Tamara N. Janevska[1]
University of Kragujevac
Faculty of Philology and Arts
Center for Scientific Research
ORCID 0009-0009-5389-0231

THE GENITIVE CONSTRUCTION ('S) AS A SIGNAL OF POTENTIAL CROSS-DOMAIN MAPPING[2],[3]

The very potential of metaphor flags to aid analysts in the process of identifying and interpreting metaphor has led to the development of metaphor signaling as a new area of study within metaphor analysis (Skorczynska, Ahrens 2015; Herrmann 2013). This paper investigates metaphor signaling by focusing on a specific type of metaphor flag (MFlag) that has not been analyzed in a more targeted fashion, and that has been excluded from consideration in the MIPVU (Steen et al. 2010). Namely, it examines the signaling use of the genitive construction by means of *'s*. This is done by observing (i) the frequency of occurrence of the *'s*-genitive with reference to its distribution across registers and (ii) the meaning and function of the *'s*-genitive as a marker of metaphor. A corpus analysis is conducted by extracting examples from *The Corpus of Contemporary American English* (COCA). The occurrences are checked for classification as MFlags following the information about direct word use and signals of cross-domain mapping provided in the procedure (MIPVU). Our data set showed that there is a marked underuse of the *'s*-genitive as an MFlag. The signaling potential of the genitive seemed less dependent on the meaning and function of the construction itself and more dependent on the role of the genitive noun as a necessary constituent element of the mapping. Future research should focus on other collocates and the cross-linguistic comparison of the signaling use of the *'s*-genitive in order to draw a more tenable conclusion regarding this construction.

Keywords: the English *'s*-genitive, metaphor flag, direct metaphor, Conceptual Metaphor Theory, MIPVU

1. Introduction

As a subdiscipline of the field of cognitive linguistics, *Metaphor Theory* (Lakoff, Johnson 2003: 271) tries to explicate the conceptual systems and language by means of mappings between two different domains of experience. Based on the linguistic evidence such as the word *cost* in "That flat tire *cost* me

an hour" (ibid. 9), one could postulate the well-entrenched metaphor TIME IS MONEY because a word that belongs to the domain of MONEY is used to structure an abstract domain such as TIME. The publication of the manual *Metaphor Identification Procedure Vrije Universiteit* (MIPVU) (Steen et al. 2010) made the methodological aspects of metaphor identification more explicit. Not only did it ease the basic problem of categorizing a particular linguistic expression as metaphorical, but it also helped identify other forms of metaphor, i.e. the cross-domain mappings which are realized by direct or implicit language, in addition to indirect language use[4]. In the case of the direct form of metaphor[5], when the two contrasted domains are both present in the discourse, the indirect conceptualization may or may not be signaled by *metaphor markers* (ibid: 12). These markers represent "lexis which flags the need for some form of similarity or projection" (ibid: 14). In other words, they alert the language user to the potential presence of the linguistic expressions of underlying cross-domain mappings. Because they hint at the possibility of metaphor-related words (MRWs), the markers are traditionally termed *metaphor flags* (coded as MFlag). These lexical units are not themselves metaphorical, but they tend to occur together with directly expressed metaphors (ibid: 94). For instance, the lexical unit *resembling* in: "Poplar leaves have an elegant outline <u>resembling</u> *that of an Arab minaret*" should be marked as an MFlag because it signals the mapping between the source (the outline of an Arab minaret) and the target (the outline of poplar leaves) in the direct metaphor POPLAR LEAVES ARE ARAB MINARET (Steen et al. 2010: 123).

Different authors have established various categorizations of metaphor markers. One such categorization was provided by Goatly (1997: 169, 173–195) who grouped markers into twenty categories[6]. The author (ibid: 186–187) refers to genitive constructions as *precision comparisons*[7], which he illustrates with the examples: "My cry for help was <u>*the cry*</u> of* **the rat when the terrier shakes it**" and "He made his **bear's*** <u>*way*</u> down the ladder, **paw** after **paw**" (the author's asterisks, italics, and bold letters[8]). On the other hand, the list that has been offered in the MIPVU (Steen et al. 2010: 40–41) includes: a) *like, as, more, less, more/less … than*; b) comparative inflection plus *than*; c) *compare, comparison, comparative; same, similar; analogy, analogue*; d) *regard as, conceive of, see as; imagine, think, talk, behave as if*; and e) *as if*. However, certain signs of indirectness have been excluded from consideration in the procedure, such as *sort of, kind of*, topic domain signaling, and the genitive construction by means of *'s* or preposition *of* (Steen et al. 2010: 176). The metaphorical semantics of the *of*-genitive has been discussed in the literature to some degree (see Goatly

---

4 For an extensive overview, see Steen et al. (2010).
5 Direct metaphor often occurs in the form of a simile (Pasma 2011: 50).
6 Wallington et al. (2003) offer a somewhat different categorization.
7 The reason is that the *vehicle* (the *source domain* in cognitive-linguistic terms) gives extra precision and specificity to the *grounds* (i.e. the similarities involved). The *grounds* are particularized by the *vehicle*-terms (Goatly 1997: 186).
8 In Goatly (1997), the *vehicle*-terms (*sources*) are given in bold, the *topic*-terms (*targets*) are underlined, the *ground*-terms are in italics, while markers are asterisked.

1997; Szymanska 2018), whereas scant attention has been paid to the *'s*-genitive with respect to metaphor signaling. In addition, Wallington et al. (2003) mention that little quantitative work has been done contrasting the co-occurrence of metaphor signals with metaphorical and non-metaphorical stretches in general. Hence, the present paper centers on the signal *'s*, which belongs to the *genitive construction* category, and explores its potential use as an MFlag. The paper begins with a brief description of the genitive construction which is followed by the discussion of some methodological issues and the presentation of the results of the analysis in the central part of the paper.

2. The English *'s-genitive*

The genitive construction[9] is typically associated with *possession*[10]. The roles of *possessor–possessee* are central to the *'s*-genitive, while the *of*-genitive assigns the conceptual roles of *entity–entrinsic entity* to its two nominals (Stefanowitsch 1998; Stefanowitsch 2003, cited in De Vaere et al. 2020: 98, 104–105). Despite this common use (i.e. as *possessive genitive*), the construction has the potential to express other meanings: (ii) *subjective genitive* (*the boy's* application), (iii) *objective genitive* (*the family's* support), (iv) *genitive of origin* (*the girl's* story), (v) *descriptive genitive* (*a women's* college), (vi) *genitive of measure* (*ten days'* absence), (vii) *genitive of attribute* (*the victim's* courage), and (viii) *partitive genitive* (*the baby's* eyes) (Quirk et al. 1985: 321–322).

In terms of the grammatical status, the *'s*-genitive can function as: (i) a *modifier* (*a ship's* doctor), (ii) a *group genitive*, where its function is parallel to the function of a preposition (*the Museum of Modern Art's* Director), (iii) *independent genitive* (His memory is like *an elephant's*), (iv) *local genitive* (Let's have dinner at *Tiffany's*), (v) *post-genitive*, where it follows *of* as a prepositional complement (an invention *of Gutenberg's*), or (vi) it can have a *determinative* function (*Jenny's* desk) (ibid: 326–331). The meaning and function of the *'s*-genitive are treated in the segment 4.2. which explores whether this genitive marker has a particular function and meaning when used as an MFlag.

3. Data and Methodology

A corpus-based study was conducted by extracting the examples from *The Corpus of Contemporary American English* (COCA). The range of eight genres was of considerable importance to the present discussion because the existing metaphor signaling research (see e.g. Skorczynska, Ahrens 2015; Cameron, Deignan 2003) has shown that the variation in signaling (i.e. the frequency and type of signal used) correlates with genre variation and the discourse

---

9 The close similarity of meaning and function between the *'s*-genitive and the *of*-genitive is discussed in Quirk et al. (1985: 321), Rosenbach (2002), and Stefanowitsch (1998: 3).

10 The treatment of the *'s*-genitive by Goddard and Wierzbicka (2019: 233) is confined to the schemas of the form [THIS SOMEONE'S] SOMETHING, where the second term refers to a concrete object (e.g. *Mary's ring*), they thus exclude instances where the second noun represents an abstract concept (e.g. *Mary's life*).

functions of metaphor. The analyses (Krennmayr 2011: 111; Herrmann 2013: 161; Kaal 2012:117) of the distribution of direct metaphor across four registers revealed that it has the highest proportion in fiction, followed by news, academic texts, and conversation. The fact that signals often occur with direct metaphors, which are predominantly a feature of fiction and news, might suggest that the frequency of signals correlates with these register types. Yet Krennmayr (ibid.) notes that direct metaphor tends not to be signaled as often as one might expect, therefore the high frequency of direct metaphor in a certain register does not automatically entail equal distribution of metaphor signals in that register. For this reason, the occurrences of the genitive were checked across all eight genres.

Markers can have different meanings, which complicates the issue of identifying those that flag a metaphor[11]. In this case, the difficulty lies in excluding the examples where the *'s* represents a short form or a contraction (of *is*, *has*, *does*, or *let's*). Searching the corpus for nouns followed by "'s" (NOUN_'s) was not precise enough, as the search results contained instances of contracted forms (e.g. I'm from the deep blue underworld, land or sea, the *world's* my oyster, I'm the pearl.), as well as those in which the item was used as a genitive marker (e.g. Economic planners also predict that Brazil could become the *world's* fifth-largest economy in a few years.). A decision was made to search the corpus for: "NOUN_'s_NOUN", as suggested by Galiano and Semeraro (2023: 13). The number of occurrences in the entire corpus was 613787. The ten most frequent collocates[12] included the following: DRIVER'S LICENSE, MASTER'S DEGREE, ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, PEOPLE'S LIVES, YEAR'S EVE, SHERIFF'S OFFICE, WOMEN'S RIGHTS, BACHELOR'S DEGREE, EDITOR'S NOTE and CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL. We analyzed 500 examples per collocate, that is, a total of 5000 examples were examined for the presence of the *'s*-genitive in a directly expressed metaphorical stretch, which were then checked for its function as a signal of potential cross-domain mapping. This was done by following the information about direct word use and signals of cross-domain mapping provided in the procedure (MIPVU). Direct metaphors were identified by: a) finding the local referent and topic shifts by focusing on the lexis which is incongruous with the rest of the text, b) testing if such units can be integrated within the overall referential and/or topical framework by means of some form of comparison, c) determining whether the comparison is non-literal or cross-domain, and if d) it represents some form of indirect discourse about the local referent or topic of the text (Steen et al. 2010: 38–39). The *'s*-genitive was marked as an MFlag when it was attached to a noun that was a part of the cross-domain comparison between concepts belonging to two distinct domains. For instance, the stretch: "in the way that did not suit him [Stanhope] or his *hawk's* face"[13] displays a cross-domain comparison between the source domain ANIMAL and the target HUMAN, as indicated

---

11 The multifunctionality of marker words has been pointed out by Low (2010), Cameron and Deignan (2003).
12 Listed in descending order.
13 The example is taken from Goatly (1997: 246).

by the lexical item *hawk* which points to a referent shift. The example therefore represents an instance of a direct metaphor. Given that the *'s*-genitive is attached to the noun that represents a source domain, the genitive is treated as a metaphor flag.

The following segment reports on the findings of our analysis. Given that the main objective is to check the potential of the *'s*-genitive to be classified as a signal of metaphor, the frequency of its occurrence in cross-domain comparisons expressed by direct language is explored in 4.1. and the qualitative discussion is provided in 4.2. The words that belong to the "topically incongruous" stretch of text are italicized, the metaphor flags are marked with an asterisk, and the register to which the sentences belong is in square brackets.

4. Findings

4.1 The frequency of occurrence of the 's-genitive as an MFlag

The overall number of direct metaphors in the corpus amounted to 20 cases, out of the 5000 analyzed examples. That is, the ten most frequent collocates combined participated in a directly expressed metaphorical stretch solely 20 times (0.4%). The number of occurrences is given in Table 1.

Table 1. *The distribution of direct metaphors across registers per collocate*

	MAG	FIC	SPOK	NEWS	ACAD	TV	BLOG	MOV	Total
DRIVER'S LICENSE	1		2	1					4
MASTER'S DEGREE					1				1
ATTORNEY'S OFFICE				1		1			2
PEOPLE'S LIVES		3	1				2		6
YEAR'S EVE		1							1
SHERIFF'S OFFICE							1		1
WOMEN'S RIGHTS							1		1
BACHELOR'S DEGREE	1		1		1				3
EDITOR'S NOTE									0
CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL				1					1
Total	2	4	4	3	2	1	4		20

Four occurrences of DRIVER'S LICENSE were a part of a directly expressed metaphorical stretch, as in the example below:

1. For other teens, a driver's license is *the golden ticket to freedom* and a car is more necessary than food or water. [NEWS]

Driver's license displays the stress pattern of a compound (ˈdriverˈs license), and can be found listed as such in the dictionary (*Longman*), which means that it should be treated as a single lexical unit according to the procedure (Steen et al. 2010: 30‒31). For that reason, it is impossible to analyze the noun that the *'s* has been attached to for potential metaphorical

meaning. The same was true of MASTER'S DEGREE (ˈmaster's deˌgree; e.g. […] the desire to do a master's degree […] act[s] more as* *a driving force from within* than the external influence. [ACAD]) and BACHELOR'S DEGREE (ˈbachelor's deˌgree; e.g. […] a bachelor's degree in, say, software engineering looks like* *a pretty good investment.* [MAG]). Since their analysis would entail exploring the potential metaphorical use of compounds, such instances (a total of 8 examples) were excluded from further analysis. The remaining 12 quotations, belonging to the collocates highlighted in bold type, were checked with respect to metaphor signaling. A summary of our annotation decisions is presented in tabular form below (Table 2).

Table 2. *The occurrence of the 's-genitive with directly expressed metaphors and annotation decisions*

COLLOCATE	CO-OCCURRENCE OF THE 'S-GENITIVE WITH DIRECTLY EXPRESSED METAPHORS	CO-OCCURRENCE OF THE 'S-GENITIVE WITH NON-METAPHORICAL STRETCHES OR WITH INDIRECTLY EXPRESSED METAPHORS	TOTAL	COMMENT
DRIVER'S LICENSE	4	496	500	Compound. Exclude from further analysis.
MASTER'S DEGREE	1	499	500	Compound. Exclude from further analysis.
ATTORNEY'S OFFICE	2	498	500	Analyze as two separate lexical units.
PEOPLE'S LIVES	6	494	500	Analyze as two separate lexical units.
YEAR'S EVE	1	499	500	Analyze as two separate lexical units.
SHERIFF'S OFFICE	1	499	500	Analyze as two separate lexical units.
WOMEN'S RIGHTS	1	499	500	Analyze as two separate lexical units.

BACHELOR'S DEGREE	3	497	500	Compound. Exclude from further analysis.
EDITOR'S NOTE	0	500	500	–
CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL	1	499	500	Analyze as two separate lexical units.

The multi-word expression *district attorney's office* in 2 and 3 is not a compound, which means that it should be analyzed as a collection of separate lexical units:

2. You're an intern. Your job is to sort the crime scene photos and talk us through them, not come up with theories. This is a district attorney's* office, not *a detective agency*. [TV]

3. There is no question the district attorney's office allowed itself to become *a tool of Lozow, Rosenthal and the ADL*. [NEWS]

In the corrective frame[14] A IS B NOT C in 2, the context makes it clear that the contrast is based on the duties of the two professions, that of an *attorney* and that of a *detective*[15]. For a unit to count as a marker of metaphor, it needs to occur in the environment of metaphorical vehicle-terms (sources) and make a reference to that metaphorical vehicle (Goatly 1997: 172, 174). More importantly, it has to indicate the need for some form of similarity or projection (Steen et al. 2010: 40). In 2, the omission of the words *attorney* and *detective* would do damage to the metaphorical reading, as both *office* and *agency* merely denote a business that provides a particular service for people. Since the comparison is seen as expressing a cross-domain mapping between an ATTORNEY and a DETECTIVE, we believe that the *'s*-genitive flags the presence of metaphor in 2. The mapping in 3, however, is between THE OFFICE and THE TOOL. The noun *office* stands for the people who work there, rather than a room or a building, and the noun *tool* is metaphorically used within the stretch of directly used language expressing a cross-domain mapping. This is due to the contrast between its basic meaning: "a piece of equipment, usually one that you hold in your hand, that is designed to do a particular type of work" (*Macmillan*, sense 1) and contextual meaning: "someone who is used by another person or group, especially to do a difficult or dishonest job" (*Macmillan*, sense 3). The *'s* in *district attorney* does not display an MFlag use in this example since the noun merely describes the domain (THE OFFICE) that participates in the mapping (THE OFFICE IS A TOOL) by indicating that it is *a group of district attorneys*. These remarks apply equally to SHERIFF'S OFFICE:

---

14 For more information on corrective frames, see Bogetić (2017).

15 Such distinction, motivated by the focus on different (social) roles, led Seen et al. (2010: 95) to argue that the comparison in: "An effective analyst provides the same service to the business *as the doctor provides to the patient*" is metaphorical, rather than literal.

4. […] the sheriff isn't going to be making policy on abortion rights in King County---but the sheriff's office can be and has been *a stepping-stone to higher office*, including offices that can play a pivotal role in women's rights. [BLOG]

The word *office* denotes the department of country government that participates in this decision-making process. The example also contains an indirect metaphor within this metaphorical stretch since the word *stepping-stone* has a more basic meaning. However, the cross-domain mapping occurs, again, between THE OFFICE and A STEPPING-STONE. The genitive in *sheriff's* simply performs a descriptive determinative function, it does not signal a need for a comparison. Both examples (3 and 4) represent instances of *personification-with-metonymy* (Dorst et al. 2011: 178) because a human agent, a *person*, has been replaced by a non-human agent, *the office*.

The collocate with the greatest number of direct metaphors, PEOPLE'S LIVES, participated in analogies with a range of different sources, illustrated below:

5. Next on "The Five," e-mail is making some people's lives *hell*. [SPOK]

6. And you can't try to scare people. Listen, this is not *a game*. These are people's jobs. These are people's lives. [BLOG]

7. In the face of so much wretchedness and gravity, what justification have Mimi and I for entertaining such *chicken-or-egg* questions as whether people's lives or their stories have, so to speak, ontological primacy? [FIC]

8. It was these reflections and their accompanying guilt, she declared […] that had led her to thinking in this new way about people's lives as* *stories* […]. [FIC]

9. "I have no right to make these sorts of guesses, Paul. Other people's lives, even your own children's, are *a complete mystery*." [FIC]

The target domain PEOPLE'S LIVES in the examples above belongs to the following specific-level metaphors: PEOPLE'S LIVES ARE HELL (5), PEOPLE'S LIVES ARE A GAME (6), PEOPLE'S LIVES ARE CAUSES[16] (7), PEOPLE'S LIVES ARE STORIES (8), and PEOPLE'S LIVES ARE A MYSTERY (9). Higher levels of generality, however, would simply involve the mappings between LIFE in general and these other sources (e.g. LIFE IS A GAME). Although the *'s*-genitive with determinative function has a definite reference, thus excluding other possibilities (*animal/plant/insect/bird life*), it does not instruct the participants in the discourse to set up a comparison between PEOPLE and some other entity. For comparison, let us consider briefly the example provided by Goatly (1997: 187): "He made his *bear's** way down the ladder, paw after paw". The genitive is attached to a noun which is in direct opposition to a human entity, the contrast is between

---

16 This is because "a chicken-and-egg situation" implies that one of the two things happened first and caused the other one to happen (*Macmillan*, sense 1). *People's lives* would represent the first element and *people's stories* the second element in the discussion on primacy in this example.

the movement of a bear and the movement of a person (A PERSON IS A BEAR). It therefore represents a linguistic realization of the conceptual metaphor A PERSON IS AN ANIMAL at a more general level. In the case of *people's lives*, the head noun (*life*) corresponds to another element which is a part of the source. Similarly, WOMEN'S RIGHTS in 10 participated in the RIGHTS ARE A FAULTLINE conceptual metaphor in which the genitive solely specifies the kind of rights, this makes it more closely related to the example in 11:

10. Have women's rights become *the fault line for Turkey's culture war*? [BLOG]

11. By contrast, the Basra children's hospital […] looks like* *a shining success story*, with gardeners tending manicured lawns in preparation for its opening. [NEWS]

In all 500 citations, YEAR'S EVE was a part of a combination NEW YEAR'S EVE. There was only one instance of it being used in a direct metaphor:

12. I think of the two days, New Year's Eve and New Year's Day, like* *two sides of a coin* with a hole through the middle […]. [FIC]

Based on the reversed stress pattern (ˌNew Year's ˈEve), we should treat the expression as consisting of two separate lexical units whose parts can be analyzed for potential metaphorical meaning. Yet the noun refers to a holiday and to one particular day (31st December). Therefore, the whole referent NEW YEAR'S DAY corresponds to ONE SIDE OF A COIN. In this respect, the collocate is similar to the examples that have been excluded from the analysis, hence the genitive does not display the use of a signal.

In only one quotation, out of 12, the *'s*-genitive indicated that a cross-domain mapping might be at play. The genitive noun *attorney's* in which the *'s* was marked up as an MFlag (in 2) was a necessary component of the mapping since there was a transfer of a relation from that noun to another entity in the source domain. The genitive nouns in all other direct metaphors in our data set simply accompanied the entity which participated in the mapping. Our results align with the claims made by Wallington et al. (2003) who stress that even if a signal co-occurs with a metaphor, it may not necessarily function as "an instruction to move into metaphor processing mode". The cognitive function of a signal for the participants in the discourse, therefore, might vary depending on the signal used.

4.2. The meaning and function of the 's-genitive as an MFlag

As explained in the previous section, the *'s* could not be treated as a potential MFlag in the three collocates (DRIVER'S LICENSE, MASTER'S DEGREE, and BACHELOR'S DEGREE) which represented single lexical units on the basis of the stress pattern. In all three collocates, the *'s*-genitive belonged to the *descriptive genitive* semantic category, and it functioned as a *modifier*. The genitive in these cases specifies "the kind of X" (*degree* or *license*), and, because of the idiomatic connection between the two nouns, no item can intervene

between the genitive noun and the head noun (Quirk et al. 1985: 1336). The use of the genitive as a descriptive premodifier is, in fact, typical of compounds (ibid.). The genitive in ATTORNEY'S OFFICE in 2 is used as a possessive genitive, since the office *belongs to* the district attorney, and it functions as a determinative, because items (underlined) can intervene between the genitive noun and the head noun, e.g. *attorney's shabby office*. It performs the same function in 3 (e.g. *attorney's new office worker/staff*), except that it is used as a descriptive genitive because *the office* stands for the group which consists of district attorneys. In this respect, it is similar to 4, given that the *'s* performs the same function (determinative) and has the same meaning (descriptive). Based on its semantic classification, the genitive in PEOPLE'S LIVES (5–9) belongs to the *possessive genitive* category. As items can be inserted between the two nouns, e.g. *people's daily/private lives*, it has a determinative function. This is especially evident in 5 and 9, because *some* and *other* belong to the genitive noun *people's*, rather than the head noun *lives*. Unlike 5–9, where the meaning of the genitive can be determined by asking the question: "Whose life?", the genitive in WOMEN'S RIGHTS and CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL shows a different pattern of use. Instead of denoting possession, it shows that these are the legal, social, and political rights and entitlements claimed for women in 10, and that it is a hospital that offers its services exclusively to infants, children, and adolescents in 11. Since the meaning can be arrived at by answering the question: "What kind of rights/a hospital?", the *'s*-genitive is used as a descriptive genitive. Given that these rights and hospitals can be further specified, e.g. *women's reproductive/political rights*, or *children's psychiatric/medical hospital*, the *'s*-genitive has a determinative function in 10 and 11. In 12, the meaning of the collocate NEW YEAR'S EVE, "the evening of 31st December" (*Macmillan*), points to the genitive with a modifying function and denotes the partitive relation between the two nouns.

The data suggests that the meaning and function of the *'s*-genitive affect the MFlag status of a word only inasmuch as the genitive functions as a descriptive premodifier. In those cases, we are dealing with a compound which cannot be split into two independent parts during the metaphor analysis. In all other cases, the situation is less clear, which points to the need for further research.

5. Conclusion

The present study investigated whether the genitive *'s* construction could be assigned the role of a signal of metaphor (MFlag). In this data set, the occurrence of direct metaphors was relatively scarce (0.4%). The analysis showed that the treatment of the *'s*-genitive as a potential MFlag token involves a number of considerations. Firstly, the multi-word expression to which the *'s*-genitive is attached has to be checked for its classification as a single lexical unit. If the *'s* is attached to a noun which is a part of a compound, it is impossible to analyze the genitive noun for potential metaphorical meaning. Rather, it is the entire compound that participates in the cross-domain mapping in such

cases, while the *'s*-genitive functions exclusively as a descriptive premodifier. Such cases should not be taken into consideration when studying the potential of the construction to flag a metaphor in the future. When the two nouns were treated as two separate units based on the stress pattern, the status of the *'s*-marked word seemed less dependent on the meaning and function of the genitive construction. Namely, the genitive did not display an MFlag quotation when it functioned as a partitive modifier or a descriptive determinative. When used as a possessive determinative, it did function as an MFlag in the case of ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, but it did not display that use in the case of PEOPLE'S LIVES. For the *'s*-genitive to function as a signal, it has to indicate that there is a transfer of a relation or an attribute *from* the noun marked by the genitive suffix to another noun in the discourse that refers to a different notion. The same has been claimed by Szymańska (2018: 3) for the N + N$_{Gen}$ expressions: "if the components of an N + NGen expression are nouns referring to two different notions (X and Y) and the one and only semantic relation between these components can be expressed as the sentence X is Y, then the N + NGen expression can only be a metaphor". The fact that it simply occurs in the environment of linguistic metaphors is not a deciding factor. We base this claim on the observation that the *scope* of a linguistic simile (i.e. direct metaphor) includes the words that introduce the source domain as premodifiers and that occur after a metaphor flag (Steen et al. 2010: 94–95). As a result, at the linguistic level of metaphor analysis, such words count as parts of a particular source domain, but the lexical units that such words modify are the ones which set up the cross-domain comparison (ibid.). This could potentially explain why the genitive was not marked as a signal in PEOPLE'S LIVES. This issue highlights Low's (2010: 294) view that, during the analysis, one needs to make a context-based inference because markers are often multifunctional. Although the possibility that the*'s*-genitive can act as a signal of metaphor should not be excluded, it would appear that such use is not very frequent, or that it is at least far less frequent than the common signals *like* or *as*. More research is needed in order to support the claim that the MFlag-status of a word is a direct consequence of a particular relation that holds between the genitive and the head noun, or that the signal correlates with metaphors conveying a certain type of information. In addition, the signaling use of the *plural genitive* (Quirk et al. 1985: 319) should be explored and its use contrasted with the genitive in singular nouns.

REFERENCES

Cameron, Deignan 2003: L. Cameron, A. Deignan, Combining large and small corpora to investigate tuning devices around metaphor in spoken discourse, *Metaphor & Symbol*, *18* (3), 149–160.

De Vaere et al. 2020: H. De Vaere, J. Kolkmann, T. Belligh, Allostructions revisited, *Journal of Pragmatics* 170, Elsevier, 96‑111.

Dorst et al. 2011: A. Dorst, G. Mulder, G. Steen, Recognition of personification in fiction by non-expert readers, *Metaphor and the Social World*, 1:2, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 174-201.

Galiano, Semeraro 2023: L. Galiano, A. Semeraro, Part-of-Speech and Pragmatic Tagging of a Corpus of Film Dialogue: A Pilot Study, *Corpus Pragmatics*, Springer International Publishing.

Goatly 1997: A. Goatly, *The Language of Metaphors*, London and New York: Routledge.

Goddard, Wierzbicka 2019: C. Goddard, A. Wierzbicka, Cognitive Semantics, Linguistic Typology and Grammatical Polysemy: "Possession" and the English Genitive, *Cognitive Semantisc*, *5*, Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 224-247.

Herrmann 2013: J. B. Herrmann, *Metaphor in academic discourse: Linguistic forms, conceptual structures, communicative functions and cognitive representations*, The Netherlands: LOT.

Kaal 2012: A. Kaal, *Metaphor in conversation*, Oisterwijk: Uitgeverij BOX Press.

Krennmayr 2011: T. Krennmayr, *Metaphor in newspapers*, The Netherlands: LOT.

Lakoff, Johnson 2003 [1980]: J. Lakoff, M. Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Low 2010: G. Low, Wot no similes? The curious absence of simile in university lectures, in G. Low, Z. Todd, A. Deignan, L. Cameron (eds,), *Researching and Applying Metaphor in the Real World*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 291-308.

Pasma 2011: T. Pasma, *Metaphor and register variation: The personalization of Dutch news discourse*, Oisterwijk: Uitgeverij BOX Press.

Rosenbach 2002: A. Rosenbach, *Genitive Variation in English: Conceptual Factors in Synchronic and Diachronic Studies*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Quirk et al. 1985: R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, Jan Svartvik, *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, New York: Longman.

Skorczynska, Ahrens 2015: H. Skorczynska, K. Ahrens, A corpus-based study of metaphor signaling variations in three genres, *Text & Talk*, *35* (3), Walter de Gruyter, 359-381.

Steen et al. 2010: G. Steen, A. Dorst, J. Herrmann, A. Kaal, T. Krennmayr, T. Pasma, *A method for linguistic metaphor identification: From MIP to MIPVU*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Stefanowitsch 1998: A. Stefanowitsch, Possession and Partition: The Two Genitives of English, Hamburg: *Cognitive Linguistics: Explorations, Applications, Research*, *23*, 1-30.

Szymańska 2018: M. Szymańska, *The coral of your lips*, *the stars of your eyes*- the function of the genitive case in a particular kind of genitive metaphor compared to other semantic functions of this case (based on examples in the Polish language), *Cognitive Studies/Étudescognitives18*, Warsaw: Instytut Slawistyki Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1-6.

Wallington et al. 2003: A. Wallington, J. Barnden, M. Barnden, F. Ferguson, S. Glasbey, Metaphoricity Signals: A Corpus-Based Investigation, *Cognitive Science Research Papers*, Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

SOURCES

Davies, Mark 2008, *The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA).* Available online at: https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/.

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English Online <https://www.ldoceonline. com/>

Macmillan dictionary <https://www.macmillandictionary.com>

Тамара Н. Јаневска

ГЕНИТИВНА КОНСТРУКЦИЈА КАО СИГНАЛ ПОТЕНЦИЈАЛНО МЕТАФОРИЧКИХ ИЗРАЗА

Резиме

У раду испитујемо сигналну употребу саксонског генитива у енглеском језику као маркера појмовне метафоре, односно потенцијал генитивне конструкције да укаже на међудоменска пресликавања између два домена. Стога посматрамо: (а) фреквентност употребе генитивне конструкције као сигнала метафоре у различитим функционалним стиловима и (б) однос значења и функције саме конструкције и метафоричности. Анализа се спроводи на примерима који су преузети из корпуса COCA, док је статус генитивне конструкције као сигнала метафоре утврђен на основу параметара који се наводе у MIPVU процедури (Стен и др. 2010). У анализираном узорку (5000 примера) забележена је слаба употреба генитивне конструкције као сигнала метафоре. Добијени резултати указују на то да у одређивању сигналног потенцијала саксонског генитива већу улогу игра носећа именица у синтагми од саме генитивне конструкције. Будуће анализе треба усмерити на друге колокате и контрастивна разматрања ове теме како би се добила шира слика истраживаног феномена и извели опсежнији закључци.

Кључне речи: генитивна конструкција, сигнал метафоре, директна метафора, теорија појмовне метафоре, MIPVU