Our talk deals with the lexical typology of words that refer to being unable to see or hear something (BLIND, DEAF). We take into consideration both their literal and figurative meanings. No vast cross-linguistic studies of this domain have been conducted so far. However, it lies at the crossroads of two important theoretical fields. The first one deals with the morpho-syntactic and semantic typology of caritive adjectives (i.e. those describing absence of a feature, see Zimmer 1964; Tolstaya 2008; Tagabileva et al. 2013; Koptjevskaia-Tamm, Miestamo 2015). The second one is linked to how the sensory lexicon is organized (Viberg 1983; Sweetser 1991; Maslova 2004 Majid, Levinson 2011; Rakhilina et al. 2012; San Roque et al. 2015; Koptjevskaia-Tamm 2015), at the same time focusing not on the lexicalization of different senses but on their metaphors.

We adopt the frame-based approach to lexical typology (Rakhilina, Reznikova 2013, 2016, see also Koptjevskaia-Tamm et al. 2015), clustering the lexemes and the extralinguistic situations they refer to with the help of the collocational analysis. Our sample includes 12 languages at the moment (Russian, Polish, English, German, French, Estonian, Moksha, Nenets, Tatar, Chinese, Hebrew, Khmer). The main data source is a typological questionnaire filled in by native speakers. Some material was gathered in dictionaries and observed in corpora.

The meanings in question can be primary and can be expressed with primary lexemes, but sometimes such adjectives can be either morphological caritives, like Nenets sæws‘i ‘blind’ (lit.: eyeless), or semantic derivatives from other meanings, e.g. Estonian pime ‘dark’.

The main dichotomies within literal meanings are the ability/inability to collocate with sense organs or with special objects for the blind/deaf, the extent of the feature (full inability to see/hear or low vision/hearing) and its permanent/temporary character (e.g. Nenets xas‘i ‘deaf’ impossible in contexts like Why do we go temporarily deaf when yawning?)

The metaphors of both BLIND and DEAF refer to something closed or hidden, cf. Russian gluxaja st‘ena (lit.: deaf wall) with its English equivalent blind wall. Interestingly, they overlap with the metaphors of DUMB, a domain adjacent to DEAF. Both DEAF and BLIND metaphorically describe unwillingness to pay attention to
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something (deaf to appeals, blind to faults). However, BLIND here productively develops a much wider range of metaphors with a shade of something overwhelming (blind love, hatred, faith, desire, passion, rage, obedience), or sometimes expresses incompetence (Chinese jišìmǎng ‘incompetent in technology, lit.: technology-blind’). As regards other specific extensions of both domains, DEAF when describing sounds shows two cross-linguistically opposite directions: a low sound (Russian gluxoj zvuk) vs. a very loud sound (Khmer soun:η thløy about voice). BLIND, on the other hand, refers to something faint (German blinder Spiegel ‘tarnished mirror’), accidental (French fortune aveugle ‘blind fortune’), or false (German blinder Alarm ‘false alert’).

Overall, the visual concept of BLIND develops metaphors more productively than the auditory concept of DEAF, which seems to support the claim that visual perception has a linguistic primacy over the other perception types (Viberg 1983; San Roque et al. 2015).

Some of the shifts we have observed lose the transparent semantic connection to visual perception and sometimes undergo constructional changes, see blind as adverbial modifier in blind drunk or as intensifier with negative polarity items (a blind bit of notice/difference/attention/interest). These data contribute to studies of complex semantic shifts involving morpho-syntactic alternations, cf. Rakhilina et al. 2010; Reznikova et al. 2012.
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Quantificational interaction analysis is receiving increasing scholarly attention. Such methods have been applied to the problem of assessing engagement in communication, and both verbal and non-verbal communication are amenable to these approaches. However, in some contexts only textual communication records—transcripts—are available. One method represents transcripts as partially ordered sequences of speaker “turns” (where temporal information reveals overlap, then the turns are not totally ordered): actual dialogue is compared with a number of derived dialogues in which each of the derivatives has the turns of the original randomly re-