

Frank Polzenhagen / Zoltán Kövecses /
Stefanie Vogelbacher / Sonja Kleinke (eds.)

Cognitive Explorations into Metaphor and Metonymy



PETER LANG
EDITION

The investigation of metaphor and metonymy has been a hallmark of Cognitive Linguistics ever since the early days of this approach to language. The study of these phenomena certainly is among the most productive fields of cognitive-linguistic research both in theoretical respects and as regards the impressive body of studies that it has engendered. Arguably, it is the most influential one in terms of its wide recognition outside the cognitive-linguistic community, with its considerable impact on mainstream linguistics and across the various sciences and domains.

Over the last three decades, several more or less distinct strands have emerged in the cognitive-linguistic study of metaphor and metonymy. One strand focuses on the role of these two phenomena in the human conceptual system, continuing along the lines of and elaborating on the original Lakoff & Johnson (1980) framework. The familiar key notion of this strand is 'conceptual metaphor/metonymy'. Other cognitive linguists locate and investigate metaphor and metonymy primarily at the level of discourse. The study of "discourse metaphors", a term advanced in Zinken, Hellsten & Nerlich (2008) and Musolff & Zinken (2009), highlights, *inter alia*, the discursive development and discourse history of specific metaphors. The third strand takes a narrower, micro-level understanding of "discourse" as its starting point and analyses metaphors and metonymies, first and foremost, as local phenomena in a specific genre, text production or talk exchange (e.g., Cameron & Maslen 2010; Semino 2008). Another recent focus is the study of multimodal metaphors (e.g., Forceville & Urios-Aparisi 2009), which addresses the expression of metaphor across various modes of representation. This pluralism of perspectives is paralleled, at the methodological level, by a pluralism of research techniques, ranging from introspection-based to corpus-based approaches and microlevel analyses inspired by methods used in discourse analysis, to name just a few.

There is an obvious tension among these perspectives and methodologies. The metaphors one finds at the textual level, for instance, are often vague, ad hoc, temporary and unstable. With these features, they hardly qualify as "conceptual metaphors" in any strict sense, i.e. as entrenched conceptualisations. Scholars working along the lines of the original Lakoff & Johnson (1980) framework argue that even those metaphors are licensed

by more general or generic metaphors firmly rooted in the conceptual system. Discourse-oriented scholars are often skeptical of this view since such higher-level metaphors cannot always be conclusively traced at the textual level and thus lack direct evidence. Furthermore, they accord much more significance to the individual metaphors, the details of the mappings underlying them and their specific linguistic form than an approach that views metaphoric expressions primarily as manifestations of broader, entrenched conceptual links (for a discussion, see Zinken & Musolff 2009).

Another important controversy arises from the question of what motivates metaphors. Over the last years, there has been an intense argument on the notion of 'embodiment' (see, e.g., the twin volumes Frank, Dirven, Ziemke & Bernárdez 2008 and Ziemke, Zlatev & Frank 2008). It is a matter of debate whether and to which degree metaphors are embodied (i.e. rooted in fundamental bodily experience), encultured (i.e. based on socio-cultural experience) or products of local discourse and context.

The relationship among the strands and perspectives sketched above is thus certainly not harmonious. At the level of practical analysis, they may often come to quite different conclusions. It would, however, be unjustified to regard these tensions as a weakness of the cognitive-linguistic theory of metaphor and metonymy. Instead, these tensions have inspired important theoretical and methodological elaborations of the original framework. Many if not most cognitive linguists in this field work along the lines of more than one of these strands, i.e. they employ a combination of perspectives and techniques and use the existing tensions to the benefit of their analysis. Among the comprehensive theoretical proposals that pick up the challenge posed by these tensions is Kövecses' recent work on the context of metaphors and on what he refers to as the "pressure of coherence" (e.g., Kövecses 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012). By spelling out various dimensions of context, his model provides potential anchor points for many if not all of the foci sketched above.

Tensions and different perspectives notwithstanding, there is much common ground shared by the aforementioned approaches: First and foremost, they all explicitly view and analyse metaphor and metonymy as *cognitive* phenomena. The title chosen for the present volume reflects this common denominator, and indeed, "cognitive metaphor" can serve as a convenient cover term.

The contributions to the present volume readily illustrate the plurality of perspectives and techniques in the current cognitive-linguistic study of

metaphor and metonymy and exemplify some of the ways in which they can be combined. The papers collected here also attest to the wide range of domains and topics to which metaphor- and metonymy-based research can be applied.

Zoltán Kövecses sets the scene with a paper on the role of metaphor and metonymy in the conceptual system. In order to clarify this role, he tackles the questions of how we can decide whether a particular linguistic expression is metaphoric or metonymic, of whether metaphor or metonymy can be considered primary in relation to the other, and of how metonymy relates to vertical polysemy.

The two subsequent contributions readdress well-studied textbook examples of the conceptual-metaphor paradigm: Olga Pavpertova provides a comparative corpus-linguistic analysis of emotion terms from the domain of HAPPINESS in English and Russian and characterises the relevant lexemes in terms of their metaphor-induced collocational profiles, which reflect partly diverging prototypes of HAPPINESS in these two languages. Erzsébet Tóth-Czifra, comparing data from English, Hungarian and German, investigates metonymic links between speech organs and language and works out the complex domain matrix of *tongue* and *mouth*.

A further paper with a pronounced comparative focus comes from Rebecca Netzel. She discusses metaphoric expressions in Lakota involving, in particular, verbs of motion, and their equivalents in several European languages. Rebecca Netzel stresses the universality of metaphor as a cognitive phenomenon, detailing, however, the specific impact of culture and typological features of a given language on the way this cognitive potential finds expression at the linguistic surface. Her contribution also presents a lexicographic account of the relevant lexical items in Lakota.

Andreas Musolff's contribution to the volume complements his earlier, comprehensive studies on the discourse history of the *body-politic* metaphor with an analysis of cross-cultural differences in the conceptual structure of the NATION-AS-BODY metaphor in contemporary China and England. These differences are reflected, inter alia, in his data from a research corpus representing MA students at his university. Andreas Musolff's paper includes an extensive annex with English lexical items from scenarios of the metaphor A STATE IS A (HUMAN) BODY.

The papers by Orsolya Farkas and Orsolya Putz analyse metaphor use in Hungarian political discourse and both focus on specific text types. Orsolya Farkas traces out the metaphoric construction of the concept of the

NATION in the three successive post-war constitutions of Hungary. Orsolya Putz investigates and compares metaphorical patterns underlying the representation of the territorial changes brought about for Hungary by the 1920 Trianon Treaty in academic and journalistic texts that stem from the last two decades.

The so-called “Arab spring”, i.e. the political uprisings and transformations in the Arab world that started in December 2010, is the immediate subject of the two contributions that follow. Nicole Möller analyses dominant metaphors used in the German and English news coverage of these events. Discussing examples from German print media, the paper by Alexandra Núñez, in turn, focuses on the structuring role of the PATH-schema in the metaphoric representation of the Arab spring.

The papers by Katrin Strobel and Carmen Simon investigate the workings and structure of INTEREST metaphors in advertisement. Katrin Strobel compares adverts from the 1940s to current adverts and traces the emergence of new types of INTEREST metaphors in recent years. Carmen Simon highlights the interplay between INTEREST metaphors and metonymies and their role in the construction of brand identity. Both authors address multi-modal metaphors.

The three subsequent contributions are concerned with the realm of scientific discourse. Ágnes Kuna investigates the metaphoric and metonymic construction of diseases and healing in Hungarian medical recipes from the 16th and 17th centuries. She takes a pragmatic perspective by focusing on the way the act of persuasion is framed in this specific text type. Réka Szabó, in turn, explores the potential of conceptual-metaphor and blending theory in the context of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy. To this end, she presents a re-analysis of a case study of a therapeutic process reported in the literature. She shows that an account in terms of conceptual blending makes transparent the constellation at the onset of a therapeutic process, the re-conceptualisation performed in the course of the therapy and the imageries that are involved and interpreted in this process. While the cognitive reality of metaphor and metonymy has long been crucial to psychoanalytic theory and practice, the blending framework can serve as an explicit tool in this discipline. The paper by Frank Polzenhagen brings us to the discourse field of the language sciences and deals with another case where the cognitive function of metaphor has been recognised by scholars for centuries, i.e. processes of grammaticalisation. He shows that remarkably elaborate accounts of grammaticalisation can

already be found in 18th-century works on language and relates this awareness of metaphoric conceptual patterns to general currents in the *zeitgeist* of this period.

The papers by Sonja Kleinke and Stefanie Vogelbacher take an explicit micro-level approach to metaphor and metonymy. Sonja Kleinke focuses on metonymy-based associative links between quotes and comments in quotations by the participants in an English-speaking public Internet forum-discussion. Her paper discusses how users exploit fully conventionalized as well as fresh and creative metonymic paths arising out of the immediate discourse and the more general contextual environment to expand on the topic of the ongoing discussion. In these complex processes, users resort to the productive, meaning-creating potential of cognitive metonymies. Stefanie Vogelbacher traces the discursive negotiation of the meaning and applicability of the newly emerging metaphoric expression *helicopter parents* in an online discussion forum. She details the successive discursive activities in an interactional sequence taken from this online debate and highlights the contextual factors that come into play in the course of this interaction.

Lisa Vollmar tackles language attitudes from a cognitive-sociolinguistic angle, taking the profile of English in Ghana as her example. As she shows with the data from her questionnaire survey, the English language is a prototypical element of the conceptual representation of specific communicative situations and of specific cultural-cognitive models in this country. Language attitudes crucially rest on the metonymic evocation of such scenarios and cognitive models.

The volume closes with a paper by Mario Brdar and Rita Brdar-Szabó, who analyse the semantically highly complex set of suffixations formed with *-ište* in Croatian. They model the extensions within the locative senses of this suffix and to its non-locative ones in terms of conceptually motivated metonymic shifts. The suffix *-ište* is hence a polysemous category, whose layout is carefully described by the authors. Mario Brdar and Rita Brdar-Szabó argue, however, that the suffix does not develop this polysemy in itself, i.e. in isolation; instead, the meaning extensions of an affix occur via the combinations it enters with its various hosts. Under this view, the polysemy of affixes is a second-order, post-factum type of phenomenon.

Finally, a note on the genesis and the rationale of the present volume is in order. It makes public some of the output of an annual symposium on metaphor and metonymy held at the English Department of the University

of Heidelberg. This symposium was initiated by Prof. Sonja Kleinke in 2009 with the aim to bring together students and lecturers interested in and working on metaphor and metonymy from a cognitive perspective and to establish a forum on which students, staff members, and colleagues from other institutes at the University of Heidelberg could share and discuss their work in progress with each other and with renowned international guests, in particular Prof. Zoltán Kövecses (University of Budapest) and Prof. Andreas Musolff (University of East Anglia). Over the last five years, this symposium has also developed into a pillar of and a thriving platform for the cooperation between the English Department in Heidelberg and the home departments of Prof. Kövecses and Prof. Musolff, i.e. the Cultural Linguistics doctoral programme at Eötvös Loránd University Budapest and the School of Language and Communication Studies at the University of East Anglia, respectively. The composition of the present book reflects the rationale of the symposium that engendered the papers. The volume unites papers by lecturers, doctoral students and graduates from these three universities. Following Kleinke, Kövecses, Musolff & Széldid (2012), it is the second book publication that documents the products of this cooperation.

We wish to thank the authors for their readiness to contribute to this collective volume and their collaboration in the process of preparing the manuscript. We also gratefully acknowledge the special contribution Dr. Sherry Foehr made to this book by meticulously going through the texts from a native-English perspective and by commenting on the papers. The symposia that provided the frame for the papers received funding by the Anglistisches Seminar Heidelberg and the DAAD. The publication of the volume was supported by the Anglistisches Seminar Heidelberg with a printing grant.

References

- Cameron, Lynne & Robert Maslen (eds.)
 2010 *Metaphor Analysis. Research Practice in Applied Linguistics, Social Sciences and the Humanities*. London: Equinox.
- Forceville, Charles & Eduardo Urios-Aparisi (eds.)
 2009 *Multimodal Metaphor*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Frank, Roslyn M., René Dirven, Tom Ziemke & Enrique Bernárdez (eds.)
 2008 *Body, Language, and Mind*. Vol. II: Sociocultural Situatedness. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

-
- Kleinke, Sonja, Zoltán Kövecses, Andreas Musolff & Veronika Szelid (eds.)
 2012 *Cognition and Culture: The Role of Metaphor and Metonymy*. Budapest: EÖTVÖS University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltán
 2005 *Metaphor in Culture. Universality and Variation*. Cambridge – New York: Cambridge University Press.
 2009 Metaphor, culture, and discourse: The pressures of coherence. In: Andreas Musolff & Jörg Zinken (eds.), *Metaphor and Discourse*, 11-24. Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.
 2010 A new look at metaphorical creativity in cognitive linguistics. *Cognitive Linguistics* 21(4), 663-697.
 2012 Creating metaphor in context. In: Sonja Kleinke, Zoltán Kövecses, Andreas Musolff & Veronika Szelid (eds.), *Cognition and Culture: The Role of Metaphor and Metonymy*, 28-43. Budapest: EÖTVÖS University Press.
- Lakoff, George & Mark Johnson
 1980 *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Musolff, Andreas & Jörg Zinken (eds.)
 2009 *Metaphor and Discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Semino, Elena
 2008 *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge – New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ziemke, Tom, Jordan Zlatev & Roslyn M. Frank (eds.)
 2007 *Body, Language, and Mind*. Vol. I: Embodiment. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Zinken, Jörg & Andreas Musolff
 2009 Discourse-centred perspective on metaphorical meaning and understanding. In: Andreas Musolff & Jörg Zinken (eds.), *Metaphor and Discourse*, 1-8. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Zinken, Jörg, Ina Hellsten & Brigitte Nerlich
 2008 Discourse metaphors. In: Roslyn M. Frank, René Dirven, Tom Ziemke & Enrique Bernárdez (eds.), *Body, Language and Mind*, Vol. 2: Sociocultural Situatedness, 363–85. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.