Xrakovskogo V. S.* [Typological explanations in grammar: to the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Prof. V. S. Khrakovskij]. Moscow: Znak, 300–312.
- Rakhilina, Ekaterina, Reznikova, Tatiana., Karpova, Olga. 2010. Semanticheskie perehody v atributivnyh konstrukcijah: metafora, metonimija i rebranding [Semantic shifts in attributive constructions: metaphor, metonymy and rebranding]. In E. V. Rakhilina (ed.), *Lingvistika konstrukcij* [Construction linguistics]. Moscow, 398–455.
- Rakhilina, Ekaterina, Reznikova, Tatiana., Kjuseva, Maria., Ryzhova, Daria. 2012. Tonkij zapah, nezhnyj vkus: o lingvističeskoj ierarhii perceptivnyh kanalov [‘Subtle smell’, ‘soft taste’: on the linguistic hierarchy of perceptive channels]. In *The fifth International conference on cognitive science. Abstracts*. Kaliningrad, 597–598.

- Rakhilina, Ekaterina, Reznikova, Tatiana. 2013. Frejmovyj podhod k leksicheskoj tipologii [A frame-based approach to lexical typology]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2, 3–31
- Rakhilina, Ekaterina, Reznikova, Tatiana. 2016. A Frame-based methodology for lexical typology. In P. Juvonen, M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.). *The lexical typology of semantic shifts*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (see the preprint at <http://www.hse.ru/data/2015/02/12/1092528126/18LNG2014.pdf>, accessed on 12.01.2016)
- Reznikova, Tatiana, Rakhilina, Ekaterina, Bonch-Osmolovskaya, Anastasia. 2012. Towards a typology of pain predicates. *Linguistics* 50-3: 421–465.
- San Roque, Lila, Kendrick, Kobin H., Norcliffe, Elisabeth, Brown, Penelope, Defina, Rebecca, Dingemans, Mark, Dirksmeyer, Tyko, Enfield, Nick, Floyd, Simeon, Hammond, Jeremy, Rossi, Giovanni, Tufvesson, Sylvia, Van Putten, Saskia, Majid, Asifa. 2015. Vision verbs dominate in conversation across cultures, but the ranking of non-visual verbs varies. *Cognitive Linguistics* 26: 31–60.
- Sweetser, Eve. 1991. *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tagabileva, Maria, Kholkina, Lilia, Kiryanov, Denis. 2013. Semantic domains “full” and “empty”: a cross-linguistic study // *ALT 2013 (10<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Association for linguistic typology)*. Leipzig, Germany. Abstracts, [https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/conference/2013\\_ALT10/pdf/abstracts/abstract\\_062\\_SemanticDomainsFullAndEmpty.pdf](https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/conference/2013_ALT10/pdf/abstracts/abstract_062_SemanticDomainsFullAndEmpty.pdf) (accessed on 12.01.2016)
- Tolstaya, Svetlana. 2008. *Prostranstvo slova, Leksicheskaja semantika v obshch斯拉vjanskoj perspektive* [Word space. Lexical semantics from the Slavic perspective]. Moscow: Indrik.
- Viberg, Åke. 1983. The verbs of perception: A typological study. *Linguistics* 21: 123–162.
- Zimmer, Karl. 1964. *Affixal negation in English and other languages: An investigation of restricted productivity*. New York: William Clowes and Sons Limited.

## Quantifying mutual understanding

Carl Vogel  
(Trinity College Dublin)

Quantificational interaction analysis is receiving increasing scholarly attention. Such methods have been applied to the problem of assessing engagement in communication, and both verbal and non-verbal communication are amenable to these approaches. However, in some contexts only textual communication records – transcripts – are available. One method represents transcripts as partially ordered sequences of speaker “turns” (where temporal information reveals overlap, then the turns are not totally ordered): actual dialogue is compared with a number of derived dialogues in which each of the derivatives has the turns of the original randomly re-