

Stylistic Use of Phraseological Units in Discourse

Stylistic Use of Phraseological Units in Discourse

Anita Naciscione

John Benjamins Publishing Company
Amsterdam / Philadelphia



™ The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Naciscione, Anita.

Stylistic use of phraseological units in discourse / Anita Naciscione.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. English language--Rhetoric.
2. English language--Style.
3. English language--Terms and phrases.
4. Discourse analysis. I. Title.

PE1442.N35 2010

808'.0014--dc22

2010028218

ISBN 978 90 272 1176 7 (HB; alk. paper)

ISBN 978 90 272 8769 4 (EB)

© 2010 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands
John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

To Judy, Reinis, & Kārlis

Table of contents

Acknowledgements	XI
List of abbreviations	XIII
 Preface by Wolfgang Mieder	 1
Introduction	7
 Part I. Phraseological units in discourse	
 CHAPTER 1	
Phraseology and cognitive stylistics	15
1.1 A discourse-based approach	15
1.2 The breakthrough of cognitive stylistics	16
1.3 The phraseological unit	17
1.4 Phraseology and stylistics	20
1.5 Attitudes to stylistic use of PUs	21
1.6 Stylistic use of PUs in dictionaries	24
 CHAPTER 2	
Identification of phraseological units in discourse	31
2.1 The phraseological unit and its base form	31
2.2 Core use	35
2.3 The concept of instantial stylistic use	39
2.4 Identification procedure	43
 CHAPTER 3	
Key concepts of instantial stylistic use in discourse	57
3.1 Stability of phraseological units in instantial use	57
3.2 Phraseological cohesion	60
3.2.1 Cohesion of the base form	61
3.2.2 Cohesion in discourse	62
3.2.2.1 Cohesion in core use	62
3.2.2.2 Cohesion in instantial stylistic use	62

- 3.3 Patterns of instantial use: Continuity versus change 65
- 3.4 Discoursal character of instantial use: Sustainability of phraseological image 73

CHAPTER 4

The most common patterns of instantial stylistic use 79

- 4.1 Extended phraseological metaphor 79
- 4.2 Phraseological pun 91
- 4.3 Cleft use 102
- 4.4 Phraseological allusion 107

CHAPTER 5

Phraseological units in the web of discourse 121

- 5.1 Instantial aspects of phraseological reiteration in discourse 122
- 5.2 Instantial cumulative use: The potential of the diminutive in English phraseology 134
 - 5.2.1 Ways of expressing the diminutive in English phraseology 134
 - 5.2.2 The diminutive in the semantic structure of phraseological units 138
 - 5.2.3 Instantial use of the diminutive in English phraseology 140
 - 5.2.4 Cumulative use of the diminutive in Lewis Carroll's poem *The Little Man that Had a Little Gun* 142
- 5.3 Instantial concurrent use 145
- 5.4 Instantial phraseological saturation of discourse 151
- 5.5 Comprehensive instantial use 162
 - 5.5.1 Umbrella use: Use of phraseological units in titles and headlines 163
 - 5.5.2 Use of phraseological units in codas 170

CHAPTER 6

Visual representation of phraseological image 175

- 6.1 Visual representation and phraseological units 175
- 6.2 Visual representation of instantial stylistic use 176
- 6.3 Visual representation in media discourse 181
- 6.4 Implicit visual messages 188
- 6.5 A discourse dimension 190
- 6.6 Visual literacy as a cognitive skill 197

Part II. Towards applied stylistics

CHAPTER 7

Applied stylistics and instantial stylistic use 205

7.1 The rise of applied stylistics 205

7.2 Teaching and learning 208

7.2.1 A discourse-based approach to phraseology in teaching 209

7.2.2 Language skills, learning difficulties, and identification errors 220

7.3 Translation of phraseological units in discourse 227

7.4 Lexicography, glossography, notes and comments 238

7.5 Advertising 245

Glossary 251

References 257

Appendixes 275

Index of phraseological units 285

Subject index 291

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank John McRae and Ronald Carter for several valuable comments on and suggestions for terminology in English. I have been greatly influenced by their works; however, needless to say, the responsibility for theoretical conclusions and any faults is all mine. I am especially grateful to John McRae for his encouragement to pursue this project. I am also grateful to all linguists who gave constructive remarks, insights, and invaluable advice on the first edition of my book: Wolfgang Mieder, Pedro Chamizo-Dominguez, Raymond Gibbs, Gerard Steen, Tatiana Fedulenkova, Christopher Goddard.

It is my particular pleasure to convey my gratitude to the Latvian Academy of Culture for providing institutional support in my research.

Many thanks to my anonymous reviewers at John Benjamins for their insightful comments. Finally, special thanks due to Kees Vaes and the staff at John Benjamins Publishing Company for their support and expertise in the publication of this book.

Any book must draw on previously published ideas. I have tried to note due acknowledgements, at the same time trying not to interfere with the flow of the discussion in the interests of the reader who wants ideas, rather than a biographical survey. I will be happy to learn of, and apologise for, any omissions in this respect.

The author and publisher wish to thank:

1. *Wright's Reprints* for permission obtained from *Time* magazine to use the cover illustration "By a Thread" (Figure 6.16), Europe edition, 18 December, 1998.
2. NI syndication Ltd. for permission to use the photo of Queen Elisabeth II (Figure 6.7) and the cartoon "A New Pair of Shoes" (Figure 6.8).

The author and publisher are especially grateful to the following for permission to reproduce copyright material:

1. *The Times* for permission to use the illustration "A Black Eye" (Figure 6.14), published on 20 September, 2003, SL 4M.

2. *The Spectator* for permission to use two figures: (1) The cover page of *The Spectator* (Figure 6.17), 10 January, 1998; (2) “Spinning out of Control” (Figure 6.18), *The Spectator*, 10 January, 1998, p. 8.
3. The *Financial Times* for permission to use the figure “The Art of Breaking a Sacrosanct Rule” (Figure 6.19), *Financial Times*, fm, 28 November, 2005, p. 3.
4. Petar Pismestrovic for permission to use his cartoon “A Black Sheep” (Figure 6.20), *Kleine Zeitung*, Austria, 20 June, 2008.
5. The painter Ivars Poikāns for permission to use his painting “A Pretty Kettle of Fish” (Appendix III) and his pen-and-ink drawing “To Let the Cat Out of the Bag” (Figure 6.1).

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders of the works reproduced in this book. If any have inadvertently been overlooked they should contact the publisher who will be happy to remedy the situation.

List of abbreviations

AmE	–	American English
AustrE	–	Australian English
BrE	–	British English
CCDI	–	Collins Cobuild Dictionary of Idioms 1995 (the Bank of English)
DPMD	–	Dorland's Pocket Medical Dictionary
ENE	–	Early New English
Latv.	–	Latvian
MiE	–	Middle English
MoE	–	Modern English
MWCD	–	Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary for Windows 1996
OE	–	Old English
PU	–	a phraseological unit
PUs	–	phraseological units
SL	–	a source language
TL	–	a target language
vs	–	versus

Preface

Actual texts show that phraseology is not a store of old fossils

Anita Naciscione, Chapter 1

About ten years ago I had the good fortune to encounter Anita Naciscione's ground-breaking study *Phraseological Units in Discourse: Towards Applied Stylistics* (2001), and I remember well my scholarly excitement when I literally devoured page after page of this unique investigation into the stylistic aspects of phraseological units in actual discoursal contexts. Of course, much had been written by then about the multifaceted nature of phraseologisms, with the founding of the European Society of Phraseology in 1999. By now there exists a steady stream of publications on phraseology in the form of dissertations, bibliographies, monographs, handbooks, and articles, but it is fair to say that this plethora of studies has not really advanced the intriguing findings by Anita Naciscione in both their theoretical and applied aspects. Scholars and students of phraseology will and should therefore applaud Anita Naciscione's skilfully revised and extensively expanded new edition of her previous book with its new title *Stylistic Use of Phraseological Units in Discourse* (2011). It surveys and analyses recent scholarship and by adding various new sections and chapters goes far beyond the theoretical scope and the contextualised examples of the original volume. Written in clear, readable, and accessible English, it is thus a most welcome book that will without doubt be of major consequence in the future development of international phraseology. There is little jargon but rather precisely defined theoretical vocabulary, all important points are illustrated by appropriate textual examples, and the entire book is presented in a way that shows a scholar in solid command of her subject matter. It is truly a magisterial accomplishment and in many ways a new publication that should be added to libraries and be part of required reading in any course on phraseology.

There is no doubt that phraseological units of all types are basically "dead" in collections and dictionaries. In fact, most of them do not include any contexts and also ignore diachronic considerations. That is not to say that individual investigations of the contextualised use of proverbs, proverbial expressions, and other phraseologisms do not exist. There certainly are such studies on some of the

major literary authors and historical figures, as for example on Geoffrey Chaucer, Charles Dickens, Abraham Lincoln, and Winston S. Churchill. But while they present the various phraseological units in context, they do not go into major detail concerning their actual stylistic use, including the variation, expansion, and augmentation of particular phrases. They could all benefit from the theoretical framework and the discussion of numerous examples that Anita Naciscione's book so appropriately provides. Anybody undertaking a stylistic and interpretive study of phraseological units in the context of literary works or the mass media would do well in making the methodology presented in her book the foundation for their work.

This is not the place to offer detailed definitions or descriptions, but it might be stated that Naciscione's special approach consists of looking at the stylistic discourse-level features of phraseological units from a cognitive perspective. And she is absolutely correct in stating that this presupposes an interdisciplinary analysis, since such fields as linguistics, psychology, folklore, literature, and iconography are necessarily part of it. Her distinction among the base form, core use, and instantial stylistic use serves very well as a theoretical basis in studying the naturally occurring phraseological units in all types of discourse. Above all, she is once and for all breaking with the traditional notion that phraseological units are characterised by fixedness, frozenness, or dead metaphors. Anybody who has studied such phrases in detail has long noticed that they are frequently varied, modified, parodied, or simply stated in a changed way in actual use. They are much more flexible and adaptable than previous scholarship has shown, and it is important to note that the author is adding the extremely important cognitive aspect to her study of the instantial use of phraseologisms. After all, when we are confronted with such texts, matters like access and recall, memory, identification, interpretation, perception, recognition, and comprehension enter into all of this. As a professor of English in Riga, Anita Naciscione is clearly aware of the fact that students of foreign languages are constantly confronted with these issues as they attempt to master the use and understanding of the phraseologisms of the target language. As a professor who is in the same boat with her, I applaud the fact that my friend has included important statements in her book on the applicability of her approach to foreign language teachers and students alike. I also want to emphasise the significant fact that she stresses the importance of historical considerations in the investigation of the stylistic use of phraseological units. After all, the use, function, and meaning of a given phrase might well change over time, as has been shown in comprehensive studies of such proverbs and proverbial expressions as "Big fish eat little fish", "Don't swap horses in the middle of the stream", "A house divided against itself cannot stand", and "To

throw the baby out with the bath water". Again and again, as I read the manuscript of this new edition of Naciscione's book and as I am writing this preface, the thought reappears to me how much all of us can and must learn from her inclusive study.

The longer first part of the book is a highly informed theoretical presentation of what the author means by "instantial stylistic use" of phraseological units that is based on applied and cognitive stylistics dealing with discourse as it appears in literature and the mass media – obviously this approach is perfectly adaptable to the study of radio, film, television, and song, that is, to the oral contextualised use of phraseological units. While I have done some of this without Anita Naciscione's theoretical framework, I must admit that my future studies will now pay much more attention to her paradigm, notably the importance of cognitive matters. After all, psycholinguistics is of extreme importance in the study of the use and comprehension of metaphors, and by including cognitive considerations much can be learned about the psychological interpretation of phraseological units in human communication of all types. A small present-day example might be President Barack Obama's relatively frequent use of proverbial phrases in his books and speeches. As a politician on the national and international scene, he and his speech-writers must very much be aware of what phraseological units he uses, especially when he addresses audiences abroad for whom his English is a foreign language. He cannot and should not automatically expect his audiences to understand such common but culturally specific phrases as "to get to first base", "to play hardball", "to pinch-hit for someone", and "Three strikes and you are out", all of which stem from the game of baseball. Clearly, he would want to employ metaphorical phrases that have a rather international currency, as for example "to fight against windmills", "to be in the same boat", "to build castles in the air", and "All that glitters is not gold". But even then he would need to be careful to make certain that these phrases carry similar meanings abroad, that they are in fact still current and understood, and that they will be appreciated by his audiences as meaningful stylistic devices, especially if he shortens, expands, or merely alludes to them, as he is prone to do. This is especially important for President Obama, since he is in fact quite eager to employ phraseological units in his political rhetoric in the United States and abroad. As such, he is a perfect example for Naciscione's sound claim that phraseologisms in actual use are not dead fossils without any deeper meaning.

Of course, the author shows all of this by numerous contextualised examples ranging from authors like Geoffrey Chaucer, William Shakespeare, Mark Twain, George Bernard Shaw, D. H. Lawrence, Lewis Carroll, James Thurber, and many others. This is an impressive spread of literary talents over time by which she is

able to show diachronically that this differentiated stylistic use of phraseological units is actually nothing new! It would be utter nonsense – as has been claimed at times – that phraseologisms in discourse are absolutely fixed. Nothing is further from the truth, as a large percentage of contextualised references show. But as expected, the author goes, of course, far beyond just stating the obvious. Instead she discusses in much detail such matters as phraseological cohesion, patterns of instantial use, extended phraseological metaphor, phraseological puns, phraseological allusion, diminutives in phraseology, phraseological titles, and even phraseological saturation of discourse. These are but a few aspects of particular interest to me that should also whet the reading appetite of others. Regarding the saturation of texts with phraseologisms, let me just mention that I have collected such textual amassments both in English and German. My International Proverb Archives hold dozens of examples from prose literature, poems, and songs that consist of proverbial collages that carry meaningful messages. To be sure, I have been able to show that the sub-genres of proverb poems and proverb songs exist, having found examples throughout history. I simply mention here François Villon's *Ballade des proverbes* from the 15th century and Bob Dylan's song *Like a Rolling Stone* (1965). In fact, there exists a definite tradition of such *tour de force* texts that also include the field of iconography, to wit the entire tradition of proverb illustrations from the late Middle Ages via Pieter Bruegel's famous oil painting *The Netherlandish Proverbs* (1559) on to comic strips.

Regarding this last point, the author has also included a completely new chapter on "Visual Representation of Phraseological Image" with which she once again charts a new way of interpreting the ubiquitous appearance of phraseologisms in various types of media. Claiming that "visualisation is part of metaphor recognition", she is especially concerned with the visual aspects that are part of metaphorical thought representation and of course also the creative employment of phraseological metaphors in visual discourse. While she does not comment in detail on the visual representation of phraseological units in woodcuts, misericords, tapestries, emblems, engravings, paintings, gold weights, coffee mugs, flags, cloths, quilts, and yes, T-shirts (a whole tradition by now!), she emphasises the appearance of phraseological illustrations in book illustrations of Mark Twain, James Thurber, Lewis Carroll, and others. Above all, the author zeroes in on how phraseologisms play a definite role in the visual aspects of the mass media, where they appear as texts with innovative and often literal pictoralisations of their metaphors. Once again her methodology could easily be transposed to the iconographic study of proverbs and proverbial expressions that has a considerable tradition among art and cultural historians, folklorists, and philologists. Her discussion of such matters as visual representation and instantial stylistic

use, implicit visual messages, and above all visual literacy as a cognitive skill is absolutely superb, and once again I would add that I wish that I had her theoretical discoveries at my disposal when I have dealt with iconographical and phraseological issues. In any case, in a modern global world where visual emblems in the press and advertising play an ever more important role, it behoves us to include in the study of cultural literacy Anita Naciscione's innovative concept of visual literacy.

One could perhaps argue that this book could have been concluded at this point, but I do commend Anita Naciscione for adding a second part to her unique study by providing a long and extremely important chapter on "Applied Stylistics and Instantial Stylistic Use". Not that she has not done so throughout the first part of her book, she now, perhaps reminiscent of the proverb "The proof of the pudding is in the eating", practices what she preaches by presenting and analysing additional and carefully chosen examples. It is here where the educator in her comes to the forefront, and I am glad that she makes this engaged commitment to the importance of phraseological units for the teaching and learning of (foreign) languages. Again, the idea of stressing phraseologisms in language classes is nothing new, and there exists a considerable amount of international scholarship on the subject matter. But it is, of course, Anita Naciscione's innovative approach based on her insightful theoretical ideas that goes beyond previous work in this area. By way of convincing examples she illustrates new ways of a discourse-based approach to phraseology in teaching, explaining at the same time such matters as improved language skills, learning difficulties, and identification problems regarding phraseological units. And yet, as we all know, it is of utmost importance that our students learn to cope with this rich phraseological communication, that they learn to identify, understand, and interpret the metaphorical phrases in the discursal context, that they know how to approach their translation, and that they are aware of their stylistic importance in advertising in particular but also in the mass media as such. Teachers and professors of foreign languages would do well in giving this particular chapter a careful reading, obviously also checking out the glossary, the comprehensive list of references, the appendix, and the index at the end of the book. All of this well written and clearly presented material is of excellent use, especially since it does include the cutting-edge state of theoretical and applied research in the ever fascinating field of phraseology.

There is an old Latin proverb "*Opus artificem probat*" (The work proves the craftsman) that is known in numerous languages and also in English as "The worker is known by his work". This is a most fitting piece of wisdom to bring this short and thus superficial preface to its conclusion. Anita Naciscione is to be congratulated on her superb scholarly accomplishment that will benefit

generations of scholars and students of phraseology. It is not easy to write a comprehensive and at the same time truly innovative study of an entire research field and yet go far beyond the present state of scholarship. But the book *Stylistic Use of Phraseological Units in Discourse* accomplishes exactly that, and its author Anita Naciscione has every reason to be proud of her scholarly achievement in the service of phraseology.

Wolfgang Mieder
University of Vermont, 2010

Introduction

The purpose of this book is to disclose stylistic discourse-level features of phraseological units from a cognitive perspective. A discourse-based view allows me to examine phraseological units in a broader context, not just in single phrases or sentences. This angle of vision is important, as discourse studies tend to overlook stylistic use of phraseological units. For instance, *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (Schiffrin et al. [2001] 2004) does not deal with phraseology in discourse at all.

A cognitive approach to stylistic use of phraseological units in discourse is a new research area. It is, of necessity, an interdisciplinary field, since these issues cannot be addressed through the knowledge resources of any single discipline. I rely on the findings of cognitive linguistics on figurative thought and language. Use of figurative language, including phraseological units, has been recognised as part and parcel of human cognition, a revealing cognitive mechanism.

Recent decades have witnessed increasing interest in various aspects of phraseology, especially after the foundation in 1999 of the European Society of Phraseology (EUOPHRAS), which has become a centre of phraseological research, organising regular conferences and other activities. Additionally, an increasing number of publications now exist on various aspects of phraseology. Here I should mention two weighty volumes on theoretical issues of phraseology that will certainly boost further studies in the area: *Phraseology: An Interdisciplinary Perspective* (Granger and Meunier [2008] 2009) and *Phraseology in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching* (Meunier and Granger [2008] 2009). In turn, research in phraseology has promoted studies in corpus linguistics and in compilation of corpus-based dictionaries.

This book attempts to explore the benefits of a cognitive approach to the stylistic aspects of phraseology both in the system of language and in actual texts. Use of phraseological image in verbal and visual discourse is of stylistic and cognitive interest for studies of both thought and language.

New findings

- My major task has been to work on elaboration of key terminology and theoretical concepts in phraseology in general, and in stylistic use of phraseological units in discourse, in particular in the face of an abundance of various existing controversial terms. For the purposes of stylistic analysis, I introduce new basic terms in English: *the base form*, *core use*, and *instantial stylistic use*. To study phraseological units at the level of discourse, it is essential to draw a distinction between the stock of phraseological units and phraseological units in actual use, which fall into core use and instancial use. Hence the importance of the distinction between: *the base form* vs *core use* vs *instantial use*. The following are theory constitutive concepts in stylistic use of phraseological units.
- Definition of *the phraseological unit* as the most significant concept for phraseology. I argue that the phraseological unit is a stable, cohesive combination of words with a fully or partially figurative meaning.
- *The base form* of the phraseological unit is an archetypal conception. It is a decontextualised unit of language, stored in the dictionary or the long-term memory of the language user, accessed when a discourse situation calls for it. It is generic to all manifestations of a particular phraseological unit in discourse.
- *Core use* is use of a phraseological unit in its most common form and meaning. In core use the phraseological unit does not acquire additional stylistic features and does not exceed the boundaries of one sentence. Core use is largely predictable; it presents neither novelty nor surprise.
- By *instantial stylistic use* I understand a particular instance of a unique stylistic application of a phraseological unit in discourse resulting in significant changes in its form and meaning determined by the thought and the context. These are stylistic instances of naturally occurring phraseological units in discourse. Instancial stylistic use explores experiences far beyond the possibilities of core use, is more sophisticated and therefore requires a greater amount of processing and analysis than core use, especially for L2 learners. Both core use and instancial use are equally valid manifestations in discourse: they are language in use. The instancial form has been created for a particular purpose; however, the term *instantial* refers only to textual manifestation. It does not refer to the base form exploited in the given context or to pattern, which are language means applied to achieve a novel stylistic effect in discourse. Instancial use is a boundless resource for writer or speaker creativity.

- *Stability of phraseological units* is an inherent, categorial feature not only in the system of language and but also in stylistic use. I argue against use of some terms which currently prevail in research on phraseology, such as *fixedness*, *frozenness*, *dead metaphors*. Stability in the system of language and flexibility in discourse do not contradict each other. Quite the contrary, they contribute to each other as a set of dialectic opposites.
- *Phraseological cohesion* derives from the figurative meaning of the PU and the structure of the unit. However, phraseological cohesion is not only part of the meaning of the base form, it is also the unity of phraseological meaning in instantial use; not only a semantic but also a stylistic relationship, realised in discourse by virtue of ties with the base constituents. Stylistic cohesion provides continuity and helps to create a narrative.
- I introduce the concept of *the pattern of stylistic use* as a reproducible mental technique. It is a set of common features and rules of instantial use of phraseological units. I have attempted to show that far more regularity exists in the instantial stylistic use of phraseological units than has been previously believed. In discourse, phraseological units secure cohesive ties to meet discourse needs by means of such patterns as extended metaphor, punning, allusion, or reiteration and their innumerable combinations. Patterns of instantial use are frequently achieved at the level of a certain length of text, larger structural units such as chapters, or at the level of a whole literary work. Texts show that instantial stylistic use of phraseological units has persisted since OE. The same basic stylistic patterns recur in discourse across centuries with varying degrees of frequency and density.
- *Sustainability of phraseological image in discourse* is the spread of a phraseological image over a length of text in sequential segments as part of the interrelated web of the discourse. Instantial use is sustainable and contributes to creation of coherence and cohesion in discourse. A phraseological unit may extend across sentence boundaries and even larger stretches of text, creating continuity, a network of unique interrelationships of figurative and direct meanings, and associative links. Sustained stylistic use reflects extended figurative thought and contributes to perception of the text as a cohesive and coherent entity.
- Cognitive insights. The study of phraseology cannot be separated from general cognitive processes. I challenge some prevailing assumptions about phraseological units in use. Clearly, instantial stylistic use cannot be discarded as a mere deviation, a distortion, a violation, or a strange exception. The reason is cognitive: instantial stylistic changes reflect the development of thought in

discourse, which is closely linked with creativity in language use. The book also explores other cognitive aspects of instantial use, such as access and recall, the role of long-term memory and working memory, and the process of identification: perception, recognition, comprehension, and interpretation. The whole process of emergence of instantial use is a cognitive performance, a pathway leading from long-term memory, which provides a base form and an instantial pattern, to creativity, which yields instantial form and meaning. Phraseological metaphor exists not only in thought and language; it also exists in visual representation and its perception. Phraseology is a mode of figuration, and a cognitive linguistic approach to figurative language is a tool that helps to perceive, understand, and appreciate stylistic use of phraseological units, and draw inferences.

- A diachronic insight into stylistic use of phraseological units, going back to the OE, MiE, and ENE periods (Shakespeare) up to Modern English, discloses cross-century stability of patterns of figurative use. Diachronic development of patterns is a development in complexity and scope. The same basic stylistic patterns recur in discourse across centuries with varying degrees of frequency and density. Diachronic changes do not contradict stability. Texts show that instantial use of phraseological units has persisted since the OE period.
- Applied stylistics. In the book, I argue in favour of the need for applied stylistics as a field of special interest: use of stylistic competence of the language user in the fields of teaching language and literature, translation, lexicography, visual representation, and advertising. I see applied stylistics as an area which explores practical use of the principles, discoveries, and theories of language, literature, and stylistics. Training in stylistic awareness will lead to significant gains in stylistic literacy, including visual literacy, which will result in functional ability to use stylistic skills sufficiently well for applied purposes and activities.

Scope of the book

The book explores key issues in stylistic use of phraseological units and offers both theoretical and applied research; it falls into two main parts. Part I is devoted to theoretical research, which is concerned with elaboration of technical terms, key concepts, and key processes. Part I offers a new approach to key terminology and basic concepts, and provides a comprehensive discourse-based treatment of phraseological units from a cognitive perspective. The book examines patterns of stylistic use of phraseological units and the role of cohesion in the sustainability of a phraseological image in discourse. Exploration of phraseological meaning

across sentence boundaries is based on ample textual illustrations of stylistic use ranging from the 8th century to Modern English, both from literary and media texts, and multimodal discourse.

Part II focuses on applied research, exploring challenges which instantial stylistic use of phraseological units cause in practical applications in various spheres of life. Applied stylistics is only an emerging trend. Indeed, phraseology is a wholly new area even as part of applied linguistics. For instance, *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (Kaplan 2002) does not explore the applied aspects of stylistic use of language in general or stylistic use of phraseological units in particular. However, the need for applied stylistics exists. One of the most important aspects is the pedagogical implications of teaching stylistic use of phraseological units. This is an essential strategy for raising stylistic awareness, which is a conscious perception and understanding of significant changes in base form and meaning, associative links and their networks, stylistic cohesive ties in text, and creation of new meaning in discourse. The importance of stylistic expertise in advertising is self-evident. Another area that calls for stylistic and cognitive competence is translation of phraseological terms. A cognitive approach is a tool that helps to comprehend the role of figurative use across languages and to recognise metaphor as a technique of abstract reasoning in the formation of terminology. Its translation is not merely part of cross-cultural communication; it is a cognitive operation of the mind. Translation of phraseological terms reveals the role of cognitive theory in translation practice. Hence it is crucial to gain full comprehension of the phenomenon and recognise the need for specialist training.

The book contains a List of Abbreviations, an Appendix, an Index of Phraseological Units discussed in the book, a Subject Index, an extensive Glossary with clear-cut definitions of key terms and concepts in stylistic use of phraseological units that support and reflect their analysis, and a comprehensive Bibliography that provides a basis for readers to pursue their further interest in the area.

This book is a revised edition of *Phraseological Units in Discourse: Towards Applied Stylistics* (Naciscione 2001b). I hope that it will contribute to further exploration of phraseological units and cognitive aspects of their use in verbal and visual discourse, which is crucial both in the theoretical and the applied sphere.

Anita Naciscione
Latvian Academy of Culture, 2010

PART I

Phraseological units in discourse

Phraseology and cognitive stylistics

Awareness of style is essential for understanding and appreciation of language in use, including both literary and non-literary texts. By focusing on use of language and stylistic features, researchers have sought to combine the approaches of the linguist and the literary critic in a particular interpretation and consider both poetic function and poetic form (Jakobson 1960). A linguistic approach to literature has generated innumerable approaches and studies since Jakobson's outstanding contribution to this subject. One of the greatest gains has been the advancement of a discourse-based approach to language phenomena.

1.1 A discourse-based approach

In stylistics the discourse-based approach goes back to I. A. Richards, who broke the then-existing tradition in rhetoric; in *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (1936) he presents the conception that the study of rhetoric should be a philosophical inquiry into the way words work in discourse.¹

Discourse analysis,² which has been fast developing over recent decades, encourages interpretation in discourse through exploration of meaning to integrate the study of language and literature (for example, Leech and Short [1981] 1994; Carter [1982] 1995a; Short [1988] 1992; Widdowson 1992; Cook [1992] 1994; Cook 1994; Carter and McRae 1996; Carter 1997; Emmott [1997] 1999). Drawing extensively on empirical research and theoretical work in linguistics, sociology, and psychology, discourse analysts explore key issues of both language use and language acquisition. Discourse analysis is a discipline that attempts to identify and describe linguistic regularities and irregularities in utterances which cannot be accounted for at sentence level; studies language in use across sentence boundaries; and explores the organisation of texts (Carter 1995: 39–40). A discourse-based

1. For a detailed study of I. A. Richards' contribution to stylistics and his cognitive approach, see West (2005: 327–336).

2. For a brief historical overview of discourse analysis see Cook ([1989] 1995: 12–13); McCarthy ([1991] 1996: Ch. 1).

view allows analysts to discern features occurring across a wide stretch of text and playing “a major role in realising the textual and interpersonal meanings of the unfolding discourse” (McCarthy and Carter [1994] 1995: 106). Recent decades in applied linguistics have witnessed a very considerable growth of interest in “discourse analysis – the study of how stretches of language take on meaning, purpose, and unity for their users” (Cook 1994: 1, 1995).

Although discourse analysis examines all types of discourse, a considerable growth of interest has arisen in the discourse of literature. This interest is also motivated by its practical implications. Study of literary discourse forms a substantial part of the curriculum of language education. McCarthy and Carter ([1994] 1995) describe the discoursal properties of language and demonstrate what insights this approach can offer to the student and the language teacher. Further exploration of the nature of discourse is thus crucial in both theoretical and applied spheres.

Discourse stylistics has emerged as a new discipline in its own right. It shows how discourse is constructed and what it conveys with the aim of proceeding to stylistic interpretation and evaluation of a text. Analysis of cohesion (Halliday and Hasan 1976: Ch. 8) is central to discourse stylistics because it reveals semantic and stylistic links. This approach is especially beneficial, as much of the research in the sixties and the seventies tended to disregard the stylistic features of language. The term *discourse stylistics* is now generally used to refer to the practice of using discourse analysis in the study of literary texts (op. cit.: Ch. 8; Carter and Simpson 1989: 11; McCarthy and Carter [1994] 1995: 135; Carter 1996: 5). Discourse stylistics deals with interpretation of semantic and stylistic relationships in text.

Style in discourse is a very complicated issue. As for phraseology, style is essential for analysis of phraseological units (PUs) in discourse to establish the role of PUs in creation of textual meanings. A context-oriented approach means that stylistic changes do not occur in isolation, but only as an integrated part of discourse.

1.2 The breakthrough of cognitive stylistics

My interest lies in figurative language in general and phraseology in particular. Cognitive science has demonstrated that figurative language is a tool of the human mind (Lakoff and Johnson [1980] 2003). Use of figurative language is a systematic and orderly part of human cognition processes (Gibbs [1994] 1999: 450); phraseology forms part of this system.

In my research into stylistic use of PUs in verbal and visual discourse, I rely on the achievements of cognitive linguistics, which have made successive contributions to the understanding of metaphor and thought, and explorations of

metaphor as a major mode of conceptual organisation. Studies by cognitive scholars over recent decades have established metaphor as a figure of both thought and language (for example, Lakoff and Johnson [1980] 2003; Paprotté and Dirven 1985; Lakoff 1986; Lakoff and Turner 1989; Gibbs 1990, [1994] 1999, 2003, 2007; Sweetser 1990; Steen 1992, 1994, 2006, [2007] 2009; Lakoff [1993] 1998; Katz 1998; Kövecses 2002, 2005, 2006).

Cognitive study has added a new dimension to discourse analysis and narrative comprehension (see Emmott [1997] 1999; Freeman 2000; Burke 2003). Use of metaphor has been recognised as part and parcel of cognition, a revealing cognitive mechanism. I fully agree with Steen that metaphors need to be investigated from the cognitive linguistic point of view, not only from that of literary criticism, as has been the case traditionally (Steen 1994: 3, 2002a: 386). The tenets of cognitive science have served as a basis for development of cognitive stylistics (for example, Lakoff and Turner 1989; Gibbs 1995, 1999b, 2002; Semino and Culpeper 2002; Steen 2002a, 2002b, 2006; Stockwell 2002; Gavins and Steen 2003).

My aim is to explore phraseological meaning and its stylistic aspects: the instantiation and development of meaning in discourse, the emergence of new associations and their chains, resulting in creation of successive sub-images, coupled with visual development of metaphorical meaning. Metaphor identification, comprehension, and appreciation become more challenging and also more interesting when metaphor is represented by a PU, not separate words.

Although discourse stylistics has proved the benefits of a discourse-based approach, much of contemporary research in both cognitive stylistics and phraseology is focused on sentence-level phenomena. Most of the examples to illustrate theory are limited to separate words, phrases, or sentences, which I see as an oversight in stylistic research. I would argue that the full stop in writing to mark the end of the sentence is not a full stop in the flow of thoughts. Many stylistic phenomena emerge in a shorter or longer stretch of text. These need to be addressed to provide a more comprehensive account of their use. That is why my concern is not just stylistic use of PUs but a cognitive approach to stylistic use of PUs in discourse. The PU is one of the modes of reflecting figurative thought.

1.3 The phraseological unit

It is a challenge to write on phraseology since it is an area with a confusing range of terminology and different approaches.³ I fully agree with Cowie that a lack of

3. It is not my aim to give a detailed survey of the terminology used in phraseology. For the most commonly used terms see Moon (1998: 2–5). See also Cowie ([1998] 2001b: 4–7).