

*(Ne)popularna
(ne)kultura*

ZBORNIK RADOVA

(Ne)popularna (ne)kultura

Zbornik radova sa VI Karlovačkih dana slobodne misli

Uredila

dr Andrea Ratković

Autorke i autori

AČANSKI Nikola

GAJDOŠ Srđan

GRUJIĆ Bojan

MANOJLOVIĆ Ž. Nina

NIKOLIĆ Aleksandar

RADOSAVLJEVIĆ KRSMANOVIĆ Anica

RANĐELOVIĆ Jovana

STEVANOVIĆ Jovana

TODOROVIĆ Stefan

Lektura i korektura

ma TODOROVIĆ Stefan

Izdavač

CENTAR ZA AFIRMACIJU SLOBODNE MISLI

SREMSKI KARLOVCI

2020

Anica Radosavljević Krsmanović*

University of Kragujevac
Faculty of Philology and Arts,
Department of English Language and Literature

Nina Ž. Manojlović**

University of Kragujevac
Faculty of Philology and Arts,
Department of English Language and Literature

**WHAT DO YOU MEAN SUSAN IS A WILD ROSE? THE
INTERPLAY OF IMAGE SCHEMAS, LINGUISTIC
METAPHORS AND CONTEXT*****

Linguistic metaphors are often idiosyncratic occurrences in language and their interpretation depends heavily on the context. However, sometimes frequent use or established mappings between certain domains (in cognitive-linguistic terms) can lead to unified interpretation of metaphoric expressions. In this paper we are aiming to examine the interpretation of certain linguistic metaphors in terms of context dependency and relatedness to conceptual metaphors. Namely, metaphoric expression *Susan is a wild rose* can be considered as linguistic concretization of conceptual metaphor WOMEN ARE FLOWERS. Nevertheless, our analysis points to the greater importance of context in interpretation of metaphoric expressions. Theoretical framework is explicature analysis (within

* anicarad@yahoo.com

** nina.manojlovic@filum.kg.ac.rs, manojlovic.nina@gmail.com

*** The paper was written within the project *(Eco)poetics*, managed by the Faculty of Philology and Arts, University of Kragujevac. The results of the survey were presented at the conference *Language, Literature, Context*, organized by the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš (April 12th, 2019).

the framework of Relevance theory), which is presently prevalent in pragmatic theory. The paper also tackles the issue of deliberate metaphors, since the Deliberate Metaphor Theory introduces the third dimension to the metaphor treatment – communication, and consequently the importance of context. Finally, we will briefly present the possibility of an alternative approach to metaphoric expressions within Relevance theory framework and suggest a possible parallels it might have with the Deliberate Metaphor Theory.

Keywords: context, linguistic metaphors, Relevance theory, explicature analysis, emergent property, encyclopedic entry, deliberate metaphor.

1. Introduction

There is no clear-cut boundary between linguistic and conceptual metaphors, hence the analysis shall focus on the typical examples of linguistic metaphors found in cognitive-pragmatic studies. The first part of the paper represents the interpretation of the results of the survey conducted with forth-year students of English language and literature. The results show that linguistic metaphors enable a wide range of interpretations that depend primarily on the context, which guides the interpretation procedure in selecting the intended emergent properties from the encyclopedic entry of a given concept. This seems to suggest that context can be more important for the interpretation of linguistic metaphors than their connection to certain metaphoric mappings.

Metaphors have long been the focus of much attention, especially in cognitive linguistic research. The vast amount of research has been conducted on conceptual metaphors, yielding numerous modifications to the Lakoff and Johnson's (1980/2003) popular approach (Fauconnier, 1994; Fauconnier&Turner, 1994, 2002, 2003; Kövecses, 2002, 2005,

2006; Evans, 2003, 2013 and others)¹. Relevance theory aims at explaining communication and the pragmatic processes which guide the interpretation process, having in mind the gap between the intended meaning and what is (and can be) encoded by the means of language. An explanatorily adequate account of communication includes both literal and figurative use of language. Hence, metaphoric expressions represent an important aspect of cognitive-pragmatic investigation of language in use.

Conceptual metaphors have been traditionally considered as the expressions via which a more concrete concept (source domain) is used to explain a more abstract one (target domain). However, language abounds in various metaphoric expressions that do not follow this pattern of the mapping between more abstract domains and more concrete ones. Apart from poetic or literary metaphors used in artistic expression, human communication comprises numerous expressions in which one concept (not necessarily abstract) is explained via another. Carston calls them “spontaneous conversational [...] cases of metaphor” (2010a, p. 170). These mappings may not be entrenched in human experience of the world. They may vary depending on an individual context, intrapersonal context (shared knowledge) and situational context. Hence, it cannot be expected that the same principles proposed by cognitive semantics can apply. The recent developments in cognitive semantics seem to suggest a different perspective (see Steen, 2008, 2011, 2015); however, this paper will observe the differentiation between linguistic and conceptual metaphors since contexts plays a crucial role in their interpretation².

¹ This does not mean that metaphors were not a subject of linguistic research prior to this; however, it is hard to deny that the interest in exploring the cognitive processes through the investigation of metaphoric expressions has rapidly increased since Lacoff and Johnson introduced their theoretical model.

² Wilson (2011, p. 197) makes the following distinction:

The cognitive pragmatic approach to metaphoric expressions is striving to provide an account on the interpretation of linguistic metaphors, assuming that the same cognitive mechanisms are involved in the interpretation of all metaphors as well as other loose uses of language (i.e. no additional or different pragmatic processes are needed). The division between conceptual and linguistic metaphors is adopted from the pragmatic theory (see Mišković-Luković, 2015) meaning that a linguistic metaphor are not entrenched in human cognition via frequent mapping between domains but rather any metaphoric expression used in language, even as an one-off example. These linguistic metaphors may be more or less common, depending on their frequency of use, i.e. they can become entrenched via repetition.

When it comes to conceptual metaphors, context plays little to no role in interpretation, since the mappings between the involved domains are so deeply entrenched in the human cognitive system and experience that these metaphors are interpreted and understood even in isolation (without context). On the other hand, linguistic metaphors rely heavily on the

As Gibbs and Tendahl point out, relevance theorists and cognitive linguists tend to focus on metaphors of rather different types. Whereas relevance theorists offer many analyses of standard examples such as (1a)–(1c), which are familiar from classical rhetoric, cognitive linguists have been more concerned with examples such as (2a)–(2c), which they see as reflecting conceptual mappings across cognitive domains:

- (1) a. Robert is a computer.
- b. Susan is a wild rose.
- c. Sally is an angel.
- (2) a. Bill's marriage is on the rocks. (LOVE IS A JOURNEY)
- b. He destroyed my defences. (ARGUMENTS ARE FIGHTS)
- c. Your theory is falling apart. (THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS)

For anyone attempting a unitary account of metaphor, the main challenge would be provide a model of analysis applicable to both categories.

context of their use in order to be interpreted in the intended way (see examples 1 and 2):

1. The spring is just around the corner
2. Kate is a bulldozer

In the first example, the mapping between the spacial and temporal domain is to be understood in the same way regardless of the context. That is, is interpreted as conveying the message that *the spring is near, it will be spring soon*. However, the concept BULLDOZER has numerous properties within its encyclopedic entry and the intended properties need to be recovered by relying on the context. The same sentence could mean that Kate is *big/strong/relentless/stubborn* etc.

So, the main question here is to try and determine what aspect is more important for the interpretation of metaphoric expressions – context or entrenchment via conceptual metaphors. To that end, a survey was conducted with 42 fourth-year students of English language and literature at the Faculty of Philology and Arts, University of Kragujevac. The students were required to fill in a questionnaire with their own interpretation(s) of the given metaphors, which were listed without any context or additional information. The metaphoric expressions were taken from the cognitive pragmatic papers in which their context and, consequently, their (possible) intended interpretation is explained. The results show that numerous interpretations (some of which are culturally influenced) are possible when these expressions are taken out of the context. This further demonstrates that context plays a crucial role in understanding the intended meanings of linguistic metaphors, since the participants are prompted to call on their own individual context, experience, and connotations. Furthermore, certain expressions within the questionnaire can be said to be in agreement with particular conceptual metaphors (e.g. *Susan is a wild rose* and WOMEN ARE FLOWERS or *Kate is a bulldozer* and HUMANS ARE

MACHINES) to further investigate whether there is a link between being a concretization of a conceptual metaphor and having fixed interpretation.

2. Theoretical framework

Unlike the cognitive-linguistic approach, more precisely Cognitive Metaphor theory, that is based on associative quality, cognitive pragmatics has developed a different view of metaphor interpretation within the inferential approach to language (Mišković-Luković, 2013, p. 47–48). The goal of the cognitive-pragmatic approach to metaphor is to explain how an addressee recovers the intended interpretation of an expression that is used metaphorically. Two major claims of this approach are 1) that there is a continuum from literal use of language, through approximation and hyperbola to metaphor, and 2) that the choice between possible interpretations relies heavily on the context of their use (Wilson, 2011, p. 202). In the same paper, Wilson (2011, p. 211) concludes that the cognitive-pragmatic and cognitive-semantic approaches are complementary to each other rather than contradictory. The author claims that RT is beneficial to cognitive linguistics because it can explain not only how addressees understand metaphorical expressions but also how they understand them in the manner intended by the speaker. In addition, RT can explain how the conclusions reached by addressees in the inferential process are warranted.

Relevance theory is based on the Cooperative and Communicative principle, i.e. the balance between the effort needed for arriving at the intended interpretation and the achieved cognitive effects. The Cognitive principle states that human cognition is directed towards the maximization of relevance, while Communicative principle presupposes that every act of ostensive communication carries the assumption of its own relevance (Sperber & Wilson, 2004). Therefore, when it comes to production, the speaker produces an output (according

to her abilities and affinities) in such a way as to reduce the hearer's processing effort. On the other hand, the hearer follows the path of least effort forming interpretative assumptions in the order of their accessibility and stopping the process when the expected relevance is satisfied or cannot be reached (Mišković Luković, 2013, p. 49).

When it comes to the interpretation of metaphoric expressions in use, within the cognitive-pragmatic approach the explicature analysis is currently the most widely spread and accepted (Sperber & Wilson, 1986/95, Carston, 2002a)³. This approach will be considered in the analysis within this paper.

2.1. Explicature analysis of metaphors

The explicature approach to metaphoric expressions treats metaphor as a special case of a broader linguistic phenomenon – meanings of utterances are mainly fragmentary and intended meanings go far beyond the linguistically encoded meanings.⁴ Figurative language use clearly illustrates the difference between what is said (what can be retrieved based solely on the process of decoding) and what is communicated (which is arrived at by decoding and applying pragmatic processes).

The basic assumptions of this approach are (Wilson & Carston, 2008): a) the use of metaphor is considered a part of a continuum containing other instances of loose language use (including hyperbola and approximation); b) interpretation of metaphoric expressions is entirely an inferential process which does not require associative mapping from one domain to another; c) derivation of an emergent property requires no special

³ Mišković Luković has recently suggested modified explicature analysis (Mišković Luković, 2013).

⁴ For more detailed account of Underdeterminacy Thesis and its significance for pragmatic research see Mišković Luković (2013).

interpretative mechanisms compared to mechanisms employed in the interpretation of literal expressions. This approach to metaphors, and communication in general, represents a gateway to a unified and explanatorily adequate account of human communication.

The biggest contribution of this approach is the introduction of the mutual adjustment process. It enables better understanding of how the addressee arrives at the interpretation intended by the speaker in a given context. Namely, explicature analysis is a model of lexical-pragmatic theory within Relevance theory according to which pragmatic processes of strengthening (narrowing) and weakening (broadening) of meaning are treated in the same way – as aspects of pragmatic enrichment of the basic proposition of the utterance (Mišković Luković, 2013, p. 50), i.e. contributing to the explicit level of an utterance. To illustrate we shall look at the following example—from Wilson and Carston (2008):

1. Caroline is a princess.

According to this approach, where both narrowing and broadening are performed in a mutual adjustment process, contributing equally at the explicit level of communication, we get the following explicature:

1.a. CAROLINE_x is a PRINCES**

The „x“ signifies reference assignment was performed, while the asterisk symbols signify an *ad hoc* concept arrived at through pragmatic processes (in this case strengthening and weakening). Namely, it is highly unlikely that Caroline is actual royalty, hence this assumption is disregarded and a broader concept is arrived at (PRINCESS*) whose denotation includes all female persons. At the same time, it is possible to arrive at a sufficient number of contextual implications to make the utterance relevant in the expected way by adopting encyclopedic assumptions that

can be accessed based on the context and the encoded concept PRINCESS. Adoption of these assumptions is the process of narrowing of the encoded concept – the communicated concept PRINCESS** is narrower than the encoded concept in that it can be applied only to the subset of real princesses (who are, for example, spoiled or demanding). In this way, the interpretation warrants the following contextual assumption (1.b.) and contextual implication (1.c.):

1.b. PRINCESS**IS SPOILED, DEMANDING (etc.)

1.c. CAROLINE_xIS SPOILED, DEMANDING (etc.)

According to this approach, the inferential processes of metaphor interpretation rely on the extraction of weak implicatures (the broader the spectrum of possible conclusions, the weaker the implicatures and the greater the hearer's responsibility for the conclusions drawn). With standard metaphors, i.e. metaphoric expressions that are common in a given language, a small number of possible assumptions within the given encyclopedic entry can be accessed, so the implicatures drawn are stronger.

2. This room is a pigsty.

Sperber and Wilson (1986/95, p. 236) discuss this metaphoric expression and explain how it is interpreted in the stereotypical context. Namely, since pigsties are indeed typically dirty and messy, the implicature that the room is dirty and messy is drawn. If the speaker had not intended to convey this implicature, the expression should have been formulated differently. Without a stereotypical context, the situation is slightly different (taken from Sperber and Wilson (1986/95, p. 236)):

3. Robert is a bulldozer.

There is a wide spectrum of potential contextual implications some of which can be dismissed immediately for being mutually

contradictory. The relevance of suchlike expressions is a spectrum of contextual effects comprised of strong or weak implicatures. In this example, there is no strong implicature evident, but rather a whole range of weak implicatures concerning Robert's characteristics – for example *strong-minded*, *stubborn*, etc. Depending on the context, not all implicatures will be accepted as intended.

As evident from the analysis of these few examples, context plays a major role in the interpretation of linguistic metaphors. When there is a range of possible implicatures, the specific context determines which implicatures will be adopted and/or abandoned. This approach calls for no special treatment of metaphoric expressions, but rather places them within a continuum of loose uses of language.

3. Methodology and data collection

Survey method was used to test in what way and to what extent the interpretations of metaphoric expressions differ from one examinee to another. More precisely, the instrument used was the questionnaire given via in-person survey method. Sampling method was quota sampling and convenience sampling, both of which are non-probability methods. Namely, the researchers made the sample by selecting participants with the highest level of English language proficiency that were available.

The questionnaire was constructed for the purpose of examining the (im)possibility of arriving at different interpretations when it comes to linguistic metaphors. The importance of context could be examined by stripping metaphoric expressions of context and checking the interpretations arrived at, since the participants are thus prompted to rely on other types of contexts, such as the personal or general knowledge context. The questionnaire contains seven linguistic metaphors taken from various cognitive-pragmatic papers (see

Appendix 1). It was administered to fourth-year students of English Language and Literature at the Faculty of Philology and Arts in Kragujevac. The students were asked to provide interpretation(s) for said metaphoric expressions.

Since this represents a small pilot study designed to examine various ways in which certain metaphoric expressions might be interpreted, and to serve as a starting point for a more extensive study, we will not present the entire the data collected.⁵ Instead we shall focus on the most important results for the question posed in this paper.

The numbers in the tables below represent the percentage of a given answer against the total number of answers (interpretations) for a given metaphoric expression.

4. Interpretation of the results

Most answers included at least two possible interpretations for each metaphoric expression (78%). Furthermore, 3.4%⁶ of the metaphoric expressions were left without interpretation (i.e. could not be understood/interpreted), further demonstrating the crucial role of context in understanding linguistic metaphors. However, two metaphoric expressions stand out within this survey, and we shall use these result to demonstrate our claim about the importance of context.

Firstly, the most unified interpretation was observed with the metaphoric expression *That surgeon is a butcher*. The concept BUTCHER triggered largely uniform interpretations (see

⁵ Some expressions yielded more unified interpretations, while interpretation of some expressions prompted widely different answers. This led to forming of categories of interpretations that have, more often than not, largely different semantic scope (e.g. semantic field *dangerous* vs. positive/negative qualities in interpretation of the metaphoric expression *John is a shark*), which could not have been predicted prior to conducting the survey.

⁶ The percentages were rounded on the first decimal.

Figure 1). This was also the metaphoric expression with the fewest answers – 47 answers in total. The reason for this may be that a partial context, so to speak, is indeed provided, since the concept BUTCHER applies to the concept SURGEON, giving access to particular area of encyclopedic entry (namely those referring to the manner of cutting flesh) and yielding similar interpretations:

Emergent property	Percentage
Unskilled	59.1.%
Killer	19.6%
Enjoys cutting	12.8%
Other	6.3%

Figure 1 – interpretation of the metaphoric expression *That surgeon is a butcher*

The great majority (59.1%) of the answers referred to an unskilled doctor (*reckless/careless when operating, doesn't take care of patients, clumsy, etc.*). There were even answers depicting him as a (*serial*) *killer* (19.6%), as well as *someone who enjoys cutting* and/or *looking at blood* (12.8%). There were two literal interpretations – that the said surgeon actually has another job as a butcher; three examinees left the space designated for answer(s) blank, and two answers referred to the absence of emotions (which can also be linked to description of his skills as a doctor). One answer, however, was an interpretation of the said surgeon as being a good doctor (*he's extremely good at his work*).

Second example that caught our attention is the interpretation of the metaphoric expression *Susan is a wild rose*. Even though many cultures have a set of flower metaphors which are typically applied to women and, from a cognitive semantic

perspective, this might point to the existence of a conceptual metaphor WOMEN ARE FLOWERS (Wilson, 2011, p. 198)⁷, the instance of a metaphoric expression in question – *Susan is a wild rose* – seems to be pervious to different interpretations (see Figure 7):

Emergent property	Percentage
Rebellious/untamable	27.1%
Beautiful/pretty	19.4%
Pertaining to uniqueness	12.7%
Promiscuous	11.5%
Various positive qualities	9.6%
Various negative qualities	10.5%
Other	8.6%

Figure 2 – interpretation of the metaphoric expression *Susan is a wild rose*

As can be seen from the table in Figure 2, the concept WILD ROSE was interpreted very differently by our examinees. Without appropriate context, emergent properties (from the encyclopedic entry of the concept WILD ROSE) that were accessed varied from *beautiful/pretty* (19.4%), *unique/rare/hard to find* (12.7%), positive qualities such as *honest, energetic, independent*, etc. (9.6%) to *rebel* (8.5%), *untamable* (18.6%), range of negative qualities such as *deceitful, hard to manage, harsh, dangerous*, etc. (10.5%) to promiscuous woman who loves to party (11.5%). The remainder of answers cannot be grouped since those interpretations are not related to each other on any semantic grounds, as far as we can tell – *broken-hearted girl, diamond in*

⁷ See also Bassi, 2019 and Kittay, 1988.

the rough, likes the Nick Cave song, unpredictable, etc. Some pertain to emotional state, some are not necessarily classified as positive or negative, and some interpretations might be considered a joke on the part of the examinees.

Generally speaking, the metaphoric expressions from the questionnaire often triggered not only different, but opposite interpretations.⁸ However, certain metaphoric expressions can be said to have triggered more uniform interpretations than others.⁹ For example, linguistic metaphor *Sally is a block of ice* provided access to the emergent properties that refer to the lack of emotions. This does not necessarily imply that there is a default interpretation, and that said expression cannot have different interpretation. For instance, if it were used in a different situational context, it might mean that *Sally is (feeling) extremely cold*, for example. As the results also show, it can refer to a *stoic person, overweight, motionless*, etc. The choice of intended interpretation will depend on the context, but it inevitably suggests that some concepts allow smaller parts of the encyclopedic entry to be accessed and, hence, fewer interpretations.

Similarly, despite the fact that majority of answers in our survey did suggest that the default interpretation is that the surgeon is a not a very good doctor, concept BUTCHER cannot be expected to yield interpretation *bad at his/her job* every time it is used in language. Moreover, if this concept is used to describe

⁸ For example, men can be loyal and good friends, but also two-faced and cunning (expression *Men are wolves*); Caroline can be nice and kind or she can be seen as being mean (interpretation of the expression *Caroline is a princess*), etc.

⁹ Furthermore, this pilot study has pointed to the importance personal and general knowledge contexts might have, as well as the fact that they could be culturally influenced. Example of this is the notable percentage of interpretations regarding the concept bulldozer that were in relation to the semantic field *stupid*, could have been influenced by certain common (cultural) tendencies of the participants.

someone whose job is to slice or chop, we can expect that quite different emerging properties to be selected from the encyclopedic entry (e.g. [wife to her husband who is chopping woods]: *You're a real butcher!*). However, as was already discussed, in our example the very pairing of the concepts BUTCHER and SURGEON seems to point more definitively to a part of the encyclopedic entry of the concept BUTCHER that contains negative qualities, even extremely negative (as the percentage of the answers pointing to a *killer* suggests).

On the other hand, certain answers were left blank, suggesting that some metaphoric concepts are more difficult to be interpreted without the context than others. In other instances, examinees provided numerous possible answers, i.e. interpretations. Such was the case with concepts PRINCES, WOLF and WILD ROSE. Moreover, some idiosyncratic answers show that there are some interpretations that cannot even be predicted. For example, certain interpretations provided for the metaphoric expression *Susan is a wild rose (broken-hearted girl, diamond in the rough, likes the Nick Cave song, unpredictable, etc.)*, some of which are metaphoric themselves, point to the possibility of even more diverse interpretations, i.e. wider range of various weak implicatures that can be arrived at. Of course, it cannot be neglected that certain percentage of answers might be disregarded as being intended as humorous, for example. Nevertheless, this suggests that the existence of conceptual metaphor WOMEN ARE FLOWERS does not contribute to the interpretation of the said concretization in language.

All in all, the results suggest that linguistic (or spontaneous conversational metaphors), some more than others, need the appropriate context (at least situational or (intra)personal, for example) in order for the recipient of the message to arrive at the intended interpretation. This might suggest that the interpretation of, at least some, metaphoric expressions diverges greatly from that of approximation or

hyperbole. However, questioning the claim that metaphors might not be part of a continuum ranging from literal use of language is beyond the scope of this paper.

5. Conclusion

When it comes to linguistic metaphors context sometimes plays a crucial role in interpretation procedure. As our analysis has shown, some metaphoric expressions can be said to have more default or uniform interpretation than others (BLOCK OF ICE, BUTCHER)¹⁰, however, their meaning can be influenced and changed by the context. Some answers could be culturally influenced (e.g. BULLDOZER yielding numerous interpretations from the semantic domain *stupid*) and, apart from the answers that could be regarded as frivolous or humorous (e.g. the results for metaphor *Susan is a wild rose*), numerous factors – such as gender, age, educational background etc. – could have affected the answers and this could be a subject for further research.

The division between conceptual and linguistic metaphors may need revision since cognitive-semantic research has long moved past exploring only the mappings between domains and how these mappings are grounded in experience. Both cognitive-pragmatic and cognitive-semantic approach aim at providing explanatorily adequate approach applicable to all metaphoric expressions. Regardless, it can be noted that, while the use of some metaphoric expressions warrants the recovery of the intended meaning, interpretation of certain metaphoric expressions depends on the context in order to recover the intended meaning. Relatively novel theory developed by Steen (2008, 2011, 2015) points to the need to introduce a third dimension to metaphor. Namely, apart from language and thought, metaphors are being examined in terms of their communicative value. The notion of *deliberateness* was

¹⁰ The same was said for the example with concept PIGSTY (see the section on theoretical framework).

introduced in order to deal with the paradox of metaphor – the fact that not all metaphoric expressions are indeed used metaphorically. So, deliberate metaphor is a metaphor used *as* a metaphor, and as such, serves a certain communicative function. Different processing of metaphoric expressions was recognized within the framework of Relevance theory (see Mišković-Luković, 2013), differentiating between descriptive and interpretative language use. We believe that this distinction might be crucial for developing an explanatorily adequate treatment of metaphor. Both Deliberate Metaphor theory and modified explicature analysis recognize the role of entrenchment and frequency of use of certain expressions in the distinction between deliberate and non-deliberate metaphor, i.e. interpretative and descriptive language use. This discussion goes beyond the scope of this paper and is a topic for further research.

REFERENCES

- Bassi, N. (2019). *A Contrastive Analysis of Metaphors Belonging to the Basic Conceptual Metaphor PEOPLE ARE PLANTS in English and Croatian*. Diss. University of Zagreb. University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. Department of English language and literature.
- Carston, R. (2010a). Lexical pragmatics, ad hoc concepts and metaphor: from a relevance theory perspective. *Italian Journal of Linguistics*, 22(1), 153–180.
- Carston, R. (2010b). Metaphor: Ad hoc concepts, literal meaning and mental images. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 110(3), 295–321.
- Carston, R. (2002a). Metaphor, ad hoc concepts and word meaning—more questions than answers. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*, 14, 83–105.
- Carston, R. (2002b). *Thoughts and utterances: The pragmatics of explicit communication*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Gibbs, R. W. (2015). Does deliberate metaphor theory have a future. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 90, 73–76.
- Kittay, E. F. (1988). Woman as metaphor 1. *Hypatia*, 3(2), 63–86.

(Ne)popularna (ne)kultura

Zbornik radova

Kövecses, Z. (2006). *Language, mind, and culture: A practical introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, G. & M. Johnson. (1980/2003). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press.

Mišković-Luković, M. (2015). *Pragmatika*. Kragujevac: Filološko-umetnički fakultet.

Mišković-Luković, M. (2014). Doslovno i figurativno značenje: pragmatičke perspektive. U: M. Kovačević (ur.), *Srpski jezik, književnost, umetnost: zbornik radova sa VIII međunarodnog naučnog skupa održanog na Filološko-umetničkom fakultetu u Kragujevcu*. Kragujevac: Filološko-umetnički fakultet, 345–355.

Mišković-Luković, M. (2013). Od fikcije ka realnosti: leksika kao osnova za generiranje stereotipa. U: B. Mišić Ilić i V. Lopičić (ur.), *Jezik, književnost, vrednosti: zbornik radova. Jezička istraživanja*. Niš: Filozofski fakultet. 47-63.

Tendahl, M. and R. W. Gibbs. (2008). Complementary perspectives on metaphor: Cognitive linguistics and relevance theory. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(11), 1823–1864.

Fauconnier, G. (1994). *Mental spaces: Aspects of meaning construction in natural language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fauconnier, G., Turner, M. (1994). *Conceptual Projection and Middle Spaces*. UCSD:Department of Cognitive Science Technical Report 9401.

Fauconnier, G. and M. Turner. (2002). *The way we think. Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. New York: Basic Books.

Fauconnier, G., Turner, M. (2003). Conceptual blending, form and meaning. *Recherches en communication*, 19(19), 57–86.

Sperber, D. and D. Wilson. (1987). Précis of relevance: Communication and cognition. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 10(4), 697-710.

Sperber, D. and D. Wilson. (1986/1995). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Sperber, D. and D. Wilson. (2004). Relevance theory. *Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 607–632.

Steen, G. (2008). The paradox of metaphor: Why we need a three-dimensional model of metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 23(4), 213–241.

Steen, G. J. (2011). From three dimensions to five steps: The value of deliberate metaphor.

Steen, G. (2015). Developing, testing and interpreting deliberate metaphor theory. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 90, 67–72.

Wilson, D. (2003). Relevance and lexical pragmatics. *Italian Journal of Linguistics*, 15, 273–292.

Wilson, D. (2011). Parallels and differences in the treatment of metaphor in relevance theory and cognitive linguistics. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 8(2), 177–196.

Wilson, D. and R. Carston. (2006). Metaphor, relevance and the ‘emergent property’ issue. *Mind & Language*, 21(3), 404–433.

Anica Radosavljević Krsmanović

Nina Manojlović

Filološko-umetnički fakultet, Univerzitet u Kragujevcu

WHAT DO YOU MEAN *SUSAN IS A WILD ROSE*? THE INTERPLAY OF
IMAGE SCHEMAS, LINGUISTIC METAPHORS AND CONTEXT

Summary

Linguistic metaphors are often idiosyncratic occurrences in language and their interpretation depends heavily on the context. However, sometimes frequent use or established mappings between certain domains (in cognitive-linguistic terms) can lead to unified interpretation of metaphoric expressions. In this paper we are aiming to examine the interpretation of certain linguistic metaphors in terms of context dependency and relatedness to conceptual metaphors. Namely, metaphoric expression *Susan is a wild rose* can be considered as linguistic concretization of conceptual metaphor WOMEN ARE FLOWERS. Nevertheless, our analysis points to the greater importance of context in interpretation of metaphoric expressions. Theoretical framework is explicature analysis (within the framework of Relevance theory), which is presently prevalent in pragmatic theory. The paper also tackles the issue of deliberate metaphors, since the Deliberate Metaphor Theory introduces the third dimension to the metaphor treatment – communication, and consequently the importance of context. Finally, we will briefly present the possibility of an alternative approach to metaphoric expressions within Relevance theory framework and suggest a possible parallels it might have with the Deliberate Metaphor Theory.

Keywords: context, linguistic metaphors, Relevance theory, explicature analysis, emergent property, encyclopedic entry, deliberate metaphor

Appendix 1 – the questionnaire

Please explain how you understand the metaphorical expressions given below (mind you, the said expressions are taken out of the context, so there is no wrong or right answer).

N.B. You can give more than one possible reading of the underlined expressions, but if you do, write them down in the order those interpretations occurred to you.

John is a shark¹

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Men are wolves

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Caroline is a princess.²

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Susan is a wild rose³

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Robert is a bulldozer.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Sally is a block of ice.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

That surgeon is a butcher.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

¹ Taken from: Carston, R. "Lexical pragmatics, ad hoc concepts and metaphor: from a relevance theory perspective." *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 22.1 (2010): 153-180.

² Taken from: Wilson, Deirdre, and Robyn Carston. "Metaphor and the 'emergent property' problem: A relevance-theoretic treatment." *The Baltic*

International Yearbook of Cognition, Logic and Communication 3.2007 (2008): 1-40.

³ Taken from: Wilson, D. (2011). Parallels and differences in the treatment of metaphor in relevance theory and cognitive linguistics. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 8(2), 177-196.

CIP - Каталогизација у публикацији
Библиотеке Матице српске, Нови Сад

316.7(082)

КАРЛОВАЧКИ дани слободне мисли (6 ; 2019 ; Сремски Карловци)

(Ne)popularna (ne)kultura : zbornik radova [sa VI Karlovačkih dana slobodne misli] / [uredila Ratković Andrea]. - Sremski Karlovci: Centar za afirmaciju slobodne misli, 2020 (Novi Sad : Studio Denik). - 162 str. ; 23 cm

Tiraž 200. - Bibliografija uz svaki rad. - Rezime na engl. jeziku uz svaki rad.

ISBN 978-86-901590-1-7

a) Социологија културе – Зборници

COBISS.SR-ID 29620489