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1 file4073949 \_Indo-European\_. Aspect, Association of < concepts > and speech elements, Associations fundamental

2 file4073949 character, attribution, compounds, grammatical < concepts > illustrated, influence, "inner form,",

3 file4073949 influence of, Chukchi, Classification: of < concepts >, rigid, of linguistic types, See \_Structure

4 file4073949 \_Structure, linguistic\_. Concord, Concrete < concepts >. See \_Concepts\_. Conflict, Consonantal

5 file4073949 ideas, Dental articulations, Derivational < concepts >. See \_Concepts\_. Determinative structure

6 file4073949 attribution, case, history of, compounds, < concepts >, grammatical, in sentence, concepts, passage

7 file4073949 compounds, concepts, grammatical, in sentence, < concepts >, passage of concrete into derivational,

8 file4073949 function and, independence of, grammatical < concepts > embodied in, grammatical processes embodying

9 file4073949 \_German\_: French influence on, grammatical < concepts > in sentence, Latin influence on, phonetic

10 file4073949 Grammar, Grammatical element, Grammatical < concepts >. See \_Concepts, grammatical\_. Grammatical

11 file4073949 underlying elements of, auditory cycle in, < concepts > expressed in, a cultural function, definition

12 file4073949 expressed in, feeling-tones in, grammatical < concepts > of, grammatical processes of, historical

13 file4073949 suffixes, reduplicated perfects, relational < concepts > expressed, sentence-word, sound as word

14 file4073949 Plattdeutsch," Plurality: classification of < concept > of, variable, a concrete relational category

15 file4073949 relational category, a derivational or radical < concept >, expression of, multiple, See \_Number\_.

16 file4073949 languages, complex, simple, Q Qualifying < concepts >. See \_Concepts, derivational\_. Quality:

17 file4073949 language, culture and, independence of, Radical < concepts >. See \_Concepts\_. Radical element, Radical

18 file4073949 types of: classification of, by character of < concepts >, by degree of fusion, by degree of synthesis

19 file4073947 language. The psycho-physical basis of speech. < Concepts > and language. Is thought possible without

20 file4073947 of a typical English sentence. Types of < concepts > illustrated by it. Inconsistent expression

21 file4073947 it. Inconsistent expression of analogous < concepts >. How the same sentence may be expressed

22 file4073947 differences in the selection and grouping of < concepts >. Essential and non-essential concepts.

23 file4073947 of concepts. Essential and non-essential < concepts >. The mixing of essential relational concepts

24 file4073947 concepts. The mixing of essential relational < concepts > with secondary ones of more concrete order

25 file4073947 form's sake. Classification of linguistic < concepts >: basic or concrete, derivational, concrete

26 file4073947 relational. Tendency for these types of < concepts > to flow into each other. Categories expressed

27 file4073947 classification suggested: what types of < concepts > are expressed? what is the prevailing technique

28 file4073947 notion of a particular object, but of a " <concept >," in other words, of a convenient capsule

29 file4073947 significant elements of speech are the symbols of < concepts >, the actual flow of speech may be interpreted

30 file4073947 interpreted as a record of the setting of these < concepts > into mutual relations. The question has

31 file4073947 the typical linguistic element labels a < concept >. It does not follow from this that the

32 file4073947 in ordinary life so much concerned with < concepts > as such as with concrete particularities

33 file4073947 element in the sentence defines a separate < concept > or conceptual relation or both combined

34 file4073947 particular images to that in which abstract < concepts > and their relations are alone at the focus

35 file4073947 itself out before the genesis of distinct < concepts > and of thinking, the handling of concepts

36 file4073947 concepts and of thinking, the handling of < concepts >. We must rather imagine that thought processes

37 file4073947 linguistic expression; further, that the < concept >, once defined, necessarily reacted on the

38 file4073947 refines the instrument. The birth of a new < concept > is invariably foreshadowed by a more or

39 file4073947 extended use of old linguistic material; the < concept > does not attain to individual and independent

40 file4073947 something of a sigh of relief, that the < concept > is ours for the handling. Not until we

41 file4073947 immediate knowledge or understanding of the < concept >. Would we be so ready to die for "liberty

42 file4073947 formal patterning, and in the relating of < concepts >. Once more, language, as a structure, is

43 file4073947 goes without saying that the more abstract < concepts > are not nearly so plentifully represented

44 file4073947 specific association of speech elements with < concepts >, and the delicate provision for the formal

45 file4073947 of a specific idea, whether of a single < concept > or image or of a number of such concepts

46 file4073947 concept or image or of a number of such < concepts > or images definitely connected into a whole

47 file4073947 . They represent, in a sense, compounded < concepts > that have flowered from the fundamental

48 file4073947 binary expressions involving a fundamental < concept >, a concept of subject matter (\_sing\_),

49 file4073947 expressions involving a fundamental concept, a < concept > of subject matter (\_sing\_), and a further

50 file4073947 of subject matter (\_sing\_), and a further < concept > of more abstract order--one of person,

51 file4073947 subsidiary and, as a rule, a more abstract < concept >; in the widest sense of the word "form,

52 file4073947 word "form," it puts upon the fundamental < concept > a formal limitation. We may term it a "

53 file4073947 represent a simple correspondence between < concept > and linguistic expression? Is the element

54 file4073947 full, untrammeled amplitude of a specific < concept >. Yet if \_sing\_ were, in any adequate sense

55 file4073947 , the fixed expression of the unmodified < concept >, there should be no room for such vocalic

56 file4073947 heart," for instance, not only is a concrete < concept > conveyed, but there cling to the form,

57 file4073947 three distinct, yet intertwined, formal < concepts > of singularity, gender classification (

58 file4073947 symbolic, linguistic counterpart of a single < concept >. We now know that such a definition is

59 file4073947 grammatical elements, the carriers of isolated < concepts >, are comparable as we pass from language

60 file4073947 naive Indian, quite unaccustomed to the < concept > of the written word, has nevertheless no

61 file4073947 grammatical elements, words, and sentences with < concepts > or groups of concepts related into wholes

62 file4073947 and sentences with concepts or groups of < concepts > related into wholes is the fact itself

63 file4073947 thrice." The multiple expression of a single < concept > is universally felt as a source of linguistic

64 file4073947 in the field of abstract and relational < concepts >, particularly when the concept is embodied

65 file4073947 relational concepts, particularly when the < concept > is embodied in a grammatical element. Thus

66 file4073947 expression of the feeling that analogous < concepts > and relations are most conveniently symbolized

67 file4073947 of language reflects merely the world of < concepts > and, on what I have ventured to call the

68 file4073947 of images, which are the raw material of < concepts >. We have, in other words, been assuming

69 file4073947 perfectly intelligible. The world of image and < concept >, the endless and ever-shifting picture

70 file4073947 power of an individual juxtaposition of < concepts > or images. III THE SOUNDS OF LANGUAGE We

71 file4073947 or we may ascertain the distribution of < concepts > with reference to formal expression. What

72 file4073947 patterns of the language? And what types of < concepts > make up the content of these formal patterns

73 file4073947 that limit the application of the radical < concept > in a relational sense. This formal pattern

74 file4073947 conceivable that in another language the < concept > of manner (\_-ly\_) may be treated according

75 file4073947 or indicating the relation of a secondary < concept > to the main concept of the radical element

76 file4073947 relation of a secondary concept to the main < concept > of the radical element. Some of these grammatical

77 file4073947 grammatical processes. As a rule, such basic < concepts > as those of plurality and time are rendered

78 file4073947 regardless of the need for expressing particular < concepts > or of giving consistent external shape

79 file4073947 consistent external shape to particular groups of < concepts >. It goes without saying that these impulses

80 file4073947 significant is that as soon as two or more radical < concepts > are put before the human mind in immediate

81 file4073947 possibilities in the way of rounding out these two < concepts > into a significant group of concepts or

82 file4073947 two concepts into a significant group of < concepts > or even into a finished thought are indefinitely

83 file4073947 three radical elements corresponding to the < concepts > of "absent," "four," and "day." As a matter

84 file4073947 self-evident symbolism, to indicate such < concepts > as distribution, plurality, repetition,

85 file4073947 probable. V FORM IN LANGUAGE: GRAMMATICAL < CONCEPTS > We have seen that the single word expresses

86 file4073947 the single word expresses either a simple < concept > or a combination of concepts so interrelated

87 file4073947 either a simple concept or a combination of < concepts > so interrelated as to form a psychological

88 file4073947 modifying or formative influence of subsidiary < concepts >. In this chapter we shall look a little

89 file4073947 closely into the nature of the world of < concepts >, in so far as that world is reflected and

90 file4073947 presence of three distinct and fundamental < concepts > that are brought into connection with each

91 file4073947 each other in a number of ways. These three < concepts > are "farmer" (the subject of discourse)

92 file4073947 \_farmer\_, \_kill\_, and \_duckling\_ define < concepts > of a concrete order. [Footnote 53: Not

93 file4073947 farmer" is in one sense a perfectly unified < concept >, in another he is "one who farms." The

94 file4073947 concept, in another he is "one who farms." The < concept > conveyed by the radical element (\_farm-\_

95 file4073947 activity (\_to farm\_), itself based on the < concept > of a particular type of object (\_a farm\_

96 file4073947 type of object (\_a farm\_). Similarly, the < concept > of \_duckling\_ is at one remove from that

97 file4073947 significance is obvious. It adds to the basic < concept > the notion of smallness (as also in \_gosling\_

98 file4073947 stressed. They do not so much define distinct < concepts > as mediate between concepts. The \_-er\_

99 file4073947 define distinct concepts as mediate between < concepts >. The \_-er\_ of \_farmer\_ does not quite say

100 file4073947 application that distinguish one concrete < concept > (\_to farm\_) from another "derived" one

101 file4073947 limited. It must perforce throw countless < concepts > under the rubric of certain basic ones,

102 file4073947 derivational" or "qualifying." Some concrete < concepts >, such as \_kill\_, are expressed radically

103 file4073947 modes of expression we have two types of < concepts > and of linguistic elements, radical (\_farm\_

104 file4073947 rather than in thought. In our sentence the < concepts > of \_farm\_ and \_duck\_ are not really involved

105 file4073947 words, they express identical relational < concepts > in an identical manner. The manner is here

106 file4073947 be looked upon as inherently relational < concepts >. Number is evidently felt by those who

107 file4073947 there would be no reason to express the < concept > twice, in the noun and in the verb. Time

108 file4073947 Time also is clearly felt as a relational < concept >; if it were not, we should be allowed to

109 file4073947 correspond to \_the farmer kill-s\_. Of the four < concepts > inextricably interwoven in the \_-s\_ suffix

110 file4073947 The distinction between a truly relational < concept > and one that is so felt and treated, though

111 file4073947 the sentence from the point of view of the < concepts > expressed in it and of the grammatical

112 file4073947 expressed by suffix \_-ling\_ II. RELATIONAL < CONCEPTS >: Reference: 1. Definiteness of reference

113 file4073947 expressed, therefore, thirteen distinct < concepts >, of which three are radical and concrete

114 file4073947 like \_in\_, \_on\_, \_at\_); the same relational < concept > may be expressed more than once (thus,

115 file4073947 element may convey a group of interwoven < concepts > rather than one definite concept alone

116 file4073947 interwoven concepts rather than one definite < concept > alone (thus the \_-s\_ of \_kills\_ embodies

117 file4073947 the expression of the various classes of < concepts > in alien types of speech. Not everything

118 file4073947 that there is no inherent reason why the < concepts > expressed in our sentence should have been

119 file4073947 that unconscious analysis into individual < concepts > which is never entirely absent from speech

120 file4073947 soon show that some or all of the thirteen < concepts > that our sentence happens to embody may

121 file4073947 them may be dispensed with; and that other < concepts >, not considered worth expressing in English

122 file4073947 as to a different method of handling such < concepts > as we have found expressed in the English

123 file4073947 therefore objective), and gender, a new < concept > of the relational order that is not in

124 file4073947 than by the words that express the concrete < concepts > (\_Bauer\_, \_Entelein\_) to which these relational

125 file4073947 \_Bauer\_, \_Entelein\_) to which these relational < concepts > ought logically to attach themselves. In

126 file4073947 attach themselves. In the sphere of concrete < concepts > too it is worth noting that the German

127 file4073947 up the idea of "killing" into the basic < concept > of "dead" (\_tot\_) and the derivational

128 file4073947 that certain of our supposedly essential < concepts > may be ignored; both the Yana and the German

129 file4073947 illustrate the further point that certain < concepts > may need expression for which an English-speaking

130 file4073947 time a radical element; the two relational < concepts >--"subject" and "object"--are expressed

131 file4073947 What, then, are the absolutely essential < concepts > in speech, the concepts that must be expressed

132 file4073947 absolutely essential concepts in speech, the < concepts > that must be expressed if language is to

133 file4073947 of all, a large stock of basic or radical < concepts >, the concrete wherewithal of speech. We

134 file4073947 context. And, secondly, such relational < concepts > must be expressed as moor the concrete

135 file4073947 concepts must be expressed as moor the concrete < concepts > to each other and construct a definite,

136 file4073947 relations that obtain between the concrete < concepts >. We must know what concrete concept is

137 file4073947 concrete concepts. We must know what concrete < concept > is directly or indirectly related to what

138 file4073947 and of a host of other possible types of < concepts >, but I can find no way of dodging the issue

139 file4073947 without the use of symbols for the concrete < concepts >. We are thus once more reminded of the

140 file4073947 between essential or unavoidable relational < concepts > and the dispensable type. The former are

141 file4073947 "dispensable" or "secondary" relational < concepts > with the large, floating group of derivational

142 file4073947 floating group of derivational, qualifying < concepts > that we have already discussed? Is there

143 file4073947 fundamental difference between a qualifying < concept > like the negative in \_unhealthy\_ and a

144 file4073947 \_unhealthy\_ and a relational one like the number < concept > in \_books\_? If \_unhealthy\_ may be roughly

145 file4073947 \_unhealthy\_. For such languages the number < concept > has no syntactic significance whatever,

146 file4073947 the group of derivational or even of basic < concepts >. In English, however, as in French, German

147 file4073947 number is not merely appended to a given < concept > of a thing. It may have something of this

148 file4073947 much else in the sentence, molding other < concepts >, even such as have no intelligible relation

149 file4073947 correspond to or "agree with" the basic < concept > to which it is attached in the first instance

150 file4073947 between the two basically distinct types of < concept >, the concrete and the abstractly relational

151 file4073947 certain violence of metaphor the material < concept > is forced to do duty for (or intertwine

152 file4073947 be elevated into a secondary relational < concept >. It would seem a little far-fetched to

153 file4073947 crassly material, philosophically accidental < concepts > that they are, a means of relating quality

154 file4073947 into two such highly attenuated relational < concepts > as are expressed by "the" and "that" the

155 file4073947 other-several-now-\_come\_. Each word involves no less than four < concepts >, a radical concept (either properly concrete--\_white\_

156 file4073947 involves no less than four concepts, a radical < concept > (either properly concrete--\_white\_, \_man\_

157 file4073947 demonstrative--\_that\_, \_which\_) and three relational < concepts >, selected from the categories of case,

158 file4073947 expression, and that only in connection with the < concepts > directly affected (there is, for instance

159 file4073947 doer's whiteness[60]). The other relational < concepts > are either merely parasitic (gender throughout

160 file4073947 that turns certain fundamentally concrete < concepts > to such attenuated relational uses. [Footnote

161 file4073947 truly define a relation of these qualifying < concepts > to \_femina\_. Such a relation might be formally

162 file4073947 subsidiary or rather non-syntactical relational < concepts > In order that the essential facts might

163 file4073947 extensions into the relational sphere, the < concepts > ostensibly indicated being now so vaguely

164 file4073947 schemes of classification into which all the < concepts > of language must be fitted. Once we have

165 file4073947 and will tolerate no flying vagrants. Any < concept > that asks for expression must submit to

166 file4073947 unconscious. They are often but half real as < concepts >; their life tends ever to languish away

167 file4073947 without a corresponding growth of a new < concept >. This type of form development, therefore

168 file4073947 to understand the nature of grammatical < concepts > and their tendency to degenerate into purely

169 file4073947 conveniently revise our first classification of < concepts > as expressed in language and suggest the

170 file4073947 inherently related in a specific way to < concepts > of type I[65] III. \_Concrete Relational

171 file4073947 to radical elements (in which case these < concepts > are frequently intertwined with those of

172 file4073947 contrast necessarily implied in defining one < concept > as against another. "Man" and "white" possess

173 file4073947 as indicating that particular substantive < concept > (object or thing) that serves as the habitual

174 file4073947 sentence.] The nature of these four classes of < concepts > as regards their concreteness or their

175 file4073947 Basic Concepts Content \\_ II. Derivational < Concepts > \_ Relation \_/ III. Concrete Relational

176 file4073947 doubt as to how to group a given set of < concepts >. This is particularly apt to be the case

177 file4073947 material content" and what is "relation." < Concepts > of class I are essential to all speech,

178 file4073947 class I are essential to all speech, also < concepts > of class IV. Concepts II and III are both

179 file4073947 to all speech, also concepts of class IV. < Concepts > II and III are both common, but not essential

180 file4073947 types I and IV, is an avoidable class of < concepts >. Logically there is an impassable gulf

181 file4073947 the gulf and set up a continuous gamut of < concepts > and forms that leads imperceptibly from

182 file4073947 II or III. It is possible for a concrete < concept >, represented by a simple word, to lose

183 file4073947 former independence. Such an element and < concept > is the \_full\_ of \_teaspoonfull\_, which

184 file4073947 between the status of an independent, radical < concept > (compare \_full\_) or of a subsidiary element

185 file4073947 reality within the main groups of linguistic < concepts > themselves. In many languages it becomes

186 file4073947 the more concrete from the more abstract < concepts > of group II. Yet we must always beware

187 file4073947 associating with certain of the abstracter < concepts > which, with us, fall in group III, unless

188 file4073947 number of derivational affixes (expressing < concepts > of group II). Some of these are quite material

189 file4073947 reveals the important fact that the plural < concept > is not as abstractly, as relationally,

190 file4073947 cleavage between concrete and less concrete < concepts > within group II, the less concrete do not

191 file4073947 distinct from the outer significance, of the < concept > expressed by a given grammatical element

192 file4073947 meaning in the word or not.] Can such a < concept > as that of plurality ever be classified

193 file4073947 ever be classified with the more material < concepts > of group II? Indeed it can be. In Yana

194 file4073947 singular and plural. Nevertheless the plural < concept > can be, and nearly always is, expressed

195 file4073947 needs no labored argument to prove that the < concept > of plurality is here hardly less concrete

196 file4073947 many a book" and "each book"), the plural < concept > would still not emerge as clearly as it

197 file4073947 naturally just as true of a great many other < concepts >. They do not necessarily belong where we

198 file4073947 Tibetan for their material attitude towards a < concept > which to us is abstract and relational,

199 file4073947 along with a number of other classificatory < concepts >,[73] to relate his subjects and objects

200 file4073947 say in advance just where to put a given < concept >. We must dispense, in other words, with

201 file4073947 from a general inventory of the types of < concepts > generally found in groups II, III, and

202 file4073947 inanimate; by form; common and proper); how the < concept > of number is elaborated (singular and plural

203 file4073947 connected by a long series of transitional < concepts >. [Footnote 74: A term borrowed from Slavic

204 file4073947 merely that the very process of juxtaposing < concept > to concept, symbol to symbol, forces some

205 file4073947 the very process of juxtaposing concept to < concept >, symbol to symbol, forces some kind of

206 file4073947 thing, the noun clusters about concrete < concepts > of that order. As the thing predicated

207 file4073947 in other words, the verb, clusters about < concepts > of activity. No language wholly fails to

208 file4073947 concerned, to the expression of derivational < concepts >, and the Bantu languages, in which the

209 file4073947 to refer to the expression of relational < concepts >[100] alone. In this modified form we shall

210 file4073947 language is one that either does not combine < concepts > into single words at all (Chinese) or does

211 file4073947 synthetic language (Latin, Arabic, Finnish) the < concepts > cluster more thickly, the words are more

212 file4073947 The elaboration of the word is extreme. < Concepts > which we should never dream of treating

213 file4073947 even for the expression of such abstract < concepts > as those of number and tense, is always

214 file4073947 plurality is predicated of certain selected < concepts >. The words \_books\_ and \_oxen\_ are therefore

215 file4073947 agglutinative type, particularly if the < concepts > expressed by the agglutinated elements

216 file4073947 operate merely in the sphere of derivational < concepts > (group II),[108] it must involve the syntactic

217 file4073947 Latin and Greek, as "concrete relational < concepts >" (group III).[109] As far as Latin and

218 file4073947 that express logically impure relational < concepts > with radical elements and with elements

219 file4073947 and with elements expressing derivational < concepts >. Both fusion as a general method and the

220 file4073947 method and the expression of relational < concepts > in the word are necessary to the notion

221 file4073947 , that is, without the admixture of such < concepts > as number, gender, and tense, merely because

222 file4073947 make of "inflection" an even more arbitrary < concept > than it need be. At the same time it is

223 file4073947 In modern Tibetan, for instance, in which < concepts > of group II are but weakly expressed, if

224 file4073947 , if at all, and in which the relational < concepts > (e.g., the genitive, the agentive or instrumental

225 file4073947 languages that do not express relational < concepts > in the word but leave them to the sentence

226 file4073947 agglutinative languages that express these same < concepts > in the word--in so far inflective-like--and

227 file4073947 classification based on the nature of the < concepts > expressed by the language. The other two

228 file4073947 all languages must needs express radical < concepts > (group I) and relational ideas (group IV

229 file4073947 languages. They are: A. Such as express only < concepts > of groups I and IV; in other words, languages

230 file4073947 linguistic expression. B. Such as express < concepts > of groups I, II, and IV; in other words

231 file4073947 Pure-relational languages\_. C. Such as express < concepts > of groups I and III;[111] in other words

232 file4073947 are expressed in necessary connection with < concepts > that are not utterly devoid of concrete

233 file4073947 Mixed-relational languages\_. D. Such as express < concepts > of groups I, II, and III; in other words

234 file4073947 of type D all or most of the relational < concepts > are expressed in "mixed" form, that such

235 file4073947 are expressed in "mixed" form, that such a < concept > as that of subjectivity, for instance,

236 file4073947 Theoretically, of course, certain relational < concepts > may be expressed pure, others mixed, but

237 file4073947 questions concerning the translation of < concepts > into linguistic symbols. Does the language

238 file4073947 language, in the first place, keep its radical < concepts > pure or does it build up its concrete ideas

239 file4073947 place, does it keep the basic relational < concepts >, such as are absolutely unavoidable in

240 file4073947 of the derivational, not the relational, < concepts >. Such languages could be termed "agglutinative-isolating

241 file4073947 that the method of handling one group of < concepts > need not in the least be identical with

242 file4073947 compound referring to the treatment of the < concepts > of group II, the second to that of the

243 file4073947 concepts of group II, the second to that of the < concepts > of groups III and IV. An "agglutinative

244 file4073947 columns II, III, IV refer to the groups of < concepts > so numbered in the preceding chapter. The

245 file4073947 if we may make bold to use a mechanical < concept >, are "canalized" into a single force. This

246 file4073947 toward the expression of "pure" relational < concepts > in the Indo-Chinese manner.[144] The insistence

247 file4073947 insistence on the concreteness of the relational < concepts > is clearly stronger than the destructive

248 file4073947 nuancing of, a finicky play on, the primary < concept >, it tends to be absorbed by the radical

249 file4073947 ) or, if need be, to overdo a little the < concept > of direction (\_Where are you running to

250 file4073947 a factor, but it is a rather subjective < concept > at best. Indians find hopelessly difficult

251 file4073947 are the symbolic carriers of significant < concepts > and groupings of concepts, why may not

252 file4073947 of significant concepts and groupings of < concepts >, why may not a strong drift or a permanent

253 file4073947 they belong to the sphere of derivational < concepts > and do not touch the central morphological

254 file4073947 them. Now it should be remembered that the < concept > of a "linguistic stock" is never definitive

255 file4073947 to change every sound, word, and concrete < concept > of a language without changing its inner

256 file4073947 the language often forces an assemblage of < concepts > that impresses us as a stylistic discovery