CSCanada
Cross-Cultural Communication
Vol. 19, No. 1, 2023, pp. 11-20
DOI:10.3968/12955

ISSN 1712-8358[Print]
ISSN 1923-6700[Online]
www.cscanada.net
www.cscanada.org

Dimensions of Construal Operations in Igbo

Chinenye Esther Onuoha[a],*

[a] Department of Linguistics, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.
*Corresponding author.

Received 7 June 2022; accepted 19 September 2022
Published online 26 December 2022

Abstract
Construals are cognitive operations which are often strikingly similar to principles of visual perception (Radden & Dirven 2007). They refer to the different ways of viewing a particular situation, and languages linguistically provide means for different kinds of construals. However, construal events differ across languages. Some languages may not have available means to express, represent and organize the different spatial relations, this leads to the inability of the speakers to freely choose the construal they want to portray as a result of lack of alternatives in their language of use. This paper aims at investigating the existence of construals in the Igbo langage. Owing to the fact that no investigation has been done on construal operations in Igbo language prior to this study, there is therefore no existing template for this research. The data for this work will however be drawn partly from examples in works on construals in addition to the researcher's intuitive knowledge as a speaker. The classifications of construals by Radden and Dirven (2007) shall be adopted as the theoretical framework in this pursuit. Part of the findings is that Igbo expresses these construals. Secondly, this finding goes to falsify Verhagen's (2007)'s. opinion that some languages may not be able to express all the construals.

Key words: Construal; Attention; Communication; Viewpoint; Cognitive operation

Onuoha, C. E. (2023). Dimensions of Construal Operations in Igbo. *Cross-Cultural Communication, 19*(1), 11-20. Available from: http//www.cscanada.net/index.php/ccc/article/view/12955
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/12955

1. INTRODUCTION
In language use, the same situation can be viewed linguistically in different ways. Our choice of words as language users, unconsciously frames our view or perspective of a particular scene. What a language user visually perceives in an event is solely dependent on what aspects of the experience he/she focuses his attention on. This is termed 'focal adjustment' by Langacker (1987), who argues that when one's focal adjustment is changed, a scene can be interpreted in different ways, providing a different construal of the same scene. Construal is central to the choices that speakers make about how a scene is linguistically 'packaged', and this in turn explains the availability of related yet distinct constructions.

"By choosing a particular focal adjustment and thus linguistically 'organising' a scene in a specific way, the speaker imposes a unique construal upon that scene. Construal can hence be thought of as the way a speaker chooses to 'package' and 'present' a conceptual representation, which in turn has consequences for the conceptual representation that the utterance evokes in the mind of the hearer". (Evans & Green, 2006:536).

Evan and Green also illustrate this with the following examples:

1) a. George ignited the love letters with a match.
   b. A match ignited the love letters.
   c. The love letters ignited.

Here, the examples reflect different construals of the same scene. In the first sentence, the act of igniting love letters involves an AGENT (George), a PATIENT (the love letters) and an INSTRUMENT(a match). Here, each component of this action chain is in focus; that is the whole event is in focus. If one were to speak of the event here in terms of the transfer of energy, the energy is transferred from the AGENT, George, via the INSTRUMENT, a match, to the PATIENT, the love letters. In (1b), on the other hand, only the INSTRUMENT, a match, and the PATIENT, the love letters, are explicitly

mentioned and as such are 'profiled'. Despite this, the AGENT is understood as part of the base (or background for understanding) of (1b), because we know that without an external agent to activate it, match sticks generally lack the inherent energy required for independent action. In (1c), only the PATIENT is profiled, but nevertheless the AGENT and the INSTRUMENT are understood as part of the base or background.

There are several classifications of construals by various scholars. Radden and Dirven (2007) point out nine (9) construals that are important in language. This work aims at examining the Igbo language to determine the extent to which it can express the nine construals. Thereafter, it will go a step further to either support or falsify the opinion of Verhagen (2007) that not all languages can adequately express these construals for lack of available options. The data for this work will however be drawn partly from examples in works on construals and partly derived from the intuitive knowledge of the researcher.

Finally, this paper goes into these issues as follows. The next section is the Literature review, which describes the construal operations, classifications of construal operations by different researchers. Section 3 explains the methodology adopted, while section 4 is the data presentation and analysis. Finally, section 5 summarizes and concludes the paper.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This section describes the concept of 'construal', types and classifications of construal operations, as well as works that have been done on construals in different languages.

2.1 Theoretical Studies

According to Verhagen (2007:48), "Construal is the cover term that is used for describing different ways of viewing a particular situation and it is a feature of the meaning of all linguistic expression." Langacker (1987: 487) defines the construal relationship as ''the relationship between a speaker (or hearer) and a situation that he conceptualizes and portrays, involving focal adjustments and imagery.'' He explains that construal relationship is incomplete without an individual on one hand and a situation on the other hand.

Construals are also described as cognitive operations that are most often likened to the principles of visual perception. For example, I may describe the contents of a bottle of whisky as being half full or half empty. In describing it as half full, I am looking at the drink that is (still) left in the bottle, and in describing it as half empty, I am thinking of the drink that is gone. The descriptions clearly differ with respect to the perspective adopted: from the perspective of a full bottle or from the perspective of an empty bottle. (Radden and Dirven 2007:22).

Construal is a cognitive operation and it is encoded and reflected through language (Hamawand, 2009, p.123), and it is based on language users visual perception (Radden and Dirven, 2007, p.22). Cruse (2006, p.33) also describes it as "a cognitive act of imposing some sort of structure on a body of conceptual content, such as profiling a portion of a domain, or viewing something from a particular perspective."

There are different classifications of construals by several scholars. These include Langacker (1987, 2007), Verhagen (2007), Talmy (2000) and Croft and Cruse (2004). These efforts are briefly summarized below.

Langacker (1987, p.117) proposes a threefold classification of construal operations which he refers to then as ''focal adjustments''. The classification is as follows:

a. Selection
b. Perspective
c. Abstraction

Selection has to do with the language users' capacity to selectively attend to some facets of a conceptualization while ignoring others. Perspective comprises linguistic manifestations of the position from which a situation is viewed, and is divided into four subtypes: (i) Figure/Ground alignment, (ii) Viewpoint, (iii) Deixis, and (iv) Subjectivity/Objectivity. Abstraction relates to our ability to establish commonalities between distinct phenomena and abstracting away from differences, and thus to organize concepts into categories. It pertains to the level of specifity at which a situation is portrayed.

This classification was later revised by Langacker in his later work (2007:421) as follows:

a. Specificity
b. Prominence
c. Perspective
d. Dynamicity

Just as in his previous classification, 'Specificity' corresponds to the Abstraction in the previous classification while 'Prominence' is a new category comprising of Figure/Ground phenomena and the phenomena formerly categorized under Selection. 'Perspective' has remained the same, except that of the subtype Figure/Ground has now been placed in the Prominence category, whereas 'Dynamicity' which is an additional category and concerns the development of a conceptualization through processing time (rather than through conceived time). (Verhagen 2007, p.53).

The next classification of construals was from Talmy (1988), who classifies the construals into four: a. Schematization b. Perspectivization c. Distribution of Attention d. Force Dynamics. However, Talmy (2000, p.40) later re-classified the construal phenomenas follow:

a. Configurational Structure
b. Perspective
c. Distribution of Attention

d. Force Dynamics

In analyzing these schematic systems, Talmy uses the schematic category 'domain' which includes the major dimensions of construal 'space' and 'time'. In addition, he also points out that a single specific construal operation from the schematic system may apply to several domains. For example, in the domain of space as well as that of time, concepts may be construed as discrete (i.e., as objects in space and acts in time) or as continuous (as masses in space and activities in time). This way of cross-combining construal operations is linguistically justified by the fact that in nominalization (which converts concepts from the domain of time to the domain of space) acts are construed as objects and activities as mass. Consider the sentence pairs below:

John called me – John gave me a call.

John helped me – John gave me some help. (Verhagen, 2007, p.54)

Croft and Cruse (2004, p.45) make a detailed classification of the different construal operations with the aim of demonstrating the close relationship between construal operations proposed by linguists and psychological processes proposed by cognitive psychologists and phenomenologists. They achieve this through forming three main classes of all the construal operations. The three classes are (1) Attention/Salience, (2) Judgement/Comparison, and (3) Constitution/Gestalt. These three broad categories are the general cognitive processes, while the sub-classes under each are the linguistic construal operations they relate to.

I. Attention/salience

A. Selection
   a. Profiling
   b. Metonymy

B. Scope (dominion)
   a. Scope of predication
   b. Search domains
   c. Accessibility

C. Scalar adjustment
   a. Quantitative (abstraction)
   b. Qualitative (schematization)

D. Dynamic
   a. Fictive motion
   b. Summary/sequential scanning

II. Judgement/comparison (including identity image schemas)

A. Categorization (framing)

B. Metaphor

C. Figure/ground

III. Perspective/situatedness

A. Viewpoint
   a. Vantage point
   b. Orientation

B. Deixis
   a. Spatiotemporal (including spatial image schemas)
   b. Epistemic (common ground)
   c. Empathy

C. Subjectivity/objectivity

IV. Constitution/Gestalt (including most other image schemas)

A. Structural schematization
   a. Individuation (boundedness, unity/multiplicity, etc.)
   b. Topological/geometric schematization (container, etc.)
   c. Scale

B. Force dynamics

C. Relationality (entity/interconnection)

Croft and Cruse's classification of construals overlaps with Langacker and Talmy's classification, even though Croft and Cruse's classification seem to be more comprehensive. However, the multiplicity of classes of construals is definitely possible to cause confusion. Radden and Dirven (2007) are able to collate and simplify them, and directly relate them to the grammar of a human language. This is the subject of the next section as the theoretical framework of this paper.

2.2 Theoretical Framework:

The theoretical framework for this work is Radden and Dirven (2007) which is a descriptive classification of construals.

The authors describe nine dimensions of construal namely: (i) viewing frame, (ii) generality vs specificity, (iii) viewpoint, (iv) objectivity vs subjectivity, (v) mental scanning, and (vi) fictive motion; (vii) windowing of attention, (viii) figure and ground, and (ix) profiling. These nine construals were grouped into two as a result of how they operate. The first six relate to viewing operations while, the latter three relate to prominence (cf. pg 22). Each of them is explained below, before applying them to the Igbo language later in section 4.

i. *Viewing Frame:* This involves taking a more distant or a closer position in viewing something in order to give a wider or more restricted viewing frame. Imagine the scene of a train travelling from Norwich to Peterborough. An observer looking at the scene from an aeroplane has a maximal viewing frame with the whole route in her view. However, when travelling on the train, the view from the window of our compartment only lets us see that part of the route which we are passing at any given moment, thereby having a restricted viewing frame. Example:

4a. This train *goes* from Norwich to Peterborough. (Maximal Vewing Frame)

b. This train is *going* from Norwich to Peterborough (Restricted Viewing Frame).

The use of the non-progressive in (4a) makes us see in our mind the whole route and schedule of the train in the British railway network (maximal view frame), while the use of the progressive aspect in (4b) only lets us see part of the scene (restricted view frame)

ii. *Generality vs Specificity*: This refers to the degree of precision with which a scene is viewed or conceived. In language, taxonomic hierarchies reflect different levels of generality and specificity. A speaker on one hand, construes a situation in a more general way when using higher-level categories. Meanwhile, on the other hand, a speaker uses lower-level categories to construe the situation in a more specific way. Example:

5a. Several *vehicles* collided on High Street last night.

b. Most of the *cars* drove way too fast.

c. A *Mitsubishi* struck another car.

d. The *Ferrari 612* was driven by a drunk driver

e. The *yellow VW Convertible* was sandwiched between two lorries.

In the example in (5), cars are referred to by means of the most general term *vehicle* in (5a), the basic-level term *car* in (5b), the more specific term *Mitsubishi* in (5c), the even more specific term *Ferrari 612* in (5d), and the still more specific term *VW Convertible* in (5e), in which the specification is achieved by using the adjective yellow. Each of these alternative ways of expression has its own contextual meaning. In a more general sense, lexical categories are used to make specific distinctions, while grammatical categories tend to express very general notions.

iii. *Viewpoint:* relates to viewing a scene from the point where the observer is positioned. In cognition, we may adopt another person's point of view. Example:

6a. Publisher: "Have we sent out the *new release*?"

b. Bookseller: "Have we displayed the *new arrivals?"*

In the above examples, the same newly published book is referred to as a new release from the publisher's point of view, and a new arrival from the book seller's point of view. The difference between the two expressions is in the different viewpoints adopted. When we use the term *new release,* we take the publisher's point of view, but when we use the term *new arrival,* we take the bookseller's point of view.

Different people may also give different versions of the same event. An illustration is seen in an argument in which two children give their own versions of the same event. Example:

7a. Bill: "Mum! Joe tripped me up with his foot."

b. Joe: "No I didn't, Mum! Bill just tripped over my foot.

The authors opine that some expressions (such as the motion verbs *come* and *go* as well as *bring* and *take*), inherently adopt the speaker's viewpoint and reflect movement towards or away from the speaker. If motion is directed towards the speaker, the speaker's viewpoint is described by using the verb *come.* If motion is directed away from the speaker, the verb *go is used.* Examples:

8a. My parents are *coming* to my graduation.

b. I am *going* to my sister's graduation.

Joint viewpoint occurs when the speaker takes their own and the hearer's viewpoint.

iv. *Objectivity vs Subjectivity***:** In objectivity, the speaker is detached from the scene, while in subjectivity, the construal of a scene involves the speaker. Example:

9a. *The President* is determined to fight a war on terrorism.

b. *I* will hunt down the terrorists.

Sentence (9a) might be said by the presidential spokesman who describes the President's policy in objective terms: the speaker is not part of the scene described. The same sentence might also be used by the President in speaking of himself in (9b) as the President by using the speaker pronoun *I.* Here, the speaker includes himself as a participant of the scene described.

v. *Mental Scanning*: This refers to the construal of a situation with respect to its unfolding in time. There are two modes of mental scanning: the sequential scanning and the summary scanning. When a situation is described by a tensed verb, it involves sequential scanning, but when a situation is not described by a tensed verb, it reflects summary scanning. These two modes of scanning are illustrated with the sentences below.

10. The couple next door have adopted a baby.

b. Another couple down the road want to adopt a baby, too.

c. Adopting a baby can be a joyful experience.

d. Older couples cannot apply for the adoption of a baby

Sentence (10a) represents the sequential scanning because the action is already completed while (10b) - (10d), reflect the timelessness of the of the noun *adoption.*

vi. Fictive Motion: is also known as abstract, mental, virtual or subjective motion. It is a special kind of mental scanning. It is the construal of a static scene in terms of motion. While in physical motion, the moving object continually changes its location in time; in fictive motion, a static object is construed as through/as if it in motion. Examples:

9a. The gate leads into the garden.

b. The cliff drops down 600 feet.

Like physical motion, fictive motion involves directionality. In sentence (9a) we mentally follow the gate as it moves into the garden, and in sentence (9b) the cliff which is a static object is imagined as dropping down to the sea.

vii. *Windowing of Attention*: This is the construal operation that involves our brain subconsciously selecting the stimuli for our attention, due to the inability/ impossibility of our brain to attend to all the stimuli around us. A good example is in a party where there are several conversations going on around you at the same time, yet you understand what the person you are talking to saying and might even hear your name spoken by another person who you were not listening to because you mentally filter out all the irrelevant bits of

the conversation. Focusing one's attention is a cognitive operation which "windows" our attention on selected elements of a scene and downplays other elements. A single scene may be described in different ways by windowing our attention on particular elements of the scene. In our linguistic construal of a scene, we can window our attention on selected elements. Whatever is explicitly mentioned in discourse shows that the speaker has given some attention to it. Radden and Dirven (2007:27) illustrate this windowing of attention using the commercial event involving: a buyer, a seller, goods, money, and the exchange of the goods and money.

10a. The cowboy bought a horse (from the sheriff) (for $500).
b. The sheriff sold (the cowboy) the horse (for $500).
c. The cowboy paid (the sheriff) $500 (for the horse).
d. The cowboy spent $500 (on the horse).
e. The sheriff charged (the cowboy) $500 (for the horse).
11a. The cowboy bought the horse for a good price.
b. The sheriff sold the horse for a good price.

The above sentences shows that the event is viewed from the perspective of the person who is expressed as the subject of the sentence. The main attention is towards the entity expressed by the subject. What a good price means depends on the subject participant. For the buyer in (11a) it means paying very little money, whereas for the seller in (11b) it means getting a lot of money. Therefore, we use sentence (10a), (11a) and (10d) if we want to draw attention to the buyer (the cowboy) and sentence (10b), (11b) and (10e) if we want to draw attention to the seller (the sherriff).

viii. *Figure and Ground*: This describes the elements of the scene that we give prominence and the elements that we downplay. The element we give prominence is the figure while the element we downplay is the ground. The figure is usually more conspicuous, more mobile, better delineated and smaller in size than the ground and as such, it attracts our particular attention and interest. The principle of figure/ground alignment also applies to language. Example:

12. The bird is on the treetop.

Here, the bird is the figure because it is the more mobile, conspicuous and smaller in size while the tree is the background.

Likewise, in language, when the two entities are of about equal size and prominence, we may switch between figure and ground. That is to say, we can speak of either the cinema near the supermarket or the supermarket near the cinema. Here either the supermarket or the cinema serves as the ground for locating the figure entity.

ix. *Profiling*:This is a special kind of figure/ground relation between an expression and its conceptual base. For example, when we speak of Sunday, we profile this particular day relative to the base 'week'. Likewise, 'elbow' profiles the 'joint' between the upper and lower arm and evokes the conception 'arm' as its base, and 'arm' profiles one of the two upper limbs and evokes the conception 'human body' as its base. We can test whether a conceptual unit is an immediate base or not by applying the test for kind of- or part of-relation. Thus, we may say a human body has two arms, an arm has an elbow and a hand, a hand has five fingers, fingers have nails, but not *a body has an elbow or *an arm has five fingers.

Table 1
Typologies of Construal Operations:

Langacker (2007)	Talmy (2000)	Croft and cruse (2004)	Radden and dirven (2007)
a.Specificity	a.Configurational Structure	a. Attention/ salience	a. Viewing Frame
b. Prominence	b. Perspective	b.Judgement/ comparison (including identity image schemas)	b. Generality and Specificity
c. Perspective	c. Distribution of Attention	c.Perspective/ situatedness	c. Viewpoint
d. Dynamicity	d.Force Dynamics	d. Constitution/ Gestalt (including most other image schemas)	d.Objectivity and Subjectivity
			e. Mental Scanning
			f. Fictive Motion
			g.Windowing of Attention
			h. Figure and Ground
			i.Profiling

2.3 Empirical Studies

In this section, we shall review some of the works that have been done on Construal Operations in different languages.

Uchechukwu (2007) discusses the Subject-Object Switching and the Igbo lexicon. The author opines that the alternation involved in the construal of a SOS sentence pair is in a way different from Langacker's alternate construals in which a change in viewpoint can also result to a 'view point alternation'. This difference lies in the fact that the SOS phenomenon does not involve the location of the viewer, rather, it involves the orientation of their construal. The alternation in an SOS sentence pair does not involve an external viewer but the conceptualization of the SOS event as a whole. Uchechukwu (2007) classifies two perspectives of the SOS phenomenon based on the orientation of their construals: the agent-oriented construal and the patient-oriented construal. The agent-

oriented construal involves the SOS constructions that are oriented towards the agent and gives more prominence to the qualities of the agent that executed/initiates an action. The patient-oriented construal on the other hand involves the SOS constructions that are oriented towards the patient, giving more attention to the qualities of the patient whom the action is happening to or affecting without the patient being able to make any contribution to the effect on him/her. The paper concludes that in a typical SOS construction, there must be the contrast of an agent-oriented experience with a patient-oriented experience because they have been proven to motivate the difference in the two citation forms of the Igbo verbal complex.

Uchechukwu and Egenti (2015) discuss construal-based classification of Igbo verbs. In their words, there is a particular perspective that is peculiar to Igbo experiential verbs, a predominantly patient-oriented perspective. It was also shown through the use of the cognitive grammar concept of construal how the SOS verbs/constructions actually code two different construals: an agent oriented construal and a patient-oriented construal. By further focusing on the patient-oriented construal within the different categories of the experiential verbs, the effort was made to highlight the fact that this particular construal is 'real'. It is an integral aspect of the Igbo language and need not be submerged under a syntactic orientation that is dominated by the citation forms and construal operations taken over from the English language (Uchechukwu and Egenti, 2015). They discuss the experiential verbs and its types which include; verbs of perception, cognition, sensation and reaction. Verbs were selected from the experiential verbs classification to form patient-oriented sentences. For instance, verb of perception ímētụ̄ which literally means 'to touch' which has literal concrete meaning that can be gleaned from the construction ímētụ̄ áká 'to touch hand'. Below is its patient-oriented construal:

a. Ó nwèrè kà ókwú ya sì métụ Uche mgbe ọ nụrụ yá.
it had that word his/her come.from touch Uche when he heard it
Stimulus Patient-Experiencer
'His words stirred Uche somehow when he heard them.'

b. *Ó nwèrè kà Uche sì métụ ókwú ya mgbe ọ nụrụ yá.

It is observed from the above sentence (a) the words affect Uche, the hearer/perceiver, who as a result is also the patient. Moreso, the construal of the sentence is therefore patient-oriented which when compared this with sentence (b) which is ungrammatical because it cannot be given an agent-oriented construal. It is observed that construal itself is seen as different ways of picturing/imagining/construing a conceived situation which could be in the form of mentally imposition prominence and structure on the object of conceptualization. It was also observed that the patient orientation of the Igbo verb cuts across all the different categories of experiential verbs identified by Uwalaka. They conclude by advocating for the recognition of this perspective (patient oriented) as an instrument for the study of aspects of the semantics of Igbo verbs in general.

3. METHODOLOGY

The present research is a qualitative study which aims at simply describing the construal operations in Igbo. This work will adopt the most recent classification of construals by Radden and Dirven (2007). Owing to the fact that no investigation has been done on construal operations in Igbo language prior to this study, there is therefore no existing template for this research. The data for this work will however be drawn partly from examples in works on construals in addition to the researcher's intuitive knowledge as a native speaker of the language in study.

4. DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS.

In this section, Igbo data representing the nine construals as proposed by Radden and Dirven (2007) will be presented and analyzed to ascertain if the Igbo language realizes the nine construal operations. Owing to the fact that no investigation has been done on construal operations in Igbo language prior to this study, there is therefore no existing template for this research. The data for this work will however be drawn partly from examples in works on construals. As already pointed out in the previous section, the work (Radden and Dirven 2007) from the literature will form the basis for the Igbo data on construals in this section.

i. Viewing Frame:

13. Úgbọàla *à* sì Ọ̀nị̀chà *gaa* Ọkā.
Vehicle DET from Onitsha go Awka
'This vehicle went from Onitsha to Awka'.

14. Úgbọàla *à* sì Ọ̀nị̀chà *na-àga* Ọkā.
Vehicle DET from Onitsha AUX-go Awka
'This vehicle is going from Onitsha to Awka'.

Sentence (13) reflects the maximal viewing frame where the observer has the whole route in view. This is observed in the use of the non-progressive gaa which makes us to see the whole route in our mind. Sentence (14) on the other hand reflects the restricted viewing frame where the observer only sees part of the route. This is realized through the use of the progressive verb *na-àga*.

ii. Generality vs Specificity:

15. *Azụ̀* ahụ̀ mèrè ofe ahụ̀ kà ọ dị ụ̄tọ̄

Fish DET do-RV soup DET COMP pro be sweet
'That fish made that soup delicious'.

16. *Okpòrokō* ahụ̀ mèrè ofe ahụ̀ kà ọ dị ụ̄tọ̄
Stockfish DET do-RV soup DET COMP pro be sweet
'That stockfish made that soup delicious'.

17. *Ntị̀ okpòrokō* ahụ̀ mèrè ofe a h ụ̀ k à ọ dị ụ̄tọ̄
Ear stockfish DET do-RV soup DET COMP pro be sweet
'That ear of stockfish made that soup delicious'.

Generality and specificity is used to distinguish between the higher-level categories and the lower-level categories. While the higher level category is more abstract and more general, the lower level category is more specific. That is why *Azụ̀* is a higher level category (a broader term) to *Okpòrokō* in (16), which in turn is a higher level category to *Ntị̀ okpòrokō* in (17). The last item *Ntị̀ okpòrokō* is descriptively more specific and more concrete than the other items in sentences (15) and (16). It can also apply to animals and plants thus;

18. *Nnụ̀nụ̀* fègòrò n'elu ụlọ̀ ha
Bird fly-up-rV AUX-above house DET
'A bird flew above their house.'

19. Ùdèlè fègòrò n'elu ụlọ̀ ha
vulture fly-up-rV AUX-above house DET
'A vulture flew above their house'.

Nnụ̀nụ̀ in (18) is a broader term than Ùdèlè in (19) which is more specific of the type of bird being referred to.

20. *Ukwù osisi* rìrì nnē n'òkìrìkiri à
Root tree eat much AUX surrounding DET
'There are so many trees in this environment.'

21. *Ukwū* ūbē kwụ̀ nà be nnà m
Root pear stand PRE house father DET
'A pear tree is standing in my father's house.

Ukwù osisi in (20) refers to trees in general while *ukwù* ūbē in (21) refers to a particular kind of tree (the pear tree).

22. Ihe nā-ārị̄ ārị̄ bàtàrà n' ụlọ̄ Okey
Thing AUX-climb come-RV PRE house Okey
'A creeping thing entered Okey's house.'

23. Agwọ bàtàrà n' ụlọ̄ Okey
Snake come-RV PRE house Okey
'A snake entered Okey's house.'

Ihe nā-ārị̄ ārị̄ in (22) represents a higher level category to *agwọ* in (23).

iii. Viewpoint:

24. Ị̀ ṅụọla mmanya ọhụrụ̄ ànyi *mēpùtàrà?*
Pro drink-RV drink new Pro do-out-RV
'Have you tasted the new drink we produced?'

25. Ị̀ ṅụọla mmanya ọhụrụ̄ ànyi *būbàtàrà?*
Pro drink-RV drink new Pro carry-in-RV
'Have you tasted the new drink we imported?'

The same drink referred to as a new product as illustrated by *mēpùtàrà* 'to produce' in (24) by the producer is also referred to as a recent good (*būbàtàrà 'to import'*) by the sellers in (25) signifying different viewpoints.

26. Èmeka *tìnyèèrè m ụkwụ wèe* kwatùo mī
Emeka put-RV pro leg CONJ push-down pro
'Emeka trapped me down with his leg.'

27. Ònyìnye *zọ̀rọ̀* m ukwu wèe dàa
Onyinye match-RV pro leg CONJ fall
'Onyinye stepped on me and fell.'

In (26) and (27), the participants of the same event give different versions of the event. In (26), Onyinye's view is that Emeka willfully instigated the fall of the patient 'Onyinye', while in (27), Emeka's view is that Onyinye inflicted pain on him and fell as a result of her action.

28. Obìnnà jì ọnyà *mata* ǹchì ahụ̀
Obinna hold trap throw-catch grasscutter DET
'Obinna caught the grasscutter with a trap.'

29. Ǹchì ahù *dànyèrè* n'ọnyā Obìnnà.
Grasscutter DET fall-in-RV PRE trap Obinna
'The grasscutter fell into Obinna's trap.'

This represents different views of the same event. While in (28), the viewpoint is from Obinna's active participation while in (29), the animal (danye) fell into the trap as though by mistake.

30. Anà- m̀ àga Enugū
VP-Pog 1P VP-FUT Enugu
'I am going to Enugu.'

31. Anà- m̀ àbịa àgbàmàakwụkwọ gī̀
VP-Prog 1P come wedding you
'I am coming to your wedding'.

In (30), the speaker takes his (speaker's) viewpoint while in (31), the speaker takes the hearer's viewpoint because if motion is towards the speaker, the verb *bịa* 'come' is used while the verb *ga* 'go' is used when motion is directed away from the speaker. So, in (31), the speaker uses the verb *bia* 'come' as though the movement is towards himself. Another aspect of viewpoint is termed

the joint viewpoint, whereby the speaker takes his own viewpoint and the hearer's viewpoint at the same time. Sentences (32-34) below illustrate joint viewpoint;

32. Ùgbu à kà ànyị gaa rie nrī
Now DET COMP pro go eat food
'Now, let's go and eat.'

This construes a scene where the speaker takes his viewpoint and that of the hearer. For example, it could reflect the scene of a mother trying to convince her child to eat. The plural personal pronoun *anyi 'we'* presents the whole event/activity as something jointly being executed by all the people present.

33. Ogè ànyi gà-àgba ọgwụ̀ èruola
Time pro AUX-dance medicine to-reach
'It's time for us to have our injection'.

34. Ànyị anāghị̄ ème mkpọtụ ebe à
Pro NEG do noise here DET
'We don't make noise here.'

iv. Objectivity vs Subjectivity:

35. *Onye isi mahādùm̀* dì njìkere imēgīdē ndi òtu nīzūzō n'ụlọ̀ akwụkwọ à
Who head university is ready to-deal badly DET group secret PRE house school DET
'The Vice Chancellor is ready to fight cultists in this institution.'

36. *Agà m̀* àchụ ndi òtu nīzūzō niīlē
Pro-AUX Pro pursue DET group secret all
'I will expel all cultists.'

37. *Ndi ọ̀kà mmụ̀ta* nwèrè nzụ̀kọ n'ehìhiè
DET higher learners give-RV meeting PRE afternoon
'Professors have meeting at noon.'

38. Ànyi nwèrè nzùko dị̄ mkpà taà
Pro have-RV meeting is important today
'We have an important meeting today.'

Sentences (35) and (37) construe a scene in which the speaker is not involved through the use of the nouns *Onye isi mahādùm̀* (the Vice Chancellor) and *Ndi ọ̀kà mmụ̀ta* (the Professors) are not part of the scenes described (it is objective). It might have been a reported speech by the Registrar or the SUG president of the University. However, in (36 and 38),the use of the personal pronouns '*A ga m' and '*Ànyi*'* the Vice Chancellor and the professor respectively include themselves as participants of the scenes described (subjective).

v. Mental Scanning:

39. Di nà nwunyē bī n'àgbàtàobì m *ekùtela* nwā.
Husband CONJ wife live PRE neighbouring Pro carry-PST child
'The couple that lives in our street has adopted a child.'

40. Enwèrè di nà nwunyē chọ̄rọ̄ *ikùtè* nwa
Have-PST husband and wife want-PST to-carry child
'There is a couple that wants to adopt a child.'

41. *Ikùtè* nwa bụ̀ ihe oke ọṅụ̀
To-carry child is something great joy
'Adopting a child is a thing of great joy.'

Sentence (39) illustrates sequential scanning because it involves a tensed verb *ekùtela 'has adopted'* which indicates an already completed event. The use of *ikùtè* 'to adopt' in sentences (40 & 41) illustrate summary scanning.

vi. Fictive Motion:

42. Ụzọ̄ à *gàbàrà* be onye isī ānyị̄
Road DET go-to-RV house who head Pro
'This road leads to our Head's house.'

43. Ugwu ahụ̀ *gafèrè* Isiagụ̄
Mountain DET pass rv-PST Isiagu
'That mountain passed across Isiagu'.

44. Osisi *gbàrà* ụlọ̄ ānyị̄ *gbùrùgburù*
Tree run-RV house Pro round
'Trees surround our house.'

In fictive motion, a static scene is described with verbs of motion, as if the static scene/object itself were in motion. In (42), one construes the road as if it is moving to the head's house. In (43), the mountain moves in our mind past Isiagū. In (44),the use of *gbàrà gbùrùgburù* 'surround', one construes the trees as they move and surround the house.

vii. Windowing of Attention:

45. *Chiàmaka* dàrà ada
Chiamaka fall-RV fall
'Chiamaka fell down.'

46. *Afere* niīlē àkụwasiala
Plate all hit-break-COMP-RV
'All the plates have broken'.

47. *Nri* ahụ̀ àwufùola
Food DET pour-RV
'The food has poured away.'

Sentences (45 – 47) represent a single scene where a person (Chiàmaka) carrying plates of food slipped and fell. This particular scene has been described in different ways by windowing our attention to particular parts of the scene. In windowing of attention, the main attention is usually directed towards the entity expressed by the subject. (45) windows 'Chiamaka', the person that fell down, (46) windows *afere* 'the plates' she was carrying, while (47) windows *nri* 'the food' in the plates she was carrying.

viii. Figure and Ground:

48. *Akwụkwọ* dị̀ n'elu *ochē*
Book is PRE up chair
'The book is on the chair.'

49. Ènwè nọ̀ n'elu *osisi* òròma.
Monkey is PRE up tree orange
'A monkey is on the orange tree.'

50. *Ụlọ̀ ọgwụ̀* ahụ̀ nọdèbèrè *ụlọ̀ ụkà*
House medicine DET is-stay-RV house church
'The hospital is near the church.'

Sentences (48) & (49) illustrate figure/ground alignment where the figure tends to be more mobile, conspicuous and smaller in size. In (48), *Akwụkwọ* 'book' is the figure while *ochē* 'chair' is the ground. In (49), Ènwè 'monkey' is the figure while *osisi* òròma 'orange tree' is the ground. Sentence (50) illustrates the figure/ground alignment where both entities are about equal size and prominence. Here, either *Ụlọ̀ ọgwụ̀* 'hospital' or *ụlọ̀ ụkà* 'church' can serve as the figure/ground.

In commercial transaction scene, the human participant, i.e. the buyer or seller always function as the figure. Example:

51. *Nne* m̄ zùtàrà àkwa àbụ̀ọ
Mother Pro buy-RV egg two
'My mother bought two eggs.'

52. Àdaōbī rèchàrà akpụ yā.
Adaobi sell-COMP-RV cassava Pro
'Adaobi sold up her cassava.'

In sentences (51) and (52), *Nne* m̄ and Àdaōbī (the buyer and seller respectively) serve as the figure. When there are no human participants in the scene, the goods serve as the figure, while the money (cost) serves as the ground. Example;

53. *Akwụkwọ* ahụ̀ bụ̀ puku nàịrà àtọ
Book DET is thousand naira three
'The book costs three thousand naira.'

54. *Ụdarà* ahụ̀ dàrà nàrị̀ àbụ̀ọ
Ụdara DET fall-RV hundred two
'That ụdara costs two hundred naira.'

Here, the goods *Akwụkwọ* and *Ụdarà* serve as the figures, whereas the money *puku nàịrà* àtọ and ǹarị̀ àbụ̀ọ are the grounds.

iv. Profiling:

55. *Izù ụkà* àtọ àgaala n'ọnwa à.
Week church three pass-RV PRE month DET
'Three weeks have passed in this month.'

56. Ọgụ̀ gbùjìrì ya *mḿkpịsị* akā ātọ̄
Hoe kill-with-RV Pro finger hand three
'The hoe cut his three fingers.'

57. *Ụbọ̀chị̀ ụkà* kà ọ gà-àbịa
Day church COMP Pro AUX-come
'On Sunday, he will come'
'He will come on Sunday.'

In sentence (55), *Izù ụkà* is profiled and the month (ọnwa) is the base. In (56), *mḿkpịsị* is profiled and the base is (aka) hand. In (57), *Ụbọ̀chị̀ ụkà* is profiled and Izù ụkà is the base.

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This work aims at describing construal operations in Igbo as classified by Radden and Dirven (2007) in a bid to determine whether Igbo expresses these construals as classified by the authors. Part of the findings of this work is that Igbo language has several ways of encoding the different viewpoints (construals). Some of these ways are similar to what is applicable in English, while a few of them differ. Secondly, the work identifies that the predominant categories that trigger construals in Igbo are the verbs and the nouns. Thirdly, the finding that Igbo expresses construals goes to falsify Verhagen (2007)'s claim of some languages not being able to express construal due to unavailability of alternatives.

REFERENCES

Abdulla, I. A., & Lutfi, A. F. (2018). *A cognitive semantic analysis of construal operations in Donne's "Go, and Catch a Falling Star"* (pp.280-296). https://doi.org/10.21271/zjhs.22.6.19

Croft, W., & Cruse, D. A. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cruse, A. (2006). *A glossary of semantics and pragmatics*. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.

Dagmar D., Milin, P., & Medimorec, S. (2020). Construal in language: A visual-world approach to the effects of linguistic alternations on event perception and conception. *Cognitive Linguistics, 31*(1), 37-72. De Gruyter. Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/cog-2018-0103.

Evans, V. (2019). *Cognitive linguistics. A complete guide* (2nd

ed.). Edinburgh. Edinburgh University Press.

Evans, V., & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive linguistics: An introduction*. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.

Hamawand, Z. (2009). *The semantics of English negative prefixes*. London: Equinox.

Hart, C. (2014). Construal operations in online press reports of political protests. In C. Hart and P. Cap (Eds.), *Contemporary critical discourse studies* (pp.167-188). London: Bloomsbury.

Jensen, K. E. (2011). Construal operations of the English progressive construction. *International Journal of Cognitive Linguistics, 1*(2). 117-141.

Jin, Y. (2021). The role of construal on the diachronic development of locative term: The case of Shang 'Above' in Chinese. *Scholars International Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, pp.189-203). DOI: 10.36348/sijll.2021. v04i07.001

Langacker, R. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Volume 1: Theoretical prerequisites*. Standford University Press.

Langacker, R. (1999b). Grammar and Conceptualization. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Langacker, R. (2007). Cognitive grammar. In the *Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. New York. Oxford University Press.

Langacker, R. (2008). *Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marian, V., & Margarita, K. (2004). Self-construal and emotion in bicultural bilinguals. *Journal of Memory and Language, 51*, 190-201.

Osuagwu, E., & Anyanwu, O. (2020). Aspects of syntactic focus constructions in Igbo. *California Linguistic Notes, 42*(1).

Paradis, C. (2005). Ontologies and construals in lexical semantics. *Axiomathes, 15*, 541-573.

Radden, G., & Dirven, R. (2007). *Cognitive English grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Talmy, L. (2000a). Concept Structuring Systems. In *Toward a cognitive semantics* (Vol. I). Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Talmy, L. (2000b). Typology and process in concept structuring. In *Toward a cognitive semantics* (Vol. II). Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Uchechukwu, C., & Egenti, M. C. (2015). Construal-based classification of igbo verbs. *Igbo Language Studies, 1,* 105-118.

Ungere, F. & Schmid, H. (2006*). An introduction to cognitive linguistics* (2nd ed.). United Kingdom. Edinburgh gate. Pearson Education Limited.

Verhagen A (2007). *Construal and Perspectivization*. In the Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics. NewYork, Oxford University Press.

Verhagen, A. (2007). Construal and perspectivization. In D. Geeraerts & H. Cuyckens (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of cognitive linguistics* (pp. 41-81). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wen, X., & Liu, J. (2017). *A cognitive construal to the interpretation of verbal irony in Chinese*. Southwest University, China; Guizhou Normal University, China.