Historical Linguistics and the Comparative Study

Contributors

Hong Duan, Li Gao, et al.

Edited and Compiled by Koros Press Editorial Board

Historical Linguistics and the Comparative Study

Contributors

Hong Duan, Li Gao, et al.

Historical Linguistics and the Comparative Study

Contributors: Hong Duan, Li Gao, et al.

Historical Linguistics and the Comparative Study

List of Contributors

Hong Duan
College of International Studies, Southwest University, Chongqing, China

Li Gao
Department of Foreign Languages, Northwest A&F University, Yangling, China

Hui Guo
Visiting Scholar to the English Department of Harvard University, Cambridge, USA
English Department of Hebei University of Engineering, Handan, China

Qing Wang
School of Public Administration, University of International Business and Economics, Beijing, China

Jalal Rahimian
Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran

Hossein Najari
Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran

Shole Hesarpuladi
Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran

Dan Dediu
Language and Genetics Department, Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen, Netherlands
Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour, Radboud University Nijmegen, Nijmegen, Netherlands

Stephen C. Levinson
Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour, Radboud University Nijmegen, Nijmegen, Netherlands

Language and Cognition Department, Max Planck Institute for Psycholin-
guistics, Nijmegen, Netherlands

Merja Kytö
Uppsala University, Uppsala / Sweden

Preface

Historical linguistics is the scientific study of language change over time. Modern historical linguistics dates from the late 18th century. It grew out of the earlier discipline of philology, the study of ancient texts and documents dating back to antiquity. The text *Historical Linguistics and the Comparative Study* provides a comprehensive and clear introduction to historical linguistic theory and methods, their views on historical and comparative linguistics. First chapter focuses on construction of sensory transfer model of gustatory and olfactory-synaesthetic metaphor. An introduction to historical linguistics has been presented in second chapter. The morphology of languages has been discussed in third chapter. Fourth chapter deals with comparative reading of Sejanus and Cato. Fifth chapter aims at looking into the history of modal verbs in Persian. The reinterpretation of neandertal linguistic capacities and its consequences have been outlined in sixth chapter. Seventh chapter aims to survey and assess the current state of electronic historical corpora and corpus methodology, and attempts to look into possible future developments. Last chapter provide an overview of many of the issues that are currently engaging practitioners in the field of English historical linguistics.

Contents

CONSTRUCTION OF SENSORY TRANSFER MODEL OF GUSTATORY AND OLFACTORY-SYNAESTHETIC METAPHOR (GO-STM) AND ENGLISH-CHINESE COMPARATIVE STUDY

Hong Duan[1], Li Gao[2]

[1]College of International Studies, Southwest University, Chongqing, China

[2]Department of Foreign Languages, Northwest A&F University, Yangling, China

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to explore the synaesthetic truth of taste and smell in particular. Based on the corpus of gustatory and olfactory-synaesthetic cases, classification and statistical tasks are undertaken, in which four main characters are discovered: 1) the particular sorts of gustatory and ol- factory-synaesthetic metaphors; 2) the bi-directional transfer in specific pairs; 3) the hierarchical distribution among sensory modes; 4) the transfer frequencies of sensory transfer tendencies. Thus, GO-STM of both English and Chinese is constructed. What's more, the comparison of English and Chinese has been conducted for the first time. According to the statistic

results, the percentage of English-Chinese gustatory and olfactory-synaesthetic dead metaphors is 48.1% and 48.3% re- spectively, and that's why we always ignore them. Furthermore, the embodiment basis of synaes- thetic metaphors is analyzed in light of recent neurological research and Cognitive Linguistics.

INTRODUCTION

Synaesthesia is metaphorical. It is a linguistic phenomenon and at the same time acts as a mode of thinking. In terms of English synaesthesia, for example, Ullmann (1957) and Williams (1976) have concluded the "hierar- chical distribution", i.e., synaesthetic transfers from the "lower" to the "higher" sensory modes; Sean Day (1996) puts his interest in the connection of neurology and linguistics; with Chinese synaesthesia, for instance, Zhao Yanfang (2001) has also illustrated her viewpoint for synaesthesia; Meng Xiaoxi (2007) has designed her STM based on Chinese poetry. However, their researches lack in the detail illustration, sufficiency of data and discus- sion on gustatory and olfactory synaesthesia. What's more, up to now, there's no comparative study between English and Chinese in these two aspects. Based on previous studies, this thesis examines, refines and compares English-Chinese gustatory and olfactory-synaesthetic metaphors by means of data, and further puts forward Gustatory and Olfactory Sensory Transfer Model (GO-STM for short) with specific data distribution.

DATA COLLECTION AND STATISTICS

Data Collection and Description

A major reason for compiling the corpus is to provide a basis for more accurate and reliable descriptions of how synaesthetic metaphors are structured and used. Large figures will therefore be needed to bring out any inherent regularity, and to reduce the margin of error to a minimum. In this study, ordinary language is chosen to the syn-aesthetic carriers, since they are too omnipresent to be ignored in daily life. The process of data collection is divided into three steps:

1) Word collection. To conduct the refinement, the choice of data is a big problem. In this thesis, Thesaurus (2003), Dictionary of Modern Chinese Classification (Dong, 1998) and Modern Chinese Dictionary (the 5th Edition), etc. are picked out as the source and standard of English-Chinese gustatory and olfactory words respectively, for as far as our knowledge is concerned, these dictionaries are the most authoritative in the field of Thesaurus. As the title of the thesis demonstrates, sense word is the scope of this study; accordingly, words of every part of speech listed in dictionaries are collected. As a result, 263 English gustatory words have been found, among which there are 128 nouns, 92 adjectives and 43 verbs, whereas, for English olfactory words, 129 have been found so far, in which there are 60 nouns, 43 adjectives and 26 verbs. On the other hand, altogether 98 Chinese gustatory words have been found, among which there are 11 nouns, 87 adjectives and as for the Chinese olfactory words, 41 have been collected, in which there are 5 nouns, 26 adjectives, 9 cross-class words (noun and adjective).

It seems that the number of words collected differs to a large extent in quantity, i.e., there are 263 English gustatory words, which is as three times as Chinese gustatory words; on the other hand, 129 English olfactory words have been collected, which is also three times more than Chinese olfactory words.

After a careful investigation, it is found that they differ greatly in the distribution of parts of speech. In Eng- lish, almost every word has its own inflective forms, while for Chinese, it does not have inflective changes. Moreover, in English there are 64 words which refer to condiment or food with strong gustatory reflection, say, garlic, onion, etc., but the corresponding words haven't been listed in Dictionary of Modern Chinese Classifica- tion. Since these words are impossible to be synaesthetic, the corresponding Chinese expressions have not been looked up and listed.

2) Checking. To check out whether the collected words are synaesthetic or not, each of them is input into British National Corpus (BNC) for English and State Language Committee Corpus as well as Modern Chinese Corpus of Peking University for Chinese. As such, 45 English gustatory-synaesthetic words have been spotted, and all of them are adjectives. In addition, there are 7 English olfactory-synaesthetic words, and still all of them are adjectives. As for Chinese gustatory-synaesthetic words, the number is 62, in which

there are 58 adjectives and 4 nouns. Compared with taste, olfactory-synaesthetic words are scant. There are only 4, among which there are 3 adjectives and 1 verb.

3) Source confirmation. Synaesthesia, as a particular kind of metaphor, consists of two factors: the source sensory mode and the target sensory mode. Thus, to study the synaesthetic situation of gustatory and olfactory words, the source sensory mode should be traced back to get the appropriate transfer modes, i.e. which sense did the word originally describe? In this study, Ciyuan (2004), Cihai (2004), Haidian[1], Dictionary.com[2], Online Etymology Dictionary[3] and Middle English Dictionary[4] are applied as the referential standard for the source sensory mode of each word which satisfies the requirement of this study. Furthermore, if the synaesthetic meaning has been listed in dictionary, viz., it will be marked as dead metaphors according to Modern Chinese Dic- tionary (Academy of Social Sciences Institute, 2005) and Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (2005).

As thus, we have compiled complete lists of their 197 English-Chinese gustatory and olfactory-synaesthetic cases in which there are 81 for English and 116 for Chinese. Moreover, the number of English-Chinese gustatory and olfactory-synaesthetic dead metaphors is 39 and 56 respectively, taking up 48.1% and 48.3% of the total re- spectively.

Methodology and Data Statistics

Methodology

In order to demonstrate how the statistic work will be carried out, sample entries from "sweet" are taken for an example:

1) Translation, to modern English. Erm, Erm, through its virtues and sweet smell. No, no, sorry. Do it word for word. We

2) Lollipop. She would listen to me reading Coleridge, black hair falling over her sweet face, red boots at the side of the bed. TRYING TO BEGIN He

3) From the cot, and was cuddling him softly, singing in a tiny, sweet voice to him till he quietened. Bridhe stood still, afraid to move (as cited from BNC).

Thus, we have "sweet smell", "sweet face", "sweet voice". They would be recorded into its appropriate spread-sheet as follows in Table 1.

We then record these into a calculation table, as Table 2 follows.

The senses being talked about, or "primary senses", are listed vertically in the left-hand column; the second- ary, synaesthetic senses into which the terms are placed metaphorically are listed horizontally across. Thus, for example, in the upmost right-hand corner is "touch in terms of sound", as in "soft music". Sums for each row and column are given, respectively, on the right-hand side for the mode in which the primary sense is placed. The dotted line running diagonally across falls where a sense is talked about in terms of itself; these will always remain zero, as such phrases are not synaesthetic metaphors.

We then add all numbers in the vertical column for a particular sense and subtract from that number the sum of the numbers across a row for that same sense. In other words, we subtract the number of times that sense is used metaphorically to talk about other senses from the times a particular primary sense is talked about. Using this algorithm, if synaesthetic metaphors are random and evenly distributed, all of these sums would be zero across the board. As they are not, the negative/positive value indicates the weighing of a sense in a "ranking" sequence. The senses are placed in order from greatest positive value to greatest negative value, which reflects the sequence of least marked sense to most marked sense. Table 3 reflects this ranking for the three examples from "sweet".

Data Statistics

In this section, the statistic findings of both English-Chinese gustatory and olfactory-synaesthetic metaphor will be demonstrated by means of the approach as Section 2.2.1 illustrates. With an attempt to investigate only the gustatory and olfactory-synaesthetic metaphors, the input and output routes pertaining to the two senses will be focused, viz., we will just compile the gustatory and olfactory-synaesthetic metaphors of those input and output transfers to and from the other four sensory modes. Therefore, such pairings will never be seen in this study as:

touch → vision

touch → sound

vision → touch

vision → sound

sound → touch

sound → vision

1) Corpus of Gustatory and Olfactory-Synaesthetic Metaphors in English

Following the way of Section 2.2.1, a corpus of gustatory and olfactory-synaesthetic transfer model in English is harvested as Table 4 shows.

The ranking for this data is as per Table 5.

Table 1. Sample entries from "sweet".

-	taste → smell	sweet smell
	taste → vision	sweet face
	taste → sound	sweet voice

Table 2. Sample spread-sheet for the tabulation of three entries from "sweet".

Primary	Synaesthetic Senses					
Senses	Touch	Taste	Smell	Vision	Sound	Total
Touch	-	0	0	0	0	0
Taste	0	-	1	1	1	3
Smell	0	0	-	0	0	0
Vision	0	0	0	-	0	0
Sound	0	0	0	0	-	0
Total	0	0	1	1	1	3

Table 3. Ranking of three sample examples from "sweet".

	Secondary Minus Primary	Ranking
Taste	(3 − 0)	3
Touch	(0 − 0)	0
Smell	(0 − 1)	−1
Vision	(0 − 1)	−1
Sound	(0 − 1)	−1

Table 4. Total data of gustatory and olfactory-synaesthetic metaphors in English.

Primary Senses	Synaesthetic Senses					
	Touch	Taste	Smell	Vision	Sound	Total
Touch	-	9	5	0	0	14
Taste	3	-	14	12	11	40
Smell	1	2	-	4	2	9
Vision	0	12	3	-	0	15
Sound	0	2	1	0	-	3
Total	4	25	23	16	13	81

As Table 5 demonstrates, it is found that smell outstrips the other senses as the most common for which to at- tach metaphors; taste are the most common sense are expressed in.

The percentages for the total data of gustatory and olfactory-synaesthetic metaphors in English are as follows in Table 6.

Table 6 gives us the following information:

a) In English corpus of gustatory and olfactory-synaesthetic metaphors, the theoretically predicted 14 patterns of transfer routes have been found.

b) Among the 81 cases, there are 52 cases in accordance with the "hierarchical distribution" law, which takes up 64.2% of the total. That is to say, this study reinforces Ullmann's claim soundly.

Table 5. Ranking for the complete data of gustatory and olfactory-synaesthetic metaphors in English.

	Secondary Minus Primary	Ranking
Taste	(40 − 25)	15
Touch	(14 − 4)	10
Vision	(15 − 16)	−1
Sound	(3 − 13)	−10
Smell	(9 − 23)	−14

Table 6. Rates of occurance for gustatory and olfactory-synaesthetic metaphors in English.

Type of Metaphor	Rate (%)
taste → smell	17.3%
taste → vision	14.8%
vision → taste	14.8%
taste → sound	13.6%
touch → taste	11.1%
touch → smell	6.2%
smell → vision	4.9%
vision → smell	3.7%
taste → touch	3.7%
smell → taste	2.5%
smell → sound	2.5%
sound → smell	2.5%
smell → touch	1.2%
sound → smell	1.2%
Total	100.0%

c) Although there exists a large proportion of regular cases, it also reminds us that the other overwhelming number of irregular cases, viz., 35.8% prevails as well.

2) Corpus of Gustatory and Olfactory-Synaesthetic Metaphors in Chinese

Following the same fashion, the corpus of gustatory and olfactory-synaesthetic metaphors in Chinese is constructed as Table 7 shows.

The ranking for this data is as per Table 8.

As Table 8 demonstrates, it is found that smell as well as sound outstrips the other senses as the most com- mon for which to attach metaphors; taste are the most common sense are expressed in.

The percentages for the total data of olfactory-synaesthetic metaphors in Chinese are as follows inTable 9.

Table 9 gives us the following information:

a) In Chinese corpus of gustatory and olfactory-synaesthetic metaphors, the theoretically predicted 13 patterns of transfer routes have been found with "smell → touch" excluded.

b) Among the 116 cases, there are 82 cases in accordance with the "hierarchical distribution" law, which takes up 70.7% of the total. That is to say, this study abides by Ullmann's claim soundly again.

c) Although there exists a large proportion of regular cases, it also reminds us that the other overwhelming number of irregular cases, viz., 29.3% prevails as well.

Table 7. Total data of gustatory and olfactory-synesthetic metaphors in Chinese.

Primary Senses	Synaesthetic Senses					
	Touch	Taste	Smell	Vision	Sound	Total
Touch	-	1	1	0	0	2
Taste	1	-	28	20	24	73
Smell	0	8	-	5	3	16
Vision	0	13	6	-	0	19
Sound	0	4	2	0	-	6
Total	1	26	37	25	27	116

Table 8. Ranking for the complete data of gustatory and olfactory-synaesthetic metaphors in Chinese.

	Secondary Minus Primary	Ranking
Taste	(73 − 26)	47
Touch	(2 − 1)	1
Vision	(19 − 25)	−7
Sound	(16 − 37)	−21
Smell	(6 − 27)	−21