The diverse discourse functions of *ape* and *monkey*

Shala Barczewska
Jan Kochanowski University

Cognitive linguists suggest that it is not words that carry meaning but meaning that is accessed through words (Evans 2006). Those meanings are encyclopedic, and thus develop as our knowledge of the world around us develops. It is this encyclopedic knowledge that helps us to cope with and create novel metaphors and metonyms – verbal as well as pictorial. These figurative expressions can serve as mental shortcuts – allowing us to compare a more abstract item with one less so – or a means of conveying one's position on a given topic (cf. Kövecses 2002, Lakoff & Johnson 1980).

Animals have become a popular metonymic tool: a polar bear on a block of ice speaks against the dangers of global warming; a sticker of a tiger or panda brings to mind the plight of endangered species; and apes and monkeys frequently appear in the debate over evolution. As argued by Evans in examples of metaphors such as *That soldier is a lion /That ballerina is a lion,* people draw on a type of folk knowledge in analyzing metaphors and metonyms where the source domain is an animal. This folk knowledge may or may not represent reality and it usually profiles a certain aspect of the animal's character at the exclusion of others (Evans 2010:631-633). It is this folk knowledge that is transferred when the given animal is used figuratively. Thus, "[…] some metaphors are not based on similarity but generate similarities" (Kövecses 2002: 82).

This study aims to explore the relationship between literal and figurative uses of *monkey* and *ape* in articles addressing the American debate over evolution. The analysis is based on usage of the lexemes in a specially designed mini-corpus of relevant news articles. These results are compared to American society's folk knowledge or image of the monkey as found in the *OED: The Oxford English Dictionary (2012)* and supported by *COHA: The Corpus of Historical American English* (Davies, 2010-). The study draws upon the *Conceptual Blending Theory* and the *Theory of Lexical Concepts and Cognitive Models* in an attempt to explain the differences in the distribution and semantic preference that the two lexemes exhibit.

References
Davies, Mark. (2010-) *COHA: The Corpus of Historical American English: 400 million words, 1810-2009*. Available online at http://corpus.byu.edu/coha/.
Evans, Vyvyan & Melanie Green (2006). *Cognitive linguistics: An introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Evans, Vyvyan (2010). "Figurative Language Understanding in LCCM Theory". *Cognitive Linguistics* 21–4, 601–662.
Fauconnier, Gilles (1997). *Mappings in Thought and Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kövecses, Zoltán (2002). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Lakoff, George & Mark Johnson (1980). *Metaphors we Live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
OED Online. (2012). Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.access-proxy.sno-isle.org.