

Cognitive Modelling
in Language
and Discourse
across Cultures

Cognitive Modelling in Language and Discourse across Cultures

Edited by

Annalisa Baicchi and Erica Pinelli

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Cognitive Modelling in Language and Discourse across Cultures

Edited by Annalisa Baicchi and Erica Pinelli

This book first published 2017

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2017 by Annalisa Baicchi, Erica Pinelli and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-9127-4

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-9127-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

By Way of Introduction.....	1
Exploring the cognitive motivation of figurativity <i>Erica Pinelli and Annalisa Baicchi</i>	
Part One. Figurativity in the Language System	
Chapter One.....	13
Figurative Language in Old Saxon: The Case of Possessive Compounds <i>Caterina Saracco</i>	
Chapter Two.....	27
“ <i>Liyo akoma liyo</i> ”: The Periphrastic Diminutive in Modern Greek <i>Evgenia Vassilaki</i>	
Chapter Three.....	43
Figurative Thought and Word Formation <i>Martha Lampropoulou</i>	
Chapter Four.....	63
Shell Nouns as Discourse Deixis and Metonymic Markers: Syntax-semantics Interface <i>Issa Kanté</i>	
Chapter Five.....	79
Illocutionary Constructions and Conceptual Metonymies <i>Annalisa Baicchi</i>	
Chapter Six.....	91
From Literal to Figurative Language: The Case of <i>Big</i> <i>Giota Syrpa</i>	
Chapter Seven.....	105
Metaphors and Relevance Theory: The Case of Sicilian <i>Maria Cristina Lo Baido</i>	

Chapter Eight.....	119
Understanding Metaphor in a Second Language: Factors Affecting the Inferential Processes <i>Maria Antoniou</i>	
Part Two. Figurativity in Discourse	
Chapter Nine.....	137
The Family of English Contrast Constructions at Discourse Level <i>Aneider Iza Erviti</i>	
Chapter Ten.....	153
Can a Tigress Change her Stripes? On the Comprehension of Metaphor-based Phraseological Calques <i>Ivana Marinić and Goran Schmidt</i>	
Chapter Eleven.....	171
Translation of Metaphorical Terms in the Field of Economics from English into Croatian <i>Goran Milić and Dubravka Vidaković Erdeljić</i>	
Chapter Twelve.....	187
Prison Discourse: Few Words, a Lot of Content. The Case of Polish and American Prisons <i>Alicja Dziedzic-Rawska</i>	
Chapter Thirteen.....	199
Conceptual Metaphors Used in Arguments in Turkish and English Scientific Texts <i>Elif Arica-Akkök and Gülsün Leyla Uzun</i>	
Chapter Fourteen.....	217
The Experiential Future: Socio-cognition and Multisensory Marketing in Matera European Capital of Culture 2019 <i>Paul Sambre</i>	
Chapter Fifteen.....	233
Metaphor and Conceptualisation of Migration in the German and Italian Press <i>Fabio Mollica and Beatrice Wilke</i>	

Chapter Sixteen Metaphor and Framing in Political Speeches: Framing Effects of Conceptual Metaphor on Recognition and Recall <i>Luuk Lagerwerf and Lina Yu</i>	249
Chapter Seventeen Is a Picture Really Worth a Thousand Political Words? Political Internet Memes and Conceptual Blending <i>Sanja Berberović and Nihada Delibegović Džanić</i>	265
Part Three. Figurativity and Emotions	
Chapter Eighteen The Conceptualisation of Fear in Italian and Russian: Different Degrees of Lexicalisation of Metonymies <i>Erica Pinelli</i>	283
Chapter Nineteen Conceptualisation of the Emotion Terms: Structuring, Categorisation, Metonymic and Metaphoric Processes within Multi-layered Graph Representation of the Syntactic and Semantic Analysis of Corpus Data <i>Benedikt Perak</i>	299
Chapter Twenty Shapes of Emotion: Exploring Primary Metaphors by Means of Word Associations <i>Misuzu Shimotori</i>	319
Chapter Twenty-One A Context-based View of Emotion Concepts: The Case of <i>Gheirat</i> in Iranian Culture <i>Mohsen Bakhtiar</i>	333
Chapter Twenty-Two The Emotion of Love in George Seferis' Poetry: A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis of One of His Poems <i>Alexandra Christakidou</i>	349

Part Four. Figurativity and Multimodality

Chapter Twenty-Three.....	367
Conceptual Metaphors and Metaphorical Expressions in Images <i>Marianna Bolognesi</i>	
Chapter Twenty-Four	383
Facing Methodological Challenges in Multimodal Metaphor Research <i>Paula Pérez-Sobrino and Jeannette Littlemore</i>	
Contributors.....	401

BY WAY OF INTRODUCTION

EXPLORING THE COGNITIVE
MOTIVATION OF FIGURATIVITY

ERICA PINELLI AND ANNALISA BAICCHI

Over the last thirty years, scholars from different scientific fields and theoretical persuasions have agreed upon the belief that human experience is conceptualised in figurative ways and verbalised through figurative discourse. The label of “figurativity” hence encompasses the two sides of a same coin, i.e. thought and language. Since the late 1970s empirical research has demonstrated that figurative thought is ubiquitous in language: for instance, speakers engaged in conversation utter six metaphors per minute of discourse (Pollio et al 1977), and figurative language is largely employed in prose dealing with many different human topics related to the psychological nature of human beings (Smith et al 1981) and also in political debates, news programmes or humorous texts (Graesser et al 1989). Most concepts are understood figuratively, which is tantamount to saying that cognition makes use of knowledge-structuring tools that are systematically employed in the construction of meaning both mentally and linguistically. Indeed, cognition encompasses an array of faculties such as perception, language, action, which are no longer conceived of as autonomous modules, but rather as functional specifications that interact in a common unitary configuration (Violi 2003). Nonetheless, cognition, being composed of many functional specifications, is nowadays investigated in the cognitively-oriented paradigm of research from many strands belonging to phenomenology and cognitive psychology as well as to language areas such as morpho-syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and discourse studies (Dirven 2005).

Cognitive modelling, the keyword in the title of this volume, hints at the Lakovian Idealised Cognitive Models (ICMs hereafter; Lakoff 1987), that is, the cognitive tools for experience understanding. ICMs make up a set of principle-governed cognitive structures comprising four main types: (1) *propositional* (frames of predicate-argument relations à la Fillmore

1977), (2) *image-schematic* (abstract topological representations interwoven with kinaesthetic experiences), (3) *metonymic* (intra-domain mappings, i.e. mappings within a single conceptual domain), and (4) *metaphorical* (inter-domain mappings, i.e. mappings across two conceptual domains).

The chapters in this volume tackle core issues in figurative language and figurative thought, and explore areas of convergence between ICMs (metaphor and metonymy, in particular) and language (morphology, syntax, lexis, textuality, and discourse), also placing the emphasis on the nature of potential developments in future research. Cognitive Linguistics has recently developed an interdisciplinary nature as its central concern and constructed robust bridges across many fields such as pragmatics, sociolinguistics, discourse studies, multimodality, psycholinguistics, and poetics, to name just a few. In a complementary fashion, the volume examines to what extent interdisciplinary issues have a bearing upon the internal paradigm of Cognitive Linguistics, thus giving shape to the major strands that have so far developed (e.g., cognitive semantics, cognitive morphology, cognitive construction grammar, cognitive translation studies, applied cognitive linguistics). The topics dealt with in the chapters testify of the great tolerance of Cognitive Linguistics towards internal variety within itself by yielding cognitive unity between convergent linguistic disciplines, and towards external interaction with major linguistic sub-disciplines, thus providing the readers with an overview of the connections between cognition and a range of social, pragmatic, and discourse-oriented dimensions of language. Overall, they contribute to raising productive debate inside and outside the Cognitive Linguistics community.

With the focus placed on fourteen languages belonging to different typological families (Croatian, English, German, Greek, Italian, Japanese, Old Saxon, Persian, Polish, Russian, Sicilian, Spanish, Swedish, and Turkish), the volume is structured in four topical sections, with each section covering several routes of research. The first section is devoted to specific aspects of figurativity in the language system: Old Saxon possessive compounds, diminutives in Greek, the meaning of English morphological suffixes, head nouns as markers of modality, illocutionary constructions, adjectival modification, and lexical pragmatics. Section 2 focuses on discourse studies and deals with English contrastive constructions, phraseology, cognitive translation studies, prison slang, specialised texts in economics, politics, and migration studies. Section 3 is devoted to a core issue in Cognitive Linguistics as it tackles the language of emotions and foregrounds the role of metaphor and metonymy in the

expression of emotive meanings across a number of different lingua-cultures. Section 4 represents the most recent wave of studies on figurativity in multimodal texts and explores how metonymies, metaphors and image schemas manifest themselves beyond and independently of language.

Part 1: Figurativity in the Language System

The first part of the volume is devoted to discuss figurativity in the language system. In her chapter on FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE IN OLD SAXON: THE CASE OF POSSESSIVE COMPOUNDS, **Caterina Saracco** deals with the possessive adjectival compounds, which are very frequent in Old Saxon. She explores this kind of exocentric compounds exploiting conceptual metaphor and metonymy, blending theory, and the reference-point construction. She is able to clearly show that exocentric possessive compounds are not semantically opaque, i.e. non-compositional phenomena, but they are easily analysable by applying the conceptual metaphor and metonymy theories. Since metaphors and metonymies represent constructional operations that we employ to conceptualise, categorise and, hence, understand the world, it is no surprise that figurative language was routinely used also in Old Saxon in the 9th century to express both emotions and mental life as well as to describe the salient characteristics of certain individuals.

In LIFO AKOMA LIFO: THE PERIPHRASTIC DIMINUTIVE IN MODERN GREEK, **Evgenia Vassilaki** investigates the use of diminutives as hedges in directive constructions in Greek and explores the conceptual motivation behind the pragmatic use of *liyo* primarily in these constructions. In particular, the Greek adverbial form *liyo* (a little) seems to have lost its literal force and undergone a process of grammaticalisation as a verbal diminutiviser playing the function of a metalinguistic hedge. Language specific metaphorical conceptualisations of time as quantity motivate a first step in this change, where *liyo* is assigned a temporal sense when used as a verb quantifier. Sociocultural norms may motivate a second step in this path of semantic change: when *liyo* is employed in directive constructions, its salient interpretation is that of a hedging device which modifies the optionality of the directive.

In the chapter FIGURATIVE THOUGHT AND WORD FORMATION, **Martha Lampropoulou** examines the way in which metonymy and metaphor motivate word formation, namely of derivatives ending in *-ify*, *-ize*, *-dom*, *-hood* and *-ship*, and whether there are cross-cultural differences when speakers employ these two ICMs. In particular, the aim is to observe the

tendency of groups of Czech, German, and Greek learners of English to indicate a preferred meaning when being presented with a new item. The results show that all participants find all meanings acceptable to a greater or lesser degree, but the tendency is common in all of them as they pinpoint the same meaning as the most prevalent one.

Issa Kanté in *SHELL NOUNS AS DISCOURSE DEIXIS AND METONYMIC MARKERS: SYNTAX-SEMANTICS INTERFACE* analyses the nouns *fact*, *analysis* and *philosophy* governing *that*-complement clauses in a sub-corpus of academic American English. These head nouns form a closed lexical class undergoing strong syntactic-semantic constraints, which can be used as multifunctional discursive markers, for example as modal, endophoric or metonymic devices. The author convincingly shows that shell nouns are employed as discourse deixis to endophorically refer to a proposition and that they can also combine with cognition-utterance verbs to express metonymy within *that*-complement clauses.

In the chapter *ILLOCUTIONARY CONSTRUCTIONS AND CONCEPTUAL METONYMIES*, **Annalisa Baicchi** explains how constructionist approaches to language are suitable to depict the interplay between indirect illocutions and Idealised Cognitive Models, in particular conceptual metonymy. Through data retrieved from the British National Corpus, the author explains how felicitous speech acts must meet the requirements of three main interacting systems: the cognitive system, i.e., the mental operations used by the speakers to produce the pragmatic meaning and by the hearers to grasp the intended meaning; the set of constructional procedures in the linguistic system; and the cultural system, with its socio-cultural conventions shared in the speech community.

The main purpose of **Giota Syrpa**'s contribution, *FROM LITERAL TO FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE: THE CASE OF BIG*, is an exploration of the literalness-figurativeness continuum. Through the analysis of the dimensional adjective *big*, which can be used both literally and figuratively, the author investigates different degrees of metaphoricity and metonymicity. More specifically, Syrpa accurately investigates the adjectival modification based on the application of the cognitive mechanisms of active zone, domain highlighting, metonymy and metaphor, and discusses the different degrees of figuration related to the interpretation of the predicating modifier construction *big+N*.

Maria Cristina Lo Baido discusses *METAPHORS AND RELEVANCE THEORY: THE CASE OF SICILIAN* and investigates the mechanisms involved in metaphor interpretation taking into account the assumptions of lexical pragmatics in the framework of Relevance Theory. She analyses some frequently occurring metaphors in present-day Sicilian and concludes that

they are the results of a process which creates ad hoc concepts, whose interpretations are claimed to be based on the ongoing interaction of encoded concepts, contextual information and pragmatic expectations of relevance, involving exactly the same interpretative processes as those used for literal utterances.

UNDERSTANDING METAPHOR IN A SECOND LANGUAGE: FACTORS AFFECTING THE INFERENTIAL PROCESSES is the investigation in which **Maria Antoniou** presents the results of an experiment where Russian and Arab learners of Modern Greek as a second language are engaged in metaphor understanding tasks. She thus gains insight into the factors affecting the understanding of the “A is B” metaphor in a second language. Among the number of interrelated factors with stronger or minor effects, directive context proved to be a powerful factor facilitating metaphor understanding, while typological distance showed no significant effect on the comprehension of the sample of linguistic metaphors.

Part 2: Figurativity in Discourse

The second part of the volume gathers studies on figurativity in discourse.

From a cognitive-linguistic perspective, **Aneider Iza Erviti** opens new pathways for the investigation of THE FAMILY OF ENGLISH CONTRAST CONSTRUCTIONS AT DISCOURSE LEVEL. Taking Langacker’s notions of profile, base and active zone as instruments for the classification of discourse constructions exemplified by the use of markers such as *but*, *however*, and *unlike*, all the constructions under scrutiny share the same meaning base but profile four different meanings, allowing the author to classify them into *contraposition constructions*, *exception constructions*, *alternative-contrastive constructions*, and *disagreement constructions*.

At the intersection between English and Croatian lingua-cultural framework, the issue of how Croats make sense of the copious literal translations of English figurative expressions into Croatian is central in **Ivana Marinić** and **Goran Schmidt**’s chapter CAN A TIGRESS CHANGE HER STRIPES? ON THE COMPREHENSION OF METAPHOR-BASED PHRASEOLOGICAL CALQUES. The authors explore and discuss the fact that culturally specific metaphors depend on the knowledge of the source culture and, for this reason, they can be construed differently in the target language.

From a contiguous perspective, **Goran Milić** and **Dubravka Vidaković Erdeljić** discuss the TRANSLATION OF METAPHORICAL TERMS IN THE FIELD OF ECONOMICS FROM ENGLISH INTO CROATIAN. The authors examine cases in which the conceptual metaphor is borrowed along with the new concept in the process of loan translation and analyse whether

such metaphorical linguistic expressions are intelligible to speakers of Croatian. This opens to a discussion on the importance of conceptual and cultural factors for the understanding of metaphorical expressions.

Alicja Dziedzic-Rawska in *PRISON DISCOURSE: FEW WORDS, A LOT OF CONTENT. THE CASE OF POLISH AND AMERICAN PRISONS* addresses the attention on a topic that is usually neglected and marginalised, i.e. the prison lingo. Nevertheless, prison slang is rich in metaphors and metonymies that necessarily imply the knowledge of the prison reality. The author investigates American and Polish prison discourse and shows that quite often prisoners use already known words but they acquire new senses when used inside the prison context.

Elif Arica-Akkök and Gülsün Leyla Uzun investigate the distribution and the frequency of *CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS USED IN ARGUMENTS IN TURKISH AND ENGLISH SCIENTIFIC TEXTS*. They pin down the frequency of conceptual metaphors in terms of argument structure and disciplines, examine the similarities and differences between Turkish and English texts, and discuss whether generalisable findings can be put forward for languages in terms of the strength of the argument and the salience of metaphor. Overall, they show that the distribution of metaphors, such as *ARGUMENT IS BUILDING*, *ARGUMENT IS WAR*, *ARGUMENT IS A JOURNEY* and *ARGUMENT IS A CONTAINER*, show differences in terms of argumentation schemes, disciplines, and languages.

In his chapter on *THE EXPERIENTIAL FUTURE: SOCIO-COGNITION AND MULTISENSORY MARKETING IN MATERA EUROPEAN CAPITAL OF CULTURE 2019*, **Paul Sambre** tackles the discourse of future project management. More specifically, through the analysis of Italian data proceeding from the bid book of the Matera 2019 project, the author concentrates on how grammar and lexis contribute to the construction of the future time in discourse by means of metaphorical mappings. The Italian dataset reveals how future ECoC conceptualisation thematises reference to visual (cinematographic), auditory (musical) and emotional values (such as shame and poverty) in a local Italian context, transposing them on a future, transnational, and positive level.

From a contrastive perspective, **Fabio Mollica** and **Beatrice Wilke** investigate the interplay between *METAPHOR AND CONCEPTUALISATION OF MIGRATION IN THE GERMAN AND ITALIAN PRESS*. The authors highlight how some factors, such as the economic situation, can affect the question of migration perception. Their analysis reveals that both the Italian and the German press handle the phenomenon of migration using an almost compassionate tone when death takes place and a more empathic language laden with powerful images that express understanding and solidarity.

Overall, the German and the Italian press make use of similar metaphors albeit with different nuances.

In their chapter METAPHOR AND FRAMING IN POLITICAL SPEECHES: FRAMING EFFECTS OF CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR ON RECOGNITION AND RECALL, **Luuk Lagerwerf** and **Lina Yu** conduct empirical research in order to investigate whether there is an interaction between metaphor and framing on information processing of political speeches. To this purpose, the authors compare effects of metaphor in combinations with generic and valence framing. Their research is the first to relate metaphor to generic framing and valence framing at the same time at such detailed level. The results of their experiment let the authors conclude that there are no or only moderating effects of metaphor on information processing and attitudinal variables.

In IS A PICTURE REALLY WORTH A THOUSAND POLITICAL WORDS? POLITICAL INTERNET MEMES AND CONCEPTUAL BLENDING, **Sanja Berberović** and **Nihada Delibegović Džanić** focus on the construction of meaning of political memes, specifically on new memes that have emerged on social media and the Internet as forms of grassroots political activism. Humorous Internet memes often employ conceptual blending as a basic cognitive operation useful to influence the audience. Humour is created in the blended space due to the unusual combination of related structures that results in incongruity.

Part 3: Figurativity and Emotions

The correlation between figurativity and emotions is the focus of the third part of the book.

In THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF FEAR IN ITALIAN AND RUSSIAN: DIFFERENT DEGREES OF LEXICALISATION OF METONYMIES, **Erica Pinelli** explores metonymies of fear in Italian and Russian with the aim of pinning down metonymies at different degrees of lexicalisation. To this purpose, the author has compiled her dataset relying on the RuTenTen Web Corpus for Russian and the ItTenTen Web Corpus for Italian. One main interesting result following from the detailed analysis shows that the general metonymy PHYSIOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF AN EMOTION STAND FOR THE EMOTION is present at different degrees of lexicalisation: in metonymic expressions, in the lexis, in etymology, and also in phraseology. Pinelli also shows that the metonymic conceptualisation of fear is similar in Italian and Russian, but some cultural specificities arise when metonymies and metaphors interact.

Benedikt Perak offers a corpus-based investigation of four emotional terms in Croatian (*strach* “fear”, *ljutnija* “anger”, *ljubav* “love” and *ponos* “pride”) in his chapter entitled CONCEPTUALISATION OF THE EMOTION TERMS: STRUCTURING, CATEGORISATION, METONYMIC AND METAPHORIC PROCESSES WITHIN MULTI-LAYERED GRAPH REPRESENTATION OF THE SYNTACTIC AND SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF CORPUS DATA. The analysis takes into account the syntactic relations that emotion nouns establish with other words, in particular with verbs and adjectives. The result of both a qualitative and quantitative analysis is a complex directed network representing the conceptual knowledge of emotion categories.

In SHAPES OF EMOTION: EXPLORING PRIMARY METAPHORS BY MEANS OF WORD ASSOCIATIONS, **Misuzu Shimotori** presents her research on the conceptualisation of the dimension of emotions in Japanese and Swedish. The author examines how emotions are conceptually shaped in the speaker’s mind by using dimensional expressions such as *big*, *high*, and *long*. Although some primary metaphors can be detected in both Japanese and Swedish, the cultural specificity of emotions is mirrored in the use of other metaphors. Some common primary metaphors are observed in associations with general dimensional adjectives such as *big* and *small*, while certain dimensional adjectives in the categories of thickness and width are used in language-specific primary metaphors.

Mohsen Bakhtiar investigates the cultural specific concept of *gheirat* in Persian, which plays an important role in constructing the identities of Iranians since it functions to protect one’s values against threat, insult, and injury. In A CONTEXT-BASED VIEW OF EMOTION CONCEPTS: THE CASE OF *GHEIRAT* IN IRANIAN CULTURE the author analyses its metaphorical and metonymic conceptualisation and its relation with other key concepts in the Iranian culture. Indeed, the *GHEIRAT* has a crucial function in the Iranian culture and, in turn, it gives rise to other emotions.

In the chapter THE EMOTION OF LOVE IN GEORGE SEFERIS’ POETRY: A COGNITIVE LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF ONE OF HIS POEMS, **Alexandra Christakidou** offers a cognitive analysis of the concept of love in a poem by the 20th century Greek poet George Seferis, who was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1963. Her analysis shows the dynamicity of love conceptualisation, which is investigated through the detection of metaphors, metonymies, blending, and synaesthesia. Much relevance is given to the use of contrast and negation that provide the poem with conflict and vividness.

Part 4: Figurativity and Multimodality

The fourth part of the volume highlights the relationship between figurativity and multimodality.

In the exploratory contribution *CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS AND METAPHORICAL EXPRESSIONS IN IMAGES*, **Marianna Bolognesi** tackles visual metaphors, and compares them to metaphors in language. With the aim of explaining the need of a differentiation between conceptual metaphors and metaphorical expressions in both visual and verbal metaphors, and thus including visual metaphors in a more encompassing theory of metaphor, the author argues that both metonymies and metaphors are typically combined to construct figurative images within the visual modality of expression, and that visual expressions vary on a scale of creativity/ idiomacity in the same way as linguistic expressions do.

In recent years interest in visual or verbo-pictorial metaphor has grown considerably. With the focus placed on the way of *FACING METHODOLOGICAL CHALLENGES IN MULTIMODAL METAPHOR RESEARCH*, **Paula Pérez-Sobrino** and **Jeannette Littlemore** propose a number of principles on which to build a sound methodology for metaphor research in non-verbal contexts. With this aim in mind, they report three corpus-based studies they conducted into multimodal metaphor and other figurative operations in advertising in order to suggest how to establish a protocol for the identification of metaphor and other figurative operations, to compile a representative and diverse corpus of real examples, to assess inter-rater reliability, and to consider the potential contributions of manual annotation software programs. The set of recommendations made by the authors show different ways to increase the validity and reliability of studies of multimodal metaphor and they will no doubt contribute to advancing the robustness of research in this field.

General Conclusions

As may be evident from the brief overview of the twenty-four chapters in the volume, the four sections cover core issues of figurativity with wide-ranging implications that are crucial to future developments of research in Cognitive Linguistics and in Linguistics in general. For example, the sections foreground the relationship that holds between literalness and figurativity in meaning construction, emphasise the role of conceptual metonymy and metaphor as the main cognitive tools at work in inferential activity and as generators of discourse ties, and illustrate the import of cognitive models in the production and interpretation of multimodal

communication. In addition, a number of more specific topics are addressed from different perspectives such as language variation and cultural models, discourse acts, the argumentative role of metaphor in discourse, the role of empirical work in Cognitive Linguistics, the import of cognitive operations in the language of emotions, the relations holding between multimodality and cognitive modelling. These features endow the volume with internal unity and consistency while at the same time preserving the identity of each of the sections and the contributions therein.

References

- Dirven, René. 2005. "Major strands in Cognitive Linguistics". In *Modelling thought and constructing meaning. Cognitive models in interaction*, edited by Annalisa Baicchi, Cristiano Broccias, and Andrea Sansò, 11-40. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Fillmore, Charles. 1977. "Topics in lexical semantics". In *Current issues in linguistic theory*, edited by Roger W. Cole, 76-138. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Graesser, Arthur, Debra Long, and Jeffrey Mio. 1989. "What are the cognitive and conceptual components of humorous texts?" *Poetics* 18:142-164.
- Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, fire and dangerous things. What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Pollio Howard, Jack Barlow, Harold Fine, and Marilyn Pollio. 1977. *Psychology and the poetics of growth: Figurative language in psychology, psychotherapy, and education*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Smith, Michael, Howard Pollio, and Marian Pitts. 1981. "Metaphor as intellectual history: Concepts and categories underlying figurative usage in American English from 1675-1975". *Linguistics* 19:911-935.
- Violi, Patrizia. 2003. "Embodiment at the crossroad between cognition and semiosis". *Recherches en communication* 19:199-234.

PART ONE

FIGURATIVITY IN THE LANGUAGE SYSTEM

CHAPTER ONE

FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE IN OLD SAXON: THE CASE OF POSSESSIVE COMPOUNDS

CATERINA SARACCO

1. Introduction

It is well known that the notion of exocentricity was used for the first time by Bloomfield (1933). He applied it to morphology to describe linguistic expressions like compounds, whereby the whole compound does not hold a hyperonymical relationship with its head, which lies outside the construction (hence the prefix *exo-*). After Bloomfield and his endocentric/exocentric dichotomy, the linguistic literature had a negative tendency to investigate only endocentric combinations. This was due also to the fact that the generativist framework was unable to treat and explain linguistic configurations such as exocentric compounds. In the syntax-oriented analysis of the generativist approach to language, the semantics of exocentric compounds was not easy to explain because the semantic properties of the headword are not represented in the whole compound's meaning¹.

It is only since the last thirty years that some researchers have devoted themselves to the morphological analysis of exocentric compounds such as *redskin* (and possessive compounds in particular, hereafter called Pcs) in several languages². But many of them, like Marchand (1960), Selkirk (1982) or Dirven and Verspoor (1998), consider this type of composition a

¹ A crucial property of a structure in the Generativist framework is that both the formal and the semantic properties of the headword in a compound need to be represented in the whole compound's structure. It is for this reason that the cases where the semantic properties do not coincide can be a problem for the tenet that words have an internal structure. In Generativism these situations are called *bracketing paradoxes*. See Williams (1981) for a systematic view.

² See for instance Marchand (1960), Kastovsky (1982), Bauer (2008), Lieber (2009), Andreou and Ralli (2015).

semantically opaque phenomenon (in opposition to endocentric compounds like *orange tree*, which are transparent lexical structures), because it goes against the theory of compositionality. In fact, on the basis of the Fregean compositionality principle, the true value of a complex expression can be retrieved by relying on the meanings of the simpler expressions, which make up the complex one (Casadei 2010, 312). Not only is this principle valid for propositions and sentences, but also for lower levels of syntax, such as complex words. In the case of exocentric compounds, the issue of semantic compositionality is yet to be solved. If it is easy to consider *orange tree* an endocentric compound expression, in which we can sum the meaning of “tree” and “orange” to understand the meaning of the whole composite structure, in the case of the Italian words *ventiquattrore* “briefcase”, but literally “twenty-four hours” and *quattroocchi* “four-eyes”, i.e. “person wearing glasses”, the meaning of the compound cannot be deduced from the meaning of its constitutive elements. It is for this reason that Pcs, and exocentric compounds in general, are regarded as non-prototypical compounds, whose semantic analysis reveals to be complex and quite often unconvincing.

The present paper aims to take a closer look at these constructions in an old Germanic language, Old Saxon, and to show that these semantically opaque compounds can be easily analysed as the most prototypical ones (determinative compounds like *orange tree*). By appealing to Cognitive Linguistics and especially to conceptual metaphor and conceptual metonymy theories, I hope I will be able to examine and offer a convincing description and explanation of this less prototypical compounding pattern: in our view, in fact, the meaning of most Pcs is motivated by metaphor or/and metonymy.

The structure of the paper is as follows: the focus of section 2 is placed on the nature of possessive compounds (*bahuvrihi*) in general, while section 3 describes this type of composition in Old Germanic languages and in Old Saxon. Section 4 is devoted to the analysis of instances of metonymies and metaphors that can operate towards the conceptualisation of the meaning of possessive compounds in Old Saxon; finally section 5 offers some concluding observations.

2. Possessive Compounds

Possessive compounds are considered exocentric compounds because they are characterised by the fact that the semantic head is not one of the two lexical elements forming the compound, but it is an external referent. The possessive compound *redskin* does not denote a special type of skin, but

rather it refers to someone characterised by or possessor of red skin. The semantic head is not formally expressed. Since a compound like this (or *paleface*, *hunchback*, *highbrow*) cannot be seen as the sum of the meanings of their two immediate constituents but as a predication about a third element, its meaning is not predictable. As the examples above illustrate, possessive compounds are today exclusively nouns and they are used to denote people, animals (like *redbreast*) and plants (like *five-finger*), profiling their most salient characteristic. With the help of a stand-for relationship, this salient property points metonymically to the category of the whole entity (Marchand 1960, Barcelona 2008 and 2011, Bauer 2008).

Although this type of word-formation is known in the literature also with the name *bahuvrīhi*³, in this work I prefer using the term *possessive compound*, because it better stresses the relation of “possession” and “having” that holds between the salient feature and the external referent.

3. Possessive Compounds in Germanic and in Old Saxon

The Germanic Pcs represent a pattern of composition that was inherited from the Indo-European types of word-formation. They arose from the determinative compounds (Brugmann 1889, 87) and are present with four different morphological structures in all Old Germanic languages (Gothic, Old High German, Old Frisian, Old Norse): Adj+N (the most frequent, OS *gēl-hert* “brave”), N+N (OS *balu-hugdig* “hostile”), Num+N (OS *ēn-wordi* “unanimous”) and Prep/Adv+N (OS *wīdar-mōd* “hostile”). One of the characteristics of Pcs in Old Germanic languages is that this type of compound is not a nominal one, as in present-day languages, but all Pcs were adjectival items. Only at a later stage could they be nominalised by conversion or by adding a derivational suffix.

Old Saxon, a Germanic language spoken in the northwest coast of Germany and in the Netherlands from 9th to 12th century, employs the four morphological combinations to produce Pcs; in this work I investigate only the first three structures (Adj+N, N+N, and Num+N)⁴.

³ *Bahuvrīhi* is a Sanskrit term, first used by the grammarian *Pāṇini* in his treatise of Sanskrit grammar *Aṣṭadhyāyī* (4th century B.C.); it literally means “much rice”, but it denotes a person “who has much rice”, i.e. “a rich person”.

⁴ The fourth combination, Prep/Adv+N, is not considered here because it will be the object of another future research project about prefixation in Old Germanic languages.

From Carr (1938) and Ilkow (1968) I have collected 41 Pcs that can be subdivided into three different groups: *pure* Pcs, *extended* Pcs and *reversed* Pcs, according to Petersen (1914-1915).

The pure type does not present a derivational suffix, which can motivate the whole compound as an adjective: OS *gēl-hert* “brave”, literally “having the heart (*herta*) courageous”, is the union of an adjective and a head noun, but the output is adjectival. These Pcs are numerous not only in Old Saxon but also in the other Old Germanic languages.

The adjectival motivation is present instead in the extended type, which has an adjectival derivational suffix after the head noun: in Old Saxon the *-ja* suffix (the oldest one, see *glad-mōdi* “happy”) and the *-ig* suffix (*slīð-mōdig* “bad”) are used.

To motivate an Adj+N pure Pc fully as an adjective, it was possible to change the constituent order as well, so that the adjective occupies the head position: OS *mōd-stark* “hostile” is a case of the reversed type of Pc.

To give an overview of the OS possessive compounds, I list below the 41 compounds according Petersen’s classification:

- pure OS possessive compounds: *dol-mōd* “foolish”, *fitil-fōt* “having white feet”, *frō-mōd* “happy”, *gēl-hert* “brave”, “bold”, *gēl-mōd* “bold”, *glad-mōd* “happy”, *gram-hert* “hostile”, *hard-mōd* “brave”, *hēlag-ferah* “of holy mind”, *hriuwig-mōd* “sad”, *jāmar-mōd* “sad”, *sērag-mōd* “sad”, “sorrowful”, *slīð-mōd* “bad”, “fierce”, *stark-mōd* “brave”, *thrīst-mōd* “brave”, “bold”, *wēk-mōd* “cowardly”, *wrēd-mōd* “bad”, “furious”;
- extended OS possessive compounds: *arm-hugdig* “sad”, *balu-hugdig* “hostile”, *eli-landig/eli-lendi* “stranger”, “foreign”, *ēn-wordi* “unanimous”, *gēl-mōdig* “cheerful”, *glad-mōdi* “happy”, *gōd-sprāki* “having good words”, “speaking well”, *gōd-willig* “having good will”, *gram-hugdig* “hostile”, *hard-mōdig* “brave”, *māð-mundi* “gentle”, *mid-firi* “adult”, “middle-aged”, *nið-hugdig* “bad”, “evil”, *sam-wordi/-wurdig* “unanimous”, *slīð-mōdig* “fierce”, *wrēd-hugdig* “malignant”, “wicked”;
- reversed OS possessive compounds: *bōk-spāhi* “who can write and read”, *hugi-derbi* “war-minded”, *mōd-karag* “sorrowful”, *mōd-spāhi* “clever”, *mōd-stark* “hostile”, *word-spāh* “eloquent”, *word-wīs* “eloquent”.

4. Cognitive Metaphors and Metonymies in OS Possessive Compounds: An Overview

In what follows I discuss how conceptual metaphors and metonymies⁵ motivate the meaning of an Old Saxon Pc.

A conceptual metaphor or a conceptual metonymy (or both) can mould the compound's head or its modifier, the whole compound or the relation between the constituents of the compound. This fact leads to the possibility to produce an inventory of several patterns of figurative possessive compounds in Old Saxon taking into account the place where the conceptual metonymic or metaphorical process operates.

First of all, we must keep in mind that the compound's heads are parts of the whole entity the Pc refers to: *frō-mōd* is “happy” but literally “having the happy spirit”, so “spirit” and the “happy person” are in a metonymic PART-WHOLE relationship. Another example from the corpus is OS *fitil-fōt* “having white feet”: the characteristic of “white feet” is conceptualised literally, but the body part and its possessor are obviously in a metonymic PART-WHOLE connection. There are also more complex cases: OS *bōk-spāhi* “who can write and read”, but literally “having a book that makes clever” has a nominal element *bōk*, which is not an *inalienable* part of a person, but an object that is part of the same *frame* (Fillmore 1977) or the LITERACY ICM (Idealised Cognitive Model, Lakoff 1987).

As Radden and Kövecses (1999) claim, a conceptual metonymy can act upon either an ICM and its parts or on two parts of an ICM. In the *frō-mōd* case, therefore, a PART-WHOLE metonymy between the noun component of a Pc and the whole compound is present; the compound *bōk-spāhi*, instead, a PART-PART metonymy holds between two elements of the same *frame* LITERACY (pupil and book).

Old Saxon figurative Pcs can also be systematically arranged in types, and this typology is built on the basis of the lexical element in the compound that is affected by a conceptual metaphor and/or metonymy. This type of analysis was already successfully applied by Benczes (2006) to the study of English metaphorical and metonymical N+N compounds and by Barcelona (2008 and 2011) to the investigation of the figurative language in Spanish and English nominal *bahuvrīhi*. Also Geeraerts (2002) analysed the interaction of metaphors and metonymies in compounds, with many examples from the Dutch language.

⁵ For a definition of conceptual metaphor and metonymy see Kövecses (2000 and 2010), Radden and Kövecses (1999).

In my small corpus of OS Pcs I have identified five patterns of figurative types, whereby the conceptual metaphor/metonymy acts upon the possessive compound, specifically: (1) on the modifying compound member; (2) on the head; (3) on both elements of the compound; (4) on the compound as a whole entity; and (5) on the relation between the two members of the compound. I discuss at least one example from each group in the following subsections.

4.1 Metonymy-based head and literal modifier: OS *gēl-hert* “happy”

We have so far noticed that the nominal element of a Pc is always in a metonymical relationship with the entity the whole compound refers to. There are also compounds whose noun member is affected by a double metonymical process, as in OS *gēl-hert* “happy”, lit. “having a happy heart”. The Old Saxon word for heart, *herta*, is not only a part of the human being, who “possesses” it (PART FOR WHOLE), but it also stands in a metonymic relationship with the compound’s overall meaning and its HAPPINESS frame. With recourse to the folk model of the human heart as the seat and producer of our emotions, happiness (as well as other emotions and feelings) could be considered a product of the heart. This happens because the heart is seen as the most salient human body part, at least in the Western culture, concerning the production and storage of feelings and emotions (Niemeier 2000). The nominal member also serves as a salient reference point to access the target in the same domain (Langacker 1993, 30): in this case we are dealing with a PRODUCT FOR PRODUCER conceptual metonymy. The modifying element *gēl* “happy” helps instead to build the meaning of the whole compound literally.

4.2 Metonymy-based head and metonymy-based modifier: OS *ēn-wordi* “unanimous”

This subsection is devoted to possessive compound expressions presenting both the noun constituent and the modifying element as metonymic in the meaning of the whole compound.

OS *ēn-wordi* “unanimous”, “in unison”, is an adjective which means literally “somebody who has only one (*ēn*) word”, and is used to describe people that agree with someone else with words. In this case the OS noun *word* is strongly embedded in the ACTION frame (in particular the AGREEING frame), where we need to speak (and to produce words) to agree

with other people. The conceptual metonymy involved here is therefore INSTRUMENT OF AN ACTION FOR THE RESULT OF THE ACTION.

In OS *ēn-wordi* “unanimous” the modifying member is also metonymic, because *ēn* “one” stands for the entire group of people that have the same opinion and express it in words. The numeral adjective *one* has therefore here the meaning “unity” and causes an INDIVIDUAL FOR GROUP conceptual metonymy.

4.3 Metonymy-based relation between the two elements of the compound: OS *bōk-spāhi* “who can write and read”

We now turn our attention to metonymies that can act between the two constituents of a Pc. As I have mentioned in section 4, a conceptual metonymy can operate also between two parts of an ICM to create a PART-PART metonymic relationship and the OS Pc *bōk-spāhi* is a good instance, because there is a PART-PART metonymy, between the element “book” (OS *bōk*) and someone who has been educated (the external referent), of the same LITERACY ICM. But in the case of OS *bōk-spāhi* “who can write and read” also the adjectival modifier *spāhi* “clever” and the modified *bōk* are parts of the LITERACY ICM, because the compound literally denotes someone “having a book which makes clever”. I cannot be a clever and cultured person if I do not have a book to get more practice in reading and writing; therefore both constituents, the noun and the adjective, are parts of the LITERACY ICM with a CAUSE-EFFECT metonymic relationship.

4.4 Metaphor-based modifier and metonymy-based head: OS *wēk-mōd* “cowardly”

In this section I place the focus on Pcs in those Old Saxon where the modifying element is metaphorically understood and the compound’s noun head is conceptualised metonymically.

OS *wēk-mōd* “cowardly” means literally “having the soft, tender spirit”. The human spirit is therefore conceptualised as an object, having a soft and malleable surface that can be manipulated metaphorically by external negative events or objects causing fear and cowardice. The conceptual metaphor SOFTNESS IS COWARDICE is comparable with OS *stark-mōd* “brave”, but literally “having the strong spirit”. In this case the human spirit has a stronger surface, which is better resistant to events causing fear and terror and making the human being capable of being “brave” (STRONGNESS IS BRAVERY).

We must notice that COWARDICE and BRAVERY are human “sensations” that are caused by external facts. When we try to understand the meaning of the expression *wēk-mōd* (similar to English “weak-tempered”) we know, perhaps implicitly, that weakness and softness cause our cowardice. To elaborate the COWARDICE concept we highlight only the emotional effects of a negative event or object on the human being: the conceptual metaphor SOFTNESS IS COWARDICE is therefore also motivated by a conceptual metonymy EFFECT FOR CAUSE, where “the soft spirit” is the entity that influences its possessor with cowardice.

Concerning the compound head *mōd* “spirit”, it has been noticed (Saracco and Agnesina, forthcoming) that in Old Saxon this word was used as a synonym for *herta* “heart”. Again, thanks to the folk model that sees the heart as the ultimate source of our emotion, OS *mōd* is a sort of human soul, the product of the human heart, a spiritual internal force that drives persons to fulfill their needs and to feel emotions: for this reason *mōd* can stand sometimes for *herta* by a conceptual metonymy PRODUCT FOR PRODUCER. I quote some examples from *Heliand* manuscript C (Sievers 1935), the longest epic poem in Old Saxon, written in the first decades of the 9th century. In (1) and (2) the word *mōd* “soul”, “spirit” can be substituted with *herta* “heart” without problems. In (1) an angel says to Joseph that he should love Mary with his heart or human soul (because of the earthly nature of the feeling); in example (2) Mary is in trouble because she lost Jesus in Jerusalem and her heart or spirit is sorrowful:

- (1) *H.*, v. 318 C: OS *endi hēt sie ina haldan uuel, minnion sie an is mode*
“[...] and (he) ordered him to keep her well, to love her in his heart/soul”.
- (2) *H.*, v. 803 C: OS *uuarth Mariun thuo muod an sorgon*
“Then Mary’s soul/heart was in trouble”.

OS *mōd* is therefore one of the two entities (see section 4.5) that were responsible for the production and preservation of human emotions and desires of the individual in the Old Saxon culture. Cowardice is therefore a condition “produced” by a *wēk mōd*, a weak spirit; between the whole compound and the head noun a PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT conceptual metonymy operates.

4.5 Metaphor-based modifier and metonymy-based head: OS *arm-hugdig* “sad”

OS *arm-hugdig* “sad” means literally “having a miserable, poor mind”. Likewise *wēk-mōd*, it is a Pc with an Adj+N morphological structure, where the adjective denotes a nominal head noun’s quality. In this case the Saxon mind is conceived of as “poor”: therefore we infer that if we have a poor mind we are sad. The POVERTY IS SADNESS metaphor seems to be unusual in present-day English, but the similarity between the two concepts is structural and based on the UP-DOWN *orientational metaphor* (Kövecses 2010, 40, 83). This kind of metaphor serves to give a basic human spatial orientation to an abstract target concept, e.g. emotions, and to conceptualise it.

In our Western culture, societies are structured hierarchically in a sort of *scale*. People are collocated at a certain layer on the basis of the amount of money they possess: when people want to climb along the scale, they try to earn *more* and to make money, to go *upstairs*. If something goes wrong, it could happen to lose (to have *less*) money and to go *downstairs*.

The WEALTH and the POVERTY concepts are therefore conceptualised by means of the MORE IS UP and LESS IS DOWN orientational metaphors.

In the same way, the HAPPINESS and SADNESS concepts are characterised (are conceptualised) by an upward/downward orientation in several languages (see 3 and 4), e.g.:

- (3) a. It. *Luca ha il morale alto oggi.*
“Luke is in high spirits today.” HAPPY IS UP
b. It. *Ho l’umore sotto i piedi.*
“My spirit is under the feet.” SAD IS DOWN
- (4) a. Germ. *Es hebt ihm die Stimmung.*
“It raises his spirits.” HAPPY IS UP
b. Germ. *Die Nachricht hat ihn niedergedrückt.*
“The news were getting him down.” SAD IS DOWN

We can think about our social uneasiness as regarding our personal bad mood: the similarity between poverty and sadness is due to the basic UP-DOWN orientational metaphor.

The noun element of the composition, OS *hugi*, is a very important word in the Old Saxon vocabulary, but its meaning is difficult to define. For example, Tiefenbach (2010, 186) translates *hugi* as “intention”, “mind”, “thought”, “feeling”, but it is hard to say what this word in the Old Saxon world really referred to. Saracco and Agnesina (forthcoming) provide an elaboration of all the conceptualisations of the term *hugi* in Old

Saxon *Heliand* and conclude that this entity was for the Saxons a sort of divine mind and soul (in opposition to the earthly *mōd*), which drove all human beings, after the action of thinking and reasoning, to what is morally right or not.

OS *hugi* is used when people have to decide to be devoted and loyal to the Christian God or not. See example (5), when Mary accepts to be the Mother of God and (6), where Pilate is asking about the humanity of Jesus:

- (5) *H.*, v. 282 C: OS *thuo uuarth eft thes uuībes hugi aftar them ārundie al gihuorban an godes uuilleon*
 “After this message the woman’s mind/soul became completely converted to God’s will”.
- (6) *H.*, v. 5342 C: OS *huat bist thu manno, te hui thu mi so thinan muod hilis?*
 “What kind of man are you, why do you conceal your spirit from me?”

If *hugi* is one of the *loci* where feelings, volition and behaviour are produced, stored and preserved, in an adjectival Pc like OS *arm-hugdig* “sad”, the nominal component *hugi* has a metonymic connection with the whole compound, again a PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT conceptual metonymy.

4.6 The whole compound is metonymic: OS *dōl-mōd* “foolish”, “daring”

This last section deals with expressions where the whole compound is metonymic. In section 3 I have explained that, unlike the contemporary situation, in the Old Germanic languages Pcs were exclusively adjectival and that they could be later nominalised. This is the case of OS *dōl-mōd* “sad”, lit. “having a foolish (*dōl*) spirit”, that can be both an adjective (7) and a noun (8) in *Heliand*:

- (7) *H.*, v. 5237 C: OS *than stuodun dolmuoda iudeo liudi*
 “The foolish Jewish people stood there”.
- (8) *H.*, v. 3722 C: OS *thuo gengun dolmuoda that sia uuid ualdand Crist uuordon spracun*
 “Then the daring ones went to speak with words to the Ruling Christ”.

As we can see in (7), in a nominal Pc a reified characteristic property of a certain category of individuals (the foolish spirit) serves as a cognitively salient reference point providing mental access to a target entity, which is