Verbs of eating and preparing food and their metaphorical extensions

Pavlić, Vedrana

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2020

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **University of Zagreb, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:131:275220

Rights / Prava: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International/Imenovanje-Nekomercijalno-Bez prerada 4.0 međunarodna

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-05-13**

UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

2019/2020

Vedrana Pavlić

Verbs of Eating and Preparing Food and Their Metaphorical Extensions

Master's Thesis

Supervisor: Mateusz-Milan Stanojević, PhD

Zagreb, 2020

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

Cognitive linguistics claims that language is motivated by the way humans perceive and experience the world around them. Lakoff and Johnson (1999) speak of the embodied mind and suggest that human concepts are not reflections of the external reality but rather that they are shaped by their brains and bodies. People use their bodies to interact with the world daily and the concepts and processes connected with the body are a basic part of the human conceptual system. As a result, these well-known, basic conceptual elements that are a part of the knowledge of the world are used in language to describe abstract notions and different less basic concepts. In the view of cognitive linguistics, the tool for such processes is conceptual metaphor. Not only are the body and its different parts used in metaphorical mappings but also concepts and processes connected with it. One of these concepts is food. The human body needs nourishment to function, which makes food an essential component of people's everyday experience. The two are inextricably connected. Through the act of consumption, food goes directly into the body and on top of that the body is used as a tool in the process of preparing food. Conceptual mappings related to food are present in English as well as other languages because food and all of the different aspects connected to it are a part of every human culture. It is not surprising, then, that the domain of food serves as a common source domain for describing various processes, abstract notions and experiences. This paper focuses on the verbal aspects of this broad domain. It argues that the basic human interactions with food are contained in two concepts: consumption and preparation. This is reflected in language with a plethora of different verbs connected with either consuming food (*eat*, *swallow*, *devour*, *nibble*, *gnaw*, *munch*, *masticate* etc.) or preparing food (*cook*, *boil*, *dice*, *peel*, *cut*, *stir*, *fry*, *bake* etc.). Therefore, the paper examines four food-related verbs, namely two verbs connected with food consumption, *eat* and *swallow*, and two verbs connected with food preparation, *cook* and *stir* and their metaphorical extensions. It looks into the difference in the number and type of their metaphorical extensions. Based on the data gathered from The English Web Corpus (enTenTen15), it will demonstrate how people use these food-related verbs in different metaphorical mappings that are a part of everyday speech and why folk understanding of language as Radden (2001) defines it plays such an important role when it comes to food-related concepts and processes and their use in language. The paper starts with a theoretical overview. Section 3 gives an overview of the methodology, followed by the results presented in section 4. The paper ends with a discussion and conclusion.

2. Theoretical background

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1999) people, like all neural beings, categorize their experiences and organize their knowledge into neural structures called *concepts*. *Concepts* structure "what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people" and therefore, play "a central role in defining our everyday realities" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 4). All of one's knowledge and beliefs are framed in terms of a conceptual system, which is "fundamentally metaphorical in nature" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 4). What this means is that human beings are inherently capable of metaphorical reasoning. Human thought processes are largely metaphorical and as linguistic expressions metaphors are possible precisely because there are metaphors in a person`s conceptual system (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 7). Cognitive linguistics states that metaphor is not a matter of language alone and that it reflects fundamental patterns of human thought. According to Su (2002, 590), "metaphor has been shown to be an integral component of the way we conceptualize experience and embody it in language". For example, conceptual metaphors make understanding easier by allowing people to easily explain abstract concepts like emotions, morality, time, etc. using the knowledge they have about basic concepts like food, drink, movement.

Cognitive linguistics produced a vast number of theoretical works about conceptual metaphor. In his work, Stanojević (2009, 340) offers an integrated model of conceptual metaphor theory which takes into account that conceptual metaphor is a dynamic ability to connect two domains while simultaneously allowing established connections to exist. He states that this ambiguity of conceptual metaphor is shown at the level of culture and embodiment and that "apart from the usual motivation through physical factors (i.e. embodiment), we claim that culture is also a factor that is simultaneously responsible for variation and cultural constraints"[1] (Stanojević 2009, 340). This text will rely on this view of conceptual metaphor during the analysis. It states that there is more than one factor responsible for metaphor grounding and that metaphor is an ability to connect two domains of experience at any given moment, which can at the same time be conventional.

According to Lakoff and Johnson's theory (1980, 6), "the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another". Therefore, conceptual metaphor consists of two domains, a *source domain* from which "we draw metaphorical

---

[1] My translation

expressions to understand another conceptual domain" and a *target domain* which is "the conceptual domain that is understood this way" (Kövecses 2002, 4), as can be seen in (1).

(1) He swallowed down his anger.

Metaphorical expression *swallowed down his anger* connects two different domains of experience. One is the domain of food and the other is the domain of emotions. The domain of food is a *source domain* because the concrete concept of ingesting from this domain is mapped onto the abstract concept of emotion control belonging to the *target domain* of emotion. The domain of food can be defined as a basic domain of experience because it is shared by all people. Su (2002, 591) states that, "we have a growing body of empirical research on the way in which metaphor source domains typically come from basic-level experiences". These experiences are shared by human beings "because of their shared bodily and cognitive makeup and because of the common features of the environments within which people interact" (Su 2002, 590). Basic-level experiences, as she calls them, are used because people are generally more knowledgeable about them and can utilise that knowledge to make the understanding of abstract concepts easier like in the example (1).

Kövecses (2002, 108) states that most of the specific source domains appear to characterise not just one target concept but several. This is what he calls the *scope of metaphor*, or "the range of cases, that is, the target domains, to which a given source concept applies" (Kövecses 2002, 108). The verbal aspects of the source domain of food analysed in this text are mapped onto several target domains, for example the domain of emotion, intellectual domain etc. but all are mutually connected. Kövecses (2002, 110) argues that this is possible because of *the main meaning focus* which represents some "basic knowledge concerning a source that is widely shared in the speech community, that can be found in most instances of the source, and that uniquely characterizes the source". This major meaning focus is a *major theme* (Kövecses 2002, 110) connecting all of the mappings of one source domain. For example, the main meaning focus for the verb *swallow* is the aspect of ingestion or internalization and each of its metaphorical extensions stems from this basic meaning.

The formula for the structure of the basic conceptual metaphor is THE SOURCE DOMAIN IS THE TARGET DOMAIN. Stanojević (2009, 341) claims that this is just a shorter way of noting the mappings between the source and target domains. Lakoff (1993, 8) defines *mapping* as a fixed pattern of conceptual correspondences across conceptual domains. To take a concrete example, the source domain analysed in this paper is the domain of food, and

one of the target domains it is mapped onto is the intellectual domain. The basic conceptual metaphor structure that Lakoff and Johnson (1980) use to describe the mapping between these two domains is IDEAS ARE FOOD. Su (2002, 594) states that, "the mapping happens between whole domains, not just individual concepts. This is evidenced by many expressions involving a variety of metaphorical concepts each united under the same source and target domains". This means that from one basic metaphorical mapping stem different concepts which share a source and target domain as shown in Table 1.

IDEAS ARE FOOD		
Source domain: food	Target domain: ideas	Example:
raw	pure, unaltered information	All this paper has in it are raw facts.
stew	think about information	Let me stew over that for a while.
swallow	accept information	I just can't swallow that claim.

Table 1

Kövecses (2002, 67-68) claims that metaphors cannot be predicted but are motivated. The question of motivation or *grounding* of conceptual metaphor is an important part of understanding how metaphor functions. The cognitive linguistic view maintains that, "in addition to objective, pre-existing similarity, conceptual metaphors are based on a variety of human experience, including correlations in experience, various kinds of non-objective similarity, biological and cultural roots shared by the two concepts, and possibly others" (Kövecses 2002, 69). Thus, motivation implies the existence of a 'natural' connection, i.e. correlation between two domains of experience. Correlations are not similarities. Kövecses (2002, 69) states that if event E1, for example adding more fluid to a container, is accompanied by event E2, for example the level of fluid rising, E1 and E2 will not be similar events; they will be events that are correlated in experience.

When talking about a basic human concept like food and its use in language the interest need not be placed on scientific or expert views but on the way ordinary people think and talk about the world around them and the elements connected to their daily experience.

This is a study of metaphor from everyday speech and therefore, it relies on the layman's understanding of the concepts belonging to the domain of food. Therefore, this paper will focus on what Radden (2001) calls *folk models of language*. He based his research on the notion of 'language' and his examples will only be used to illustrate the theory before going into the analysis of the food-related verbs and their metaphorical extensions. Radden (2001, 55) states that 'language' is not a primary concept but tends to be derived from more basic notions within the language frame. These earlier or basic senses "tend to belong to one of the following domains: (i) articulation and speech organs, (ii) linguistic action, and (iii) basic linguistic units" (Radden 2001, 57). This happens across languages and as he claims, "it is not haphazard but cognitively motivated" (Radden 2001, 56). In his simplified model, the understanding of speaking and language is reduced to articulation and a small set of speech organs. For example, some expressions use speech organs to denote the ability to speak, as is shown in the example (2).

(2) imati jezik (have tongue)

Radden (2001, 63) states that the concept of 'tongue' is typically used as a metonymy for 'language'. In the folk model of language, the tongue enables people to speak, and its presence ensures a person's ability to speak as shown in the example (2). According to Radden (2001, 63), "the conceptual link between having a thing and making use of it is commonly exploited metonymically as PRECONDITION FOR ACTION. Not having the thing required for the action consequently means 'not being able to perform the action'". Metaphorically this is expressed as the loss of one's tongue or as having one's tongue tied or stuck, as shown in the example (3).

(3) *be tongue-tied*

The tongue being tied is metaphorically understood as 'inability to speak'. Radden (2001, 56) deems that "metaphors, metonymies and metaphtonymies elaborating the metonymies reflect our naïve understanding of language". His theory is used to explain the grounding of the food-related metaphorical expressions. This paper will show how metaphorical structures that have food as their source domain are a product of folk theories about food.

Kövecses (2000) emphasizes the importance of folk understanding in his study of metaphors of emotions. He differentiates between an *expert theory* and *folk theory of*

language. By a folk theory of language, he means some "shared, structured knowledge that in many cases can be uncovered on the basis of ordinary language" (Kövecses 2000, 114). These knowledge structures are not metaphorical and can be thought of as general knowledge of the world. In his study he describes a basic cultural model of emotion that reflects this general, shared knowledge about emotions. His model is significant for this analysis because the corpus sample shows that the domain of food is commonly used as a source domain when defining different aspects of the emotional domain. Kövecses (2000, 2) distinguishes *expressive* and *descriptive* emotion words. Figurative terms and expressions belong to the descriptive category because they "denote various *aspects* of emotion concepts, such as intensity, cause, control, etc. and they can be metaphorical and metonymical" (Kövecses 2000, 4). Therefore, these expressions do not primarily express emotions but describe them (Kövecses 2000, 4). According to Kövecses (2000, 64), "The most general notion of the Western folk theory of emotion is that: (1) a cause leads to emotion and (2) emotion leads to some response". Metaphorical source domains focus either on the "emotion ⇒ response" part of the scenario or on the "cause ⇒ emotion" part (Kövecses 2000, 64). The cultural model of emotions Kövecses (2000, 129) describes is also based on Talmy's force schema (1988) and it consists of 5 stages: (1) cause of emotion ⇒ (2) emotion ⇒ (3) attempt at control ⇒ (4) loss of control ⇒ (5) response. His model is a combination of different basic level metaphors. The first one is the *container.* Kövecses (2000, 37) states that "the container image defines an "inside-outside" perspective for the human body. This seems to be a near-universal way of conceptualizing the body in relation to the emotions" because emotions in many cultures are seen as occurrences inside the body. Secondly, Talmy's (1988) force schema when applied to emotions produces the EMOTION IS FORCE metaphor from which stem the specific level metaphors focusing on distinct aspects of emotion. The specific level version of the EMOTION IS FORCE metaphor which is connected to the source domain of food is EMOTION IS INTERNAL PRESSURE INSIDE A CONTAINER. This metaphor assumes two more metaphors: PEOPLE ARE CONTAINERS for the emotions and EMOTION IS A SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER, typically a fluid or gas (Kövecses 2000, 65). If an emotion-substance puts too much pressure on the body-container some external results will be visible because the emotion-substance will spill from the container. To prevent the external result of the pressure there is an attempt at control to keep the emotion-substance inside. Many of the source domains have "control" as their target within the domain of emotion (Kövecses 2000, 43), which includes the domain of food. For example, *swallow* is

mapped onto the domain of emotion to explain the aspect of emotion control. Kövecses (2000, 43) states that "control is a complex notion that, in the realm of emotion at least, can be broken down into three parts, or stages: attempt at control, loss of control, and lack of control." Given these stages, the source domains tend to focus on different stages: attempt at control, loss of control, and lack of control (with possible overlaps) (Kövecses 2000, 43).

The above-mentioned concept of a CONTAINER is also the basis for the so-called *conduit metaphor*, which is one of the basic level metaphors used in this analysis. According to Kövecses (2002, 74), "conduit metaphor arises from non-metaphorical assumptions about the human body: The body is a container. Food consists of objects and substances. We receive food from outside the body and it goes into the body". Therefore, the body is equated with a container on the basis of non-metaphorical knowledge about containers. According to Kövecses (2002), the conduit metaphor reflects how people conceptualize communication, which can be seen in the example (4).

(4) There are millions more who haven't learned a thing, however – they *swallowed the nonsense* about 'weapons of mass destruction' whole.

If the human body is seen as a container that can internalize food then it can also, based on *metaphorical entailment* (Lakoff 1987), internalize information. *Metaphorical entailment* is "making metaphorical conclusions about certain aspects of the target domain based on the conclusions and knowledge about the source domain"[2] (Stanojević 2009, 341-342). The metaphorical expression "*they swallowed the nonsense* about 'weapons of mass destruction' whole" shows how one specific aspect from the source domain of food, namely the aspect of internalization is used to signal accepting information showing how people view the process of exchanging information.

In some metaphorical instances found in the sample *swallow*, *stir,* and *cook* are followed by particles *up* (*swallow up, stir up, cook up*) and *down* (*swallow down*) making them phrasal verbs. According to Rudzka-Ostyn (2003, 7), "English phrasal verbs, especially by the metaphorical use of the particle, enable us to conceive of *abstract* domains in terms of *concrete* domains". Every phrasal verb consists of a lexical verb, for example, *cook*, and a topological particle, like *up*, whose literal meaning refers to the physical space. Topological particles are used in metaphorical constructions because "it is easier to talk about abstract

---

[2] My translation

actions by seeing them as concrete movements" (Rudzka-Ostyn 2003, 2). Geld and Stanojević (2018, 90) distinguish between two types of phrasal verbs, ones where the topological particle, signals spatial orientation (*pull down*) and ones whose meaning is aspectual, connected with starting or finishing an action (*swallow up*). Topological particles *up* and *down* reflect our view of the position of objects on a vertical scale and the transfer from concrete to abstract motion can be used in metaphorical mappings to signal a number of things, for example to view people and their bodies as containers (*swallow down anger*).

Finally, John Newman (1997) studies verbal concepts related to eating and drinking and their roles as source domains. He states that the target domains onto which the domain of eating is mapped are various, but include *the emotional domain, the intellectual domain,* and *the psychological domain* (Newman 1997, 214). This paper applies some of his broad categories to the specific food-related verbs. His research is based on folk models as well, and he states that "the layperson's use of language is rooted in a folk understanding of the process involved" (Newman 1997, 215). He characterises the act of eating as multifaceted and argues that it contains different components, one of which is the act of swallowing. Literally to swallow something means taking in food or drink through the mouth and the gullet into the stomach. He argues that the concept of swallowing "serves as a basis for conceptualising various kinds of events which one might classify as 'internalization'" (Newman 1997, 216). Internalization reflects the general knowledge and assumptions about the body and the way it functions. The body is seen as a container into which the food goes. The act of swallowing involves a transfer of the food from the outside into the container, i.e. the body, making it no longer visible. This process is metaphorically mapped onto different domains which will be further explained and exemplified in the following paragraphs.

3. Methodology

The research conducted in this paper is based on the data collected from The English Web Corpus, enTenTen15. Four food-related verbs were chosen, two connected with food consumption, *eat* and *swallow*, and two connected with food preparation, *cook* and *stir*. *Eat* and *cook* are prototypical verbs in their respective categories, and they are broadly used, while *swallow* and *stir* are not so prevalent. These particular verbs were chosen to investigate whether their salience influences the number and type of their metaphorical extensions. A

sample of 100 examples was selected from the corpus for each of the chosen verbs using the 'lemma' function which listed all the different forms of the verbs. The examples in the sample are both metaphorical and non-metaphorical, but the focus of the analysis is on the metaphorical ones. Both *swallow* and *stir* had a large number of metaphorical examples, 60 out of 100 for *swallow* and 56 out of 100 for *stir*. *Cook* had 4 metaphorical examples out of the sample of 100 and *eat* none. From this it can be deduced that the salience of the verb may be connected with the number of their metaphorical extensions. Less salient verbs have a larger number of metaphorical uses and vice versa. As for the type of their extensions the collected material is divided into several groups for each of the verbs, based on certain similarities among the examples.

4. Results

The following paragraphs contain the analysis of the examples found in the corpus for each of the four verbs. The verbs with the most metaphorical extensions, namely *swallow* and *stir* are presented first, followed by *eat* and *cook*.

4.1 Swallow

Swallow belongs to a group of verbs connected with the concept of food consumption. Its primary meaning is food-related, namely taking in food or drink through the mouth into the stomach. It is less frequently used than the other verb from this group, *eat,* but it has a greater number of metaphorical extensions. These stem from its primary meaning of ingesting through the mouth. The concrete concept of consumption serves as a motivation for all of them. The following paragraphs will illustrate all the different metaphorical extensions, which will be divided into three groups based on Newman's (1997) division of target domains: *internalization, emotional domain, intellectual domain*, and the way they are related to its primary meaning and each other.

4.1.1 Internalization

The first group of examples represents what Newman (1997) calls *internalization*. As he defines it internalization is "incorporating something into one's personal or private sphere" (Newman 1997, 216). It requires an agent and it involves a "clear transition from being visible and outside the body to being no longer visible and inside the body" (Newman 1997, 216). *Swallow* in its primary meaning indicates some form of absorbing or taking something into oneself. The verb is used to signal many different types of internalization, whether literal or figurative, which will be mentioned in this section. In the literal sense it indicates physically taking food or drink into the stomach through the gullet. The body is seen as a container into which the food goes. However, it also has a metaphorically extended meaning closely related to this primary one, which is to engulf and cause something to utterly disappear *physically* as in (5).

(5) A house was literally *swallowed up* by the swollen river racing past it in Oklahoma.

Firstly, it is important to note that the particle *up* plays an important role here, making *swallowed up* a phrasal verb. According to Rudzka-Ostyn (2003, 75), "*up* is the most frequently used English particle". Its frequency can be explained by the fact that "an *upward* position or motion, both physical and especially abstract, is in a very special way part of our daily experience" (Rudzka-Ostyn 2003, 75). As it was mentioned, a topological particle, which is in this case *up*, can carry either spatial or aspectual meaning. In this use *up* has an aspectual meaning and denotes completeness. The verb *swallow* signals consumption and when used with the particle *up* it indicates that something is completely consumed or devoured [see (5)]. The agent in the example is not a person, however, the river metaphorically became a living being that consumed the house and no part of it can be seen anymore. The house is internalized. Moreover, *swallow* can be used with other physical occurrences, as is shown in (6-8), to mean to physically take something in its interior or depths and making it disappear.

(6) The floor collapsed, *swallowing* all of the guests.
(7) Some of these cracks are large enough to *swallow up* a wolf, others are small enough to not even hold a lizard.
(8) Supermassive black holes at the hearts of active galaxies *swallow* large amounts of gas.

All three examples function in the same way as the above-mentioned example (5). The collapsed floor [see (6)], the cracks [see (7)], and black holes [see (8)] play the role of a metaphorical mouth through which the object or substance is internalized. Again, in example (7) the particle *up* indicates completeness and the fact that the whole object is affected by the act.

In the previous paragraph it was described how *swallow* metaphorically indicates the act of taking something in physically. However, besides physical, *swallow* can also be used for abstract and figurative actions of taking in or absorbing as in (9-12).

(9) The abyss which they say *swallowed up* all souls must surely be of immense extent.

(10)   You showed us today that when we feel that God has abandoned us, and that the jaws of hell threaten *to swallow* us and all we hold dear (…)

(11)   It explained why my moods would go from Euphoria to feeling like a huge black hole was trying to *swallow me up*.

(12)   Designed to *swallow* sound.

All of the examples demonstrate how motivation for this metaphorical use yet again lies in the layman's understanding of the physical concepts. The abyss that swallows souls [see (9)] and the jaws of hell [see (10)] are not an actual, physical abyss and the jaws of a predator. They are physical concepts used to represent another concept, which is that of an afterlife. It can be said that the verb *swallow* in all of the examples from this group signals taking something in figuratively, as one would physically internalize something. Therefore, the physical act motivates the metaphorical use of the verb. Similarly, *swallow* denotes not solely taking something inside but can also mean that something gets 'lost' or 'drowned' in something else, as if absorbed, as in (13-16).

(13)   His figure was *swallowed up* by the sameness of the valley—the desert has a way of hiding things in the open.

(14)   Like many students at Arizona State University, Carlos Melendez came from another continent to earn his degree, but his journey crossed an ocean of red tape that was so deep it almost *swallowed* him.

(15)   I'm hoping it's not a sign of anything but my pedestrian (as opposed to vehicular? cyclist?) tech skills that my first post to this blog got lost. We think Word Press *swallowed* it.

(16)   It did pain her to have Mansfield forgotten; the friends who had done so much-the dear, dear friends! But here, one subject *swallowed up* all the rest.

The main difference between example (13) and others in this group is that in (13) *swallow* is used to describe a physical experience, i.e. a visual perception of a small figure getting lost in a large space, as if the space absorbed it. In the other examples the act of absorption is an abstract one. *Swallow* in this sense can be used in contexts where one thing is overpowered by the other and therefore destroyed as if absorbed, like in (16) where the subject is put in the role of a dominant force that consumes all others and makes it a part of itself. In examples (13) and (16) *swallow* is followed by the particle *up* which again denotes completeness.

Swallow can be used to indicate taking something as a possession, for example a territory as in (17).

(17)   (…) his sons and grandsons managed, over the next hundred years, *to swallow up* a dozen other Imperiums that bordered the Ophelian/Tallarn alliance (…)

In this example the stress is on taking a territory for oneself. The territories were absorbed and made a part of a larger empire. The use of the particle *up* indicates that the whole object was affected by the act. Therefore, the smaller territories are completely internalized by the empire. In the same manner *swallow* can also indicate that something is completely enveloped or covered as in (18-21).

(18)   A thick forest has *swallowed* the site and, with the exception of monitored visits, it is entirely off-limits to humans.

(19)   'How many periwinkles do you see?' he asked. 'That's right, millions. And while they look nice they are really trying their best *to swallow* the whole marsh.'

(20)   The rejection of the Medical expansion, which states were given the right to do by the Supreme Court in the only conservative victory on Obamacare, is one of the few tools remaining to help prevent Obamacare from *swallowing* the nation.

(21)   Sentineled by the messengers of God, we shall not be surprised by sudden assaults nor *swallowed up* by overwhelming forces.

Examples (18) and (19) have to do with the physical territory which is enveloped and overrun by the forest [see (18)] and periwinkles [see (19)]. Examples (20) and (21) signal enveloping people. Besides physical territory, *swallow* can indicate taking possession of something as in (22).

> (22)   Now that Delta has *swallowed up* the unionized Northwest Airlines, the union is building for another vote.

The larger company buys the smaller one and makes it a part of its own business so the smaller one stops being independent. Therefore, the larger company internalized the smaller one and made it a part of itself.

Lastly in the category of internalization, *swallow* can also mean occupy entirely or to be engrossed in something, as in examples (23-25).

> (23)   We can become *swallowed up* in thoughtless routines and endless distractions...
> (24)   This deeper anxiety *swallowed them up*.
> (25)   And then financial challenges *swallowed* us whole.

When saying that one is *swallowed up* in something it means that it occupies all of one's time and energy and that the person is consumed by it. Here again physical consumption motivates the metaphorical one.

4.1.2 Swallowing emotions

The previous sections dealt with different types of absorption and taking something in. However, besides absorption, *swallow* can also metaphorically be used to signal restraint, control or suppression, usually of some strong feeling or emotion, as in (26).

> (26)   *Swallowing his pride*, my father went to a neighbour, Mr. Feldman, for advice.

The concept of emotion is universal across cultures. Kövecses (2002) claims that in order to understand how people talk and think about their emotions it is important to study the folk understanding of emotion. In his study of emotion metaphors, he describes the basic cultural model of emotions based on Talmy's force schema (1988): (1) cause of emotion ⇒ (2) emotion ⇒ (3) attempt at control ⇒ (4) loss of control ⇒ (5) response (Kövecses 129). The concept of swallowing is connected to what he calls *attempt at control*. *Swallow* is used with strong emotions to indicate suppression as can be observed in examples (27-31):

(27)   When it comes to success, one can *swallow ego* and let go of the pride and move towards better benefits.

(28)   The first few years following my divorce I was kept busy looking after the boys fulltime, earning some money doing part-time bookkeeping and *swallowing my pride* and accepting the single parent pension.

(29)   Should the worst happen, we will *swallow our tears* (…)

(30)   Put fear in your back pocket and *swallow those butterflies*.

(31)   He *swallowed down his anger*.

In all examples, the use of *swallow* signals attempt at controlling one's feelings and mental restraint. What these examples have in common is firstly that pride [see (26-28)], sadness [see (29)], fear [see (30)], and anger [see (31)] are universally seen as strong (negative) emotions. *Swallow* is used to indicate an attempt to control these emotions so they would not manifest externally. Emotional suppression is metaphorically connected with the physical act of swallowing, i.e. pushing the food or drink down through the oesophagus. The mapping again comes from the folk understanding of the human body as a container that holds food. If the body can hold food, according to the principle of *metaphorical entailment* it can also hold emotions. Like food is physically internalized and pushed down to the stomach, emotions are also internally pushed deeper into the container-body and hidden from other people. The concept of consumption is used to describe the abstract aspect belonging to the domain of emotion, which is emotion control. What is more, in example (31) it can be seen that *swallow* can also be followed by the particle *down* making it a phrasal verb. Most spatial or literal uses of *down* indicate that an object has moved from a higher to a lower location and these changes in space can be associated with differences in volume, prices, emotions etc. (Rudzka-Ostyn 2003, 107). *Down* is used to refer to a decrease in intensity, degree, size or activity,

therefore, in this example it signals better control of the emotion. If an emotion is *swallowed down* it implies that the intensity of the emotion is lowered, enabling better control.

Swallow can also be mapped to the domain of communication to convey a similar meaning. In the previous section it has been discussed how *swallow* can be used metaphorically to express suppression of strong feelings and emotions. Similarly, it can also be used to convey a different kind of suppression, as in (32).

> (32)   Father Albert looked up through the screen at his fellow clergyman and *swallowed his words* like a lump of bitter fruit.

As in the previous group of examples the stress also lies in keeping something internal, in this case words. Swallowing words means refraining from uttering them. The motivation behind the use of *swallow* comes from non-metaphorical knowledge. Example (32) reflects the *conduit metaphor* as Kövecses (2002) defines it. As it was mentioned the conduit metaphor arises from non-metaphorical assumptions about the human body: The body is a container. Food consists of objects and substances. We receive food from outside the body and it goes into the body (Kövecses 2002, 74). In example (32) words, i.e. the information that one wants to express, are not shared but are stopped before reaching the communication channel and kept inside the container, i.e. the person. Therefore, this primary aspect of meaning of swallow, namely ingesting through the throat is metaphorically extended to the domain of communication and sharing information. This extension will be further exemplified in the following section that deals with acceptance i.e. internalizing information.

4.1.3 General acceptance (intellectual domain)

Swallow can also be used to mean accepting a piece of information without question or suspicion, as in (33-35)

> (33)   There are millions more who haven't learned a thing, however – they *swallowed* the nonsense about 'weapons of mass destruction' whole.
>
> (34)   The party *swallowed* Cameron's stern warning that cuts would only happen when it was fiscally sensible, sweetened with small cuts in corporation tax and the creation of an Office of Tax Simplification.

(35)   They have *swallowed* it, which points in the direction of the accreditation of a literary hoax.

It can be noticed that *swallow* is used to denote gullibility in the first two examples. In the example (35) the tale was metaphorically consumed by the readers, i.e. it was internalized. Swallow denotes their accepting whatever information it has to offer. All three examples are *conduit metaphors*. According to Kövecses (2002), the conduit metaphor reflects how people conceptualize communication. In his work, he describes communication through three metaphors: EXPERIENCES ARE OBJECTS, COMMUNICATION IS SHARING (EXPERIENCE) OBJECTS and PEOPLE ARE CONTAINERS (FOR EXPERIENCE OBJECTS) (Kövecses 2000, 88). As he states, the knowledge that people are containers transfers onto their minds and bodies, therefore, THE MIND IS A CONTAINER and the BODY IS A CONTANER. When a person shares a bit of information with another person i.e. sends it from one container to another that bit is internalized by the receiver and it becomes a part of him so that both parties share that explicit piece of information. However, sharing information does not mean accepting. The concept of consumption is used to signal this acceptance. As was mentioned, Kövecses (2002) states that food consists of objects and substances and goes into the body. When the food is swallowed it is pushed deeper into the body, i.e. the container. Acceptance assumes that the received information is also processed on a deeper level. That is why *swallow* is used to signal a deeper level of internalization. This type of internalization can have a negative connotation as it is observable in the examples (33) and (35).

Similarly, swallow is used in this sense as a part of the expression 'swallow the bait', as in (36).

(36)   *The bait was swallowed.* Naren came without suspicion.

Metaphorically, Naren's behaviour is equated with that of a fish that would swallow a hooked worm. Swallowing the bait means completely accepting something, especially a lie or a trick, which carries a negative connotation. Similarly, the negative connotation also applies to the idiom "bitter pill to swallow" which is used to signal that accepting a given situation is unpleasant as in examples (37-38).

(37)   Unfortunately, a good number of these run in a higher resolution on PS4 than Xbox One, which is *a bitter pill* for gamers expecting the next-gen experience *to swallow*, even if the games still look and play great when tackled in isolation.

(38)   When one realizes that the fundamentals of the world are not based on reason makes for *a very tough pill to swallow*.

As was mentioned in the two previous paragraphs, metaphorically *swallow* signals acceptance. The 'bitter pill' part of the idiom implies that it is unpleasant to accept the given situation or information and it stems from the folk understanding. From everyday experience, swallowing pills is connected with unpleasantness and the bitter taste it triggers. Therefore, in this expression people map their basic knowledge from the sensory domain i.e. the sense of taste to the abstract notion of unpleasantness.

When signalling acceptance *swallow* is a part of another fixed expression which is *swallow more than on one's plate.* This expression indicates that the information, idea or state of affairs which one needs to accept is not what is expected, as shown in the example (39).

(39)   In the face of a global food crisis, it's clear that we've been forced to *swallow far more than what's on our plates.*

This expression is used when trying to convey that one has to accept far more than one expects. Again, the premise for the expression comes from everyday experience and the understanding of quantity. If the body is viewed as a container it means that it can hold a fixed amount of substance inside it. The plate is a measure of the amount of food a person eats per meal. If one needs to eat more than what's on the plate it implies that the amount of food is bigger than expected and may cause unpleasant sensations for the body. If *swallow* signals acceptance swallowing more than on one's plate means having to accept more than one is prepared to do or wants to do.

Finally, the expression "to swallow camels" appeared in the sample, although it is not a frequently used expression. It denotes overlooking something that is right in one's face while at the same time focusing on something minor, as exemplified in (40).

(40) I have commended my zealous evangelical brethren for calling out obvious social moral dilemmas, but we together have *swallowed camels*, and overlooked deadly sins that consume us all.

The expression "You blind guides, straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel!" is said to have originated from the Bible (Matthew 23:24) and in the above example it is not used in its entirety. There are two food related verbs in the original expression, *strain* and *swallow*. The logic behind the expression is simple, gnats are small animals and would easily pass through a strainer, but here one is straining them out, therefore, not allowing them to pass and separating them like one would separate solid part from liquid in a strainer. This is metaphorically transferred onto the notion of focusing on minor details while at the same time *swallowing* camels i.e. overlooking an obvious problem.

Based on the number and type of the examples found in the sample it can be said that swallow has several metaphorical uses which are all connected by its basic meaning of ingesting through the mouth. All three categories, namely, internalization, emotion control and general acceptance stem from the way people perceive the concept of consumption.

4.2 Stir

The meaning of *stir* diachronically changed. *Stir* is a verb whose primary meaning was connected with movement[3], as in the example "She heard him stirring in bed." The element of movement is what connects all of its different meanings, literal and figurative. However, nowadays *stir* is considered to be a food-related verb and the first meaning that is listed in contemporary dictionaries is "to move food around in a dish or pan using a spoon or other object".[4] In this sense *stir* can be placed in the group of verbs connected with food preparation along with the verbs *cook*, *fry, boil* or *mix*. From this concrete meaning stem other figurative meanings, which are divided into 3 groups based on their similarity: rousing emotions, inciting a reaction and causing disturbance.

4.2.1 To rouse emotions

---

[3] https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=stir
[4] https://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/stir_1#stir_1__1

As it was noted above, *stir* has different metaphorical extensions that stem from the previously mentioned meaning of mixing ingredients by moving them inside a container. The first metaphorically extended meaning denotes rousing feelings and emotions, like in the examples (41-46)

(41)   While that may have *stirred* the crowd's passion for a radical change…

(42)   Russia will *stir up* discontent in retaliation for the ouster of their ally.

(43)   How long should I be content to speak with small groups of people about these concerns as I can find the time *to stir* the interest…

(44)   And his ascent coincides with a rising trend of Indian right-wing Hindu nationalism that has *stirred up* major concern among many foreign observers.

(45)   It's so good that you'll be shaken AND *stirred*.

(46)   When she said these words, I was *stirred* to tears.

The basic cultural model of emotion that Kövecses (2000) describes starts with (1) *cause of emotion*. This implies that there has to be some event, force or trigger that provokes a reaction i.e. the emotion that leads to this reaction. The basic meaning of the verb *stir* is connected with movement. As was mentioned, the meaning of *stir* changed diachronically to primarily refer to moving food, liquid or some other substance inside a container. The metaphorical use of the verb *stir* is connected to the human knowledge of the behaviour of liquids or substances in a container. It was already mentioned that people see the human body as a container that holds emotions. If there is no external influence and these emotions are 'still' and 'dormant' they do not manifest on the outside. However, if they are affected by a force, the emotional state changes and emotions 'move' around the metaphorical container therefore becoming harder to control and causing a visible reaction. *Stirring emotions* implies causing more pressure on the body-container and a higher force one has to control which leads to the (4) *loss of control* and (5) *result*, i.e. emotions manifest on the outside, for example in a form of tears [see (46)].

4.2.2 To cause/incite

Besides evoking emotions, *stir* is also used to denote that something is caused, incited, or instigated by something else, which can be seen in examples (47-51)

(47) But Bjørn Lomborg, who is always happy *to stir up* controversy (…)

(48) And, not uncommonly, nothing *stirs* my competitive spirit quite like sibling rivalry.

(49) The latter can be seen as a risky strategy because of the potential for these more vociferously critical outlets to *stir up* political unrest among those opposed to the regime…

(50) It was here that he would have stumbled upon the idea of *stirring* the conscience of the masses through a TV show that highlighted critical issues, presented gory case studies and requested people's participation.

(51) It's a question that's *stirred* debate for decades…

In all of the examples from this group *stir* is used to denote a cause. The use of the verb is again motivated by the folk understanding of the behaviour of liquids in a container. When there is no movement and the liquid is still there is no change and it is easy to control. However, when some force moves the liquid there is a change in the balance and it becomes visible on the outside. *Stir* here means to cause a change. The emphasis is put on the end result, for example, political unrest [see (49)] or controversy [see (47)]. S*tir* marks that the situation changed, the state of rest became the state of unrest. In the examples (47) and (49) *stir* is followed by the particle *up* which carries aspectual meaning. Therefore, the phrasal verb *stir up* denotes the start of an action.

4.2.3 To disturb

The examples in the last group are not metaphorical extensions of the above-mentioned food-related meaning but are extended from the older meaning, which is to move or to be moved. However, these are connected to the folk theory as well. *Stir* is used to denote pushing or poking something so as to displace, disturb or mix parts of, but also to agitate, as in examples (52-55):

(52) You're *stirring up* the hornet's nest.

(53) Denying people's freedom, or even coming across like you are denying people's freedom will also *stir up* the cage.

22

(54) Look, I've *stirred* this a little but it is really just a version of the old "content versus process" argument.

(55) Such people were convinced that Kenyatta was a mastermind of a secret tribal cult, led by unscrupulous extremists who *stirred up* the primitive masses to further their own ambitions.

All of the examples are metaphorical extensions of physical movement. The emphasis is again on the end result, for example causing a disturbance as in (52), (53) and (55). In the example (54) the goal is not to agitate but to manipulate because the information was rearranged in order to produce a different effect. But *stir* is again used to signal a force that triggers a metaphorical movement that has some result in the end.

All metaphorical extensions of *stir* are connected by the aspect of movement. The first two groups, namely *rousing emotions* and *inciting* stem from the folk understanding of the way liquids move in a container. The third category is different because it is motivated by the original meaning of the verb which is physical movement. This means that although *stir* is synchronically connected with food, the diachronic meaning may still motivate some of its metaphorical senses. It can also be noticed that both *stir* and *swallow* are mapped onto the domain of emotion. The main difference is in the aspect they describe. *Swallow* implies emotion control while *stir* indicates the loss of it because the results manifest on the outside.

4.3 Other verbs: cook and eat

Cook and *eat* are prototype verbs in their respective categories. *Eat* belongs to the category of food consumption while *cook* belongs to the category of food preparation. What they have in common is their frequency, which is what also separates them from the previously mentioned verbs *swallow* and *stir*. *Eat* is used frequently when talking about food, which can be seen in The English Web Corpus where *eat* has 1,781,733 occurrences. However, despite a large number of occurrences, no metaphorical extensions have been found in the sample of 100 sentences which shows that *eat* is not as metaphorical as the other verb from the same category, *swallow*. Similarly, *cook* is also a frequently used verb form the category of preparing food. *Cook* has 483,841 occurrences in the enTenTen15 corpus. In the sample of 100 sentences, there were 4 instances where *cook* was used metaphorically, therefore it can be said that both *cook* and *eat* are not as metaphorical as *swallow* and *stir*.

In all of its metaphorical uses found in the sample *cook* is followed by the particle *up*, making it a phrasal verb. It signals devising a plan, scheme, story or excuse to deal with a particular situation as in the examples (56-59).

(56)   I know you have some fancy lawyers who can *cook up* some kind of crazy theory as to why this is all legal and above board.

(57)   Under the pretense of beefing up security, disgraced former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld had *cooked up* the system to strip 700,000 civilian defense workers of the right to organize or bargain or even have a fair grievance procedure and pay standards.

(58)   There was some secret plan being *cooked up* by the committee to strike deals with social democratic governments in Europe.

(59)   *Cooking up* a project from scratch.

This metaphorical extension of *cook* comes from the everyday knowledge about the act of preparing food. *Cook up* mostly means to prepare food quickly from different ingredients.[5] The meaning of the particle *up* in this sense is aspectual, and it refers to finishing something quickly. The concept of preparing something out of nothing is metaphorically mapped onto the concept of devising a plan or completing a project. Based on the examples (56-58) *cook up* can metaphorically imply manipulation and dishonesty. As it was mentioned, *cook up* is a phrasal verb. Rudzka-Ostyn (2003, 86) states that, "a feature that is characteristic of many verbs with **up** is that what was hidden or unknown becomes visible or known". This is connected with the spatial aspect of the particle *up*. She explains that "when the entity is at or comes to a higher level or location, it is noticed more easily. That is not only true of concrete objects but also of abstract entities to which one draws sb's attention" (Rudzka-Ostyn 2003, 86). Therefore, *cook up* implies devising something from nothing so that it becomes known, accessible or visible.

It is safe to say that both *cook* and *eat* are widely used in everyday speech because food consumption and preparation is something most people do on a daily basis. However, their use is predominantly literal, not metaphorical. This does not mean that *eat* and *cook* do not have any metaphorical extensions, only that their use in everyday speech is not largely metaphorical. A possible explanation for their non-metaphoric use lies exactly in their

---

[5] https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/cook%20up

salience. *Cook* and *eat* are the most salient of the four verbs which is visible from their frequency in the corpus. They are familiar to the speakers and are conventionally used to refer to the concepts of food consumption and food preparation in everyday language. Salience has been modelled as a significant factor in metaphor research (Stanojević 2014, 6). In his work Stanojević researches anger metaphors to determine the effect of salience on the number of metaphorical extensions. He discovered that *anger* has a lower percentage of metaphorical uses than other terms referring to the same concept, *fury* and *rage*, but a wider usage. He concludes that the salience of *anger* and its conceptual make-up mean that it can be inherently connected with more domains, some of which will be non-metaphorical (Stanojević 2014, 17). Based on similar findings, this research assumes that this is also true for the domain of food. Although *cook* and *eat* are widely used in everyday communication and their frequency and familiarity enable them to connect with more domains than *stir* and *swallow,* which are not used as much, a great number of these domains are actually non-metaphorical which is seen from the small number of metaphorical expressions found in the sample.

5. Discussion and conclusion

The domain of food has an important place in the human conceptual system and food related concepts are used metaphorically to express many different experiences, actions and abstract concepts. The previous section offers a detailed account of the different metaphorical extensions that utilize verbal aspects from this domain in order to express various notions. Given the overall number and type of extensions presented, it can be said that the domain of food is a productive source domain often used in the English language. The two main verbal categories described, namely food consumption and food preparation, describe the basic relationship between food and the human body. The findings for both categories of verbs are similar. In the category of food consumption, *swallow* has the most metaphorical extensions from a sample of 100, although it is not as frequently used as *eat*, which has none. The same goes for the category of food preparation where *stir* has more metaphorical extensions than *cook*, which is used on a daily basis. Therefore, it may be assumed that salience of the verb has an influence on the number of metaphorical uses and that more salient verbs have a smaller number of metaphorical extensions. When it comes to the type of extensions, both *swallow* and *stir* have a significant number of metaphorical extensions which are all

connected by a central meaning. For the verb *swallow*, the aspect of ingestion connects all of its different mappings. What is more, all three categories of extensions, namely *internalization*, *emotion control* and *general acceptance* use the general knowledge about the process of physical ingestion through the mouth so it can be said that the mappings are influenced by the folk theory about the domain of food. As for *stir*, it is the aspect of movement that connects the three categories. However, what separates them is the motivation of the mappings. The first two groups, *rousing emotion* and *inciting* are motivated by the food-related sense of movement of substances in a container. The last category is motivated by the diachronic meaning of the verb, which is to physically move, regardless of the synchronic connection to the domain of food. Therefore, it can be said that metaphorical extensions may also be influenced by diachronic meaning.

Another thing which is visible is the connection between the domain of food and the domain of emotion. Both verbal categories from the domain of food are mapped onto the domain of emotion but they describe different aspects of the emotional domain, namely emotion control and the loss of it. The connection between the two domains could be further explored in future research that would investigate all of the different mappings that exist between the two domains using both verbal and nominal categories.

The main limitation of this research is the small number of verbs analysed. More conclusive results could be reached by including more verbs from the two main categories. Another possible future avenue of research would be to look into the difference between the use of verbal and nominal categories belonging to the domain of food in metaphorical mappings.

Abstract:

The aim of this thesis is to see, through a study of the examples from The English Web Corpus (enTenTen15), what influences the number and type of metaphorical extensions of the verbs of eating and preparing food. It is argued that the basic human interactions with food are contained in two concepts: consumption and preparation. Therefore, the paper examines four food-related verbs, namely two verbs connected with food consumption, *eat* and *swallow*, and two verbs connected with food preparation, *cook* and *stir* and their metaphorical extensions. A sample of 100 sentences was chosen for each of the verbs and only the metaphorical examples were analysed. The results show that the domain of food is a productive source domain often used in the English language and the use of the verbal concepts belonging to this domain in different metaphorical mappings is motivated by folk theories about food.

Key words: metaphor, cognitive linguistics, folk theory, verbs of eating, verbs of preparing food

References

Geld, Renata, i Mateusz-Milan Stanojević. 2018. *Strateško konstruiranje*
    značenja riječju i slikom: konceptualna motivacija u ovladavanju jezikom.
    Zagreb: Srednja Europa.

Kövecses, Zoltán. 2000. *Metaphor and emotion: language, culture, and body*
    in human feeling. Studies in emotion and social interaction. Cambridge,
    New York: Cambridge University Press

Kövecses, Zoltan. 2002. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction.* USA: Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh: the Embodied Mind and its*
    Challenges to Western Thought. New York: Basic Books

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live by.* London: The University of
    Chicago Press

Lakoff, George. 1993. The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. In UC Berkley Previously
    Published Works. DUI: https://escholarship.org/uc/item/54g7j6zh

Newman, John. 1997. "Eating and Drinking as Sources of Metaphor in English". In
    Cuadernos de Filología Inglesa, 612, 213-231.
    https://www.researchgate.net/publication/27338638_Eating_and_Drinking_as_Source
    s_of_Metaphor_in_English

Radden, Günter. 2001. „The folk model of language". *metaphorik.de* 1: 55–86.
    https://www.metaphorik.de/de/journal/01/folk-model-language.html

Rudzka-Ostyn, Brygida. 2003. *Word power: phrasal verbs and compounds: a*
    cognitive approach. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Stanojević, Mateusz-Milan, Ivo Tralić, and Mateja Ljubičić. 2014. "Grammatical Information
    and Conceptual Metaphors: The Case of Anger." In *Language as Information:*
    Proceedings from the CALS Conference 2012, edited by Anita Peti-Stantić and
    Mateusz-Milan Stanojević, Peter Lang Edition, 131–54. Frankfurt am Main: Peter
    Lang

Stanojević, Mateusz-Milan. 2009. "Konceptualna metafora u kognitivnoj lingvistici: pregled
    pojmova". In *Suvremena lingvistika*, 35, 68, 339-369

Su, Lily I-wen. 2002. "What Can Metaphors Tell Us About Culture?". In *Language and*
    Linguistics, 613. 589-613
    http://www.ling.sinica.edu.tw/files/publication/j2002_3_05_5018.pdf

Talmy, Leonard. 1988. "Force dynamics in language and cognition". *Cognitive Science*, 12, 49–100