Semiotic Categorization of Fantastic Subject in Child Story: Based on Conceptual Blend Theory

Amir Hossein Zanjanbar[1]
Gholamhossein Karimi Doostan[2]

Abstract

With the replacement of the conceptual blended network model instead of the two-headed model of conceptual metaphor, Fauconnier and Turner (1994) argue that, in addition to explaining the metaphorical aspects of immediate understanding, this model is capable of explaining non- metaphorical aspects. The network pattern, besides the two domains of the input and mapping, also includes the public space and fusing space. The mixed space emanates from the mental mixing of two or more input spaces. Given that the blended space is fantastic, the choice of the theory of fusion approach is appropriate for imaginary characters in fantasy subject. On the other hand, according to Pierce's (1931,1958) classification, the sign is of three kinds: symbolic, iconic, and index. Based on this division, the research is ahead in the categorization of fancy story subjects. In this regard, this research aims to answer four questions about the fantasy stories of the children: what is the difference between the subject of intermingling and coincidence? What is the difference between the definitions in the inter-semiotic and in-semiotic? According to Pierce's semiotic categories, what classes do in-semiotic intercourse subjects ranked? What are the mechanisms of the inputs of mixed space for subject creation, while meaning creation? This research uses semiotics for the first time, to study of mixed spaces as well as to classify fancy story subjects. The frequent use of imaginary characters in the child stories, and the lack of interdisciplinary research in this field, reveals the need for research in order to eliminate gaps.

In this study, "Subject" refers to an actor or actionable character that, as the protagonist or one of the main characters, plays a role in advancing the plot. This study classifies mixed subjects from three perspectives, including time sequence, metaphor, and semiotics.

In terms of time sequence, it is of two types: In time (chronic) mixed subjects, the central element of intro domains are the time sequence relation to

---

[1] M.A Student Computational linguistics, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran (corresponding author); rahimi.zanjanbar@ut.ac.ir
[2] PhD in Linguistic, Professor in Department of Linguistic, Faculty Member of Tehran University, Tehran, Iran; gh5karimi@ut.ac.ir

each other, like a subject that has undergone a transformation. In the story of 'Ugly Duckling' (Andersent,1999), the semantic center of the first intro is an ugly duckling, and the semantic center of the second intro is a graceful swan. The second intro space (the mental space associated with the swan) is formed in the time sequence of the first intro space (the mental space associated with the duckling).In case of Synchronous subject matter, the central element of the two intro domains is that they have no time sequence in relation to each other. In " Chimney-Head Mom " (Mazarei, 2013), the image drawn in the book from the subject of the story, consists of a combination of two intro spaces, one in which the semantic center is "mother", and in the other, the semantic center is "*Chimney*". These two semantic centers are two completely independent conceptual categories, which have been combined since the beginning of the story, and have no relation of time sequence to each other.

In terms of metaphor, two types were discovered. One is *metaphor-based mixed subject* in which two spaces or intro domains can be based on two domains of origin and destination, from a conceptual metaphor. In Chimney Head Mom (Mazarei,2013), the subject is based on the conceptual metaphor of "the highest degree of anger (intro first), the highest degree of fire (intro second)," (Kuchsh,2014, p:197). Because in the mixed space, every time Mom gets angry, Her Chimney head smokes, and the plot is based on this "smoking in anger" feature. The other is *metaphor-independent mixed subject*. In *Lonely Black Line* (Honarkar,2015), the subject image of a line is shown, the lower half of which is a set of black lines, and the upper half of which is the body of a boy. That is, the subject is the product of a fusion space, whose intro, in the role of origin and destination, is by no means a conceptual metaphor.

In terms of semiotics, it is of two types, including *intrastitial mixed subject* and *interstitial mixed subject*. In the former, two independent signifiers, as two intro spaces, can be combined, and from the combination of these two intros, an independent sign emerges, which is a mixed subject. These two independent signs can belong to one sign system, or to two different sign systems (for example, one belongs to the verbal sign system and the other to the non-verbal system). In *interstitial mixed subject*, on the other hand, by combining both aspects of the three aspects of "representation, interpretation, subject," as intro spaces, a mixed space is obtained, called the intertextual interconnected space.

The main goal of the research is to mark the classification of semiotics of intra-symbolic fusion. This research shows that the intra-symbolic mixed subject is of three types: symbolic, iconic, and indexed. In all three cases, at first, the semantic center of one of the intros is "representation", and the semantic center of the other intro is "interpretation." Second, "representation" and "interpretation" in the subjects of *symbolic fusion,* " iconic fusion," and *indexed fusion* are, respectively, aspects of the *symbolic*, *iconic* or *index* sign. The position of the object is determined in becoming iconic or symbolic or indexing the sign not in blending. For example, in iconic blending, the object does not have a direct role, because in any of the data, it does not enter directly but indirectly. This happens as it embodies *interpretation*; it plays a role through the presence of *interpretation* within the data of the mixed space intro.