

Chapter 1 : Linguistics - Wikipedia

Linguistics is the scientific study of language, and involves an analysis of language form, language meaning, and language in context. The earliest activities in the documentation and description of language have been attributed to the 6th century BC Indian grammarian Pāṇini, who wrote a formal description of the Sanskrit language in his Aśādhya«.

Some languages may be official in their eurozone member state but have not been accepted as official in the EU. This is the case, for instance, with three of the four official languages of Spain, whose government itself has blocked the acceptance of the other three for official use in the EU. Turkish is not marked by the euro sign because, although it is an official language in Cyprus and the euro is the official currency there, it has not been accepted as an official language in EU institutions. Most languages use a plural or immutable singular with numbers, but Estonian and Finnish use the partitive case. Languages of part of the European Union[edit] Asturian[edit] In Asturian , there has been a controversy about the spelling of the word. The official academic dictionary uses the spelling *eu*, [7] respecting the Asturian tendency to write nouns with a final *-u*. When Bulgaria issues Euro coins, if the Greek model is followed, the alternative spelling will go on the national obverse side. The word for euro, though, has a normal form with the postpositive definite article "the euro". In contrast to euro, the word for "cent" has a full inflection both in the definite and the plural form: The word *stotinki* , singular *stotinka* , the name of the subunit of the current Bulgarian currency can be used in place of cent, as it has become a synonym of the word "coins" in colloquial Bulgarian; just like "cent" from Latin *centum* , its etymology is from a word meaning hundred "sto" . *Stotinki* is used widely in the Bulgarian diaspora in Europe to refer to subunits of currencies other than the Bulgarian lev. Bulgaria on the other hand stated that it wants to take into account the different alphabet and the principle of phonetic orthography in the Bulgarian language. Of other national Slavic languages using the Cyrillic alphabet, Macedonian , Russian and Serbian also use the spelling . Catalan[edit] In Catalan the official plural is the same as its regular plural euros. Croatian[edit] In Croatian the euro and cent are called euro and cent occasionally the word *eurocent* is used instead of cent to distinguish the euro denomination versus its foreign counterparts. Plural forms are, like in many Slavic languages, somewhat complex. The general plural form of euro is *euri*, but the paucal or identically written but not identically pronounced genitive plural *eura* is used with all numbers, thus 27 eura. The numbers ending in 1 e. The general plural form of cent is *centi* and it is used with most numbers. The numbers ending in 1, except for those ending in 11, take the nominative singular cent, while those ending in 2, 3 and 4 except 12, 13 or 14 take the paucal *centa*. Both euro and cent in Croatian are of masculine gender. Pronunciation follows the rules of Croatian. Occasionally the word *eurocent* is used instead of cent to distinguish the euro denomination versus its foreign counterparts. The Czech declension uses different form of plural for various numerals: For compound numerals, there are two variants: The partitive genitive is used only when the whole numeral phrase is in nominative or accusative phrases, otherwise the expected case is used: Moreover, these otherwise common declensions are often ignored and non-declined euro is used for every value 22 euro , even though this form is grammatically incorrect. Danish[edit] The word euro is included in the version of *Retskrivningsordbogen* , [14] the authoritative source for the Danish language according to Danish law. Two plurals are given, euro when referring to an amount, and *euroer* when referring to coins. Both cent and *eurocent* are mentioned; the plural and singular forms are identical. Zeus, terapeut, eutanasi, Europa. In Dutch , most abstract units of measurement are not pluralised, including the former Dutch guilder gulden in Dutch and Belgian franc called frank in Dutch , and now the euro. This coincides with EU legislation stating that euro and cent should be used as both singular and plural. The euro is divided into cent, as was the guilder. The Belgian franc was divided into centimes. The word *eurocent* is sometimes used [15] [16] to distinguish it from the cents of other currencies, such as the dollarcent, [17] but originally mainly to differentiate it from what used to be 0. In the Netherlands, slang terms that were previously applied to guilder coinage and banknotes are sometimes applied to euro currency. Examples in the Netherlands include *stuiver* for 5 cents, *dubbeltje* for 10 cents. Another nickname is "ros" "redhead" or

"roskes" "little redheads" , referring to the colour of the coins. English[edit] Official practice for English-language EU legislation not necessarily in national legislation [1] is to use the words euro and cent as both singular and plural. Because the s-less plurals had become "enshrined" in EU legislation, the Commission decided to retain those plurals in English in legislation even while allowing regular plurals in other languages. Prior to , the inter-institutional style guide recommended use of euro and cent without the plural s, and the translation style guide recommended use of invariant plurals without s when amending or referring to original legislation but use of regular plurals in documents intended for the general public. Although it began to appear at the turn of the s, its usage is still rare. Because Irish broadcasters took their cue from the Department,[citation needed] the "legislative plurals" tend to also be used on the news and in much Irish advertising. This has had the effect of reinforcing the s-less plurals. The print media also follows the popular usage of "euro" for both banknotes and amounts. Faroese[edit] In Faroese and Icelandic the euro is called evra, a feminine noun derived from the Faroese name of Europe, Evropa; this makes Faroese with Icelandic one of only two European languages in which the word for the euro is feminine. The plural is formed regularly: The cents are often called sent which is a neuter word and has the same form in the nominative plural. Sentti is problematic in that its primary meaning in colloquial language is "centimeter". In Helsinki slang , a common nickname for euro is ege. In Tampere slang Eero, a common male name, may be used for euro. French[edit] In French, the singular is un euro masculine. The official plural is the same as the regular plural euros. French-speaking Belgians use cent more often than centime because[citation needed] centime coins for the Belgian franc worth, on 1 January about three U. German[edit] Plural: In German, Euro and Cent are used as both singular and plural when following a numeral, as is the case with all units of measurement of masculine e. Meter, Dollar or neuter gender e. However, when talking about individual coins, the plurals Euros and Cents are used. Initial letter C is often used in loanwords and corresponds to various pronunciations depending on the language of origin e. Most of these words are therefore eventually spelt phonetically e. Kaffee, Tschechien Czech Republic , Zentimeter. Latin words beginning with "ce" such as centum hundred traditionally represent [ts] in German, and German words derived from these have therefore long been spelt with a Z, which represents [ts] as in Zentrum centre , Zentimeter centimetre , etc. Equivalently, some German speakers pronounce the beginning of the word "Cent" [ts], but since they are familiar with the English pronunciation of the American unit cent, most people pronounce it [s]. As these are nouns, both Euro and Cent are capitalised in German. The Deutsche Mark was worth half as much as the euro a ratio of approximately 2: Among some punks , the word "Oi", as in the punk rock subgenre of Oi! The term was most often written using the mock currency code FRZ. Numbers are given with a comma as decimal separator. A plural form evra, as if from a regular declinable neuter noun in -o, is sometimes used in a jocular way. Some colloquial names for currency are also in use for the euro. Nevertheless, all Greeks understand the word to stand for 10 cents of any currency and thus use it for non-euro currencies like the dime of the US dollar. These words come from the words for five and ten respectively.

Chapter 2 : Linguistic Violence

Notes Wednesday, October 7th I suggest you study my notes with the book open for reference I hope this is helpful! Good luck => If you have any questions concerning the material, please feel free to give me a call: , or email me: pakula@calendrierdelascience.com General Linguistics LIN

CHS Research Bulletin 4: Geographically, Karia was recognised in antiquity as the area south of the Maeander River, extending east to the Salbakos Mountains Map 1 ; it shared borders with Lydia to the north, Phrygia to the east, and Lykia to the southeast. Karia in the Hellenistic Period. This paper will focus on one aspect of the cultural complexities of the region: It can be presumed that a level of bilingualism among sectors of the Karian population was well established before this time. I will first examine the evidence we possess for the articulation of deities in the Karian language. This remains a growth area and the identifications are tentative; however, such a survey of the modern state of scholarship provides an important corrective to the dominance of the Greek source material. I will then consider the different strategies adopted in the process of assimilation. The majority of texts in the Karian language are from private contexts, primarily funerary or religious; in the case of the latter, it is possible to suggest a votive context for certain texts, and through comparison with the names of deities in other Luwic languages, make suggestions as to the identity of the gods honoured. A votive inscription on the rim of an Attic black figure krater, dated to the last quarter of the sixth century BCE, was discovered in the sanctuary of Zeus Megistos and Hera in the coastal city of Iasos: Melchert prefers to read it as a theophoric personal name derived from the two deities. This Karian sequence occurs in two texts: In the Egyptian text E. The tentative identifications of the names of Karian deities that can be made indicate a strong connection with the names of gods in the other Luwic languages. As yet, it is not possible to propose secure parallels between particular cults attested in Greek and the Karian evidence, though it is known that the identification of local Karian deities with those of the Greek-speaking world took place. But the religious landscape was much more varied, with numerous local cults distinguished by particular attributes and characteristics; epithets marked the distinctive identities of local cults, and there were a number of strategies by which the rendering of Karian gods in Greek sought to preserve this individuality. It is less clear at this stage whether the cult of Zeus Labraundos was considered the same as that of Zeus Stratios. The epigraphic material, on the other hand, suggests that Zeus Labraundos was the preferred mode of addressing the deity within the sanctuary, and was the title by which the cult was known in the region more broadly. In the process of identification with the Greek god Zeus, the local particularity of the cult was distinguished by its cult epithet; in the case of Zeus Labraundos, the primary epithet was toponymic, related to the name of the sanctuary itself. This was a common strategy employed in Karia; for instance, we can note the cult of Zeus Panamaros of the sanctuary of Panamara, or the cults of the different tribes of Mylasa;[52] thus the Greek name for the deity was combined with a Karian geographical name, apparently transliterated into Greek. The epithet in the cult of Zeus Stratios, on the other hand, reflects something of the character of the deity, namely its warlike character. The association of both cult titles with the deity worshipped at the sanctuary of Labraunda raises the possibility that different strategies of assimilation could be employed in different contexts in reference to the same cult. This apparent flexibility in the process of assimilation can also be identified in the different names adopted in the Greek language for the primary deity of Mylasa. The processes by which the gods of Karia were assimilated with those of the Greek-speaking world were various, and different strategies could be employed in different contexts, revealing a certain level of fluidity. It can be supposed that Karian speakers continued to call their deities by their native names as long as Karian was spoken; they remained in circulation concurrently with the Greek names, and apparently without any confusion among worshippers about their inherent unity. In other instances, assimilation does not seem to have been attempted, with the transliteration of the Karian name into the Greek script; thus the worship of the god Sinuri continued into the Hellenistic period;[57] a newly published inscription from Pidasa, dated to the late fourth century BCE, further attests to the existence of a previously unknown Karian theonym, Toubassis. The gradual dominance of the Greek language among the communities of Karia did not automatically create

conformity between cultures, nor did it lead to the loss of an awareness of regional history. Exploration of the strategies employed in the process of assimilation reveals that the identification of local gods with the Greek pantheon preserved the fundamentally local character of the cults. Karian divine names may have eventually disappeared as the Karian language itself declined in usage; but the process was gradual, and we can envisage the coexistence of divine names for a number of generations. Local cults remained rooted in the local landscape, and even when their practice was articulated in Greek, their association with the Karian history of the region is marked. Ancient conceptions of the divine permitted a great degree of accommodation and variation between peoples; the identification of Greek gods with those of foreigners is a frequent motif in our literary sources, notably Herodotus. In the case of Karia, the communities of the region were not of remote interest to the Greek-speaking cities of the coast, but were integrated into their networks for as long as we can trace their history. Syncretism arose in this environment as a natural by-product of long-term contact and integration between different language communities. The naming of the gods in both Greek and in Karian reveals that the cults and mythologies of Karia could be incorporated into the wider Greek framework without undermining local, and sometimes explicitly Karian, religious identities. Notes [1] See Ulf, esp. The cultural unity between eastern and western Karia is not assured. The editors of LGPN VB, xxxi-xxxii, note the differences in naming practices in different regions of Karia; in particular, the indigenous names in the eastern region seem to be affiliated more with Phrygia and Pisidia rather than the western region. FGrH Strabo. Although it is not explicitly stated, it should be presumed he was referring to Karian-Greek bilingualism; though a Persian presence in the region should also be expected in Karia. See now Salmeri. As yet, there are no secure identification of verbs Melchert, though see the possible interpretation of C. Ia 3, Adiego. See Piras Ki 1, Adiego, ; there is no clear evidence for a connection between the two texts. Hy 1, Adiego et al. Eu 2 Adiego includes the sequence armon, which may be related to the moon god; Adiego, suggests it could be the accusative of armo-. The same sequence occurs in a Karian-Egyptian bilingual text from Memphis, E. See below for theophoric names possibly connected with Arma. Adiego, ; ; Melchert Herda, Fig. Bernand, n. Apollo Didymeus is attested in another text, dated to the second third of the sixth century BCE: However, Adiego, , and Melchert, , both support the original interpretation of the text as a dedication to a god. Si 2a, line 5, Adiego. On the perceived affiliation between Herakles and Melqart, see Malkin Parker 67, suggests that in some cases the familiarity of the theophoric name was of greater importance than offering a direct translation of both elements. Hy 1; Adiego et al. Transliteration was also prominent: See the discussion of Anatolian names in Adiego Labraunda 27 Hekatomnos ; I. Labraunda 13, 14 Maussollos ; I. See now Debord. The most explicit passage to acknowledge the variations in names between peoples occurs in his discussion of Aphrodite: Parker ; Versnel 60ff. The Carian Language Brill. Indigeni, Greci e Romani in Asia Minore, ed. La Lycie et la Carie antiques. The Lycians in Literary and Epigraphic Sources. Hittites, Greeks and their Neighbours. Defining a Karian Identity under the Hekatomnids. Culture, Language and Religion between Anatolia and the Aegean, ed. Their Value as Evidence. Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars. Mycenaean and the Kingdom of Ahhiyawa. Multiple Languages, multiple identities. Religions of Asia Minor. Die Karer und die Anderen. Akten des religionsgeschichtlichen Symposiums in Bonn. A Linguistic History of Ancient Cyprus. Coping With the Gods. Wayward Readings in Greek Theology.

Chapter 3 : Linguistics The Origin of Language

Several linguistic issues have arisen in relation to the spelling of the words euro and cent in the many languages of the member states of the European Union, as well as in relation to grammar and the formation of plurals.

The Origin of Language by Edward Vajda Yesterday we discussed the gulf that separates the creative use of language by humans from the inborn signals of animals. Bees returning from their first flight out of the hive know perfectly how to perform their complex nectar dances. With humans, the precise form of language must be acquired through exposure to a speech community. Words are definitely not inborn, but the capacity to acquire and use language and use it creatively seems to be inborn. Today we will ask two questions: And how did the first language come into being? Concerning the origin of the first language, there are two main hypotheses, or beliefs. Neither can be proven or disproved given present knowledge. Many societies throughout history believed that language is the gift of the gods to humans. The most familiar is found in Genesis 2: This belief predicates that humans were created from the start with an innate capacity to use language. Wherever humans exist language exists. Every stone age tribe ever encountered has a language equal to English, Latin, or Greek in terms of its expressive potential and grammatical complexity. Technologies may be complex or simple, but language is always complex. Charles Darwin noted this fact when he stated that as far as concerns language, "Shakespeare walks with the Macedonian swineherd, and Plato with the wild savage of Assam. English has about seven tense forms and three noun genders; Kivunjo, a Bantu language spoken on the slopes of Mount Kilimanjaro, has 14 tenses and about 20 noun classes. There are no primitive languages, nor are any known to have existed in the past--even among the most remote tribes of stone age hunter-gatherers. Nevertheless, it is impossible to prove that the first anatomically modern humans possessed creative language. It is also impossible to disprove the hypothesis that primitive languages might have existed at some point in the distant past of Homo sapiens development. At some point in their evolutionary development humans acquired a more sophisticated brain which made language invention and learning possible. In other words, at some point in time humans evolved a language acquisition device, whatever this may be in real physical terms. The simple vocalizations and gestures inherited from our primate ancestors then quickly gave way to a creative system of language--perhaps within a single generation or two. This hypothesis cannot be proven either. Archeological evidence unearthed thus far, seems to indicate that modern humans, Homo sapiens, emerged within the last 30,000 years. By 30,000 BC all other species of humanoids seem to have been supplanted by Homo sapiens. Could the success of our species vis-a-vis other hominids be explained by its possession of superior communicative skills? Speaking people could teach, plan, organize, and convey more sophisticated information. This would have given them unparalleled advantage over hominid groups without creative language. Of course, no one knows whether other species of humanoids--Homo erectus and Homo neanderthalis -- used creative language. Perhaps they also did. In any case, Homo sapiens, "the wise human," should perhaps really be called Homo loquens, "the speaking human" because language and humans are everywhere found together, whereas wisdom among humans is much more selectively distributed. Moving on to our second question, if humans acquired the capacity for language either by divine gift or by evolution, then exactly how might humans have devised the first language? There are several hypotheses as to how language might have been consciously invented by humans based on a more primitive system of hominid communication. Each hypothesis is predicated on the idea that the invention of language and its gradual refinement served as a continuous impetus to additional human mental development. None of the invention hypotheses I will mention is convincing and most sane linguists agree that the origin of language is still a mystery. But the inventive, sarcastic names given these hypotheses by their critics prove that even linguists can at times be creative. First, there are four imitation hypotheses that hold that language began through some sort of human mimicry of naturally occurring sounds or movements: Language began when humans started naming objects, actions and phenomena after a recognizable sound associated with it in real life. This hypothesis holds that the first human words were a type of verbal icon, a sign whose form is an exact image of its meaning: Some words in language obviously did derive from imitation of natural sounds associated with some object: Chinook Indian

word for heart--tun-tun, Basque word for knife: Each of these iconic words would derive from an index, a sign whose form is naturally associated with its meaning in real space and time. The problem with this hypothesis is that onomatopoeia imitation of sound, auditory iconicity is a very limited part of the vocabulary of any language; imitative sounds differ from language to language: Even if onomatopoeia provided the first dozen or so words, then where did names for the thousands of naturally noiseless concepts such as rock, sun, sky or love come from? In this case the first word would have been an involuntary ha-ha-ha, wa-wa-wa. These began to be used to name the actions which caused these sounds. The problem with this hypothesis is that, once again, emotional exclamations are a very small part of any language. They are also highly language specific. For instance, to express sudden pain or discomfort: Thus, exclamations are more like other words in that they reflect the phonology of each separate language. Unlike sneezes, tears, hiccoughs or laughter, which are innate human responses to stimuli, the form of exclamations depends on language rather than precedes language. Also, exclamations, like most other words are symbols, showing at least a partially arbitrary relationship between sound and meaning. Moo, bark, hiss, meow, quack-quack. In other words, the first human words were a type of index, a sign whose form is naturally connected with its meaning in time and space. But, once again, onomatopoeia is a limited part of the vocabulary of any language. The linguistic renditions of animal sounds differ considerably from language to language, although each species of animal everywhere makes essentially the same sound: Japanese kokekoko e Russian owl: Charles Darwin hypothesized though he himself was sceptical about his own hypothesis that speech may have developed as a sort of mouth pantomime: In other words, language developed from gestures that began to be imitated by the organs of speech--the first words were lip icons of hand gestures. It is very possible that human language, which today is mostly verbal, had its origin in some system of gestures; other primates rely on gesture as an integral part of communication, so it is plausible that human communication began in the same way. Human gestures, however, just like onomatopoeic words, differ from culture to culture. English crossing the finger for good luck vs. Russian "fig" gesture; nodding for yes vs. A second set of hypotheses on language origin holds that language began as a response to some acute necessity in the community. Here are several necessity hypotheses of the invention of language: Language may have evolved from warning signals such as those used by animals. Perhaps language started with a warning to others, such as Look out, Run, or Help to alert members of the tribe when some lumbering beast was approaching. Other first words could have been hunting instructions or instructions connected with other work. In other words, the first words were indexes used during everyday activities and situations. Language developed on the basis of human cooperative efforts. The earliest language was chanting to simulate collective effort, whether moving great stones to block off cave entrances from roving carnivores or repeating warlike phrases to inflame the fighting spirit. It is fairly certain that the first poetry and song came from this aspect of beginning speech. Songs of this type are still with us: Volga boatmen, military marching chants, seven dwarfs working song. Plato also believed that language developed out of sheer practical necessity. And Modern English has the saying: Necessity is the mother of invention. Speech and right hand coordination are both controlled in the left hemisphere of the brain. Could this be a possible clue that manual dexterity and the need to communicate developed in unison? Sturtevant argued that, since all real intentions or emotions get involuntarily expressed by gesture, look or sound, voluntary communication must have been invented for the purpose of lying or deceiving. He proposed that the need to deceive and lie--to use language in contrast to reality for selfish ends-- was the social prompting that got language started. There are no scientific tests to evaluate between these competing hypotheses. All of them seem equally far-fetched. This is why in the late 19th century the Royal Linguistic Society in London actually banned discussion and debate on the origin of language out of fear that none of the arguments had any scientific basis at all and that time would be needlessly wasted on this fruitless enquiry. Attempts to explain the origin of language are usually taken no more seriously today either. Recently, comedian Lily Tomlin came up with her own language invention hypothesis: Each of the imitation hypotheses might explain how certain isolated words of language developed. Very few words in human language are verbal icons. Most are symbols, displaying an arbitrary relationship of sound and meaning. However, the extended use of natural indexes still leaves unexplained the development of grammar--the patterns in language which have definite structural functions but no specific meaning. Where

did grammar come from? There is nothing like grammar patterns with definite functions yet no set meaning in animal systems of communication. In isolated instances it can be shown that a grammatical pattern developed from chance lexical combinations: But these are isolated instances. How language developed a complex grammar remains a complete mystery. This means that how language developed is equally a mystery. And since so many languages exist today, a second question arises: Was there one or more than one original language? Was there one or more than one invention of language? There are about 5, languages spoken on Earth today.

Chapter 4 : Materials for A Bibliography of Dravidian Linguistics, part 2: Entries Hahn to Zvelebil.

Names have a distinctive grammar. A survey of the three main traditions in the study of names: onomastics, philosophy, and linguistics, reveals much concern with the meaning of names.

Robert Litke and Deane Curtin Amsterdam: Linguistic Violence Introduction 1. I am a woman. I am black, poor, and lesbian. I am uneducated and unhealthy, disrespected, and discontent. Since, in part, I am who I am because of what I am not, what I am not is integral to the constitution of who I am. Whatever I say or whatever I do is tainted by my particularity and by my epistemic and moral fallibility. I cannot and should never try to pretend I am the Voice of Reason. Sartre has taught me that I want to be what I am not--what I have not yet become. Nevertheless, whether actively or passively, consciously or unconsciously, in being who I still am, I help to maintain what I am not. For this reason, I suspect, Paul Churchill ended his essay on why we seem unable or unwilling to end torture and genocide by saying, "We are all Bosnians. We are all Serbians. I am sexist, racist, heterosexist, classist, colonialist, part of an educational elite, affluent, cared for medically, well respected, and quite comfortable. I need to be sensitive to the "other" that I am not and to the "-isms" from which I have not totally escaped. If Foucault can say that before the nineteenth century "life itself did not exist," I can say, following Sartre in his view that I am not free until all are free, that "I do not exist. We cannot truly exist until a world of positive peace and global justice is realized. Perhaps humanity itself will never exist. What Am I Talking About? In addressing linguistic violence, I am mindful of numerous forms of violence that I will pass over in silence. For example, I will not be commenting on the on-going slaughter in Bosnia. Often, the number and gravity of the instances of such forms of violence far exceed what is typically found in linguistic violence; in several cases, they are also far more pressing. My comments, then, need to be seen as an effort to draw attention to only a small portion of a much larger picture. Nevertheless, I will be trying to show how this linguistic portion of the picture relates to the larger problem of violence in society. In my recent research on linguistic violence, I conducted a computer search of Philosophers Index, Sociological Abstracts, and Linguistics and Language Behavior. I focused my search on sources indexed since which referenced both language and violence or related combinations of terms, such as linguistics and alienation, language and oppression, language and domination. Surprisingly, I obtained pages of abstracts on over sources. Though many of these sources turned out to be irrelevant, quite a few presented me with new and intriguing perspectives, as well as much more empirical information than I usually come across when I restrict myself to philosophical sources. My subsequent efforts involved organizing this material, which I grouped into sources relevant to addressing three key questions. In this essay, I indicate how these sources help in responding to the following questions. First, does it make sense to talk about linguistic violence? Second, what is the extent of linguistic violence? Third, what can be done about linguistic violence? To answer the first question, I argue for the extension of the term violence to cover more than physical harm and against a strictly institutional view of language. As a partial answer to the third question, I cite a couple of feminist critiques of language that can serve as paradigms for responding to linguistic violence. The Reality of Linguistic Violence 2. Extension of the Term Violence Hannah Arendt says that "violence is nothing more than the most flagrant manifestation of power. Numerous writers, in fact, have applied violence to more than direct bodily harm. I will give two examples. Within philosophy, Newton Garver has developed a typology of violence that includes overt and covert forms, as well as personal and institutional forms. Within peace studies, John Galtung has distinguished direct, symbolic, and cultural violence. In an insightful comment on his triangle image, Galtung notes, "Violence can start at any corner in the direct-structural-cultural violence triangle and is easily transmitted to the other corners. With the violent structure institutionalized and the violent culture internalized, direct violence also tends to become institutionalized, repetitive, ritualistic, like a vendetta. His initial criticism is that such writers draw from the condemnatory nature of the term "violence. More specifically, he stresses that "as the range of things denoted by a term expands, its descriptive force contracts. For example, to call an act "murder" is both condemnatory and descriptive in that one is also implying that someone has been killed. Further, a contrast between descriptive and condemnatory terms is a vacuous

distinction if no statements are purely descriptive--if all of language is ideologically or normatively charged. He contends that violence is neither the only nor the most common form of immoral behavior. He goes on to state: The contemporary tendency to extend the notion of violence assumes that it is the necessary condition for justifiably designating an action or practice as immoral. This assumption in turn seems to arise from our marked tendency to adopt an entirely negative What Platt notes can occur, but I and many others oppose harm and still affirm other moral principles. Jim Sterba, for one, has not only brought several of these moral alternatives to our attention, but he has also argued for their reconcilability. Moreover, I can regard harm as a sufficient condition for moral condemnation, rather than a necessary one. He suggests that claims that others are acting in violent ways can be used to justify counterviolence and can lead to increased social sanctions. Such a development, he says, could "increase the amount of real violence in the world rather than to decrease it, while at the same time decreasing the amount of personal freedom in the world by extending the realm of behaviours justifiably subject to social control. While one cannot be a nonviolentist without being a pacifist, one can be a pacifist without being a nonviolentist. If Holmes is correct that nonviolence is broader than pacifism, then violentism is broader than warism. Hence, I define violentism as the belief that use of violence is and perhaps should be used to achieve goals, and I suggest that global culture has been and probably long will be one of violentism. I think this concept, though not this term, is actually part of what Cady tries to convey in one of his more recent essays. In my conclusion, I will say a few words about nonviolentism. But how does language do violence? How does language hurt or harm us? Rejecting the theory of etymological oppression, Stephanie Ross argues that "the ancient roots of ordinary English words cannot--by themselves--make those words oppressive. For example, while assault is a hurt, undetected burglary is a harm. As she puts it, "One can be oppressed unknowingly but offense requires logically or conceptually the awareness and acknowledgment of its victim. The issue is whether such linguistic violence is an unavoidable consequence of the institution of language or whether through conscious effect it can be eliminated. The Debate over Language as an Institution The view that language is an institution is now largely associated with Ferdinand de Saussure. He regards language as a convention that is beyond the control of the speakers who passively assimilate it. In his terminology, "The signifier, though to all appearance freely chosen with respect to the idea that it represents, is fixed, not free, with respect to the linguistic community that uses it. As Saussure sees it, "in language there are only differences" and its "concepts are purely differential and defined not by their positive content but negatively by their relations with the others terms of the system. When this institutional view replaced the voluntarist view, many saw this shift as part of the achievements of liberal political philosophy. Talbot Taylor notes that, in contrast, a voluntarist view includes a normative element which "inevitably raises fundamentally political questions of responsibility, power, authority and ideology. Instead, since appeal is made to descriptive linguists for empirical answers to questions concerning rules, the institutional view claims to be "independent of political issues of authority, power and ideology. But has this shift really moved beyond all forms of problematic authoritarianism? Tooke seems to be a precursor of Nietzsche in this regard. If, in language, our situation is one in which there is no escape from the mechanisms of power, then it is better that we be aware of our situation. The difference, as Taylor notes, is that institutionalism "places that authority under the institutional control of a newly empowered elite, the new masters: While phenomenologists have tended to focus on the prospects that such linguistic creations can enrich our being, Young stresses how ideologists have used linguistic creations for distortion and oppression. If Being or the Leader gives us names for things, does this practice enable language to determine thought? We seem to have come full circle. The institutional approach, which freed us from traditional political authorities, turned authority over to professional linguists who themselves have too often been coopted by the totalitarian state. Nevertheless, Young suggests that while the efforts by totalitarian states to control thought through the control of language are the closest we can get to a laboratory experiment on whether the determinist thesis is correct, it demonstrates only limited success. In addition to political dissidents, many feminists and some socialists have also been at the forefront of those who have challenged the authoritarianism in the institutional view of language. They have done so in recognition of human freedom and in pursuit of linguistic emancipation. The time has come for peace activists to join in this struggle to a much greater degree. The

Analysis of Linguistic Violence 3. Rossi-Landi and the Radical Interpretation of Wittgenstein The concept of linguistic alienation can be traced back to Marx. Richard Wilkie observes, "Language symbol alienation, that is, the estrangement of human beings from their concepts and ideas as expressed in words, appears to Marx to be the case of language symbols having lost or distorted their human referent. People, therefore, having lost such referential meaning in their language, will have lost or lost control of their own consciousness as well, since Arguing that speaking is a type of work, Rossi-Landi explores the analogies between linguistics and economics. Since words can be marketed, language can function as capital with huge profits being reaped by the elite groups that control the means of linguistic production. Those portions of language that are treated like private property result in linguistic alienation for the masses. Just as the philosopher-fly can only leave the trap of the fly-bottle by the forgotten route of entry, every user of language can reach the end of linguistic alienation only by a thorough understanding--and rejection--of the hold of the fetish object. This is the connection with negative thought Rossi-Landi detected in Wittgenstein. The founding of a school that would expound doctrines in the medium of words would simply represent the failure of the critique of language. Methodological minimalism in philosophy has as its consequence maximalism in the medium of deeds. I will try to take this recommendation of methodological minimalism to heart. As a consequence, I will act more like Wittgenstein in suggesting we look at how language is used--to the diverse ways in which linguistic violence is practiced. Also, in the spirit of Rossi-Landi, I will not only describe these uses but also criticize them.

Chapter 5 : Language and the euro - Wikipedia

ĩ»¿Florin Curta *THE SLAVIC LINGUA FRANCA (Linguistic Notes of an Archeologist Turned Historian)** When it comes to writing history, archaeologists like to think they have a better claim to chronological accuracy than linguists.

Entries Hahn to Zvelebil. Andronov, Author Hahn, F. Kurukh Grammar, Calcutta, Kurukh Folklore, Calcutta, Finnisch-Ugrisches aus Indien, Wien, The Structure of Kannada, Dharwar, Canarese Grammar, Bangalore, Essay on the Language of the Southern Chins and its affinities, Rangoon, Tamil Language, Madras, Semantemes and morphemes in Tamil language, Nagerkoil, Conjugation of Tamil Verbs, Manamaturai. Notes on the Study of the Brahui Language, Quetta, A Guide to Tamil, Madras, Practical Tamil, Parts, Madras, Praudhasala vyakarana mattu chandolankarasara, Udupi, Tamil Course for European Schools, Madras, A Grammar of the Kannada Language, Mangalore, Grammatica malabare, Roma, Kannada varnagalu, Dharwar, La diffusion de langues anciennes du Proche-Orient: Dravidian origins and the West, Orient Longmans, Gondi, Tea District Labour Association, A Tamil Grammar designed for use in colleges and schools, Madras, A Manual of the Mardia Language, Kedgaon, Introduction to Spoken Telugu, New York, Problems in the practical transcription of modern spoken Telugu, Proceedings of the 25th International Congress of Orientalists, Moscow, A Short Grammar of the Telugu language, Madras, Manuel of Tamil Language, Madras, Introduction to Telugu Grammar, London, A Brahui Reading Book, Ludhiana, A Grammar of the Carnataka Language, Madras, Introduction au tamoul, Paris, Grammatika tamiljskogo razgovonogo jazyka A grammar of the Tamil language, Leningrad, The tribes inhabiting the Neilgherry Hills,? Tamiz, Kalaikkalanciyam 5, Cennai, Report on a linguistic mission to Northwestern India, Oslo, Simplified Grammar of the Telugu Language, London, A compendium of Andhra vyakaranamu or a catechism of Telugu grammar, Madras, An introduction to the Grammar of the Gondi language,? Grundriss der Sprachwissenschaft Tom 3, Wien, Lewis Rice, Bangalore, History of Kannada Language, Mysore, An Introduction to Dravidian Philology, Anantapur, Andhra bhasa caritramu, Valtairu, Kannada Literary and Colloquial: Grammar of the Koi Language, Ranchi, First Gondi Manual, London, The Rudiments of Telugu Grammar,? A Grammar of the Malayalam Language, Cottayam, Jazyk telugu Telugu language, Moscow, A larger Grammar of the Tamil Language in Both its dialects; to which are added the Nannul, Yapparungalam and other native authorities, Madras, One Alphabet for All India, Madras, A Catechism of Tamil Grammar No. Vocabulario tamulico com a significacam portugueza. Kelavu kannada vyakarana vicaragalu, Dharwar, And Sree Kantaiya, T. Introduction to spoken Kannada, Mysore, n. Some Telugu words in Gatha Saptasati, Delhi, Prehistoric South India, Madras, Studies in Dravidian Philology, Madras, Dravidian Cognates, Madras, NasaIs and Nasal Accentuation in Dravidian; 2. The Tense Forms of the Brahui Verbs; 3. The Gondi Verb, Ramamurti Commemoration Volume, Guntur, Tamil aydam, IA, 62, The Evolution of Malayalam Morphology, Ernakulam, Grammar in Lilatilakam, Trichur, Kannada made easy, Bombay, s. A Grammar of the Tamil Language, Madras, The Todas, London, Phonemics of Old Tamil, Poona, Some Problems in Kannada Linguistics, Dharwar, The elements of Telugu grammar, Madras, Vyakaranamitram for schools and colleges, Mangalore, Evolution of Malayalam, Poona, Jazyk malayalam Malayalam language, Moscow, Notes on Aryan and Dravidian Philology, Madras, Dravidian India, Madras, A Grammar of the Kolami Language, Hyderabad. A Grammar of the Gondi Language, Hyderabad. Words and Their Significance, Madras, A Tamil Vade-Mecum, Madras, Tamil Prosody, Jaffna, A Kanarese Grammar, Mysore, Outlines of the Malayalam Grammar, Madras, Sravniteljnyj Slovarj vsech jazykov i narechij, po azbuchnomu porjadku raspolozhennyj Comparative Lexicon of all Languages and Dialects, alphabetically arranged, St. An Abridgement of Tamil Grammar, Madras, The Telugu Primer, Madras, A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages, Tamil molinul, Trichinopoly, Historical Tamil Reader, Annamalainagar, Index of Purananuru, Trivandrum, History of the Tamil Language, Madurai, Iyattamil ilakkanam, Cennai, Collarayccik katturaikal, Cennai Sethu Pillai," TC, 9, 3, Nature in Tamil poetry, Singapore, Conversational Tamil, Colombo,

Chapter 6 : Language Log Â» Some linguistic notes on the Taiwan election

The Sacred Name movement itself began in the late s as an offshoot of the Church of God, Seventh Day denomination, its main focus being (as the phrase "Sacred Name" suggests) the use of God's Hebrew name.

So the tendencies should not be taken as sharply honed, well-developed research programs or theories. Rather, they provide background biases for the development of specific research programsâ€”biases which sometimes develop into ideological stances or polemical programs or lead to the branching off of new specialisms with separate journals. Elman , Lappin and Shieber Despite these terminological inconsistencies, we can look at what typical members of each approach would say about their vision of linguistic science, and what they say about the alternatives. Many of the central differences between these approaches depend on what proponents consider to be the main project of linguistic theorizing, and what they count as a satisfying explanation. Many researchersâ€”perhaps mostâ€”mix elements from each of the three approaches. Certainly, there are no logical impediments for a researcher with one tendency from simultaneously pursuing another; these approaches are only general centers of emphasis. The goal is to describe how this public record exhibits certain perhaps non-phenomenal patterns that are projectable. American structural linguistics of the s to s championed the development of techniques for using corpora as a basis for developing structural descriptions of natural languages, although such work was really not practically possible until the wide-spread availability of cheap, powerful, and fast computers. For example, it was perhaps justifiable to criticize Bloomfield for adopting a nominalist ontology as popularized by the logical empiricists. But he was later attacked by Essentialists for holding anti-mentalist views about linguistics, when it is arguable that his actual view was that the science of linguistics should not commit itself to any particular psychological theory. He had earlier been an enthusiast for the mentalist and introspectionist psychology of Wilhelm Wundt; see Bloomfield Externalism continues to thrive within computational linguistics, where the American structuralist vision of studying language through automatic analysis of corpora has enjoyed a recrudescence, and very large, computationally searchable corpora are being used to test hypotheses about the structure of languages see Sampson , chapter 1, for discussion. Edward Sapir expressed a characteristic Emergentist theme when he wrote: Language is primarily a cultural or social product and must be understood as suchâ€” It is peculiarly important that linguists, who are often accused, and accused justly, of failure to look beyond the pretty patterns of their subject matter, should become aware of what their science may mean for the interpretation of human conduct in general. One particularly influential study, Labov , examines the influence of social class on language variation. Other sociolinguists examine the relation between status within a group on linguistic innovation Eckert This interest in variation within languages is characteristic of Emergentist approaches to the study of language. MacWhinney aims to explain linguistic phenomena such as phrase structure and constraints on long distance dependencies in terms of the way conversation facilitates accurate information-tracking and perspective-switching. Functionalist research programs generally fall within the broad tendency to approach the study of language as an Emergentist. According to one proponent: The functionalist view of language [is] as a system of communicative social interactionâ€” Syntax is not radically arbitrary, in this view, but rather is relatively motivated by semantic, pragmatic, and cognitive concerns. Van Valin , quoted in Newmeyer Syntax is not autonomous from semantics or pragmaticsâ€”the rejection of autonomy derives from the observation that the use of particular grammatical forms is strongly linked, even deterministically linked, to the presence of particular semantic or pragmatic functions in discourse. Tomlin , quoted by Newmeyer And the claims of Van Valin and Tomlin to the effect that syntax is not independent of semantics and pragmatics might tempt some to think that Emergentism and Essentialism are logically incompatible. But this would be a mistake, since there are a large number of nonequivalent autonomy of form theses. Even in the context of trying to explain what the autonomy thesis is, Newmeyer Another takes autonomy of form to be a normative claim: The third and fourth versions are ontological: And in the fifth version the autonomy of syntax is taken to deny that syntactic patterning can be explained in terms of meaning or discourse functions. For each of these versions of autonomy, there are Essentialists who agree with it. Probably the paradigmatic Essentialist agrees with them

all. But Emergentists need not disagree with them all. Paradigmatic functionalists like Tomlin, Van Valin and MacWhinney could in principle hold that the explanation of syntactic form, for example, will ultimately be in terms of discourse functions and semantics, but still accept that syntactic categories cannot be reduced to non-linguistic ones. The researcher with predominantly Essentialist inclinations aims to identify the intrinsic properties of language that make it what it is. For a huge majority of practitioners of this approach—researchers in the tradition of generative grammar associated with Chomsky—this means postulating universals of human linguistic structure, unlearned but tacitly known, that permit and assist children to acquire human languages. This generative Essentialism has a preference for finding surprising characteristics of languages that cannot be inferred from the data of usage, and are not predictable from human cognition or the requirements of communication. Rather than being impressed with language variation, as are Emergentists and many Externalists, the generative Essentialists are extremely impressed with the idea that very young children of almost any intelligence level, and just about any social upbringing, acquire language to the same high degree of mastery. From this it is inferred that there must be unlearned features shared by all languages that somehow assist in language acquisition. Thus, while Bloomfield understood it to be a sensible practical decision to assign semantics to some field other than linguistics because of the underdeveloped state of semantic research, Chomsky appears to think that semantics as standardly understood is not part of the essence of the language faculty at all. Today there are many Essentialists who do hold that semantics is a component of a full linguistic theory. For example, many linguists today are interested in the syntax-semantics interface—the relationship between the surface syntactic structure of sentences and their semantic interpretation. Linguists who work in the kind of semantics initiated by Montague certainly focus on the essential features of language most of their findings appear to be of universal import rather than limited to the semantic rules of specific languages. Useful works to consult to get a sense of the modern style of investigation of the syntax-semantics interface would include Partee, Jacobson, Szabolcsi, Chierchia, Steedman. It may be useful to contrast the three tendencies by looking at how they each would analyze a particular linguistic phenomenon. We have selected the syntax of double-object clauses like Hand the guard your pass also called ditransitive clauses, in which the verb is immediately followed by a sequence of two noun phrases, the first typically denoting a recipient and the second something transferred. For many such clauses there is an alternative way of expressing roughly the same thing: We will call these recipient-PP clauses. In order to provide even a rough outline of his proposals, it will be very useful to be able to use tree diagrams of syntactic structure. A tree is a mathematical object consisting of a set of points called nodes between which certain relations hold. Nodes are labeled to show categories of phrases and words, such as noun phrase NP; preposition phrase PP; and verb phrase VP. When the internal structure of some subpart of a tree is basically unimportant to the topic under discussion, it is customary to mask that part with an empty triangle. Consider a simple example: A The guard checked my pass [active clause] My pass was checked by the guard. In analyses of the sort Larson exemplifies, the structure of an expression is given by a derivation, which consists of a sequence of successively modified trees. Larson calls the earliest ones underlying structures. The last and least abstract in the derivation is the surface structure, which captures properties relevant to the way the expression is written and pronounced. The underlying structures are posited in order to better identify syntactic generalizations. They are related to surface structures by a series of operations called transformations which generative Essentialists typically regard as mentally real operations of the human language faculty. One of the fundamental operations that a transformation can effect is movement, which involves shifting a part of the syntactic structure of a tree to another location within it. For example, it is often claimed that passive clauses have very much the same kinds of underlying structures as the synonymous active clauses, and thus a passive clause like Aii would have an underlying structure much like T1. A movement transformation would shift the guard toward the end of the clause and add by, and another would shift my pass into the position before the verb. In other words, passive clauses look much more like their active counterparts in underlying structure. In a similar way, Larson proposes that a double-object clause like B. B I showed my pass to the guard. Larson adopts many assumptions from Chomsky and subsequent work. One is that all NPs have to be assigned Case in the course of a derivation. Case is an abstract syntactic property, only

indirectly related to the morphological case forms displayed by nominative, accusative, and genitive pronouns. Objective Case is assumed to be assigned to any NP in direct object position, e. He also makes two specific assumptions about the derivation of passive clauses. The subject position is the obvious one, because there it will receive Nominative Case. Second, there is an unusual assignment of semantic role to NPs: Larson proposes that both of these points about passive clauses have analogs in the structure of double-object VPs. First, Case assignment to the position immediately after the verb is suppressed; and since Larson takes the preposition *to* to be the marker of Case, this means in effect that *to* disappears. This entails that the NP after *to* will not get Case unless it moves to some other position. Larson makes some innovative assumptions about VPs. First, he proposes that in the underlying structure of a double-object clause the direct object precedes the verb, the tree diagram being T2. This does not match the surface order of words showed *my pass to the guard*, but it is not intended to: A transformation will move the verb to the left of *my pass to* to produce the surface order seen in B. What is important here is that T2 is the basis for the double-object surface structure as well. The additional NP is assigned the affected-entity semantic role. Larson assumes that in this position the *guard* can receive Case. What remains is for the verb to move into a higher V position further to its left, to obtain the surface order: The complete sequence of transformations is taken to give a deep theoretical explanation of many properties of B. The reader with no previous experience of generative linguistics will have many questions about the foregoing sketch e. But the foregoing should suffice to convey some of the flavor of the analysis. The key point to note is that Essentialists seek underlying symmetries and parallels whose operation is not manifest in the data of language use. For Essentialists, there is positive explanatory virtue in hypothesizing abstract structures that are very far from being inferrable from performance; and the posited operations on those structures are justified in terms of elegance and formal parallelism with other analyses, not through observation of language use in communicative situations. We will use her work as an exemplar of the Emergentist approach. The first thing to note is that Goldberg does not take double-object clauses like B. So she is not looking for a regular syntactic operation that can relate their derivations; indeed, she does not posit derivations at all. She is interested in explaining correlations between syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic aspects of clauses; for example, she asks this question: How are the semantics of independent constructions related such that the classes of verbs associated with one overlap with the classes of verbs associated with another? A construction can be defined very roughly as a way of structurally composing words or phrasesâ€”a sort of templateâ€”for expressing a certain class of meanings. Like Emergentists in general, Goldberg regards linguistic theory as continuous with a certain part of general cognitive psychological theory; linguistics emerges from this more general theory, and linguistic matters are rarely fully separate from cognitive matters. So a construction for Goldberg has a mental reality: Many words will be trivial examples of constructions: The double-object construction, which Goldberg calls the Ditransitive Construction, is a moderately abstract and complex one; she diagrams it thus p.

Chapter 7 : What's in a Name? Linguistic Considerations in the Study of Karian Religion

Linguistics and the components of language Linguistics is defined as the study of language systems. The second component of language is morphology (from Greek morphē "form'). and of their classification. or components.

Nomenclature[edit] Before the 20th century, the term philology , first attested in , [19] was commonly used to refer to the study of language, which was then predominantly historical in focus. Linguistics is a multi-disciplinary field of research that combines tools from natural sciences, social sciences, and the humanities. The theory of variation therefore would elaborate on the different usages of popular languages like French and English across the globe, as well as its smaller dialects and regional permutations within their national boundaries. The theory of variation looks at the cultural stages that a particular language undergoes, and these include the following. Pidgin[edit] The pidgin stage in a language is a stage when communication occurs through a grammatically simplified means, developing between two or more groups that do not have a language in common. Typically, it is a mixture of languages at the stage when there occurs a mixing between a primary language with other language elements. Creole[edit] A creole stage in language occurs when there is a stable natural language developed from a mixture of different languages. It is a stage that occurs after a language undergoes its pidgin stage. At the creole stage, a language is a complete language, used in a community and acquired by children as their native language. Dialect[edit] A dialect is a variety of language that is characteristic of a particular group among the language speakers. This is what differentiates a dialect from a register or a discourse , where in the latter case, cultural identity does not always play a role. Dialects are speech varieties that have their own grammatical and phonological rules, linguistic features, and stylistic aspects, but have not been given an official status as a language. Dialects often move on to gain the status of a language due to political and social reasons. Differentiation amongst dialects and subsequently, languages too is based upon the use of grammatical rules, syntactic rules, and stylistic features, though not always on lexical use or vocabulary. The popular saying that " a language is a dialect with an army and navy " is attributed as a definition formulated by Max Weinreich. Universal grammar takes into account general formal structures and features that are common to all dialects and languages, and the template of which pre-exists in the mind of an infant child. This idea is based on the theory of generative grammar and the formal school of linguistics, whose proponents include Noam Chomsky and those who follow his theory and work. This should not make us think, though, that it is actually any better than any other dialect. As a social practice, discourse embodies different ideologies through written and spoken texts. Discourse analysis can examine or expose these ideologies. Discourse influences genre, which is chosen in response to different situations and finally, at micro level, discourse influences language as text spoken or written at the phonological or lexico-grammatical level. Grammar and discourse are linked as parts of a system. Registers and discourses therefore differentiate themselves through the use of vocabulary , and at times through the use of style too. People in the medical fraternity, for example, may use some medical terminology in their communication that is specialized to the field of medicine. This is often referred to as being part of the "medical discourse", and so on. That is the stage when a language is considered a standard variety, one whose grammatical laws have now stabilised from within the consent of speech community participants, after sufficient evolution, improvisation, correction, and growth. The English language, besides perhaps the French language, may be examples of languages that have arrived at a stage where they are said to have become standard varieties. In some analyses, compound words and certain classes of idiomatic expressions and other collocations are also considered to be part of the lexicon. Dictionaries represent attempts at listing, in alphabetical order, the lexicon of a given language; usually, however, bound morphemes are not included. Lexicography , closely linked with the domain of semantics, is the science of mapping the words into an encyclopedia or a dictionary. The creation and addition of new words into the lexicon is called coining or neologization, [34] and the new words are called neologisms. However, this is often considered a myth by linguists. The capacity for the use of language is considered by many linguists to lie primarily in the domain of grammar, and to be linked with competence , rather than with the growth of vocabulary. Even a very small lexicon is theoretically capable of producing an

infinite number of sentences. Relativity[edit] As constructed popularly through the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis , relativists believe that the structure of a particular language is capable of influencing the cognitive patterns through which a person shapes his or her world view. Universalists believe that there are commonalities between human perception as there is in the human capacity for language, while relativists believe that this varies from language to language and person to person. The 20th century German linguist Leo Weisgerber also wrote extensively about the theory of relativity. Relativists argue for the case of differentiation at the level of cognition and in semantic domains. The emergence of cognitive linguistics in the s also revived an interest in linguistic relativity. Any particular pairing of meaning and form is a Saussurean sign. For instance, the meaning "cat" is represented worldwide with a wide variety of different sound patterns in oral languages , movements of the hands and face in sign languages , and written symbols in written languages. Linguistic patterns have proven their importance for the knowledge engineering field especially with the ever-increasing amount of available data. Linguists focusing on structure attempt to understand the rules regarding language use that native speakers know not always consciously. All linguistic structures can be broken down into component parts that are combined according to sub conscious rules, over multiple levels of analysis. For instance, consider the structure of the word "tenth" on two different levels of analysis. On the level of internal word structure known as morphology , the word "tenth" is made up of one linguistic form indicating a number and another form indicating ordinality. The rule governing the combination of these forms ensures that the ordinality marker "th" follows the number "ten. Although most speakers of English are consciously aware of the rules governing internal structure of the word pieces of "tenth", they are less often aware of the rule governing its sound structure. Linguists focused on structure find and analyze rules such as these, which govern how native speakers use language. Linguistics has many sub-fields concerned with particular aspects of linguistic structure. The theory that elucidates on these, as propounded by Noam Chomsky, is known as generative theory or universal grammar. These sub-fields range from those focused primarily on form to those focused primarily on meaning. They also run the gamut of level of analysis of language, from individual sounds, to words, to phrases, up to cultural discourse. Sub-fields that focus on a grammatical study of language include the following. Stylistic analysis entails the analysis of description of particular dialects and registers used by speech communities. Stylistic features include rhetoric , [37] diction, stress, satire , irony , dialogue, and other forms of phonetic variations. Stylistic analysis can also include the study of language in canonical works of literature, popular fiction, news, advertisements, and other forms of communication in popular culture as well. It is usually seen as a variation in communication that changes from speaker to speaker and community to community. In short, Stylistics is the interpretation of text. Theoretical[edit] One major debate in linguistics concerns the very nature of language and how it should be understood. Some linguists hypothesize that there is a module in the human brain that allows people to undertake linguistic behaviour, which is part of the formalist approach. This " universal grammar " is considered to guide children when they learn language and to constrain what sentences are considered grammatical in any human language. Proponents of this view, which is predominant in those schools of linguistics that are based on the generative theory of Noam Chomsky , do not necessarily consider that language evolved for communication in particular. They consider instead that it has more to do with the process of structuring human thought see also formal grammar. Functional[edit] Another group of linguists, by contrast, use the term "language" to refer to a communication system that developed to support cooperative activity and extend cooperative networks. Such theories of grammar , called "functional", view language as a tool that emerged and is adapted to the communicative needs of its users, and the role of cultural evolutionary processes are often emphasized over that of biological evolution. This is analogous to practice in other sciences: Prescription , on the other hand, is an attempt to promote particular linguistic usages over others, often favouring a particular dialect or " acrolect ". This may have the aim of establishing a linguistic standard , which can aid communication over large geographical areas. It may also, however, be an attempt by speakers of one language or dialect to exert influence over speakers of other languages or dialects see Linguistic imperialism. An extreme version of prescriptivism can be found among censors , who attempt to eradicate words and structures that they consider to be destructive to society. Prescription, however, may be practised appropriately in the teaching of language

, like in ELT , where certain fundamental grammatical rules and lexical terms need to be introduced to a second-language speaker who is attempting to acquire the language. Anthropology[edit] The objective of describing languages is often to uncover cultural knowledge about communities. The use of anthropological methods of investigation on linguistic sources leads to the discovery of certain cultural traits among a speech community through its linguistic features. It is also widely used as a tool in language documentation , with an endeavour to curate endangered languages. However, now, linguistic inquiry uses the anthropological method to understand cognitive, historical, sociolinguistic and historical processes that languages undergo as they change and evolve, as well as general anthropological inquiry uses the linguistic method to excavate into culture. In all aspects, anthropological inquiry usually uncovers the different variations and relativities that underlie the usage of language. Sources[edit] Most contemporary linguists work under the assumption that spoken data and signed data are more fundamental than written data. Nonetheless, linguists agree that the study of written language can be worthwhile and valuable. For research that relies on corpus linguistics and computational linguistics , written language is often much more convenient for processing large amounts of linguistic data. Large corpora of spoken language are difficult to create and hard to find, and are typically transcribed and written. In addition, linguists have turned to text-based discourse occurring in various formats of computer-mediated communication as a viable site for linguistic inquiry. The study of writing systems themselves, graphemics , is, in any case, considered a branch of linguistics. Analysis[edit] Before the 20th century, linguists analysed language on a diachronic plane, which was historical in focus. This meant that they would compare linguistic features and try to analyse language from the point of view of how it had changed between then and later. However, with Saussurean linguistics in the 20th century, the focus shifted to a more synchronic approach, where the study was more geared towards analysis and comparison between different language variations, which existed at the same given point of time. At another level, the syntagmatic plane of linguistic analysis entails the comparison between the way words are sequenced, within the syntax of a sentence. For example, the article "the" is followed by a noun, because of the syntagmatic relation between the words. The paradigmatic plane on the other hand, focuses on an analysis that is based on the paradigms or concepts that are embedded in a given text. In this case, words of the same type or class may be replaced in the text with each other to achieve the same conceptual understanding.

Chapter 8 : Linguistic Superstition And The Sacred Name Only Movement

Many other examples of searing weibo (microblog) criticism concerning the election in Taiwan are collected in this abluowang article.. Such adversative passive constructions have been common in online political discourse in recent years.

Daniel Botkin Let me begin by saying that I am in favor of the reverent and proper use of the Sacred Names. In our congregation, we utter the Name every Sabbath when we face Jerusalem and say the Shema: However, I avoid using the Name in casual conversation, because I truly do regard it as a Sacred Name which should be used only in a sacred context. The issue I wish to address is misrepresentation of that "Name. In these Sacred Name Only groups hereafter SNO , I have witnessed some adherents using the Name in a lighthearted manner in casual conversation, even while joking around. However, my main complaint against the SNO movement is not the use or non-use of the Name per se, but the fact that their linguistic superstition about "God" and "Lord" unnecessarily separates brethren from one another. Their linguistic superstition discredits SNO advocates and gives Christians and Jews an excuse to reject everything else that is being restored through the Messianic movement--the Sabbath, the Feasts, the dietary laws, etc. Paul warned Timothy about teachers who are continually "doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings [suspicions]" I Timothy 6: I cannot think of a more accurate description of the SNO movement which has been driven by linguistic superstition since its inception. Linguistic superstition is the belief that saying certain "negative" words will produce negative results, and saying certain "positive" words in just the right way will produce positive results. This sort of belief system is most apparent in occult magic. Practitioners of occult magic believe that certain words have an inherent power or force within them which can be harnessed and utilized when the words are pronounced in a precise, prescribed manner. The seven sons of Sceva believed this. When they saw Paul doing miracles in the name of Yeshua, they tried to cast out a demon by saying, "We adjure you by Yeshua whom Paul preacheth. You would think that Bible Believers would know better than to get entangled in linguistic superstition. Sadly, that is not the case. Now, we are seeing linguistic superstition of another sort being manifested in the Sacred Name Only movement. They insist that He must be addressed by His Hebrew Name. Much of what I have read in SNO literature is dangerously close to the occult thinking that existed in first-century Gnosticism. The Oxford Illustrated History of Christianity pg. This in itself is not sorcery, of course, but it is a step in that direction. This sort of thinking can lead to linguistic superstition and worse. The SNO movement has produced a mixture of good and bad fruit: Does the good fruit outweigh the rotten fruit or vice versa? We will let God be the Judge of that. We do not wish to judge, but to warn against the poison of rotten fruit. The purpose of this article is not to attack or embarrass or publicly humiliate anyone. The sole purpose of the article is to expose error. For this reason, SNO writers and sources will not be cited. If readers wish to know the sources, that information will be shared privately. Unfortunately, some of the errors in the SNO movement are not harmless. The proof of this statement is in the rotten fruit the movement has borne. This unhealthy fruit is primarily a glaring lack of love for the brethren. And I have been reading SNO literature regularly since the mids. Indeed, many SNO proponents do not even consider the brethren their brethren. Christians who do not use the Hebrew names are often regarded as lost at best and as devil worshipers at worst. One large SNO organization printed these words in a newsletter last August: SNO believers do not fare much better when it comes to loving their own. One well known SNO leader who has been around for decades admits this. A Christian reader hearing about this for the first time might well be asking the questions: Where in hell did that idea come from? However, for the benefit of those who want an explanation of how this convoluted idea developed, let me explain. SNO believers think it is disrespectful at best or Satan worship at worst to refer to the Creator by these generic titles. However, the Hebrew equivalents of these two words, elohim and adonai, are also generic words that often refer to false pagan gods and to human lords. Yet the Creator refers to Himself as elohim and adonai hundreds of times in the Hebrew Scriptures. If He is not offended by the generic titles in Hebrew, why should He be offended by the equivalent generic titles in English? English even has the added advantage of capitalizing the G- or the L- to distinguish

the true Creator from the false pagan gods and the human lords. Because the pronunciations of these two words are very similar, they claim that "God" is the god of good luck. However, the fact that two words in two different languages sound the same is not proof that the two words are cognates. On the contrary, such is usually not the case. For example, Spanish con "with" has no connection to English cone; German nein "no" has no connection to English nine; Hebrew ki "because" has no connection to English key; Yiddish teler "plate" has no connection to English teller; Russian tut "here" has no connection to English toot, etc. It seems I agree with you on these issues. Some refuse to transliterate Adonai, even though Scripture uses this word over times to refer to the Creator. Isaac Mozeson wrote in the letter previously mentioned: The Hebrew Bible refers to the Creator as Adonai over times. It is linguistic superstition to avoid a word that the Hebrew Bible freely uses. Yes, it is possible that the Greeks borrowed the Hebrew Adonai and used it to refer to their god Adonis. The fact that pagans use some of the same nouns for their idols is no reason for us to stop using the words. If the pagans were to say that their gods are "good" and "strong," would SNO believers feel a need to avoid these two adjectives and use different synonymous adjectives such as "beneficent" and "powerful"? However, the terms mighty one and master are every bit as generic as god and lord. This is evident even in SNO literature, which refers to false gods as "mighty ones," the only difference being capital letters. This is not spiritual progress; it is simply re-inventing the wheel. The New Testament writers could have written the Hebrew characters into the Greek script, but there is no solid evidence that they did any such thing. It is very important to note this: Even when they were directly quoting Old Testament Scripture, the New Testament writers used the generic Greek titles as substitutes for the Sacred Name. A generic title is substituted every single time. If the New Testament is to have any bearing whatsoever on our theology, we cannot ignore the fact that the New Testament writers used generic titles as substitutes for the Sacred Name. The only argument SNO proponents can use to try to refute these facts is to accuse "wicked scribes" of changing the New Testament manuscripts. Some go so far as to claim that the entire New Testament was originally written in Hebrew, complete with the Sacred Name, of course. History tells us that Matthew originally wrote his gospel in Hebrew, but there is no reason to suppose that the rest of the New Testament was originally written in Hebrew. On the contrary, when one considers the fact that the epistles were addressed to congregations composed primarily of Greek speaking believers who knew little if any Hebrew, the idea seems ludicrous. To accuse wicked scribes of tampering with the text is circular reasoning, and has no basis in historical or linguistic fact. Theories have been put forth to try to debunk the Greek New Testament. Some SNO proponents have claimed that Paul could not have known Greek well enough to write his epistles in that language. Jews did not learn Greek, we are told by SNO writers. We know from Acts I also found this information in a pamphlet: The Greek language was common in Palestine, even though the vernacular was Aramaic and the Sacred tongue was Hebrew. Traina, the man who is regarded by some as the "granddaddy" of the SNO movement. Luke, New York Times Writer? Some SNO believers argue against a Greek New Testament by stating that the Greek text is awkward and clumsy, "poor Greek"; therefore the New Testament must be a translation of a Hebrew original--which, it is assumed, contained the Hebrew names, of course. Is the Greek of the New Testament so poor that a Hebrew original must be assumed? We will let two scholars who know Greek answer the question. Brad Young, a present-day scholar of great repute, states that Paul, in his epistles, "gives evidence of his bi-lingual abilities by writing in Greek like a native" Paul the Pharisee, Yavo Digest A SNO proponent sent me a copy of this article, complete with his complimentary underlining, arrows, brackets, and exclamation marks in the margins. I marked a few more things in the article myself. It seems to me Assuming this to be generally correct Yet SNO people will swallow an unproven theory simply because it agrees with their doctrine. One major reason SNO advocates misunderstand the "Name" issue is because they do not realize the broader meaning of the Hebrew word shem usually translated "name". When they read a verse that says something about "the name of Yahweh," they think mainly in terms of nomenclature, the word that is used to address someone. However, shem means much more than just "name" in this narrow sense of nomenclature. Shem also means the reputation, honor, or character of the person. Any good lexicon will confirm this. Isaac Mozeson also confirms this in his letter to me: The Scriptures say many things about the name of Yahweh. There are verses that speak about misusing, blaspheming, or shaming His name. There are verses about knowing, glorifying, praising, trusting in, and

speaking of the name of Yahweh. These verses are not referring to the correct pronunciation of the four-lettered Tetragrammaton; they are speaking about the character and reputation of Yahweh.

Chapter 9 : Surname | calendrierdelascience.com

On the one hand a proper name may fail to correspond an object and hence devoid of meaning and also fail to present an atomic sentence in which it lies with an argument to the function stipulated with concept expression.