METAPHORIC AND METONYMIC CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF THE HEAD – A DICTIONARY-BASED CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH AND SERBIAN[∗]

UDC 811.111'373.612.2   811.163.41'373.612.2

Biljana Radić-Bojanić[1], Nadežda Silaški[2]

[1]Department of English, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad
E-mail: radic.bojanic@gmail.com
[2]Faculty of Economics, University of Belgrade
E-mail: silaskin@sbb.rs

Abstract. *Within the theoretical framework of Conceptual Metaphor and Metonymy Theory we deal with three metaphoric and metonymic conceptualizations of the* HEAD *in English and Serbian (*THE HEAD IS AN OBJECT; THE HEAD IS A CONTAINER, *and* THE HEAD STANDS FOR A PERSON*) to establish whether they manifest any cross-conceptual, cross-linguistic or cross-cultural differences. Since the mind is embodied, and both English and Serbian are cerebrocentric languages in which the head is seen as the locus of reasoning, we expect to find little difference in the three conceptualizations of the head between the two languages. However, since the mind is also culturally constructed, we hypothesise that the differences will mainly manifest in the linguistic instantiations in the two languages.*

Key words: *conceptual metaphor, conceptual metonymy,* HEAD *metaphors,* HEAD *metonymies, English, Serbian.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Within the theoretical framework of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff & Johnson 1980; Johnson 1987; Lakoff 1987; etc.) and Conceptual Metonymy Theory (Radden & Kövecses 1999; Radden 2000; Barcelona 2000a; etc.), in this paper we set out to contrastively explore the similarities and differences between metonymic and metaphorical meaning extensions of the English lexeme *head* and the corresponding Serbian lexeme *glava*. We focus on the three selected metaphoric and metonymic conceptualizations of the HEAD in the two languages (THE HEAD IS AN OBJECT, THE HEAD IS A CONTAINER, and

---

THE HEAD STANDS FOR A PERSON) to establish whether they are shared in the two languages, or, alternatively, whether they manifest any relevant cross-conceptual, cross-linguistic or cross-cultural differences.

By conducting a cross-linguistic and cross-cultural analysis of the HEAD expressions in English and Serbian, an attempt will be made to check the validity of the idea that human mind is embodied and that the folk model of *head* serves the purpose of conceptualizing various human actions, feelings and activities, as well as to show how metaphor, metonymy and image schemata have a decisive role in understanding the meaning of expressions which contain the lexemes *head/glava* in them.

The main hypothesis of the paper is the following: since the mind is embodied and human concepts are crucially shaped by our bodies and brains, we expect to find little difference in the metaphoric and metonymic conceptualizations of the head between English and Serbian. However, since the mind is also enculturated, i.e. culturally constructed, we argue that the differences will mainly manifest in the linguistic instantiations in the two languages.

In the next section we deal with the basic tenets of Conceptual Metaphor and Metonymy Theory, focusing on the differences between metaphor and metonymy as cognitive processes, as well as the concept of image schema which will be used as a framework for investigating how "human meaning, which is often metonymic and metaphoric in nature, arises from the interaction between body and culture." (Yu 2009: xii).

2. A COGNITIVE VIEW OF METAPHOR, METONYMY AND IMAGE SCHEMA

In Conceptual Metaphor Theory, as initiated and propounded by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), metaphor is no longer regarded as a mere textual, stylistic decoration, an ornamental figure of speech whose only contribution is to the expressiveness of the text. Instead, metaphor is now understood as a matter of thought and human cognition (Lakoff & Johnson 1980; Johnson 1987; Lakoff 1987; etc.) which pervades our everyday lives. It is a partial mapping from a familiar *source domain* onto a less familiar *target domain*. The TARGET DOMAIN IS SOURCE DOMAIN formula describes the metaphorical connection between the two domains, where complex and abstract concepts (target) are thought of and talked about in terms of conceptually simpler and more concrete notions (source), more closely related to our physical, embodied experience (e.g. LOVE IS A JOURNEY, TIME IS MONEY, etc.). However, while *metaphor* is now used as the equivalent to *conceptual metaphor*, *metaphorical expression* is understood as the linguistic realisation of a particular conceptual metaphor.

Metaphor as a cognitive model has so far attracted much more scholarly attention than metonymy, "although [metonymy] is probably even more basic to language and cognition" (Barcelona 2000b: 4). The last decade, however, has witnessed several important contributions to Conceptual Metonymy Theory, as originally proposed by Radden and Kövecses (1999) (see also e.g. Radden 2000; Barcelona 2000a; Panther & Thornburg 2003; etc.). While metaphor includes a projection from one conceptual domain onto another conceptual domain, metonymy, on the other hand, is understood as a conceptual projection whereby one domain is partially understood in terms of another domain included in the same experiential domain (Barcelona 2000b, 2000c). It is, therefore, an intradomain phenomenon (Deignan 2005: 73). Because of the difference in the number of domains used for the conceptual mapping between metonymy and metaphor (one versus

two domains of experience), metonymy is said to be based on *contiguity*, i.e. on elements that are parts of the same idealised cognitive model[1], while metaphor is based on similarity or predictability between two domains of experience.

However, despite the above mentioned, seemingly clear-cut, difference between metaphor and metonymy, the two cognitive mechanisms "often 'meet' at conceptual and linguistic crossroads" (Barcelona 2000b: 1). Therefore, a strict difference between them cannot be drawn easily. Many authors now point out that all metaphors are essentially metonymically-based (see e.g. Barcelona 2000a; Radden and Kövecses 1999; Niemeier 2000; etc.), defining a metonymy-based metaphor as "a mapping involving two conceptual domains which are grounded in, or can be tracked to, one conceptual domain" (Radden 2000: 93). Metaphors are based on experience and the connection between two domains of experience which make up a metaphorical mapping "is often encapsulated by means of metonymic abstraction" (Barcelona 2000b: 52). Since our contrastive analysis of the HEAD and GLAVA metaphors has shown that they are, in a vast majority of cases, metonymy-based, we shall use the notion of metonymy-based metaphors throughout the text that follows.

In Cognitive Linguistics, image schema is understood as an embodied prelinguistic structure of experience that motivates conceptual metaphor mappings, playing an important part in our understanding of the world. Image schemas are important since they "help to explain how our intrinsically embodied mind can at the same time be capable of abstract thought. As patterns of sensory-motor experience, image schemas play a crucial role in the emergence of meaning and in our ability to engage in abstract conceptualization and reasoning that is grounded in our bodily engagement with our environment" (Johnson 2005: 15). Image schema is defined as "a recurring, dynamic pattern of our perceptual interactions and motor programmes that gives coherence to experience" (Kövecses 2006: 207) and "without which our experience would be chaotic and incomprehensible." (Johnson 1987: xix). Image schemas "make it possible for us to use the structure of sensory and motor operations to understand abstract concepts and draw inferences about them" (Johnson 2005: 24). They are "gestalt structures, consisting of parts standing in relations and organized into unified wholes, by means of which our experience manifests discernible order." (Johnson 1987: xix).

3. DATA COLLECTION AND METHODOLOGY

The corpus of our analysis has been compiled from several monolingual English and Serbian dictionaries as well as the dictionaries of idioms and idiomatic expressions in both languages.[2] This forms a solid basis for a comparative and cross-linguistic exploration into the two cultures defined by their respective languages, English and Serbian. In our opinion, conventionalized, lexicalised, or dead, metaphors,[3] often metonymically

---

[1] According to Lakoff (1987: 68), *idealised cognitive models* are primary ways in which human beings organize knowledge. They may consist of a number of entities forming a coherent whole in our experience of the world as they co-occur repeatedly.

[2] Our analysis excludes unconventional, novel HEAD/GLAVA metaphors and metonymies, those "which can be understood only with reference to context" (Deignan 2005: 74).

[3] In this paper, no distinction will be made between lexicalized metaphors and idioms, although a clear one is frequently made in cognitive linguistic literature because many have argued that metaphors motivate idioms (Gibbs 1994, 2006).

based, being "*automatic*, *unconscious* mappings, pervasive in everyday language" (Barcelona 2000b: 5), provide ample evidence to support or refute our hypothesis which we elaborate on further in the text.

In our analysis we follow the methodological principles for the identification and description of conceptual metaphors in expressions which contain lexemes *head/glava* proposed by Barcelona (2001). We make a clear distinction here between conceptual metaphor, on the one hand, and metaphorical expression on the other, where "the linguistic expressions (i.e. ways of talking) make explicit, or are manifestations of, the conceptual metaphors (i.e. ways of thinking)" (Kövecses 2002: 6). In other words, "it is the metaphorical linguistic expressions that reveal the existence of the conceptual metaphors" (Kövecses 2002: 6), which means that we started from the linguistic instantiations in English and Serbian in order to arrive at a conclusion about the existence or non-existence of the same conceptual metaphors and metonymies in the two languages as well as the use of the image schema which plays an important role in these linguistic instantiations. Linguistic instantiations of the same conceptual metaphor or metonymy may not be the same in the two languages, but the conceptual metaphor or metonymy will nevertheless be regarded as the same "even though the elaborations, the specifications and corresponding linguistic expressions of the metaphor are not exactly the same, or equally conventionalized, in both of them" (Barcelona 2001: 137).

4. HEAD AND GLAVA IN ENGLISH AND SERBIAN

According to Niemeier (2011), there are three general types of conceptualization of the mind and emotions: (1) *abdominocentrism*, where the mind is located in or around the abdomen; (2) *cardiocentrism*, according to which the mind is located in the heart region; and (3) *cerebrocentrism*, where the mind is located in the head or more precisely the brain region. All the major Indo-European languages (including English and Serbian, therefore) allegedly share the last approach to the conceptualization of the mind. It rests on the well-known Western dichotomy according to which the head is the seat of intellect and rational behaviour, while the heart is the seat of emotions. This dualism, according to Niemeier (2011: 50) "contradicts scientific knowledge which argues that not only cognition, but also emotions are generated in the mind." However, the head/heart dichotomy, with occasional exceptions, still perseveres in European languages and cultures and in Anglophone culture the head "is primarily seen as the locus of rational thought, standing in opposition to emotions." (Niemeier 2008: 358).

In the sections to follow we deal with the three selected metaphoric and metonymic conceptualizations of the HEAD in English and Serbian and their corresponding metaphorical expressions.[4]

---

[4] As this is a dictionary-based analysis, we focus on the expressions which specifically contain the words *head/glava* in them, at the same time fully aware of the fact that in English *head* and *mind* are related metaphorically and metonymically. However, here we confine ourselves only to the *head* expressions.

4.1. The head is an object

The first of the two analyzed metaphoric conceptualizations, THE HEAD IS AN OBJECT, has proven to be a rich source of metaphorical expressions in both languages. They can be grouped into several sub-metaphors.

(a) THE HEAD IS A SOLID OBJECT

 The conceptualization of the head as a solid object is reflected in Serbian, for example, in the expression *tvrda glava* ['hard head']. This solid object is construed out of certain hard material so that the content which is supposed to reside in someone's head (ideas, thoughts, plans, rational attitudes, etc.) cannot enter the container, thus remaining outside the container, although the underlying logic of the head as a container presupposes contents filling it (Maalej 2008: 400). *Tvrda glava* ['hard head'], therefore, stands for an obstinate, stubborn person whose head, metonymically standing for that person, does not allow new ideas to enter its interior, nor does it allow the existing ideas to leave it, all this being prevented by the hardness of the container. Examples like *Naivcima baš ne možeš uterati u glavu* ['you cannot force this into naïve people's head'] indicate that it is not the reverse, i.e. that a *thick head* is someone who does not let stupid or wrong ideas *exit* their head.

The same metaphoric mapping exists in English as well. Namely, the expression *have a thick head*, for example, clearly indicates that the head is conceptualized as a solid object which does not allow intelligent thoughts to enter, so the person with a thick head is considered to lack intelligence or wisdom. Other examples that illustrate this sub-metaphor also rely on the conceptualization of the head as an object made of solid material, which can be handled in a variety of ways (e.g. in Serbian the head can be screwed on or put in a bag).

(b) THE HEAD IS A MOVING OBJECT

The HEAD IS A MOVING OBJECT conceptualization rests on the UP-DOWN image schema, which represents spatial orientations or relations. It is possible for the head to move up and down thus metaphorically employing various types of physical experience with this body part. This metaphorical conceptualization is cognitively connected with the HAPPY IS UP and SAD IS DOWN conceptual metaphors, clearly linguistically manifested in many examples from our data collection – if you are happy, you tend to keep your head up (e.g. in the clouds), whereas the opposite feeling, sadness, is expressed by putting your head down.

However, in its movement not only up and down but sideways, zigzag, or even backwards, the head may reach the limits which, in fact, are the limits of rational behaviour. Thus, an extreme movement of one's head (e.g. spinning or swirling or twisting) causes a person to feel dizzy, which metaphorically means a loss of rational behaviour and a loss of the capacity to think clearly, as indicated in the expressions *zavrteti nekome glavu* ['spin someone's head'] or *make someone's head spin* in Serbian and English respectively.

Along the similar lines, if you *bury your head in the sand*, a behaviour typical of an animal (ostrich), you lose your ability to think rationally and tend to avoid the situations which you are not able to handle. The same expression exists in Serbian, *zabiti glavu u pesak* [stick one's head in the sand] and it is also found in several other languages.

(c) THE HEAD IS A BRITTLE OBJECT

The realisations of this metaphor demonstrate that the head is sometimes perceived not as a hard, solid object which withstands all changes and remains unbroken and un-shattered, but as an object which cracks under pressure. As the example *bang/bash your head against a brick wall* implies, the wall is harder than the head, so the head will break because of the action of banging or bashing.

The Serbian example, *razbijati glavu o nečemu* ['bang your head about something'], illustrates an additional dimension of this metaphor, because it seems that the person is banging their head in order to crack it open and release its contents thus solving a prob-lem which is bothering them, or in order to open the head up to a solution to the problem. In either case the state of the head as a solid object is not desirable as it prevents the so-lution of the problem.

In addition, if someone's head is full of worries, problems or thoughts, it cracks (*puca mi glava* 'my head is cracking'), once again linguistically and conceptually proving that the head is sometimes conceptualized as a brittle object as well as a container filled with various types of contents.

(d) THE HEAD IS A PRECIOUS OBJECT

In this sub-metaphor, the head is metaphorically structured as an object which is highly coveted, to such an extent that a life may be lost if this precious object is lost (*izgubiti glavu* ['lose one's head']). A cognitive and experiential explanation for this metaphorical conceptualization lies in the fact than the mere loss of one's head through decapitation leads to the loss of one's life, which is why the notion of head is directly connected with its irreplaceability and preciousness. Furthermore, if a metonymical link of the head and the human being is observed, it is clear that the loss of head is equated with the loss of life. English does not have this expression, in which the loss of the head stands for losing one's life.[5]

The examples from our data illustrate the described conceptualization: in English someone can *pay with their head* if they make a mistake, because that will cost them their life. Words like *pay* and *cost* indicate that life is seen as a commodity with a price tag on it and since the price is truly high, i.e. someone's life, this commodity is considered to be exceptionally precious. A similar linguistic realisation is found in Serbian, where you can put a price on someone's head (*uceniti glavu nekome*), which practically means you pay a certain amount of money to someone to take someone else's life.

4.2. The head is a container

The HEAD IS A CONTAINER metaphor[6] rests on the CONTAINER image schema. There-fore, we first provide the kind of bodily experience which causes the emergence of this schema, give a list of its structural elements, and explain its underlying logic.

Johnson claims (1987: 21) that "[o]ur encounter with containment and boundedness is one of the most pervasive features of our bodily experience." Kövecses (2006: 209) ar-gues that the bodily experiences that motivate the existence of the CONTAINER image

---

[5] Interestingly enough, English and Serbian share another metaphor which is linguistically realized as *izgubiti glavu* ['lose one's head']). This metaphor, however, refers to the situation in which a person becomes so confused or overly emotional about something so that they lose control over their emotions and cannot think and reason logically.

[6] This metaphor entails the HEAD IS A SOLID OBJECT metaphor, but is analysed separately because of the particular features of the CONTAINER schema which are not identified in the general HEAD IS A SOLID OBJECT metaphor.

schema, although varied, may be reduced to two general types of experience. Firstly, our bodies are containers – they contain our body organs, blood, other fluids, etc. Secondly, we function "within larger objects as containers" (Kövecses 2006: 209), such as buildings, rooms, forests, which contain us. It is mainly the former type of experience that we focus on here, dealing with the head as a container in English and Serbian.

Three structural elements make up the CONTAINER image schema: "interior", "exterior", and "boundary", and "it is the organization of [its] structure that makes [it] experientially basic meaningful pattern in our experience and understanding." (Johnson 1987: 61). The structure of the CONTAINER schema, with its components (an inside, a boundary, and an outside) is "typological in the sense that the boundary can be made larger, smaller, or distorted and still remain the boundary of a container schema" (Lakoff & Johnson 1999: 32). Also, all major parts of the human body may be seen as containers (see, e.g. Yu 2009, Niemeier 2000, etc.) with the boundaries and the contents they carry, which may be emptied, spilled, poured, etc. The CONTAINER image schema, therefore, is inherently embodied.

In the CONTAINER schema, the head is metaphorically understood as "a three-dimensional entity that can hold things inside." (Díez Velasco 2001/2: 53), meaning that the head is conceptualized as a bounded space with its inside and outside, where a content is stored. Kövecses (2002: 156) claims that "[a]s a rule, we are more interested in the content of a container than in the mere container so that we commonly find metonymies that target the content via the container rather than the reverse metonymic relationship."

Thus, *head/glava* expressions are frequently used "to refer to the head's presumed content, that is the brain, the mind, human ratio, intelligence" (Niemeier 2008: 358). In fact, the head is conceptualized as a container which, similar to any other container, may be filled with certain content. In other words, these expressions "focus either on its fullness vs. emptiness or on the dynamic process of filling or emptying it" (Niemeier 2008: 363), e.g. *puna glava briga* ['head full of worries'], *šuplja glava* ['hollow head'], *napuniti nekome glavu nečim* ['fill someone's head with something'], and *izbiti iz glave* ['beat something out of someone's head']). According to the shared cultural model of the head, which claims that the head is the locus of reasoning, if a head is hollow (*šuplja glava*) or empty (*prazna glava*), and if, at the same time the head stands for the person, then these expressions focus on the lack of brain inside this person's head (the head conceptualized as a container is without any content), which, in turn, is based on the activation of another metonymy, BRAIN FOR INTELLECT/REASON.

Other contents of the head are also determined according to the person's behaviour or characteristics. Hence, a person's silly behaviour is conceptualized in Serbian as that person having bugs or flies in their head (*imati bube/mušice u glavi*) instead of a brain which performs intelligent activities. Another atypical content of a person's head is success, which is found in linguistic expressions in both languages, where in English a person's head is *big* or *swollen* because of success, or in Serbian, fame, money or popularity entered someone's head and made them conceited (*udarila mu je slava u glavu* ['fame hit his head'].

In addition, the filling of someone's empty head, i.e. the head metaphorically structured as a container without its content, is perceived as making that person forcefully accept someone else's opinion or a point of view, as illustrated in expressions such as: *napuniti glavu nekome nečim* ['fill someone's head with something'] in Serbian, and *put something into somebody's head* in English.

Generally speaking, both in English and Serbian, the content of the head mainly refers to intellectual ability, memory, intelligence and reason, thus again confirming the existence of the shared folk model of the head in both languages.

4.3. The head stands for a person

Both English and Serbian are languages in which it is possible to say 'the *head* and the *body*' ('*glava* i *telo*' in Serbian), which means that the head may be conceptualized, in the sense of its being a physical entity as (1) a part of the body with which it forms a coherent whole; and (2) a separate entity, which exists independently of the rest of the body (cf. Wierzbicka 2007: 16). Nevertheless, the most basic meaning of *head*, both in English and Serbian, refers to the top part of the human body. This basic meaning of the head, however, is frequently used metonymically so that the head stands for the whole person, thus realising the BODY PART FOR PERSON metonymy (Barcelona 2000b: 6), which is, in turn, activated by the overarching PART FOR WHOLE metonymy (more traditionally called *synecdoche*). This is surely a unique characteristic of the head to stand for the body as a whole, unlike other body parts which in most cases seem not to be sufficiently prominent or relevant to perform that metonymic role.

The HEAD FOR A PERSON metonymy is very frequently chained to the previously explicated metaphor, the HEAD IS A CONTAINER, both in English and Serbian. In this metonymy, the content of the container is metonymically linked with the person, i.e. the properties of the head stand for the relevant and most salient properties of the person (physical and/or mental). This metonymy, in fact, is the condensation of two more basic and general metonymies, CONTENT FOR CONTAINER and PART FOR WHOLE. The content of the head (e.g. the mind) is metonymically linked to the container, the head, which is in turn metonymically linked to the person. Let us illustrate this metonymy by several examples from both languages: in Serbian, *tvrda glava* ['hard head'], *prazna glava* ['empty head'], *šuplja glava* ['hollow head'], respectively standing for a stubborn, unintelligent and stupid person, as well as *empty head* in English.

In its most basic meaning (the uppermost part of the human body), the head may metonymically stand for the two sexes in Serbian, in the expressions *muška glava* ['male head'] and *ženska glava* ['female head'], which is not the case in English. The expression *ženska glava* ['female head'] is only used in the vocative form (*ženska glavo*). As evidence from the dictionaries suggests, the expression *ženska glavo* is used in contexts which mainly include a derogatory address and a condescending attitude. This is to an extent the reflection of the culture of the Balkans, where women are not considered to be as wise or practical as men and are therefore thought to have a less worthy head, which is even linguistically marked as 'female'. The other expression, *muška glava*, however, is sometimes used as a reaction to the previous expression and most frequently in a jocular context, although there may be situations when the expression has a derogatory connotation. Its most frequent metonymically based metaphoric meaning, however, refers to a male person who is in charge of a household (intertwined with the HEAD FOR CONTROL metonymy), the one without which a family cannot function properly since it is the main bread-winner and a decision maker. Here, "the head is seen as the main locus for decisions and for the exertion of power" (Niemeier 2008: 360). These two expressions belonging to the HEAD FOR A PERSON metonymy (*ženska glava* and *muška glava*) reflect one of the main cross-cultural differences between English and Serbian due to the different elements of cultural models, a patriarchal one being characteristic for the Serbian culture.

Both *krunisana glava* ['crowned head'] in Serbian and *crowned head* in English metonymically stand for the institution via the HEAD FOR A PERSON metonymy. Finally, the school context *head* in English does not have its counterpart in Serbian, although an old-fashioned expression *glavešina* ['man of the house'] is still used to refer to a male person who runs e.g. a household but not a school or any other formal institution.

5. DISCUSSION

After a careful analysis of our data, it turned out that the *head* in the Anglophone culture is primarily seen as the locus of rational thought, standing in opposition to emotions, which is also the case in Serbian. No striking differences have been found between English and Serbian as far as the three selected metaphoric and metonymic conceptualizations of the HEAD are concerned. One question that researchers have raised is whether basic bodily experiences are interpreted differently by different cultures, and whether these experiences are filtered differently through cultural models before being rendered into language. The findings gleaned from our analysis indicate that the minds of both Serbian and English speakers are indeed "embodied." The basic bodily experiences tied to *head/glava* are interpreted and expressed fairly similarly in both languages.

Some differences, however, are made manifest in the linguistic instantiations between the two languages. Thus, for example, the HEAD STANDS FOR A PERSON metonymy seems to be linguistically instantiated in Serbian by many more expressions than in English, as evidenced in the following examples: *mudra glava* ['wise head'], *bistra glava* ['bright head'], *pametna glava* ['smart head'], *luda glava* ['crazy head'], *usijana glava* ['incandescent head'], *šuplja glava* ['hollow head'], *prazna glava* ['empty head'], etc. Morphologically speaking, these are exocentric noun phrases, where optional, dependent words change, specifying the main characteristic of the *head* which metonymically stands for a person. The use of such phrases in English is not very common.

Generally speaking, our hypothesis that, since human concepts are fundamentally shaped by our bodies and brains, little difference will be found in the three metaphoric and metonymic conceptualizations of the head between English and Serbian, and that the differences, if any, will mainly manifest not at the conceptual level, but in the linguistic instantiations in the two languages due to the mind being culturally constructed, has proven to be correct. Both English and Serbian share all three conceptualizations, resting mainly on the shared folk model of the head, according to which it is the centre of human ability to think rationally. Without the head, human beings would be deprived of their basic property which differentiates them from animals – their mental faculty and the capacity to behave rationally, seated in their head. It is only in some extreme situations (when the head is spinning or twisting) that it loses its primary role as the seat of rational behaviour and the "emotional" takes hold of the "rational" (see Niemeier 2008: 362).

Conceptualizations, however, also depend on cultural models. It turned out that the general cultural model of the head is rather similar in English and Serbian, which in turn predetermines the linguistic realizations to a great extent. Thus, the reference to the head as a person with certain characteristics is not only much more frequent in Serbian than in English, but specific Serbian expressions do not have their linguistic counterparts in English, most probably due to the differences which notwithstanding exist between the two cultures in regard to the understanding of the head.

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper an attempt has been made to describe the three selected metaphoric and metonymic conceptualizations of the HEAD in English and Serbian (THE HEAD IS AN OBJECT; THE HEAD IS A CONTAINER, and THE HEAD STANDS FOR A PERSON) to establish whether they are shared in the two languages or, alternatively, whether they manifest any cross-conceptual, cross-linguistic or cross-cultural differences. Our results, although indicating a considerable conceptual and linguistic overlap between English and Serbian, should be taken as tentative, mainly due to the fact that the data collection on which the analysis was performed originates exclusively from dictionaries. Further comparative research and a more thorough analysis of a different, perhaps contextualized and more extensive corpus of data are needed, which may reveal some more elaborate linguistic and cultural differences in the metaphoric and metonymic conceptualizations of the HEAD between English and Serbian. It would also be fruitful to contrast the research results obtained in this way with some other, genetically unrelated, languages and cultures in order to find conceptual and linguistic universals or differences.

REFERENCES

1. Barcelona, A. (ed.). (2000a). *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
2. Barcelona, A. (2000b). "Introduction. The cognitive theory of metaphor and metonymy." In: Barcelona, A. (ed.) *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin: 1-28.
3. Barcelona, A. (2000c). "On the plausibility of claiming a metonymic motivation for conceptual metaphor." In: Barcelona, A. (ed.) *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin: 31-58.
4. Barcelona, A. (2001.) "On the systematic contrastive analysis of conceptual metaphors: case studies and proposed methodology." In: Pütz, M., S. Niemeier and R. Dirven (eds.), *Applied Cognitive Linguistics II: Language Pedagogy*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin: 117-146.
5. Díez Velasco, O. I. (2001/2). "Metaphor, metonymy and image schemas: an analysis of conceptual interaction patterns." *Journal of English Studies* 3: pp. 47-63.
6. Deignan, A. (2005). "A Corpus Linguistic Perspective on the relationship between Metonymy and Metaphor." *Style* 39(1): pp. 72-91.
7. Gibbs, R. (1994). The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language and Understanding, Cambridge University Press, New York.
8. Gibbs, R. (2006). *Embodiment and Cognitive Science*, Cambridge University Press, New York.
9. Johnson, M. (1987). The body in the mind: The bodily basis of reason and imagination, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
10. Johnson, M. (2005). "The philosophical significance of image schemas." In: Hampe, B. (ed.), *From perception to meaning: Image schemas in cognitive linguistics*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York: 15-33.
11. Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor. A Practical Introduction*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
12. Kövecses, Z. (2006). *Language, mind and culture: a practical introduction*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
13. Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things*, Chicago University Press, Chicago.
14. Lakoff, G. (1993). "The contemporary theory of metaphor." In: Ortony, A. (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 202-255.
15. Lakoff, G. & M. Johnson. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*, Chicago University Press, Chicago.
16. Lakoff, G. & M. Johnson. (1999). Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought, Basic Books, New York.
17. Maalej, Z. (2008). "The heart and cultural embodiment in Tunisian Arabic." In: Sharifian, F., R. Dirven, N. Yu and S.Niemeier (eds.), *Culture, Body, and Language: Conceptualizations of Internal Body Organs across Cultures and Languages*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin: 395-429.
18. Niemeier, S. (2000). "Straight from the heart – metonymic and metaphorical explorations." In: Barcelona, A. (ed.) *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin: 195-213.
19. Niemeier, S. (2008). "To be in control: kind-hearted and cool-headed. The head-heart dichotomy in English." In: Sharifian, F., R. Dirven, N. Yu and S.Niemeier (eds.), *Culture, Body, and Language: Conceptualizations of Internal Body Organs across Cultures and Languages*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin: 349-372.

20. Niemeier, S. (2011). "Culture-specific concepts of emotionality and rationality." In: Callies, M., A. Lohöfer & W. Keller (eds.), *Bi-Directionality in the Cognitive Sciences. Examining the Interdisciplinary Potential of Cognitive Approaches in Linguistics and Literary Studies*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam: 43-56.
21. Panther, K. U. & L. L. Thornburg. (eds.) (2003). *Metonymy and Pragmatic Inferencing,* John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
22. Radden, G. (2000). "How metonymic are metaphors?." In: Barcelona, A. (ed.) *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin: 93–105.
23. Radden, G. & Z. Kövecses. (1999). "Towards a theory of metonymy." In: Panther, K. U. & G. Radden (eds.), *Metonymy in Language and Thought*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam: 17-59.
24. Wierzbicka, A. (2007). "Bodies and their parts: An NSM approach to semantic typology." *Language Sciences* 29: pp. 14–65.
25. Yu, N. (2009). *From Body to Meaning in Culture*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam and Philadelphia.

DICTIONARIES USED

1. *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English.* (2009) 5th edition, Pearson Education, Harlow. Available at http://www.ldoceonline.com/
2. *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners.* (2007) 2nd edition, Macmillan Education, Oxford. Available at http://www.macmillandictionaries.com/about/med/
3. Nikolić, M. (ed.) (2007). *Rečnik Matice srpske* (*Dictionary of Matica srpska*), Matica srpska, Novi Sad.
4. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary.* (2011). 8th edition, Oxford University Press, Oxford. Available at http://oald8.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/

METAFORIČKA I METONIMIJSKA POIMANJA GLAVE – KONTRASTIVNA ANALIZA REČNIČKIH ODREDNICA U ENGLESKOM I SRPSKOM JEZIKU

Biljana Radić-Bojanić, Nadežda Silaški

Pod okriljem teorije pojmovne metafore i metonimije rad istražuje tri metaforička i metonimijska poimanja GLAVE u engleskom i srpskom jeziku (GLAVA JE PREDMET, GLAVA JE SADRŽATELJ, i GLAVA STOJI ZA OSOBU) sa ciljem da ustanovi da li one ukazuju na međupojmovne, međujezičke ili međukulturne razlike. Pošto je um utelovljen, a engleski i srpski jezik se smatraju cerebrocentričnima, jer se glava smatra mestom gde se nalazi razum, ne očekujemo da ćemo naći mnogo razlika u tri poimanja glave u pomenuta dva jezika. Ipak, pošto na um utiče i kultura, pretpostavljamo da će se razlike uglavnom uočiti u jezičkim realizacijama u engleskom i srpskom jeziku.

Ključne reči: *pojmovna metafora, pojmovna metonimija, metafore GLAVE, metonimija GLAVE, engleski jezik, srpski jezik*