The Construal of Space in Language and Thought

Edited by

Martin Pütz

René Dirven

1996

Mouton de Gruyter

Berlin · New York

Cognitive Linguistics Research
8

Editors
René Dirven
Ronald W. Langacker
John R. Taylor

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York

The Construal of Space in Language and Thought

Edited by
Martin Pütz
René Dirven

1996
Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York

Mouton de Gruyter (formerly Mouton, The Hague)
is a Division of Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin

♾ Printed on acid-free paper
which falls within
the guidelines of the ANSI
to ensure permanence and durability.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

International L.A.U.D.-Symposium (19th : 1994 : Duisburg, Germany)
The construal of space in language and thought / edited by Martin Pütz, René Dirven.
p. cm. – (Cognitive linguistics research ; 8)
Selected papers of the 19th International L.A.U.D. Symposium, held at Duisburg. Mar. 22-25, 1994.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 3-11-015243-6
1. Space and time in language-Congresses. 2. Cognitive grammar-Congresses. I. Pütz, Martin, 1955- . II. Dirven, René.
P37.5.S65I58 1996
415–dc20 96-34598
CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The **construal of space in language and thought** / ed. by Martin Pütz ; René Dirven. – Berlin : New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 1996
(Cognitive linguistics research ; 8)
ISBN 3-11-015243-6
NE: Pütz, Martin [Hrsg.]; GT

Printing: Gerike GmbH, Berlin
Binding: Mikolai GmbH, Berlin
Printed in Germany

Acknowledgements

This collection of papers is the result of the 19th International L.A.U.D. (*Linguistic Agency University of Duisburg*) Symposium on "Language and Space" which was held at the Gerhard Mercator University of Duisburg, March 22-25, 1994.

While compiling this volume we have incurred a number of debts that we wish to acknowledge. We are deeply indebted to two of the three editors of the book series "Cognitive Linguistics Research" Ronald W. Langacker and John R. Taylor, whose support was crucial to the emergence of this volume.

Furthermore, our sincere thanks go out to the authors, who have responded with professionalism to all the requests that have been made of them. In this regard, the editors of this volume would also like to express a great debt of gratitude to the expertise of the many scholars who acted as our referees: Carlo Serra Borneto, Willem J. Botha, Eugene H. Casad, Kenneth W. Cook, Östen Dahl, Wolfgang Dressler, Gilles Fauconnier, Bruce Hawkins, Dirk Geeraerts, Louis Goossens, Gottfried Graustein, John Haiman, Richard Hudson, Yoshihiko Ikegami, Laura A. Janda, Ekkehard König, Zoltan Kövecses, Bernd Kortmann, Tomasz Krzeszowski, Barbara Kryk-Kastovksy, Ronald W. Langacker, Adrienne Lehrer, Stephen C. Levinson, Dragoslav Momirovic, Peter Mühlhäusler, Winfried Nöth, Günter Radden, Brygida Rudzka-Ostyn, Rainer Schulze, Michael Stubbs, Elżbieta Tabakowska, John R. Taylor, Jan Ulijn, Claude Vandeloise, Anna Wierzbicka, and Cornelia Zelinsky-Wibbelt.

Beyond these, we would like to thank the student helpers at the University of Greifswald, namely Silvio Hermann and Jacqueline Färber for compiling the Subject Index and Hendrik Wieck for proof-reading major parts of the manuscript.

Finally, we would like to express our thanks to Anastasia Moraïtis, who did a marvellous job in designing the layout of the book and in taking care of the laser print-out.

It is hoped that this volume will contribute to stimulating and broadening the research on the conceptualization of space, its functioning in human thought, and consequently to the further expansion of the new paradigm of Cognitive Linguistics.

Martin Pütz

René Dirven

Contents

PART D:

SPACE AS AN ORGANIZING PRINCIPLE OF THOUGHT

Section 7: Discourse as space

Section 8: Abstract worlds as space

Introduction: Language and the cognitive construal of space

Martin Pütz

The symposium held in Duisburg in the spring of 1989 marked "the birth of cognitive linguistics as a broadly grounded, self-conscious intellectual movement" (Langacker 1990: ix). What Langacker was referring to here, was the 14th International LAUD Symposium (*Linguistic Agency University of Duisburg*) held in Duisburg, Germany, in 1989. This symposium was the *First International Cognitive Linguistics Conference*. It was during that conference when the *International Cognitive Linguistics Association* (ICLA) was founded, the journal *Cognitive Linguistics* launched, and a new series *Cognitive Linguistics Research* set up. The proceedings of the Duisburg conference were published in the new series by Geiger & Rudzka-Ostyn (1993).

Five years later, from March 22-25, 1994, the newly named Gerhard Mercator University of Duisburg once again invited researchers from all over the world to present their views and insights on a conference theme entitled "Language and Space". On the 400th anniversary of Mercator's death, the University of Duisburg renamed itself as Gerhard Mercator University to honour the great 16th century Flemish cartographer and universal scholar who spent 50 years of his lifetime in Duisburg, measuring and describing the "space" of the whole world by putting together all his maps in his "Atlas" (posthumously published in 1606). The "Language and Space" Symposium in 1994 aspired to be a tribute to Mercator of the linguistic world. The celebration of the Mercator Year and the fifth anniversary of the International Cognitive Linguistics Association's public existence was more than just a happy coincidence. "Space" is also at the very heart of all conceptualization and consequently at the very heart of the new cognitive paradigm in linguistics that seeks to explore the fundamental, spatial basis of conceptualization in and through language. Originally, Langacker even intended to label his new grammar model as "space grammar" and only later, in line with other scholars, was the more abstract name "Cognitive Grammar" established.

The 30 contributions to this volume are a selection of the papers presented at that 19th International L.A.U.D. Symposium. The papers, which have been arranged in four parts, reflect some of the major aspects of the interaction between language and space:

Part A: "Space in language", i.e. the way it is reflected in its lexical and grammatical structures.)

Part B: "Space as a cultural artifact", i.e. the variability in the construal of the domain of space.

Part C: "Space as a bridge to other conceptual domains", i.e. the metaphorical exploitation of space and its role as a dominant principle of thought.

Part D: "Space as an organizing principle of thought", i.e. the fundamental, "spatial" way of conceptualization itself.

These four main parts of the volume are further subdivided so that altogether the book contains eight sections.

Central among all contributions is the notion of 'construal', which refers to the relationship between a speaker (the conceptualizer's choice) and a situation that s/he conceptualizes and portrays in one of many alternative ways. This 'construal' relationship implies an active role on the part of the language user in organizing and structuring, i.e. "construing" his or her world (Taylor 1995). The 30 papers of this volume are a comprehensive account of the choices of conceptual and linguistic alternatives available to the speaker (hearer) which determine the construal of space in language and thought.

PART A: SPACE IN LANGUAGE

Section 1: Pointing, deixis, and distance

Since man is "in space" and since space is also "in man", the human conceptualizer must create a number of deictic pointers to trajectors in space which may be framed in collaboration with demonstratives (the prototypical device), but also in totally unexpected ways, e.g. as verb suffixes or prosodic markers.

The speaker's choice of certain linguistic expressions may suggest a construal of a situation in terms of communicative needs and intentions. In this respect Haruko Minegishi Cook's contribution "The Japanese verbal suffixes as indicators of distance and proximity" focusses on the more active role of the language user in portraying a given situation. Cook analyzes the Japanese verbal suffix *-masu* as an expression of 'social deixis' or distance and demonstrates how distance is interpreted in various speech contexts. She emphasizes the importance of recognizing the distinction between the interpreted meanings of a deictic word and the encoded meaning of its linguistic form. The distinction is certainly necessary in order to account for the various meanings associated with the Japanese addressee-honorific suffix *masu*.

A more prototypical device in creating deictic pointers is the use of "Demonstratives as locating expressions". In his paper, Walter De Mulder attempts to show that demonstratives are not pointers which indicate where in the context their referent is to be found. Rather, by analyzing French demonstrative noun phrases such as *ce N* 'this/that N', he shows that the only meaning they convey is that their referent must be identified with the help of a contextual element within the spoken discourse. Identifying the referent of these opaque deictic expressions then means that it will be necessary to combine their linguistic meaning with perceptual interpretative strategies. To strengthen his views, De Mulder exploits the figure-ground model as a fundamental feature of cognitive organization, i.e. the perception of a visual scene divided into the foregrounded figure and the fixed background.

In the same vein, the importance of spatial deixis in language is taken up in Milena Žic Fuchs' paper entitled "'Here' and 'there' in Croatian: a case study of an urban standard variety". Žic Fuchs focusses on issues of spatial deixis and in particular on a number of the Croatian equivalents of the English demonstrative adverbs *here* and *there*, such as the pronominal demonstrative adverbs *ovdje*, *tu*, and *ondje* 'here' which form a three-number paradigmatic set for designating location. One of Žic Fuchs' conclusions is that, historically speaking, this three-way spatial distinction based on participant roles (proximal to the Speaker/Hearer and non-proximal to either of them) was originally found in the Stovakian dialect, and then taken over into Standard Croatian. She leaves the question open for further diachronic research as to why systems of deictic expressions change within languages and dialects.

In more marginal or peripheral ways, the construal of space encoded in "Prosodic and paralinguistic signals of distance" is the topic of Janina Ozga's contribution. Ozga analyzes the relation between prosody and distance from a cognitive point of view and examines the universal principles underlying the spatially constrained use of prosody and paralanguage. She shows that certain prosodic and paralinguistic features are non-trivially and non-randomly associated with linguistic forms involving the notion of space.

Section 2: Conceptualizing space in prepositions and in morphology

Going beyond these first "localization" concepts from the speaker's viewpoint, the human conceptualizer has to structure the whole of his visual field along a number of vertical and horizontal axes so that subfields can be created into which motion can be projected. Here, it is especially prepositions and morphology which come into play.

Accordingly, Elena Bellavia's paper "The German *über*" proposes a radial lexical network symbolizing the whole semantic area covered by the lexical unit *über* 'over'. Exploiting the trajector/landmark distinction, Bellavia gives a detailed account of the different uses of 'über' (+noun) and 'über' as a verb prefix and then attempts to compare and unify their meanings in a radial lexical network approach. She concludes that the prepositional phrase '*über*+noun' represents a more general characterization of movement, while verbs prefixed by *über* are specifications for the purpose of construing particular aspects.

It is a happy coincidence that Robert B. Dewell also focusses on the German preposition *über* with respect to how the speaker "construes" his conceptualization in a specific way. In contrast to Bellavia, however, he concentrates on "The separability of German *über*", discussing the question of when this prefix is separable and when inseparable. He first offers a sharp criticism of traditional treatments of the subject, based on the ground that data on prefixes are not described adequately and, moreover, that basic underlying patterns are not being investigated. Instead, Dewell argues for new directions of inquiry, i.e. the consideration of some basic cognitive issues such as the representation of path, the development of specialized semantic variants from spatial path images, and the role of prefixes in conveying aspectual contours or transitivity. He convincingly argues that there are regular patterns and semantic constraints which underlie and explain the alternate use of prepositional phrases both as separable and as inseparable prefixes.

In her paper "Prepositional prototypes", Sally Rice is more cautious in proposing an actual network for spatial prepositions, offering instead a "working 'regional' model". The model accounts for a prepositional network which may "ultimately reveal a structure with a temporal region and core sense, a spatial region and core sense, and a more diffuse but coreless abstract region surrounding them both". Rice presents an empirical analysis of the three most basic English spatial prepositions to show that there are prototypical semantic values for *at*, *on*, and *in* which are spatial in meaning. Furthermore, she suggests that in the subjective lexicons of speakers there may be multiple prototypes for a certain preposition, some of which cannot be spatially defined at all.

The semantics of English verbs with a focus on the tense modality system is the topic of Carlos Inchaurralde's paper "Space and movement in the English verb system". He argues that space has certain topological properties that can be expressed mathematically. Resorting to mathematical formulae, he adopts a geometrical perspective through which he demonstrates that the tense modality system and the lexical characterization of verbs can be analyzed through the concepts "space" and "movement". In line with the general theme of the section - the structuring of the visual field along a number of vertical and horizontal axes - Inchaurralde concludes that the same modal form, e.g. *would*, could be used for indicating remoteness either on the vertical axis of time or on the horizontal axis of hypotheticality or in a combination of the two.

The last contribution in this section is Dieter Kastovsky's paper "The representation of space in English derivational morphology". It is devoted to the interplay between the functions of morphological and word-formation issues and the notion of "space" as a "pervasive lexical-semantic category". Kastovsky focusses on various types of English word-formation patterns such as compounding, prefixation, and suffixation with reference to their involvement in creating space-denoting lexical items: in other words, processes in which spatial/locative relations play a certain role. It becomes obvious that English word-formation serves to encode spatial relations for nominating as well as for pronominalisation purposes and that e.g. prefixation exclusively yields relational formations, i.e. "formations which encode a spatial relation but do not directly refer to a space manifestation".

PART B: SPACE AS A CULTURAL ARTIFACT

Section 3: Can language use cope with space?

Having all these devices for the conceptualization of space at hand, the question arises: how do they function in actual language use and, even more fundamentally, do they function in any satisfactory way?

The question is taken up by Willem Botha in his paper entitled "Spatial deixis in Afrikaans dictionaries". Botha turns his attention to spatial deictic problems the lexicographer must take into account. First, s/he must portray the individual meanings of typical deictic words such as *here*, *there*, *front*, *back*. Second, s/he must project the meanings of certain localities which get their meanings from the locality of a conceptualizer in relation to certain arbitrary reference points, using typical deictic words which could not properly be understood outside a particular context. Botha addresses these

problems by analyzing the way in which some spatial deictic words are portrayed in an Afrikaans monolingual dictionary.

Eugene Casad provides us with data from Cora, a Uto-Aztecan language of Northwest Mexico and poses the question "What good are locationals, anyway?" In other words, do they function in any satisfactory way? The author attempts to reply to the question by illustrating some of the functional usages of various grammatical elements such as adverbs, particles, demonstrative pronouns, etc. which indicate various kinds of spatial, temporal and logical concepts. His general conclusion is that in Cora, many locational and directional morphemes and lexical items relate to other domains of the grammar: they may distinguish one word from another, or they may help to distinguish different tense aspect forms of the same verb. In short, "without locationals, the Coras would have to talk about the world in an entirely different way", which certainly emphasizes the active role of the language user in organizing and structuring his or her world.

Karin Wenz's paper "Iconicity in verbal descriptions of space" also begins with the assumption that the description of space presupposes previous cognition, namely internalization of the environment. She assumes that the verbalization of spatial experience yields insights into the processes of perceiving space. The iconic principles which govern the semiotic relationship between spatial cognition and the textual representation of space are empirically discussed and evaluated. The notion of 'iconicity' (Haiman 1985) as the conceived similarity between conceptual structure and linguistic form can therefore be seen as one of the salient aspects to the construal relationship discussed at the beginning of the Introduction.

Section 4: Variability in the conceptualization of space

The general idea presented in the previous papers that the conceptualization of space presupposes the knowledge of man's broad or particular environment inevitably leads to the next step in the exploration of the conceptualization of space: to what extent is space a cultural artifact or a social construct created by the mind of man as a social being, dependent on his environment. Indeed, the conceptualization of space varies considerably among non-European cultures, especially African and Oceanic.

An elucidating example revealing the variability in the conceptualization of space is John Taylor's paper "The syntax and semantics of locativized nouns in Zulu". Taylor provides a cognitive account of locativized nouns expressing spatial relations in Zulu, the largest language group of the Republic of South Africa. In particular, Taylor addresses the semantics of locativized nouns with reference to their expression in conjunction with

motion verbs, e.g. the use of these nouns in copulative constructions to indicate the place of a trajector entity. One of Taylor's suggestions is that the function of the locative morphology in Zulu is to convert a "thing" concept into a "place" concept. Furthermore, he claims that locativized nouns do not contain any notion of "to" or "from". They do not denote a place construed as goal, source, or path, but as a pure "place".

Yet another 'case study' emphasizing the cross-cultural variability in the conceptualization of space is illustrated by Deborah Hill in her paper "Distinguishing the notion 'place' in an Oceanic language". Hill analyzes data from the Oceanic language Longgu which is spoken on the island of Guadalcanal in the Solomon Islands. She argues that in that language there is a linguistic and cultural importance attached to the notion "place" or, in more specific terms, "home place", which is the linchpin for the whole system of spatial reference. Hill concludes that there are recurring patterns of conceptualization or 'themes' in language. Thus the distinction between what is "home" and what is "not home", reflected in the distinction between direct and indirect possession (what is part of me and what is not part of me), can be seen as different manifestations of the same theme.

Variability in the conceptualization of space *per se* is also a prominent topic in Barbara Kryk-Kastovsky's paper "The linguistic, cognitive and cultural variables of the conceptualization of space". She convincingly argues that the variety of deictic systems operating in a multitude of languages requires a complex and multidisciplinary approach. From a synchronic perspective, deictic systems should not only be studied according to their use in standard varieties. In order to establish contrasts, dialectal features should also be part of the investigation. Furthermore, diachronicallly, deictic systems call for intralinguistic analyses so as to be able to detect the history of particular forms within the development of a single language.

In their contribution "Rethinking some universals of spatial language using controlled comparison", Sabine Neumann and Thomas Widlok present field research data from two languages of Southern Africa. The paper explores the potential of regional comparison in the field of spatial conceptualization and in particular discusses the question of whether the division between Bantu-speaking agropastoralists and Khoisan-speaking hunter-gatherers corresponds with two distinctive ways of encoding and conceptualizing spatial relations.

PART C: SPACE AS A BRIDGE TO OTHER CONCEPTUAL DOMAINS

Section 5: From one meaning to another

Now, even if "space" never exists or existed independently 'out there', and is basically a product of man's mind and social context, the concept of space has always served as the 'primary' conceptualization onto which many other conceptual domains have been mapped. Thus, spatial concepts can be shown to become a principle for the organization of the conceptualization of ever more abstract domains such as that of "total enclosure", as framed by the 'middle voice', and also of concepts such as viewpoint or subjectivity.

The construal of our world is not limited to the categories provided by our culture and fixed in our language. Human thought processes are largely metaphorical (Lakoff/Johnson 1987), which suggests that in creating new concepts from existing ones we are also able to extend our repertoire of linguistic expressions. The analysis of metaphorical concepts or nonliteral expressions is at the center of Carlo Serra Borneto's contribution entitled "Polarity and metaphor in German". Serra Borneto first examines the notion of "conceptual polarity", which reflects a general human tendency in thinking. Polarity is at work at all linguistic levels and refers to linguistic items which are conceptually in competition with one another such as the German verbs *liegen* 'to lie' and *stehen* 'to stand'. Serra Borneto attempts to show how the schema of polarity can be applied to a number of conceptual and orientational metaphors involving the use of the 'locational' verbs *liegen* and *stehen*.

More abstract domains are discussed in Susan Strauss' contribution "Metaphors of 'total enclosure' grammaticizing into middle voice markers". Strauss illustrates the value of cross-linguistic research and draws attention to the fact that human languages exhibit strikingly similar and consistent grammatical patterns in "describing, reacting to, and expressing particular types of experiences and events". Strauss examines how and to what basic degrees auxiliary verbs in Japanese and Korean function as grammatical analogues to the reflexive marker in Romance or the middle voice marker in Spanish.

Section 6: From space to time, events, and beyond

One of the major domains that have been conceptualized in terms of space is time, which is even commonly referred to as "temporal space". But other linguistic and conceptual construals such as complementation, perfectivity, viewpoint and subjectivity are also relatable to notions of space.

The syntax of English complementation is certainly an area which cannot be adequately accounted for without conceptual explanations. The topic of sentential complementation is taken up in Marjolijn Verspoor's paper "The story of *-ing*: a subjective perspective", whereby she investigates the general cognitive principles that motivate complement distribution. One of her main concerns springs from the observation that each type of complement may occur with typical action verbs and/or mental causation verbs and also with typical perception verbs or cognition verbs. Since those different verb classes comprise both spatial and non-spatial members, she sets out to ask the question whether there is one abstract schema that plays a role in complement selection with both groups of verbs. She eventually shows that the query can be responded to positively.

Likewise, the notion of 'time' as conceptualized in terms of space is taken up by Kenneth W. Cook in his contribution entitled "The temporal use of Hawaiian directional particles". Cook deals with the extension of Hawaiian directional particles into the domain of time. The Hawaiian case seems to be peculiar in that the directionals are used to indicate degrees of temporal remoteness. Furthermore, Cook's paper motivates these degrees of temporal remoteness of Hawaiian directional particles in terms of human bodily experience. In particular, the direction indicated by *aku* ('away from the speaker') has no limits as one can traverse the earth/sea endlessly, whereas 'up' and 'down' are limited in traditional human experience: "one can only go up as far as one can jump or climb, and one is similarly limited in one's downward movement".

Conceptual construals such as perfectivity are taken up by Ewa Dąbrowska in her article entitled "The spatial structuring of events: a study of Polish perfectivizing prefixes". Using a cognitive grammar perspective, she gives a detailed analysis of five polysemous prefixes which are related to spatial prepositions and which are said to have clearly spatial meanings. Her main purpose is to show how these prefixes change the meaning of the verb to which they are attached and what determines which prefix is chosen in a given situation.

Also based on the Polish system of time is Agata Kochańska's account "Temporal meanings of spatial prepositions in Polish: the case of *przez* and *w*", where the temporal senses of two Polish prepositions are discussed within the cognitive framework. This approach makes it possible to analyze

temporal senses of prepositions as members of coherent categories centered around the prototypical spatial meanings. Kochańska also makes it clear that cognitive linguistics seems to account for the fact that the grouping of temporal and spatial senses of prepositions in one polysemous category is highly meaningful and natural for speakers of Polish and many other languages.

In any construal of a situation, the notion of 'perspective' is central to the construal relationship. It may refer to the conceptualizer's viewpoint, *viz.* the "mental route" that a speaker takes in presenting a scene or event. The choice of a particular perspective or viewpoint in construing the world is discussed in Heidrun Dorgeloh's contribution "Viewpoint and subjectivity in English inversion". Dorgeloh sets out to investigate three inversion types - after deictic adverbs and following locative as well as non-locative constituents - which are related in a specific way. Inversions contain a reference point as vantage point from which a scene or event is seen, thereby expressing a particular viewpoint or perspective which the speaker assumes. Inversion can then be described as one device "whereby the immediate nature of an experience is reproduced in a subjective manner".

The section concludes with a paper by Cornelia Zelinsky-Wibbelt in which she poses the question: "How do we mentally localize different types of spatial concepts"? Zelinsky-Wibbelt is mainly concerned with the behaviour of spatial predicates and with their metaphorical and metonymic derivations. She ends up with a model in which three different contextual functions operate on accordingly different lexical representations: contextual 'selection' operates on lexical representations which are equally valid, contextual 'configuration' operates on an abstract schema, and contextual 'shift' operates on the prototypical sense of the spatial predicate.

PART D: SPACE AS AN ORGANIZING PRINCIPLE OF THOUGHT

Section 7: Discourse as space

Space serves as an organizing principle of thought not only in the iconic reflection of events in sentence order, but also in the structure of discourse as a whole. "Discourse space" thus becomes a complex metaphor reflecting various principles of organization.

In the same vein, Vimala Herman's paper "Space in dramatic discourse" looks at how space is created linguistically in fictional texts and how it can be put to use in interaction. Vimala's work also seeks to explore how the non-verbal organization of physical space via architecture, stage design, and the relationship of stage and audience have contributed to the ways in which space may be conceptualized within the constraints of dramatic use.

'Conversation' as a genre is yet another example of discourse dealt with in Lorenza Mondada's paper entitled "How space structures discourse". Mondada sets out to analyze spatial expressions used as markers to structure discourse, e.g. 'to come to our subject', in a particular text corpus. These texts are descriptions of space, exploiting the ambiguity of those markers' referential domain, which can refer both to territory or to textuality. Mondada makes it clear that the ambiguity is used by speakers to structure and motivate their discourse.

"Discourse space", as a complex metaphor reflecting various principles of organization, is also dealt with by Winfried Nöth in his contribution "The (meta-)textual space". Nöth discusses two kinds of spatial metaphors of the metatext, i.e. "our way of referring to the text". These metatextual metaphors may be alive or transparent, at times opaque and, according to Nöth, apparent only to the etymologist. We can trace the geometry of these metatextual spatial concepts as it consists in its zero dimension of points, in its first dimension of lines, in its second dimension of surfaces or planes and in its third dimension of bodies. Nöth provides the reader with numerous other examples of metatextual metaphors, e.g. as they may be observed in the three dimensions of textual space reflecting the three main dimensions of human orientation: the horizontal (right/left), the vertical (above/below), and the sagittal (front/back).

Section 8: Abstract worlds as space

Space also becomes an organizing principle in the structuring of other important domains of experience such as language acquisition, the understanding of science and of specific subfields of it such as theography.

The domain of language acquisition is focussed upon by Steven Frisson, Dominiek Sandra, Frank Brisard, and Hubert Cuyckens in their article "From one meaning to the next: the effects of polysemous relationships on lexical learning". The authors attempt to investigate the hypothesis that extension processes are an inalienable aspect of human categorization, one that is motivated in part by its warranting high efficiency in lexical learning. According to the authors, there seems to be clear evidence for the claim that the concept of semantic distance can serve as a key notion in the field of lexical acquisition. Thus, a series of experiments led to the assumption that notions of vagueness, homonymy, and polysemy obviously play an important role in determining the exact status of the results and

their implications.

A more abstract domain - metaphorically conceptualized in terms of more concrete domains - is examined in Olaf Jäkel's paper entitled "Metaphorical scenarios of *science*". Within a cognitive theory of metaphor, Jäkel seeks to investigate metaphors as observed in a highly abstract domain such as the discourse of science. Jäkel is mainly interested in the whole conceptual domain of science as it is organized by a scenario which consists of several elements such as nature, a scientist, methods, theories, and scientific progress. Jäkel assumes that this generalized science-scenario "includes all the ingredients necessary for a fully-fledged conceptualization of science".

Concluding this section is Jean-Pierre van Noppen's contribution entitled "Language, space and theography: the case of *height* vs. *depth*" which focusses on a religious domain of metaphorization processes. The author is concerned with descriptive theology ('theography') which, in many cases, deals with metaphorical modes of expression such as the spatial language of localization and orientation and which, according to van Noppen, provides important insights into the relationship between the human and the divine. In line with the cognitive commitment, van Noppen states that these spatial metaphors are based on the "universal human experience of interaction between the body and its environment".

The symposium's original theme was "Space in language and language in space". Both aspects of this theme have been developed in an extremely rich and encompassing manner. Space has been shown to be conceptualized by almost all word categories and by the most unexpected grammatical devices; space has moreover been conceptualized with such a great diversity in various languages that the concept of space is by and large a cultural artifact, just like emotions are now claimed by social constructionalists to be cultural creations. The second half of the theme "Language in space" has been widened and deepened as 'language and thought in space', whereby the concepts of space available to a speech community enable the creation of further abstract conceptualizations and the organization of thought as such. Space is therefore at the very heart of thought.

References

Geiger, Richard A. and Brygida Rudzka-Ostyn (eds)
1993 *Topics in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Haiman, John (ed.)
1985 *Iconicity in Syntax*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson
1980 *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Langacker, Ronald
1990 *Concept, Image, and Symbol*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mercator, Gerardus
1606 *Atlas sive cosmographicae meditationes de fabrica mundi et fabricati figura* ... Amsterdam: Judocus Hondius.

Taylor, John
1995 Introduction: On construing the world. In: Taylor, John and Robert E. MacLaury (eds). *Language and the Cognitive Construal of the World*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1-21.

Part A

Space in language

Section 1

Pointing, deixis, and distance

The Japanese verbal suffixes as indicators of distance and proximity

Haruko Minegishi Cook*

1. Introduction

Since language is used by human beings, it is situated in time and space. In this sense, we assume that all languages encode spatial notions. Languages extend the notion of space from the physical to the temporal, psychological and social domains. Honorifics are typically seen as a marking of social ranking and politeness but they can also be seen as markers of distance (cf. Brown and Levinson 1987).

This paper takes the view that a Japanese honorific form is an indicator of distance and that the indication of politeness is one manifestation of distance. It analyzes the Japanese addressee honorific form *masu* and its non-honorific counterpart, the plain form, as indicators of distance and proximity.[1] Although such a proposal has been previously made, the present study makes the following contribution: (i) Distance/proximity is not only interpersonal but also intrapersonal; (ii) The meanings of distance and proximity are encoded in the linguistic form and other meanings (including polite and non-polite) are implicatures in the speech context. This analysis can account for various meanings associated with the *masu* and plain forms which could not be explained in the conventional analysis. The data used in this study come from various genres of natural speech.

In Japanese, sentences end in either the *masu* form or in the plain form, as shown in (1a) and (1b).

(1a) *John ga Mary to dekake-masu.* (*masu* form, honorific)[2]
S with go out
'John goes out with Mary.'

(1b) *John ga Mary to dekake-ru.* (plain form non-honorific)
S with go out
'John goes out with Mary.'

The referential meanings of (1a) and (1b) are identical but their social meanings differ.[3] Previously a number of scholars (Goldstein and Tamura (1975), Harada (1976), Ikuta and Ide (1983), Martin (1964) and Neustupny (1978) among others) analyzed the *masu* form as a polite speech level marker. Under this analysis, sentence (1a) expresses politeness to the addressee, and sentence (1b) expresses intimacy or lack of politeness to the addressee. In much of the literature, it has been stated that the polite style is used when the addressee is a person who is socially superior or equal to the speaker (cf. Harada 1976) or is used to talk with outsiders (cf. Shibatani 1990). Mutual plain form exchanges indicate that there exists an informal, casual or inside relationship between the interlocutors. In this respect, the *masu* and plain forms respectively resemble the second personal pronouns V (as in French *vous*) and T (as in French *tu*) that occur in many European (and some other) languages. However, the difference is that the V and T pronouns are used only when the referent is the second person whereas in Japanese the *masu* and plain forms are used regardless of the referent of an utterance.[4] In this way, they are far more pervasive.

The *masu* form has been also analyzed as a marker of distance (Hinds 1976, 1978; Ikuta 1983; Jorden and Noda 1987; Shibatani 1990). Based on his findings in natural interview data, Hinds (1976) claims that the *masu* form is chosen when there is perceived distance between the speaker and the addressee. Hinds (1976) also reports that the *masu* form appears when a high status person (other than the addressee is present, and when the situation is formal. Both Ikuta (1983) and Shibatani (1990) propose that the *masu* form indicates psychological distance between interlocutors. Examining conversations with respect to the *masu* and plain forms, Ikuta (1983) also notices that the *masu* form tends to mark topic shift. Thus she proposes that the *masu* form is a marker of not only interpersonal but textual distance. The assumption in these proposals is that the plain form is a marker of interpersonal or textual proximity.

Recently, Maynard (1991, 1993) has claimed that when speakers are more "aware" of the addressee as a separate entity, they are more likely to use the *masu* form and when they are less aware of the addressee, they are more likely to use the plain form. Maynard explains that in an intimate conversation the plain form is normally used because in such context, due to *amae* "psychological and emotional dependence", "the speaking self finds less need to address 'thou' as a completely separate and distinct entity" (1993: 178). Since separateness and oneness involve the notion of space, her proposal can be seen as one of distance and proximity. Although these proposals are insightful, these scholars have not clarified how their analysis relates to the conventional meaning of the *masu* form and its other social meanings.

In sum, there are at least three important questions yet to be answered: i) How is the meaning of distance/proximity related to the meaning of politeness/non-politeness? ii) How is the meaning of distance/proximity related to other social meanings? iii) Can the types of distance so far proposed (physical, psychological/interpersonal, and textual) adequately account for many uses of the *masu* and plain forms? In what follows, I will attempt to answer these three questions by showing that there is a difference between the encoded and situational meanings of these forms.

2. The encoded meaning

The idea of encoded meaning vs. implicature is not new in the literature. Grice (1975) discusses the notions of natural and non-natural meanings.[5] Natural meaning is directly linked to the linguistic form and non-natural meanings are implicatures that are derived from the literal meaning of an utterance used in a given context. For implicatures to arise, the literal meaning must be present. Similarly, in the case of deictics, for situational meanings to arise, the encoded meaning must be present. I use the terms encoded and interpreted meanings for Grice's natural and non-natural meanings, respectively.

Both Hanks (1990, 1992) and Levinson (1979, 1983) argue for the importance of recognizing the distinction between the interpreted meanings of a deictic word (i.e. conveyed meanings, situational meanings, or implicatures) and the encoded meanings of the linguistic form.

To understand and explain the nature of honorifics and the extent to which they are used in various social situations, it is important to clarify this distinction. More specifically, such a distinction can account for pragmatic processes in which various usages or situated meanings are established.

The question is what counts as an encoded meaning? Although Hanks (1990) states that there is no clear test to distinguish the encoded meaning from situational ones, he mentions, "The division [of the two levels of meaning] is mainly a matter of the relative consistency or constancy of association between form and meaning, not of the *kind* of information" (1990: 53). In this paper I assume Hanks' claim concerning the difference between encoded and situational meanings and further propose that the encoded meaning of a social deictic expression is the one that is always present and that it is a part of the meaning(s) of an utterance in any instance of use. In this formulation, there may be more than one meaning assigned to a form simultaneously: the encoded meaning is one, and the others are situational meanings derived from the encoded meaning in a given context.

In some instances, the encoded meaning may be the only meaning in the context. In other instances, since situational meanings are interpretations, there may be more than one situational meaning assigned to a deictic feature.

2.1. The encoded meaning of the masu *form*

In this section I propose that the encoded meaning of the *masu* form is not politeness but distance. Furthermore, my proposal is different from the previous analyses of the *masu* form as an indicator of distance in that it includes distance between the self and his/her social role (i.e. intrapersonal distance).

It is difficult for the conventional analysis of the *masu* form (i.e. politeness) to explain the use of *masu* in some social contexts such as that of scolding a child. Consider example (2). Here the mother is angry at child K (a seven-year-old boy) because he is not sitting at the dinner table properly and because he is shaking the table. She scolds K by using *desu*, the copula form of *masu*, and *-masen*, the negative of *masu*.

(2) Mother

1 -->*Dooshite soo yatte gatan gatan suru n desu ka?*
why so do rattle rattle do NOM COP INT
'Why are (you) shaking (the table)?'

2 -->*Tatehiza ikemasen.*
erect knee no good
'Don't draw up your knees.'

The use of *masu* in example (2) does not index politeness. It can be explained by the analysis that the *masu* form indexes distance between the speaker and the addressee. When the mother scolds the child, she creates psychological distance from the child. Since the encoded meaning must be present in all instances of the form, the meaning of politeness cannot be the encoded meaning of the *masu* form.

It is known that the deictic meaning of space is often extended to the feeling level. For example, based upon a study on demonstratives, R. Lakoff (1974) claims that emotional and spatial distance and closeness are clearly related. Haiman (1983: 800) also notes, "physical distance is an obvious metaphor for social distance ...". Thus, it is not unreasonable to assume that the distance encoded by the *masu* form can be physical and/or psychological (i.e. interpersonal).

The claim that the encoded meaning of the *masu* form is distance can account for the fact that this form is generally used between speakers who are not in a close personal relationship and when the addressee is not present in the speech context (see Hinds 1976). Family members who usually speak in the plain form in face-to-face conversation often use the *masu* form when they are physically apart (e.g. in letters).[6] In my data, when the family members are making a cassette tape to send to one of the daughters, H, who lives in the U.S., the speakers generally shift to the *masu* form, which is illustrated in example (3). Normally AT, who is a sister of H, speaks to H with the plain form if H is in the immediate speech context. However, in (3) AT uses the *masu* form consistently with H.

(3) [AT is recording a message for her sister H]

1 -->*Kurisumasu kaado o todokimashita. Doomo arigatoo.*
Christmas card o reach past much thank
'(I) received (your) Christmas card. Thank you.'

2 -->*Eee kochira kara no Kurishumasu kaado mo*
FI this side from LK Christmas card also
todokimashita ka?
reach past INT
'Did (you) receive (our) Chirtmas card?'

3 -->*Taakii wa umaku yakemashita ka?*
turkey T well bake past INT
'Did (you) bake (your) turkey well?'

4 *Eee, hajimete no Kurisumasu yama de sugosu no*
FI first time LK Christmas mountain at spend NOM
-->*totemo ii desu ne.*
very good COP FP
'Well, (it)'s very nice to spend the first Christmas
(after marriage) in the mountains.'

5 -->*Urayamashii desu.*
envious COP
'(I)'m envious of (you).'

6 *Atashi mo tabun Ichigatsu ni koo 'sukii ni*
I too maybe January in this ski to
ikoo' nante kangaete,
go what Q think
boonasu mo deta koto de eee (.) *hokuhoku*
bonus also paid NOM COP FI delighted
--> *shite imasu.* ((laugh))
do exist
'I'm also thinking of going skiing in January, and
(I) got (my) bonus and well (.) (I)'m happy.'

* *-mashita* is the past tense of *-masu*.

It is true that letters and recorded messages are potentially available to a third party. In this sense, they may lose some of the intimacy associated with a face-to-face conversation between people in a close relationship, which might motivate speakers to use the *masu* form. Although this effect is partially responsible for the use of *masu* form in letters and recorded messages between intimate parties, the fact that even letters which include highly private matters can be written in the *masu* form suggests that physical distance is also responsible for the use of the *masu* form in these genres.

The previous studies on the *masu* form which claim that it marks distance only consider the distance between topics in text and between the speaker and the addressee or the third party. However, as shown in example (4), this formulation is not adequate. In example (4), which comes from a dinner table conversation, the mother uses a *masu* form when she tells the children that there is more omelette. Note that child C does not use a *masu* form but uses a plain form *hoshii* 'want'. There was neither a higher status person nor an outsider in the speech situation.

(4) Mother

Tamagoyaki hoshii hito
omelette want person
--> *mada arimasu yo, okawari.*
still have FP seconds
'Anyone who wants omelette,
there's still some more.'

Child C

Kamaboko hoshii.
fish cake want
'(I) want fish cake.'

The mother's use of the *masu* form is difficult to explain within the proposal that it indexes distance between the speaker and the addressee or the third party. I propose that the *masu* form also indexes distance between the self and his/her social role that the self presents to others at the time of interaction (cf. Scollon and Scollon 1981). To speak like a 'mother', 'teacher', 'doctor', 'businessman' etc., the speaker creates distance from the innate mode of self and puts on a mask of a particular social role. Hinds (1976) also observes that professional opinions and evaluations can cause a shift from the plain to *masu* in adult-to-adult conversation. I claim that the *masu* can mark distance within one speaker. This analysis can account for example (4). One of the important responsibilities associated with the role of the Japanese mother is to provide food to the members of the family. The mother's use of the *masu* form here indexes distance between the speaker's self and her social role as a 'mother'.

In sum, I propose that the encoded meaning of the *masu* form is distance, which includes distance between the innate mode of self and his/her social role (i.e. intrapersonal distance).

2.2. The encoded meaning of the plain form

The previous studies on the *masu* form all suggest that the plain form marks intimacy or psychological proximity since a lack of interpersonal distance is intimacy. However, this formulation does not explain some uses. Consider example (5) which comes from a neighborhood quarrel. In this example, both speakers use the plain form. Here the landlord, Mr. Suzuki, is very angry because one of his tenants put out his trash without separating burnable and unburnable items.[8] A neighbor is defending the tenant. Clearly, in (5) the speakers are opposed to each other and do not share a sense of intimacy or oneness.

S=Suzuki, the landlord; N=neighbor

(5) S: *Ne, chanto soo iu fuu ni hakkiri to wakatte iruba*
FI properly such way in clearly knowing exist if
--> *watashi wa okoranai yo.*
I T angry NEG FP
'You see, if you clearly separated it [the trash], I
would not get angry.'

N: *Kare, shiranakatta n da kara*
he know NEG past NOM COP because