

**INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON RECENT ADVANCES IN LINGUISTICS
(ICRAL)**

THE METAPHORIC CASE IN LANGUAGE

Dr G Ravisankar and Dr. A.Kalaiarasi

1.0 Language

Language has a very important social purpose, because it is mainly used for linguistic communication. Communication is quite possible without the use of language. For example, a dog barks and tells its master of the approach of a stranger. Like wise a child cries and informs its mother that it is hungry, thirsty etc., In both examples it is cited above that communication does take place, but no language is used.

A Language can be used in two ways for the purpose of communication. It can be spoken, or written. In other words we can communicate by using the same language, by using the spoken medium or by using the written medium.

2.0 Metaphoric Case in Language:

I would like to deal the Metaphoric case by using HINDI Language with English Language.

According to contemporary syntactic theory, the KARTHA (Noun) jhil (Lake) in the given two examples are formally, in the nominative case and semantically the Subject of the two activities denoted by the verbs “muskura” (Smile) and “dubo” (Drown).

1. Jhilmuskurarahi he (The lake is smiling)
2. Jhil ne use dubodiya (The lake drowned him)

The usages are different the use of “Jhil” in the 1st example is an instance of the figure of speech called “Personification”, ie the speech in which inanimate or abstract things are spoken of as having life. This does not relate with the 2nd example of “Jhil” in the

2nd example , inn which though allowing the possibility of “Animate Human” interpretation, is not necessary so --- “The lake could drown without being human”. The meaning slightly deviates in the 2nd example, unlike in the 1st example, is not due to personification, but rather of the modulated case of “**Jhil**” (**the lake**). The Laocatie case is shifted to the subject (**KARTA**), modulated to function semantically as the subject and as a consequence, requires the verb to agree in number, gender, person.

3. Jhil use duborahi he :**GENDER AGREEMENT (The lake is drowning him)**

When we compare the 2nd and 3rd example it is clear that the speaker or the listener not only sees them as a structures parallel to the corresponding structures with the cases are not shifted but make meaning of this structure in terms of that transformed case is understood in its primordial sense. Therefore the 2nd example is seen as related to, and also understood in terms of :Vehjhil me dub gaya (He drowned in the lake) Veh is used as Karta (Subject) Jhil is used as Adhikarana (Locative)

The relationship between the 1st and 2nd example relates with the structures is a systematic relationship of the Subject Configuration ie (karaka configuration) articulated in the terms of Karaka modulation ie change of the subject into another.

In the **2nd and 3rd example** we have the same event seen in two different perspectives, this is a truth of linguistic perception, the speakers will have intuitive awareness of an immanent relationship in the case of 2nd and 3rd example which can be shown as:

(Subject) Karta– (Locative) Adhikarana = (subject) Karta – Dative

This is the configuration of the 2nd example(He drowned in the lake)

It is significance to grasp that it is not appropriate to talk of “derivation” of one structure from the other or “transformation” of one structure into another, in so far as both these terms seem to invalidly suggest the change of one form into the another. In fact nothing stops to be and nothing comes into being, and the two structures simply represents two existing parallel ways of looking at and reporting the same action. The relation between them is a semantic abstraction which might be reflected and captured in morphological and syntactic forms as well as in varying degrees.

The relation between parallel structures Relational – Modulation , and the change effected as Relational Change. Relational Changes are possible and whether they can be

systematized. The possible relation changes express the relationship between one proposition type and the other. Thus, the propositional structure underlying the sentence

Karta (Subject) – Karana (make to do) – Karma (object)

1. Usneupai se yehsocha(**He thought of this with his idea**)

(Sampradana (Dative) – Karma (Object) – Adhikarana (Locative)

2.1

Uskoyehupai me sujha(**This idea occurred to him in his mind**)

Karta (Subject) – Karma (Object)

2.2 Uskeupai ne yehsoca(**His brain thought of this**)

Karta (Subject)- Karma (Object) – Sampradana (Dative)

2.3 Uskeupai ne yeh use sujhaia (His idea make this thought occur to him

The following changes relate from 1 to 2.1

In the **first example : Subject is changes into Dative in the 2.1 example and the Karana is changes into Locative in the 2.1 example.**

1st example **Karta – Karana – Karma = 2.1 example Sampradana – Karma – Adhikarana**

a. **Karta(Subject) - Sampradana(Dative)**

b. **Karana(Instrument) - Adhikarana (Locative)**

Again we have

In the 1st example

Karta (subject) – Karana (instrument) – Karma (Object)

The two Changes in the Relation here are:

a. **Karana – Karta**

b. **Karta – subject is deleted.**

Again we have

In the 1st example

Karta – Karana – Karma = 2.3 example Karta – Sampradana – Karma

The two Relational Changes are:

- a. Karta – Sampradana**
- b. Karana -- Karta**

Example for ABLATIVE to SUBJECT ; Subject to ABLATIVE

- 1. He got scared of him
- 2. He scared him.

The above said example is called as bi-directional relation change, which represents a shift in the point of the same event

Example for ABLATIVE to INSTRUMENT and INSTRUMENT to ABLATIVE

- 1. He fired the gun: “He” is the Subject and “Fired the Gun” is Instrument**

The proportional type allows no change of perspective

Example: 1. He passed (SUBJECT) Karma

- 2. He passed him (Karna) (Karma)**

We can treat the change from Transitive to Intransitive as process of true derivation in “usne(He), usko(Him) us se(by him). These represents for us further extension of the event by the separation of the AGENT (USNE “he”) from the performing Subject (US SE “by him”) which has relation with Instrument and which is inserted into the Transitive event (Passed) to get the derivation event (get to stop)

3.0 Conclusion

Through metaphoricization of cases, a given proposition type can be modulated to another perspectives and often several changed perspectives has immense significance as we have

Seen for for literary semantics and for the philosophy of the language. In literary semantics, the process explains the choices that are available to the creative writer, and enables the reader to determine the author’s meaning in terms of the choice the speaker makes in representing an event in one given way therefore excluding the other options. This paper says that if the

propositional modulation or structures draw certain boundries around human though then this Changes in the Relational Modulation represents the freedom within the boundries.

Refernces

1. Derrida, Jacques. "Philosophy before Grammar" Textual Strategies ed. J.V.Harrari.1979.
2. Kapoor, Kapil.Semantic Structure and the Verb.A Propositional Analysis.Intellectual Publishers. Delhi.1985.
3. Hindi Grammar Book.