

Extending Body-Part Terms in the Domain of Emotions

Iwona Kraska-Szlenk

Abstract

This chapter discusses semantic extensions of body-part terms in the domain of emotions. Cross-linguistic evidence demonstrates that lexemes, such as, *heart*, *face* or *eyes* exhibit considerable convergence in developing figurative meanings associated with the conceptualization of emotional states and their manifestation. Common paths of semantic extension are based on metaphors, e.g. LOCUS OF EMOTIONS IS HEART, DEAR PERSON IS EYE(S), as well as on metonymies, e.g. HEART FOR EMOTIONS, FACE (FACIAL MANIFESTATIONS) FOR EMOTIONS. It is argued that such co-occurring patterns are integrated with language-specific cultural models which reflect different conventionalization and usage practices.

1 Introduction

The literature on grammaticalization provides indisputable evidence that body-part terms in various languages follow similar paths in extending their meanings into abstract domains. Heine (this volume) distinguishes several major domains of cross-linguistic grammaticalization patterns that draw on the model of the human body. Heine's generalizations are supported by the data of innumerable languages researched over a long period of time from a descriptive, as well as from a theoretical perspective.¹ The question arises as to whether it is equally possible to search for common extension patterns of body-part terms outside the area of grammaticalization?

Comparative evidence of semantic extensions in other domains is not as overwhelmingly compelling as in the case of grammaticalization, which

1 The major works on grammaticalization which contain the data on body-part terms serving as source domains include Heine (1997), Heine et al. (1991), Svorou (1986), as well as many other works devoted to particular languages or language groups. Heine and Kuteva's (2002) lexicon deserves special attention since it summarizes the previous achievements of grammaticalization in general and provides a broad access to body-part terms, in particular; see also references in Heine (this volume).

follows from the obvious difference in the number of studies devoted to each topic to the advantage of the latter but, more importantly, to a difference in the number of possible extended meanings. While grammatical notions constitute a relatively small target category, all other cases of possible lexical change amount to a virtually infinite number. This is also true in the case of body-part terms which have developed relatively few grammaticalized meanings, but have elaborated networks of senses extended into many other domains. Yet, the rapidly growing literature on the lexical semantics of body-part terms in languages of the world demonstrates that there is also a considerable convergence in semantic extension into various other domains. This can be best observed in a collection of studies on various languages (e.g. Sharifian et al. 2008, Maalej and Yu 2011, this volume) and in contrastive studies, especially those which compare unrelated and geographically distant languages, such as e.g. Kraska-Szlenk (2004a, 2005a,c) on Swahili and Polish, or Siahaan (2011) on German and Indonesian.

Even though the comparative evidence provided by such studies does not even approach the amount of data and analyses available for the studies on grammaticalization, it nevertheless suggests certain tendencies in semantic development which are too common to be caused by chance, especially since they are triggered by well-understood cognitive processes. Cross-linguistically prevailing patterns seem to be particularly widespread in the following domains: the domain of emotions including certain address terms, the domain of knowledge and reasoning, and the domain of social interactions and values. All these domains are metonymically related to the human body although they may also involve metaphor as a cognitive mechanism. The metonymic bond provides a strong organizational schema for such extensions by which the equivalent body-part terms in different languages follow the same direction of semantic change. For the sake of space, this chapter will focus only on the first of these domains.

In addition, there exists a large area of extensions which are mapped through metaphor onto the target domains lying outside the domain of the human body in which the metaphoric mapping of body-part terms is practically unlimited and may include various domains, such as, plants and their parts, landmarks, human made artifacts, foods and other objects. Unlike in the metonymy-grounded extensions mentioned earlier, the meaning extension in cases of this kind is unconstrained as to the target domain (provided some analogy can be made) and is minimally constrained by the schemata used in metaphor application, which may be built on various attributes assigned to particular body parts that are associated with multiple visual aspects or functions of the same lexemes. Cases of this kind, such as e.g. English *eye of the*