

Nastazja Stoch

University of Warsaw

Linguistic diagrams may be classified in many ways. The most relevant typology of diagrams in this paper is the one created in regard to the type of mapping between the linguistic form and meaning. The mappings are formulated within the diagrammatic principles governing language, yielding an explanatory function of the motivation behind a given formal structure.

An overview of the typology of diagrammatic principles governing language exposed in the literature shows that it is not consistent. It required a meticulous analysis of different concepts under different names, often overlapping without explicit indication. It resulted in deriving three main diagrammatic principles in language: that of sequence, quantity, and proximity.

Iconicity of sequence has been often interchangeably used with iconicity of temporality and iconicity of linearity. Nöth's (1990) typology of syntagmatic diagrams was convincing enough to realize that iconicity of temporality and iconicity of linearity are merely subtypes of iconicity of sequence, because not any iconic sequence must be temporal or linear. It also proved that iconic temporality and linearity are distinctive. Therefore, after inspecting Nöth's proposal, I adapted this division of possible sequential diagrams in language between temporal sequence, spatial and conceptual sequence, the latter, in turn, being divided into causal, linear, and hierarchical sequence. The only modification to this proposal concerns moving causal sequence under the governance of temporal sequence (due to the argument that causality involves temporal perception of the cause-effect relation), and offering one more dimension of iconic sequence, namely, iconicity of epistemic sequence.

Iconicity of quantity has also been studied under different labels. In particular, the most often term associated with it is iconicity of complexity. However, I formulated arguments to view it as a subtype of iconicity of quantity. Another term related to the quantity diagram in language is markedness. I debunked the idea to identify iconicity of complexity with markedness, even though they partially overlap in the extension of instantiating them. Another confusion is caused by listing iconicity of repetition and iconicity of reduplication as (implicitly) disjunctive principle, although they are univocally prescribed under the overarching principle of quantity. I have then decisively classified the iconic principle of reduplication as specific type of the iconic principle of repetition being manifested on the morphological level. In result, the principle of quantity has two subtypes: repetition (having reduplication is its subtype) and complexity. Lastly, iconicity of absence was joined to this first-level division of types of iconic quantity, next to iconicity of intensification and informativeness, none of which could be subdued to neither repetition nor complexity in their entirety.

Iconicity of proximity may have required most clarification. I discovered that iconicity of distance, alienation, adjacency, cohesion and contiguity are indistinguishable concepts, defined in the same way as iconicity of proximity. However, after further inspection, I preserved only iconicity of distance as a true synonymy of iconicity of proximity. I excluded the plausibility of using the terms “cohesion” or “contiguity” to refer to iconicity of proximity by pointing out their conventionalized applications in describing different linguistic phenomena. “Iconicity of alienation” is similar to “iconicity of (in)alienability”, therefore I did not use it extensively to not confuse it with (in)alienability, which I classified as a specific manifestation of iconicity of proximity. Iconicity of adjacency (divided into iconicity of grammatical adjacency and iconicity of head proximity) has been also defined to be a particular case of iconicity of proximity, next to iconicity of causal distance and juxtaposition.

References:

- Givón, T. (1995(1991)). Isomorphism in the grammatical code: cognitive and biological considerations. In R. Simone (Ed.), *Iconicity in Language* (pp. 47-76). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Greenberg, J. H. (1966). Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In J. H. Greenberg (Ed.), *Universals of Language* (2nd ed., pp. 73-113). Cambridge & London: The M.I.T. Press.
- Haiman, J. (1985). *Natural Syntax: Iconicity and Erosion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haspelmath, M. (2008). Frequency vs. iconicity in explaining grammatical asymmetries. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 19(1), 1-33.
- Hiraga, M. K. (1994). Diagrams and metaphors: Iconic aspects in language. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 22, 5-21.
- Lacková, L. (2015). Iconicity and topic-focus sequentiality. *Czech and Slovak Linguistic Review*, 1, 44-55.
- Leech, G. N., & Short, M. (2007). *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose* (2nd ed.). Harlow: Pearson.
- Newmeyer, F. J. (1992). Iconicity and generative grammar. *Language*, 68(4), 756-796.
- Nöth, W. (1990). The semiotic potential for iconicity in spoken and written language. *Kodikas/Code: Ars Semiotica*, 13(3/4), 191-209.
- Tai, J. H.-Y. (1985). Temporal sequence and Chinese word order. In J. Haiman (Ed.), *Iconicity in Syntax* (pp. 49-72). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Van Langendonck, W. (2007). Iconicity. In D. Geeraerts, & H. Cuyckens (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wescott, R. W. (1971). Linguistic iconism. *Language*, 47(2), 416-428.