

**Bilješke i diskusija**  
**Notes and discussion**  
**Notizen und Diskussion**

**Mario Brdar**

Sveučilište Josipa Juraja Strossmayera  
Pedagoški fakultet  
Osijek

***Jezikoslovlje:***  
**The tongue in the mind's ear**

When the decision was reached in early 2002 that this journal ought to be relaunched and made into an open, international forum, the editor-in-chief suggested that an editorial note is in order in the new issue that would explain the journal's background and its future goals. When an internationally renowned board of consulting editors was successfully called into life, and when first contributions from abroad started getting in, in other words, when it appeared that the journal is on a good course, the editor-in-chief suggested that the pleasure of composing of this editorial note be mine, as I happened to have been engaged in the most visible part of the work in the preparation stage, so to say, acting as the executive hand that carried out most of the suggestions of the whole editorial board. Not surprisingly, I declined this particular offer. Now that the double issue for 2002 is about to go to press (and a couple of papers are being revised that will most likely appear in the first issue for 2003), I feel that a note might be useful, not a prefatory one, but just a post-script mostly focussing on the journal's name, and thus revealing some of the quandaries that the editorial board was in during the past year.

There is hardly any need for the editorial board to comment on the papers published. After all, the papers speak for themselves. However, let me just as well make two points. Firstly, it is clear that most papers in the present volume are true to what the editorial board envisaged: most papers contest or re-evaluate some established conceptual and/or methodological traditions. The second point that must be made clear is that most of the papers in Croatian (both articles and book reviews and notices) had been submitted either long before the decision to relaunch the journal, i.e. while it was in a limbo, or during the time the board was busy reviving the journal. This explains in part the relatively high proportion of the number of papers in Croatian when compared to the number of papers in English and German. This proportion is quite

likely to change in the issue to follow, but hopefully not to the detriment of Croatian. If all goes well, it will shift more and more from the status of the metalanguage, i.e. the medium, to the status of the object language, i.e. the topic of papers composed in the other two languages.

This also explains why the journal continues with Volume 3, and does not start anew. The first volume, with one issue, was published in 1998, and was followed by a double issue of Volume 2 in 1999. This means that there is a gap for 2000 and 2001. For quite some time, the possibility was entertained of starting with a clean slate, i.e. either changing the name of the journal (for the reasons to be discussed below) and naturally starting with volume one, or keeping the name but at least starting afresh with a new series. The expanded editorial board eventually decided that the continuity in both the journal's name and volume sequence, with an acknowledged gap in publication, is the wisest option.

In fulfilling its mission - holding up for discussion theoretical and descriptive issues relevant to the linguistic community at large and thus aiming at reflecting current trends in linguistic research – *Jezikoslovlje* will clearly contribute to the development of linguistic research in Croatia. First of all, by being a forum that reflects current trends it will help the Croatian linguistic community keep pace with colleagues abroad. *Jezikoslovlje* is also intended to promote Croatian linguistics by publishing contributions by Croatian linguists, and last but not least on Croatian (occasionally in Croatian). However, the traffic of ideas is expected to be bidirectional, i.e. the journal is to be a means of not only importing but also of exporting ideas. This latter goal can only be achieved if contributions also take a broader perspective and succeed in linking up to worldwide trends in terms of their methodology, the theoretical framework in which they are couched, and the relevance of their findings. One of the prerequisites is the choice of an international medium that would make such work more widely accessible (e.g. writing on Croatian in English or German).

In the remainder of this note I will be trying to kill two birds with a single stone. On the one hand, I would like to demonstrate that even an apparently petty issue such as the etymology of the journal's name can be discussed in a manner that makes the topic theoretically relevant and interesting for larger audience. On the other hand, I hope to convince the reader that *Jezikoslovlje* is an apt name for a linguistic journal.

So what's in this name? A morphological analysis yielding two immediate constituents linked by an interfix seems very plausible at first sight: *jezik-oslavljje*. If we disregard the interfix, the right-hand IC of this compound-like structure can be further broken down into two morphemes: *slov-lje*. Of course, it is also possible that this is a synthetic compound-like structure where the

---

final suffix *-lje* is added to a complex base. This question, however, is not our immediate concern here.

The left-hand constituent, *jezik*, is not a trouble-maker here. This is a pattern of metonymic extension of the type SPEECH-ORGAN-FOR-LANGUAGE, attested in language after language, particularly in Indo-European languages, but also in Uralic, Turkic, Semitic, Caucasian, Chadic, and American Indian languages (cf. Radden 2002).

This accounts for the first part of the subtitle of this note. But what about the meaning of the whole word, why should the tongue be in the mind's ear? Checking on the word *jezikoslovlje* in Croatian and Croatian-English dictionaries, one finds that, provided the word is included, two senses are offered, viz. two English equivalents, respectively. Bujas (1983) gives both *philology* and *linguistics* as its English equivalents, while Drvodelić (1989) provides only *philology*. Simeon's encyclopedic dictionary of linguistic terms (1969: 619) indicates that the term was coined by Bogoslav Šulek in 1860 as the equivalent of the German term *Philologie* (the same person is recorded as being responsible for the term *jezikoznanstvo* (cf. Russian *jazykoznanie*), coined in 1874 and corresponding to German *Sprachwissenschaft*). The dictionary of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts provides *filologija* as the first gloss, immediately followed by *lingvistika*. The fact is that *jezikoslovlje* is not a terribly frequent form. A search in the Croatian National Corpus, which at present contains 30 million words, yielded 17 tokens (with 4 different case forms)<sup>1</sup>. I must admit here that I myself hardly remember ever having come across the word before joining the editorial board in 2002, apart from the occasion on which I read Katičić (1986).

Studying the tables of contents of the first two volumes of *Jezikoslovlje* (all in all 3 issues), one may get the impression that the journal was more about philology than linguistics.

A brief comparison with some other words ending in *-(slov)lje*, does not seem to lend unequivocal support to this assumption. Babić (1986) cites, among others, forms such as: *mudroslovlje* and *bogoslovlje*. The first constituents are *mudr(o)-* and *bog-*, i.e. 'wise' and 'God', respectively. The former word was a failed attempt to replace the internationalism *filozofija* (i.e. philosophy), an attempt that failed for good long, long before the present author was born, and thus cannot be blamed on the present-day Croatian language policy. The latter word is quite current in the sense of 'theology' (cf. *Bogoslovni fakultet* 'Faculty of Theology'). There is a clear analogy between *jezikoslovlje* and *mudroslovlje* to the effect that in both words the first constituent corresponds to the second constituent in their Greek counterparts (on

---

<sup>1</sup> The corpus can be searched at [www.hnk.hr](http://www.hnk.hr).

which they may be assumed to have been modelled), while *-slovlje* in both cases corresponds to *philein* 'love'. If *mudroslovlje* is the love of wisdom, then *jezikoslovlje* is the love of language. However, *bogoslovlje* is a different case, as *-slovlje* here corresponds to Greek *-logia*. In other words, the second constituent denotes something that is more study- or science-like.

However, the statement on its scope and goals, agreed on by the new expanded editorial board, is clearly at odds with such purely philological orientation. A change of the journal's name seemed to be well-advised - a possibility that was duly considered.<sup>2</sup>

Anić (1999: 417), however, defines *jezikoslovlje* as *proučavanje jezika, lingvistika* ('study of language, linguistics'), but does not include any reference to philology. So it appears as if we witnessed here a shift in the meaning of the term from the 'philology' towards the 'linguistics' sense. Is this shift perhaps attributable to what Jahn (1999) describes as the Croatization language policy? Specifically, this might seem like an old word from the Croatian linguistic heritage being revived after having long been in disuse.<sup>3</sup> Notice that it is possible that the other competing term coined by Šulek, *jezikoznanstvo*, may have been dispreferred by many speakers on the grounds of being felt to be too close to Russian, which currently does not enjoy a prestigious status in the Croatian society, due to the politics of the past. In sum, the shift of meaning would seem to be essentially arbitrary from a linguistic point of view. In other words, it takes place for extra-linguistic reasons, either due to ignorance, i.e. confusing philology for linguistics, or due to the wish to replace the international term *lingvistika* for basically political reasons. If *jezikoslovlje* was originally used in the sense of philology, such a shift would

<sup>2</sup> Note that the board in fact did not face much of a choice. Changing the journal's name to something English or Classical could have led to some high-sounding, presumptuous (and in the long run ridiculous) syntagma, or to partial infringement (as most apt and/or eye-catching names are already in use). Opting for either interpretation of its scope and goals (i.e. either choosing to be a philological or a linguistic journal), but sticking to the resources of Croatian morphosyntax, the journal had to manoeuvre in a very narrow space left by two well-established Croatian journals, viz. *Filologija* and *Suvremena lingvistika*. *Jezikoslovlje* may be a tongue-twister, and suspicious, or even offensive to some linguists, but it is at least original, quite unique, and hopefully eye-catching (if this were one of the ingredients that go into making a successful journal, in addition to eye-catching contents).

<sup>3</sup> By way of digression, let me just point out that the only linguistic term that Jahn discusses is *syntax* (i.e. *sintaksa* in Croatian), which is claimed by his informant (allegedly a teacher of Croatian) to be systematically replaced by the term *sročnost*. In a matter of fact, *sročnost* is not an innovation but a long-established term covering what is in English called concord or agreement, nothing more and nothing less. Cf. Katičić (1991), where the term *sintaksa* is used in the title of the volume, and *sročnost* is duly used in the sense of concord.

---

not make much sense for at least two reasons. If the alleged purpose of resurrecting an old Croatian word is to “preserve the purity” of the language, then this purpose is not served if the “original sense” is betrayed. On top of this, it is just like robbing Peter to pay Paul – if *jezikoslovlje* is used as a patch to render *lingvistika* superfluous, another gap emerges because there is no native term replacing *filologija*.

In what follows below, I would like to show, that even if Anić (1999) may be wrong about not supplying the philology<sup>4</sup> sense for *jezikoslovlje*, he is at least right about glossing it as the study of language, i.e. linguistics in the sense of German *Sprachwissenschaft* (language-science, i.e. getting to know/acquiring knowledge about language).

We might assume that the right-hand constituent, *-slovlje*, is etymologically related to *Slaven* ‘Slav’, *slaviti* (v.) ‘praise’, and *sloviti* (v.) ‘speak, tell, announce’. This is indeed borne out by most etymological dictionaries. One could then jump to the conclusion that *jezikoslovlje* should be taken to mean something like ‘the activity of talking about/discussing language’. Since scholarly discussions are prototypically dialectic exchanges between participants not possessed of identical bodies of knowledge, i.e. one knows more about a given topic than the other participant, the latter then benefits from the discussion because he is given an opportunity to learn something. Of course, the roles may be reversed, and the direction of the transfer of knowledge reversed at the next turn. Last but not least, even the participant that apparently acts as the primary source of knowledge, may her-/himself be learning in the process, as we all have experienced on many occasions. It may almost sound like a joke, but such dialectic exchange may be thought of as a phenomenon resting on a metonymic basis: scholarly discussion goes hand in hand with transfer of knowledge (in whatever form), and thus ultimately leads to the acquisition/possession of body of knowledge (in the sense of *Wissenschaft*).

However, there is harder evidence that *jezikoslovlje* indeed covers the sense of ‘linguistics’, more precisely, that *-slovlje* has to do with cognition. The evidence is to be found if one decides to plunge into much deeper etymological strata. The ultimate etymon of *-slovlje*, and *slovo* ‘letter’, and *Slaven* and *sloviti*, seems to be IE *\*kleu-* ‘hear’.

To try to argue for a link between *-slovlje* and cognition on the basis of such an etymological affinity may seem surprising, even incoherent. The link is, on the face of it, totally unmotivated. At best, assuming such a link would imply some sort of meaning extension from the domain of perception onto the

---

<sup>4</sup> In fact, in the official nomenclature of scientific disciplines approved by the Croatian Ministry of Science and Technology, *jezikoslovlje* is being used as a hyperonym of both philology and linguistics.

domain of cognition, probably based on a metaphor. This type of general extension is in fact widely attested, as discussed in Sweetser (1990). The only trouble with this is that it is actually out of sync with Sweetser's prediction that such metaphoric mappings from perception to cognition are more likely for certain perceptual modalities than for some others. Specifically, verbs of visual perception are claimed by her to be universally more likely to develop into verbs of knowing than verbs related to any other perceptual modality. In other words, verbs of hearing are not very likely to develop a usage meaning 'know'. Rather they will acquire the sense of 'heeding, obeying', i.e. extend into the domain of social interaction. If they are nevertheless also found to develop in the direction of cognition they, at best, exhibit a usage meaning 'understand'.

It has been recently shown by Evans and Wilkins (2000)<sup>5</sup> that Sweetser's prediction about the universality of the extension of visual perception verbs to cognition readings (like 'see' > 'know') cannot be upheld. Making use of data from a broad range (approximately 60) of Australian languages, they demonstrate that verbs denoting higher intellection, i.e. cognition in the sense of 'think' and 'know' are recruited from verbs for aural perception, rather than from 'see' verbs. Cf. some of their examples:

Pitjantjatjara

- (1) itit-la            takata    kuli-ntja            wiya  
long.ago-LOC    doctor    hear/know-NOMZR NEG  
'In the old days we didn't know about doctors'

- (2) yumpa-na    puṯu    nguwan    kulini  
face-I        in.vain    hardly    hear/remember  
'I can't really remember the face'  
(Goddard 1992: 39)

Dalabon

- (3) 'ngale!    kvhrdvh-kah    kvhrdvh-kah    kvhrdvh-kah'  
oh.yes    this.way-LOC    this.way-LOC    this.way-LOC

kah-rok-wona-rre-ninj.

3way-hear-REFL-PASTPERF

"'Oh yes, along this way, this way, this way,'" he remembered/ recalled/knew the way along'

<sup>5</sup> This article provides, of course, not only arguments for the present note, but also the obvious inspiration for its subtitle.

---

Vestiges of this pattern can also be detected in Indo-European languages, e.g. in English or Croatian. Verbs of aural perception can of course be used in the sense of ‘understand’, as in the questions in (4-5):

(4) A mistake has been made, do you hear me?

Croatian

(5) Jesi li me čuo?  
AUX-2SG Q-PARTICLE me-ACC heard  
‘Have you heard (and understood) me?’

In both examples the implicature arises – if the addressee has perceived the message, i.e. has heard it, s/he must have understood it.

A verb of hearing may occasionally be also used in the sense of ‘know’:

- (6) a. Have you heard the one about...  
b. Never heard of him.

(6) a. may be understood as the speaker simply inquiring whether the interlocutor has aurally perceived the joke in question, but it is normally enlarged into an inquiry as to whether the interlocutor knows the joke. Similarly, (6) b. is normally interpreted in the sense that the speaker does not know the person in question. The same patterns are attested in Croatian, and in many other languages, even some non-Indo-European ones, e.g. in Hungarian.

Let us now return to some expressions deriving from the other etymon of interest, \**kleu-*, that was discussed above. As pointed out by Sweetser (1990: 35) words coming from this root often mean ‘tale, report, fame, glory, news’. This is the case in Latin *clūor* ‘fame’, and *clueo* ‘be famous’, and while Cl. Greek *klúo* means ‘hear’, its nominalizations and adjectivalizations are *kléos* ‘fame’ and *klutós* ‘famous’, respectively. They can be traced to the same etymon which developed in Croatian into *slava* ‘fame’ and *slavan* ‘famous’. Fame, and being famous or well-known, clearly have to do with knowledge.

This shift from hearing to knowing, though not very systematic, and nowadays as good as obscured, is in fact no less well motivated than the shift from seeing to knowing. In other words, the latter is as unmotivated as the former. The explanation that Sweetser (1990: 39) gives basically presupposes some metaphorical mapping, the common denominator between vision and cognition being distance:

... vision is connected with intellection because it is our primary source of objective data about the world... Vision gives us data from distance. This ability to reach out is a significant parallel between vision and intellection, since the

objective and intellectual domain is understood as being an area of personal *distance*, in contrast to intimacy or closeness of the subjective and emotional domain... Vision is also identical for different people...

But this assumption of a parallel is clearly biased in that it presupposes one particular type of cognition and knowledge (the objective one, probably one arrived at experimentally, assuming emotional distance from what is being observed), and one particular stage in the development of society and technology. Otherwise, distance need not result in cognition. Being emotionally disinterested and detached from what one studies can of course be beneficial, but detrimental as well (e.g. because of lack of motivation). Finally, it is almost a platitude to point out that spatial distance is reversely proportional to successful visual perception, and may thus prevent cognition.

I would like to submit that the shift from both visual and aural meaning to the domain of knowing (both objective and subjective) can perhaps be better motivated if we assume underlying metonymic chains instead of metaphors. What is going on in both perception modalities is a complex scenario or ICM. Successful perception presupposes the readiness/attention of the organism.

Note now that both Croatian *čuti* and English *hear* derive etymologically from the Indo-European root *\*(s)kēu-* 'watch, look', which is in turn claimed to derive from the nostratic *\*cuHΛ* 'watch, observe', also reflected in Kartvelian *\*čew-* 'pay attention'. We could assume that the initial stage of the perceptual process came to be reinterpreted as denoting its result, i.e. the lexemes originally denoting attention came to mean perception itself. In other words, we witness a high-level predication metonymic mapping of the CAUSE-FOR-RESULT type here. Closer to our times, we may illustrate this on the English pair *listen to* – *hear*. The former activity may lead to the event of hearing, but hearing does not presuppose listening, you can hear things without listening to, i.e. without consciously attending to the task. This sort of conceptual contiguity in the sense of defeasibility/cancellability is just what is predicted for high-level metonymies (cf. Panther and Thornburg 2002). In the next step, what is heard gets processed and incorporated into the knowledge system of the organism in one way or another. If a particular piece of information is relevant and possibly recurrent, it is more firmly incorporated into the knowledge system and can be retrieved independently of the original aural stimulus. In other words, the same high-level metonymy kicks in here again. What has been heard and turned into operationalisable data is now known. This is clearly reflected in the fame/famous cluster of examples above. This now explains how knowledge gets in through ears, and also why the tongue is in the mind's ear.

This sort of motivation, grounded in human bodily and mental endowment, can equally account for both modalities (or perhaps any other modality) as



---

starting points for the shift towards intellection. So what was it that made language after language (but not Australian ones) choose visual perception over aural one as the starting point, or perhaps, if my arguments above hold water, what was it that may have made many languages shift from one model to the other at some point?

Part of the answer is offered in the concluding section of Evans and Wilkins (2000), when they suggest that “the same semantic domain can have its universal and its relativistic side, a foot in nature and a foot in culture,…” As pointed out above, Sweetser’s concept of cognition seems to be biased by modern Western civilization. At the time the two models may have competed, society was very different. Vision was of course very important, but it was certainly not the only factor relevant to the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge. What is more, “objective”, first-hand knowledge arrived at on the basis of direct observation was less privileged in comparison with that acquired through exchange with other humans. In fact, one can safely assume that before the invention of a writing system, and before technological and economical advance could ensure sustainable and high-quality light independent of meteorological conditions, oral transmission of knowledge in concentrated form, was the primary form of dissemination of knowledge that was handed down from generation to generation. It is not incidental that the oldest texts preserved were in the form of verse, to be sung or recited in front of the audience. The regular metre with its rhythmic contours, the use of rhyme and alliteration, recurrent collocations, were all devices that facilitated their oral perception and memorization, so that they could be preserved and handed down further. Once the circumstances started changing, when writing systems were devised, and as the medium for actual recording became more and more accessible, as the lightning techniques became more reliable, the preservation and transfer of knowledge was less and less dependent on aural perception, and the other model could take over. Where such circumstances did not arise, or did not arise so quickly, e.g. in indigenous Australian societies, as demonstrated by Evans and Wilkins (2000), the aural modality went unchallenged.

Let me now return to the issue of the aptness of the journal’s name. Just like the process of cognition starts with the attention, the state of readiness and opening of channels of communication, *Jezikoslovlje* shall be open to all schools and currents of linguistic thought. It shall promote the idea that linguistics, like all science, is a cumulative cooperative enterprise, encouraging an attitude of tolerance and patient listening to, i.e. reading, other people’s ideas/work, and then trying to suggest a solution to the problems or to make clear their relevance to theoretical issues by posing further questions.

---

**References:**

- Anić, Vladimir (1998<sup>3</sup>). *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb.
- Babić, Stjepan (1986). *Tvorba riječi u hrvatskom književnom jeziku*. Zagreb: JAZU - Globus.
- Bujas, Željko (1983). *Hrvatsko ili srpsko – engleski enciklopedijski rječnik*. A – LJ. Zagreb: Grafički zavod Hrvatske.
- Drvodelić, Milan (1989). *Hrvatsko - engleski rječnik*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Evans, Nicholas, David Wilkins (2000). In the mind's ear: The semantic extension of perception verbs in Australian languages. *Language* 76.3: 544-592.
- Gluhak, Alemko (1993). *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik*. Biblioteka Vocabula. Zagreb: August Cesarec.
- Goddard, Cliff (1992). *Pitjantjatjara/Yankunytjatjara to English Dictionary*. Alice Springs: Institute for Aboriginal Development.
- Jahn, Jens-Eberhard (1999). New Croatian language planning and its consequences for language attitudes and linguistic behavior – the Istrian case. *Language and Communication* 19: 329-354.
- Katičić, Radoslav (1986). *Novi jezikoslovni ogledi*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Katičić, Radoslav (1991<sup>2</sup>). *Sintaksa hrvatskoga književnog jezika*. Zagreb: HAZU – Globus.
- Panther, Klaus-Uwe, Linda L. Thornburg (2002). The roles of metaphor and metonymy in English –er nominals. In: Dirven, René, Ralf Pörings, eds.: *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. Cognitive Linguistics Research 20, 279-319. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Radden, Günter (2002). The folk model of language. In: Bublitz, Wolfram, Manfred von Roncador, Heinz Vater, Hrsgg.: *Philologie, Typologie und Sprachstruktur. Festschrift für Winfried Boeder zum 65. Geburtstag*, 85-99. Frankfurt am Main et al.: Peter Lang.
- Simeon, Rikard (1969). *Enciklopedijski rječnik lingvističkih naziva*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Skok, Petar (1971). *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Zagreb: JAZU.
- Sweetser, Eve E. (1990). *From Etymology to Pragmatics. Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.