



UDK 165.194:81'373.612.2  
81'373.612.2:159.942  
811.163.42'01:930.2  
Izvorni znanstveni članak  
Prihvaćeno za tisak 18. 11. 2013.

*Amir Kapetanović*  
*Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*  
*akapetan@ihjj.hr*

## Searching for hidden ancient containers in the Old Croatian language: the body and emotions as containers

The article uses cognitive metaphor theory to analyse the conception of both the body and of emotions as containers. Reflections of two differing conceptual metaphors projecting the container image schema (THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS and EMOTION IS A CONTAINER) in both the Old Croatian language and the modern Croatian standard language are documented. Additionally, the ancient conception of emotion as a fluid (EMOTION IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER) is described, and it is shown how emotion can be both a substance in a container and a container substance in both medieval and modern Croatian texts. The final section of the article confirms the application of the container image schema to imaginary beings through descriptions of the devil's body from medieval Croatian texts. This research made use of a digitally searchable online corpus of the Croatian language (containing 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century texts), as well as an as-of-yet publicly inaccessible digital archive of Old Croatian texts (currently consisting of texts written in the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> century). This article is a contribution to diachronic research of conceptual metaphor, as well as an attempt to apply cognitive metaphor theory to medieval studies research attempting to reveal the foundational conceptions of medieval man. It is concluded that Croatian written heritage contains traces of very old (universal) concepts, which have remained stable throughout the ages.

### 1. Introduction

1.1. "Body" is a key word in both cognitive linguistics and medieval studies. Without a review of the human body, medieval studies is able to explain very little, since medieval society is considered a culture (civilisation) of movement (Le Goff 1998: 487; Schmitt 1991: 59). Cognitive linguistic research is aimed at proving the embodiment of the mind: "The mind is inherently embodied. (...) The mind is not merely embodied, but embodied in such a way that our conceptual systems draw largely upon the commonalities of our bodies and of the environments we live in" (Lakoff and Johnson 1999: 3, 6).



Most cognitive linguists do not study metaphorical concepts in a diachronic perspective. One of the reasons for this is that linguistic portrayals of such concepts cannot be empirically studied in “living” language, but rather must be studied on the basis of research (of corpora) of old texts – that is to say, only in a limited and static context. Such historical research has, however, become more common in recent time.<sup>1</sup> Generally speaking, medieval studies should not stop at claims that the human body was the object of hatred and self-punishment, or that denial of bodily pleasure or comfort (asceticism) was important. In the Middle Ages, the human body was considered a source of sin, a barrier on the path to salvation,<sup>2</sup> the “prison of the soul”<sup>3</sup> (Platonic heritage), or the “dreadful clothing of the soul” (Gregory the Great)<sup>4</sup>.

It would do well for medieval scholars to analyse such medieval metaphorical statements from the perspective of cognitive metaphor theory, the foundations of which were laid by Lakoff and Johnson in 1980, and which is still being developed today. The exclusion of such an approach is visible, for example, in Bynum’s (1995: 7) statements on the correspondence between the medieval and modern concepts of the body: “Medieval people’ (...) did not have ‘a’ concept of ‘the body’ any more than we do; nor did they ‘despise’ it (although there is reason to think that they feared childbirth, or having their teeth pulled, or amputation of limbs without anaesthesia). Like the modern

- 1 Current cognitive linguistic historical research has been summarised by M. E. Winters (Winters, Tissari and Allan 2010: 6–9), who divides them into three approaches (directions) to research: 1) “prototype theory and categorisation around prototypes” (e.g. Geeraerts, Winters, Kemmer); 2) “semantic extension and change” (e.g. Sweetser, Dirven, Lewandowska-Tomaszczuk); 3) “relationship between synchrony and diachrony” (e.g. Sweetser, Langacker). In the same book (2010: 9–14), see also an overview of current important publications and conferences. In the past decade, many books and articles have been published, among which some of the most significant are, e.g.: Haser 2000, Blank 2001, Gevaert 2001, Tissari 2001, Koivisto-Alanko and Tissari 2006, Trim 2007, Allan 2008, Koch 2008. In the Croatian scientific community, the earliest contributions to cognitive linguistics are the work of M. Žic Fuchs (e.g. 1991, 1992–1993), and cognitive linguistic theory is rarely applied to linguistic historical research (e.g. Kapetanović 2009; Raffaelli 2009). Taking cognitive linguistic theoretical postulates into account, I. Raffaelli’s book in the Croatian language (2009) systematically describes the basic theses, assumptions, and methods of diachronic semantics as a discipline.
- 2 On these claims, see, e.g., Bynum 1995, also containing further medieval literature on this subject.
- 3 On this claim, see, e.g., Biernhoff 2002: 23, 39. See also Courcelle 1965.
- 4 According to Le Goff 1998: 473. However, it should also be pointed out that affirmative medieval theological views on the value of the body (e.g. in the words of Bonaventura, T. Aquinas), and in analysing the manner of human behaviour, find that the perception and image of the body in the Middle Ages was not unchangeable: the early medieval heterodynamic picture of the weak and fragile human body (which, under environmental pressures and limitations, sought support in the company and activities of other people and the working of forces) gradually, from the 11<sup>th</sup> to the 15<sup>th</sup> century, changed into an autodynamic picture of the body (inspired foremost by knightly ideals of physical strength, intellectual skill and professional successes) (see Kleinschmidt 2000: 81–84). Bodily motions in the Middle Ages were paid a great deal of attention to, since it was believed that gestures were expressions of internal states and feelings, and that they were connected with the moral values of the individual (e.g. Hugh of St. Victor in his work *De institutio novitiorum* from the first half of the 12<sup>th</sup> century).

world, the Middle Ages were characterized by a cacophony of discourses”. This work cannot detect and analyse all concepts of the body<sup>5</sup> assumed by Bynum, nor can these concepts be compared with modern conceptions. However, through cognitive metaphor theory, Croatian written heritage can be used to document and explain basic concepts of the body founded on a naïve (folk) conception of the world. It is assumed that such a conception was as common in the Middle Ages as it is today. Such an assumption is not unfounded as such conceptions of the body are likely universal, considering that they are based on bodily experience.

1.2. Only a few of the aforementioned metaphorical statements on the medieval conception of the human body found in medieval studies literature (e.g. the *prison of the soul* as a place of residence for the soul, the *dreadful clothing of the soul* as a cover for the soul) point to the possibility of confirming the presence of the **container image schema** (see Johnson 1987; Lakoff and Kövecses 1987; Lakoff and Johnson 1999) and the conceptual metaphor THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR THE SOUL. Detecting these metaphors, which this paper shall neither explain nor illustrate through Croatian examples, only serves to open the subject of this discussion, and makes the aforementioned (and as-of-yet unexplained) assumption even more likely: Croatian medieval culture produced metaphorical statements reflecting the container image schema.

The paper will be structured as follows: Section 2 will use cognitive metaphor theory to attempt to document reflections of this schema in Old Croatian<sup>6</sup> texts (2.1.) and confirm the presence of the conceptual metaphor THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS (2.2.). The conception of emotions as a fluid

5 Debate on the conception of the body could unnecessarily lead towards philosophical and theological discussions on the material, psychological and spiritual in human nature, and towards a discussion of the distinctions and relationships between *body*, *flesh*, *mind*, *person*, *soul* and *spirit*. Conclusions cannot be made on such questions in the context of this work, and so they shall not be touched upon. This analysis moves in another direction. However, it must be clear that this analysis considers the *body* a foundational concept, not the individual component parts of the body (flesh or bodily organs) or the complex, abstract concept of person (on this, see the end of the introduction). The body is only one (visible) component of the *person* (or more specifically, of the Self), while the *body* is something concrete. What is considered concrete can also be unclear and inexplicable, such as in discussions of abstract things. It is still not possible to explain the function of some of the parts of the body, or why the body turns against itself in some autoimmune syndromes (e.g. Hashimoto’s disease).

6 The attributive *Old Croatian* describes the linguistic form of expression in any Croatian literary language during the Middle Ages (11<sup>th</sup> – late 15<sup>th</sup> century). Old Croatian (non-liturgical) texts are mainly written in the Čakavian literary language, some are written in the Croatian Štokavian literary language (Dubrovnik and surroundings), while Kajkavian texts are not present until the 16<sup>th</sup> century (Kajkavian linguistic traces are only found before this point in Old Church Slavonic-Čakavian, Čakavian, or Latin texts). This research does not take Croatian Old Church Slavonic (liturgical) texts into consideration. The reason for this “distancing” from liturgical texts is the lack of understanding of the world that existed among the common people (the so-called folk theory), although it is apparent that expression in medieval vernacular could not have been free of medieval theological perceptions and interpretations, just as theological discussions and liturgical texts could not avoid “folk theory” in their understanding of the world, at least as far as the conception of the world through bodily experience is concerned.

(EMOTION<sup>7</sup> IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER)<sup>8</sup> shall also be documented through Old Croatian examples (2.2.1.). For the sake of distinction, statements confirming the conception of emotion (emotional states) as a container (or a container filled with a substance)<sup>9</sup> shall also be included in subsection 2.3. (EMOTION [EMOTIONAL STATE] IS A CONTAINER). This is an entirely different metaphor than the first two, as the target domain is emotion instead of the body, while in the first two metaphors the body is the object, and emotions are the (fluid) substance. All of these metaphors shall be observed in the following section from a diachronic perspective. Before the conclusion of this paper in the fourth section, a separate section (3) will consider the application of the conceptual container schema in conceptions of imaginary creatures, such as the devil. In Croatian medieval examples, the devil is not a bodiless creature – the body of the devil can also be filled with specific content, and can also intrusively fill the human body as content. The Christian world-view, which is imprinted in Croatian medieval texts, considers that the devil cannot be a *person*, although he is conceived of through the conceptual container schema. Some Croatian medieval texts, in addition to Satan (as a personal name), also name individual demons,<sup>10</sup> however this serves to separate them as *individuals* in a hierarchy and collective (demons). Such contemplations exceed the focus of this work, however they also raise another issue relevant to this theme, which shall be briefly considered here before moving on to the analysis central to this paper.

Manifestations of the metaphor THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS could also be observed as the general-level metaphor A PERSON IS A CONTAINER, as has become common practice in recent cognitive linguistic works that discuss the “Divided-Person metaphor” (Lakoff 1996: 102–103) or the “General

7 Current research has shown that the body is a universal human concept, while emotion is a culturally defined concept (Wierzbicka 1999: 2–4), or rather that emotion is a “complex (decomposable) and culture-specific” concept, as opposed to some other concepts, which are “simple (non-decomposable) and universal (e.g. FEEL, WANT, KNOW, THINK, SAY, DO, HAPPEN, IF)...” (*Ibid.*: 8). In this analysis, *emotion* is a hyponym that abstracts various emotions, and it is used, as Wierzbicka says, “as an abbreviation for, roughly speaking, ‘feelings based on thoughts’” (*Ibid.*: 12). This avoids potential differences, even small ones, between concepts reflected in the meanings of the same lexemes in a diachronic perspective (e.g. *love* in the Middle Ages and today) or synonyms for the same emotion (*rage*, *fury*). On the generic level, emotions can be observed as STATES ARE CONTAINERS (on this, see, e.g., Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 30).

8 Different conceptions of specific emotions in some Croatian early modern texts (*Ranjinin zbornik*, an epic by Marko Marulić) have already been the subject of analysis (Kapetanović 2009; Kapetanović 2012). These contributions only occasionally touch on some conceptions of emotions in the Middle Ages.

9 On container objects and container substances, see Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 30): “Substances can themselves be viewed as containers. Take a tub of water, for example. When you get into the tub, you get into the water. Both the tub and the water are viewed as containers, but of different sorts. The tub is a CONTAINER OBJECT, the water is a CONTAINER SUBSTANCE.”

10 See, e.g., the names *Polelos*, *Garijel*, *Iprocel/Ipročel*, *Viliton* in *Uskrsnutje Isusovo* (HSP 2010: 743–768).



Self–Subject metaphor” (Lakoff and Johnson 1999: 269–284).<sup>11</sup> Although it would certainly be easier to simply apply this conception of ‘personality’ to the Middle Ages without posing questions, numerous anthropological works and ethno–linguistic contributions warn that caution is necessary when projecting culturally specific concepts from one culture to another or lexicalised concepts from one period of history to another (see, e.g., Wierzbicka 2010). The complex concept of *person* is not universal – it varies throughout history as it has been significantly defined by law, morals, responsibilities, and roles within the family unit, status within the societal unit, etc., although Mauss (1938) claims “that there has never existed a human being who has not been aware, not only of his body, but also of his individuality, both spiritual and physical” (Mauss, in: Carrithers, Collins and Lukes 1985: 3).

There is no room here for a more comprehensive observation of the difference between the ‘individual’ and the ‘person’ in various societies and periods,<sup>12</sup> although it is important to the subject at hand to emphasise that many examples taken from medieval texts reflect the separation of the individual from the community (naming, use of the personal pronoun I). However, this is not sufficient to discuss the concept of the ‘person’ on the basis of such examples.<sup>13</sup>

## 2. Discussion: The container image schema and the body / emotions as containers in Old Croatian texts

The focus of this analysis is the container image schema and the conceptual metaphors THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS and EMOTION IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER. The metaphor EMOTION (EMOTIONAL STATE) IS A CONTAINER will also be taken into consideration for the sake of distinction, since the first two metaphors treat the body as the object and emotions as a (fluid) substance, while

11 According to the interpretation of A. Lakoff and M. Backer from 1992 (Lakoff and Johnson 1999: 268), a person is considered a whole consisting of two entities (Self + Subject). Lakoff (1996: 102) writes: “The Subject is supposed to be in control of the Self. The Subject can reason, but cannot function directly in the world, as the Self can. The Subject is always the locus of consciousness, subjective experience, perception, reason, and judgment. The Self consists of other aspects of a whole person—the body, emotions, a past history, social roles, and much mores.” Aside from this: “Our metaphoric conceptions of inner life have a hierarchical structure. At the highest level, there is the general Subject–Self metaphor, which conceptualizes a person as bifurcated. (...) It is not a trivial fact that every metaphor we have for our inner life is a special case of a single general metaphor schema. (...) In the general Subject–Self metaphor, a person is divided into a Subject and one or more Selves” (Lakoff and Johnson 1999: 269).

12 See, e.g., contributions in Carrithers, Collins and Lukes 1985. It is perhaps important to this topic to emphasize the conclusion drawn in this book by La Fontaine, who compares four non–western cultures (1985: 139): “... I suggest, the recognition that concepts of the person are embedded in a social context (...) Social characteristics of individuals are represented by images of the living body, not by concepts of the person.”

13 It is also important to note that abstract constructs belonging to “internal life” are conceived of as parts of the *body*, which is apparent from the examples provided in this text.



the metaphor EMOTION IS A CONTAINER treats emotion as the object and the body as the substance of the object.

In order to document the stability of the container image schema and the aforementioned metaphors from the Middle Ages until today, the research methodology should compare samples from relatively modern Croatian texts (19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century) with samples from Croatian medieval texts (from the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> century) in a diachronic perspective.<sup>14</sup>

### 2.1. Container image schema

The container image schema is certainly a very old (universal) pattern, as it is based on bodily experience and experience with containers (e.g. Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Sweetser 1990; Lakoff and Johnson 1999; Kövecses 2005). Archaeological and anthropological research of some North American petroglyphs representing (animal) bodies as containers point to its being prehistoric (cf. Culley 2008). In the modern Croatian standard language, (non-)metaphorical projections of this schema can be easily detected through the use of the prepositions *u* ('into, in') and *iz* ('out of, from')<sup>15</sup> as seen in these examples:

(1) *Sotona si ti, Cekinaru rebambiveni! – zavrišti prodorno tetka Juvanina iz svega svoga sitnog i smežuranog tijela* (R. Marinković)

*You are the devil, you senile miser! – screamed Aunt Juvanina piercingly from all of her tiny and wrinkled body.*

(2) *Sav život, što je još preostao u njegovu tijelu, skupio se negdje u prsima* (J. Horvat)

*All the life left in his body gathered somewhere in his chest.*

The same is apparent in Old Croatian texts, regardless of their differing dialectal "colour". This shall be illustrated here through two examples from

14 For this directed type of analysis, which does not analyse all concepts for the *body* and *emotions*, quantitative indicators are not a part of the argumentation, and it was sufficient to locate a few attestations in various corpora in order to draw conclusions and list examples. Examples from modern texts were selected on the basis of searching the *Croatian Language Repository* (Hrvatska jezična riznica, <http://riznica.ihj.hr>), an online corpus (digitised text archive) of numerous 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century Croatian texts. Because of the accessibility and searchability of these sources, examples from this corpus are not listed according to their printed editions, and they are cited only by listing the author of the text. Medieval Croatian examples were selected through searching of a digital concordance of around 100 digitised medieval texts. Considering that these written sources are not yet publicly available (online), a list of editions in which the sources of these examples have been published is included at the end of the paper. Along with the examples, an abbreviation containing the source and folio/page of the source is listed (which are also marked in the printed editions). As some texts were inaccessible in the concordance of medieval texts, some texts relevant to this analysis are occasionally cited according to the chrestomathy of Štefanić et al 1969.

15 On the significance of the prepositions *in / into* and *from / out of*, see Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 29. On the Croatian preposition *u* and its connection to the container schema, see Šarić 2008 (especially section 2). On the preposition *u* and the container image schema on the basis of examples from the modern Croatian language, see Parizoska 2009. The preposition *iz* in its prototypical meaning, like the prefix *iz-* (see Belaj 2008: 93–113), points to a transition of an object from an intralocative into an extralocative state.

Čakavian Old Croatian texts containing the prepositions *v* or *va* ('in, into') and the preposition *s*<sup>16</sup> ('out of'):

(3) *Ali kako to jest bilo / da Bog pride v tvoje tilo? / Kako li je va te prišal? / Kak[o] li je dol i s neba sišal?* (MSM Fir 2a)  
*But how was it / that God entered into your body? / How did he enter into you? / How ever did he come down from the heavens?*

(4) *Kada pride ona [smrt!] tada, / duša van izide s tila* (ČsVMŽ Tk 71a)  
*When she [death!] comes then, / the soul goes out of the body.*

## 2.2. THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS

Many Croatian medieval texts richly attest to the conception of the body as a container filled with various abstract content (entities), and this is made apparent through the usage of various kinds of word whose root is *pln / pun* ('full', 'fill-'):

(5) *Ti si Makarij Duha Sveta naplnjen* (ŽSO 53b)  
*You, Macarius, are filled with the Holy Spirit*

(6) *ditić tada restiše i krip|aše se pun mudrosti* (ZL 8a)  
*the child then grew and was healthy and was full of wisdom*

(7) *čovjek koji se kune napunit će se od nepravde* (Cvet Libro 22b)  
*the man who swears shall be filled with injustice*

(8) *i još ne kako ljudi grišni, puni sih zlih ćudi* (MSN 18b)  
*and no more as sinful people, full of these evil habits*

(9) *Zdrava, Marija, milosti puna* (ADM 6b)  
*Hail, Mary, full of grace*

(10) *O Židovi, tvardi dosti, puni vsake nemilosti* (MP Pic 121b)  
*o Jews, so cruel, full of every disgrace.*

None of these examples displays the conceptual metaphor THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS. This metaphor is apparent in numerous Old Croatian examples, a few of which follow:

(11) *a niha sam plna žalosti* (PoMH PP 195b)  
*and now I am full of sadness*

(12) *O sestrice Magdalena, ka s' žalosti vsake puna / cić naš(e)ga G(ospo) d(i)na, jerbo straha bih ja puna* (Uskr Tk 15b)  
*O Sister Magdalene, you who are full of all kind of sadness / for the sake of our Lord, I was full of fear*

16 This is not the same as the preposition *s* ('with'), but is a separate preposition that evolved from *iz* ('from').

(13) *Zdrava, **plna** vse m(i)losti vsega **veselja i radosti!*** (MP Zdš 146a)  
*Healthy, **full** of all of the grace of **happiness and joy!***

(14) ***Plna** si **radosti!** / a ja sam **plna** vse **žalosti*** (JMGZ Bč 27a)  
*You are **full** of **joy!** / and I am **full** of all **sadness***

(15) *ah, jerbo **straha** bih ja **puna*** (MsM Zad 14a)  
*ah, because I was **filled** with a great **fear***

(16) *A čudo vaze vsih, i hvalahu Boga, i **napuniše se straha...*** (BL 64b)  
*And the miracle took all, and they praised God, and **were filled with fear***

(17) *Darij **radosti napuni** se i reče...* (Aleksandrida, Štefanić 1969: 327)  
*Dario **was filled** with **joy** and said...*

(18) *Aleksandar to čuw, **gnjiva i srditosti napuniv se...*** (Aleksandrida, Štefanić 1969: 322)  
*Alexander, hearing this, **filled** with **rage and anger***

(19) *Tada se Nabukodonozor kralj **napuni gniva*** (BL 56a)  
*Then King Nebuchadnezzar was **filled** with **rage**.*

The following statements show that this metaphor can also be found in the modern Croatian standard language:

(20) *I neka **srdžba zakipi u njemu** prama Mirku i prama svemu njihovu razgovoru sinoćnjem* (D. Šimunović)  
*And may **rage boil in him** towards Mirko and towards all of their conversation from last night*

(21) *I u **čovjeku** zašumi, zapjeva, **zažubori radost**, bujna, pijana, blistava radost, koja omamljuje i opaja* (I. Kozarčanin)  
*And **joy** rustles, sings out, **babbles in man**, exuberant, drunk, brilliant joy, that intoxicates and dazes.*

### 2.2.1. EMOTION IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER

The aforementioned examples from the modern Croatian standard language (20, 21) confirm the conception of emotion as a fluid<sup>17</sup> (EMOTION IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER), which is rooted in the distant past. It is known that Hippocrates (c. 460 BCE – 380 BCE) connected health and sickness and the character of an individual with the four bodily humours (phlegm, yellow bile, black bile and blood), and this teaching influenced Galen (129 – 200 AD) and medieval medicine. This conception relies on bodily (embodied) experience, and not on

17 But not only a fluid. Kövecses (2010: 108) mentions the following conceptual metaphors with a target domain of emotion: EMOTION IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER, EMOTION IS HEAT/FIRE, EMOTION IS A NATURAL FORCE, EMOTION IS A PHYSICAL FORCE, EMOTION IS A SOCIAL SUPERIOR, EMOTION IS AN OPPONENT, EMOTION IS A CAPTIVE ANIMAL, EMOTION IS A FORCE DISLOCATING THE SELF, EMOTION IS BURDEN. Kövecses (2003: 217–218) also registers many more metaphors for emotion.

knowledge of anatomy, which was fairly undeveloped in the Middle Ages (W. Harvey described the circulatory system with the heart as a pump only in the 17<sup>th</sup> century).

The Old Croatian examples mentioned (11–19) do not show how the mentioned emotions are conceived of – they could have been conceived of as liquids or gases, for example. They only make it apparent that the body is a container filled with a specific substance (emotion). The conception of emotion as a fluid in Old Croatian texts can be confirmed in a number of interesting examples which must be separated from those above, as they describe a conception in which only one part of the body (the heart or the soul) is located in a fluid emotion (container substance) within the body (container object). Both the heart and the soul are considered the centre of emotion in western folk tradition. The verb form *plove* ('swims') is directed towards the fluid state of *tuga* ('sadness'):

(22) *Srce moje v tugah plove* (MP Zdš 140b)  
*My heart swims in sadness*

(23) *zač mi duša v tugah plove* (M Tk 116a)  
*because my soul swims in sadness.*

Such a conception is still present today, and adequate examples are also found in modern Croatian texts (the verb form *prelije* ['floods'] is directed towards the fluid state):

(24) *Tuga mu prelije srce* (I. G. Kovačić)  
*Sadness flooded his heart.*

In all of the examples mentioned, the *heart* / *soul* are not containers for sadness (as in the Old Croatian example: **V srći mi je tuga luta** MP K2: 709 = 'There is deep (?) sadness **in** my **heart**').<sup>18</sup> Instead, sadness becomes a container substance for the *heart* or *soul*. Encompassing them as a container (*sadness*) negatively affects the *heart* or *soul* (since sadness is a "negative" emotion).

18 On the use and meaning of the adjective *ljut* in old texts (especially with the meaning of 'deep' and 'heavy'), see Raffaelli 2009: 220–236. On the conception of the heart as a container in the English language, see Niemeier 2000: 206–209. In this work, the author lists and analyses three categories (the heart as a metonymy for human feelings / the heart as a metonymy for an entire person / the heart as a valuable object) in addition to the category of the heart as a container. The examples mentioned (22–24) do not fit into any of these categories. One might believe that the *heart* and *soul* in these examples should be interpreted as a metonymy (synecdoche) for the entire "person", however all of these examples oppose such an interpretation through the use of the possessive pronouns *moje* 'my', *mi* (*meni*) 'to me', *mu* (*njemu*) 'to him', which show that the *heart/soul* do not represent the entire body but that they *belong* to it as parts. It should also be stated that other cultures use other internal organs besides the heart in the role of the centre of emotional life in the body. On the *liver*, see an explanation in e.g. Enfield 2002.

### 2.3. EMOTION (EMOTIONAL STATE) IS A CONTAINER

All prior examples for the metaphor THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS should be differentiated from modern examples of the metaphor EMOTION IS A CONTAINER:

(25) *Utěraše u strah bolje od mene* (M. Bogović)  
*They have forced better men than me into fear*

(26) *redom dolaze klanjati se i kako plivaju u radosti* (K. Š. Gjalski)  
*... they come in order to bow and they swim in joy.*

This Old Croatian example serves as a confirmation of the presence of this conception in Croatian medieval texts:

(27) *Ne htij tuko v strahu biti* (MSN 39a)  
*Do not be in so much fear*

(28) *... jedinorojenu kćer koju Roksandu ku v radosti velici rodih...* (Aleksandrida, Štefanić 1969: 329)  
*... my only born daughter Roksanda, whom I bore in great joy...*

All of these examples contain the preposition *u / v*, which doubtlessly points to intralocativity. Thus, all of these emotions (*fear, joy*) alongside the preposition *u / v* are conceived of as containers encompassing the body. However, it must be noted that *fear* is not conceived of as a fluid (as opposed to the Old Croatian and modern example of *joy*, which points to a conception of joy as a fluid). It is not certain whether the fluid state of *joy* should be connected with the fact that joy is occasionally followed by tears. The final explanation is much more convincing in the Old Croatian example for *žalost* ('sadness'):

(29) *U žalosteh ja vsa plovu* (MP K1 54b)  
*I am swimming wholly in sadness.*

This interpretation is more convincing if we know that there are conceptual metonymies in which the effect of a state (*tears*) takes the place of the state (e.g. *pluti u suzama* = 'to pour forth tears'<sup>19</sup> > 'to be in deep sadness'), as is confirmed by this Old Croatian example:

(30) *Molim da me vsaki zove / majku ka vsa v suzah plove* (MSN 80b)  
*I ask that all call me / a mother who swims in tears.*

Since the conception of the body and emotion as a container and of emotion as a liquid is present in both medieval Croatian and modern texts, it can be concluded that such conceptions have remained stable throughout time.

<sup>19</sup> See AR, s.v. 2. *pluti*.

### 3. A digression on the devil

The Middle Ages are full of magical stories about animals and hybrid anthropo(zoo)morphic creatures whose bodies were a mix between human and/or animal bodies.<sup>20</sup> In addition to this, the imaginations of medieval people created modified bodies of people from faraway, inaccessible parts of the world, as is seen in a medieval “collection of knowledge” called the *Lucidar* (< *Lucidarius*, see, e.g., Kapetanović 2010: 17–18). These ancient people saw supernatural creatures in the bodies of animals (e.g. *snake* = devil), and animals symbolised some “personal” characteristics or abstract concepts (e.g. *raven* = sadness, *bee* = justice, *hare* = fearfulness).<sup>21</sup>

In the feudal Middle Ages, people feared the monstrous body of the devil, his hidden workings, and his embodiments as other creatures, or even his consumption of the human body. It is therefore unsurprising that the first of ten questions Thomas Aquinas asked the devil was: “Do demons have bodies joined to them by nature?”<sup>22</sup> The female fear of defloration by the devil is also often attested. Numerous discussions were held in the Middle Ages on the devil (or evil spirits) and how they entered the human body.

On one hand, it was said that the devil entered someone’s body (e.g. Judas’, exp. 31), however theological argumentation (exp. 32) stated that this was impossible:

(31) *U: Ne uze li Juda to rečeno posvećenje kako učini sveti Petar?*

*M: Ne, nišće, jerbo on ľubi Isukrsta, i kako on uze posvećenje, on ga stisnu za Isukrstom, da Juda, jerbo nenavidi Isukrsta, on prija samo priliku iz ruk, da kripost od posvećenja osta u Isukrstu. I zato, kako on uze on kruh, **ulize va ņ djaval** (Luc Tih 34a)*

*U: Did not Judas take consecration like Saint Peter?*

*M: No, he did not, because he loves Jesus Christ, and after he took consecration, he accepted it for Jesus Christ, but Judas, since he hates Jesus Christ, took only the image of bread from his hand, but the power of the consecration stayed in Jesus Christ. And thus, after he took the bread, **the devil entered into him.***

(32) *U: Kako diš, da ne mogu učiniti zlo, da oni drugoć **ulizu u tilesa ľudska** i ubiju jih.*

*M: Ja hoću, da znaš, **da djaval ne more ulisti u tilo ľlovičasko**; po ta put vidilo bi se da ľlovik jima dva duha, a ľlovik ne more jimati drugi duh nego dušu svoju, ka jest stvorena od Boga. Da djaval ulize dobro kadgodir u ľlovika meju mezdru i kožu i muči ga vele zlo i čini ga govoriti po svojoj volji, kadgodir ga ubije. Da on ne more učiniti nijedno zlo duši, zač ľlovik*

20 On the miraculous in the Middle Ages, see, e.g., Le Goff 1993: 54.

21 The most popular medieval form of literature (besides the *Bible*) were bestiaries. On traces of Croatian medieval bestiaries, see Kapetanović 2004.

22 This work is *De malo* (*On Evil*), from the 13<sup>th</sup> century. According to Boureau 2009: 425.

*jest posvećen po svetom krstu po put da je posvećen jedan tempal uljem i krizmom (Luc Tih 54b–55a)*

**S(tudent):** *How can you say that they could not do evil, but at another time, they re-enter the human body and kill them.*

**T(eacher):** *I want you to know that **the devil cannot enter the human body**; in that way a man would seem to have two spirits, and man cannot have another spirit besides his soul, which was created by God. But the devil can indeed enter at some times under a man's skin and torture him harshly, and influence him to speak after his will, occasionally killing him. But he cannot commit a single thing to the soul, because man is consecrated according to the holy cross by having a temple of oil and chrism consecrated.*

A container schema is also used in the conception of the devil and his appearance. This is proven through examples stating that the body of the devil can be filled with some kind of content. Two Croatian versions of the *Lucidar* exist, each offering a different answer as to what the devil's body is filled with – one says *arrogance* and *evil*, while the other says *deception* and *lies*:

(33) *Uč(i)t(e)!: Dam ti viditi da vsaka tvar iščet k(a)ko bi obrela spodobanije k sebi i zato djavaal hoti podobno k sebi imiti. To bē zmiija ka hodi li lukavo i povlači trbuh po z(e)mļi. Tako hodit djavaal nepravadno i lukavo i krivo, z(a)č je(st) **pln velike superbije i zlobi**. I k(a)ko zmiija povlači trbuh po z(e)mļi, tako i djavaal povlači trbuh po z(e)mļi lasteći ļudi ki bihu sagrešili telesnim zakonom. (Luc Sien 48a)*

**Teacher:** *I let you know that every creature looks for how to attain an appearance for itself and for this reason wants to have the devil for himself. This was the snake, who moves sneakily and drags his stomach across the land. Thus the devil moves unjustly, evilly and wrongly since he is **full of great arrogance and evil**. And just as the snake drags his stomach across the land, so the devil drags his stomach across the land, cheating people who have sinned bodily.*

(34) *Svako stvorenje poteže k svojoj prilici; gdi zmiija već poteže na priliku od djavaal nego druga skot, jere zmiija grede okrugla potežući tarbuh po zemļi, djavaal grede okrugal, jerebo je pun **himbe i laži**, i stavi se rado činiti svaki grih. (Luc Tih 16b)*

**Every creature strives for its own external appearance; where the snake appears more like the devil than some other animal, since the snake moves roundly dragging its stomach across the land, the devil moves roundly since he is **full of deception and lies**, and gladly gives in to the doing of any sin.**

This same version of the *Lucidar* speaks of the birth of the Antichrist, whose body is filled with demons while he still remains *protected* within the body of his mother (an evil woman). Since the content of the woman's body is

the body of the Antichrist, who is filled with the bodies of demons, the schematic and complex conception of the body as a container and body within a container are both present:

(35) **M: Antihrst** hoće se roditi u velikom gradu Babilonskom od jedne zle žene ka će biti od kolina Adamova, i **unutri u utrobi matere svoje** biti će **pun djavlov...** (Luc Tih 72b).

**T(eacher):** The **Antichrist** will be born in a great city of Babylon to an evil woman who will be Adam's descendent, and **inside his mothers womb** he will be **full of devils**.

All in all, these examples related to the body of the devil unquestionably point to the application of the container image schema. It is difficult to conceive of an imaginary being without a body. Examples (33, 34) also reflect the metaphorical conception of the devil's body as a container for lies (or *arrogance, evil, deception*). The lie is his *differentia specifica*<sup>23</sup> in comparison to the human body (in which the soul<sup>24</sup> is temporarily housed and in which emotions "flow"). The entry of the devil into the human body (container) as an interloper is also interesting, and theological intervention in such a conception is also apparent (example 35). Human experience with containers (example 36) is shown to be key in conceiving of the Antichrist (a complex of negatively valued containers: the womb of an *evil* woman, the *Antichrist's* body filled with *devils*).

#### 4. Conclusion and future research directions

This analysis and comparison of samples of medieval and modern Croatian texts has confirmed and documented two different conceptual metaphors projecting the container image schema (THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTION and EMOTION IS A CONTAINER) in the Old Croatian language and in the modern Croatian language. In addition to this, the presence of the very old conception of emotion as a fluid (EMOTION IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER) has been shown, and it has been shown how emotion can be both the content of a container and a container substance in both medieval and modern Croatian texts. The analysis of descriptions of the body of the devil in medieval texts has shown the application of the container image schema in the conception of imaginary beings.

23 Such a conception is not exclusively medieval. The Bible also connects the devil with *lies* (see, e.g., John 8:44).

24 For example, although the departure of the soul from the body should always have a negative connotation since it means death (non-existence), connotations change in medieval Christian religious discourse on the relationship *inside – outside* and the relationship between the soul and body. The body is conceived of in some medieval (religious) texts as a hindrance and obstacle to salvation, and not as a protector of sensitive content. In other words, the desire for the soul to be freed from the body is not in accordance with the metaphor PROTECTION IS CONTAINMENT (Sweetser 2004: 30), and so the soul leaving the body (container) has an exceptionally positive connotation, and its containment in the body (container) an especially negative one.

This shows that Croatian written heritage contains traces of very old (and universal) concepts, which have remained stable despite the passage of long periods of time. No social “force” can be attested that would be powerful enough to suppress or ignore these conceptualisations. Just the same, no knowledge of the anatomy of the human body was necessary for such conceptions, and they were not suppressed or eliminated through later discoveries.

An inclusion of the cognitive linguistic perspective into medieval socio-cultural-historical research would be of great help for attaining insight into the life and thought of medieval man, for explaining apparent antagonisms, and for attesting similarities/equalities and differences in conceptions across different epochs.

Finally, many value judgments and images of the body are based on spatial relations (in this case: *outside* – *inside*) and the conception of the body as a container that can be filled and emptied. Both entry into and location within a container and exiting and emptying from a container can apply both a negative and positive connotation to the body. Although the human body and the imaginary body of the devil share the same container image schema, their bodies, in the naïve folk world view, are not filled with the same content. This also allows the inference of value judgments that existed in the Middle Ages, as well as within religious communities: the image of the devil’s body being filled with lies confirms that, of all characteristics, lies and dishonesty were truly hated the most in the Middle Ages. Such observations, which would require an axiological analysis of specific concepts, exceed the thematic framework and theoretical background of this work.<sup>25</sup> However, they open new horizons for research.<sup>26</sup>

## 5. References

- Allan, Kathryn (2008). *Metaphor and Metonymy: a Diachronic Approach*. Wiley – Blackwell.
- AR = *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika I–XXIII* (1880–1976). Zagreb: JAZU.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (ed.) (1999). *Językowy obraz świata*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy (©2012). *Językowe podstawy obrazu świata*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Belaj, Branimir (2008). *Jezik, prostor i konceptualizacija. Shematična značenja hrvatskih glagolskih prefiksa*. Osijek: Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku, Filozofski fakultet.
- Biernhoff, Suzannah (2002). *Sight and embodiment in the Middle Ages*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Blank, Andreas (2001). Words and Concepts in Time: Towards Diachronic Cognitive Onomasiology. *Metaphorik.de* 1. 6–25.
- Boureau, Alain (2009). Demons and the Christian community. *The Cambridge History of Christianity, Vol. 4. Christianity in Western Europe c. 1100–1500*. Ed. M. Rubin, W. Simons. Cambridge University Press. 420–432.

25 This is subject matter encompassed by cognitive ethnolinguistics, which is intensively being developed by the Lublin ethnolinguistic school, headed by J. Bartmiński (see, e.g., Bartmiński 1999, Bartmiński 2012).

26 The author wishes to thank K. Štrkalj Despot, J. Vučković and anonymous reviewers for their readings of this work and for their comments, which were of help in thinking through some parts of the text.

- Bynum, Caroline (1995). Why All the Fuss about the Body? A Medievalist's Perspective. *Critical Inquiry* (22)1. 1–33.
- Carrithers, Michael, Steven Collins and Steven Lukes (1985). *The category of the person. Anthropology, Philosophy, History*. Cambridge University Press.
- Courcelle, Pierre (1965). Tradition platonicienne et traditions chrétiennes du corps-prison ("Phédon" 62 b; "Cratyle" 400 c.). *Revue des études latines* 43. 406–443.
- Culley, Elisabeth V. (2008). Supernatural Metaphors and belief in the Past: Defining an Archaeology of Religion. *Belief in the Past: Theoretical Approaches to the Archaeology of Religion*. Eds. K. Hays-Gilpin, and D. S. Whitley. Left Coast Press. 67–83.
- Enfield, Nicholas James (2002). Semantic analysis of body parts in emotion terminology: Avoiding the exoticisms of 'obstinate monosemy' and 'online extension'. *Pragmatics and Cognition* 10(1). 85–106.
- Gevaert, Caroline (2001). Anger in Old and Middle English: A "hot" topic? *Belgian Essays on Language and Literature*. 89–101.
- Haser, Verena (2000). Metaphor in semantic change. Ed. A. Barcelona. *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 171–194.
- Johnson, Mark (1987). *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*. University of Chicago.
- Kapetanović, Amir (2004). Tragovima srednjovjekovnoga bestijarija u Hrvata, *Filologija* 43. 47–63.
- Kapetanović, Amir (2009). Pojmovne metafore za emocije u Ranjininu zborniku. *Rad HAZU* 502. 109–121.
- Kapetanović, Amir (2010). Lucidarij iz Petrisova zbornika. *Građa za povijest književnosti hrvatske* 37. 1–32.
- Kapetanović, Amir (2012). Otisci tijela u umu i govoru: Emocije u Marulićevoj epici. *Poj željno! Iskazivanje i poimanje emocija u hrvatskoj pisanoj kulturi srednjega i ranoga novoga vijeka*. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. 187–215.
- Kleinschmidt, Harald (2000). *Understanding the Middle Ages: The Transformation of Ideas and Attitudes in the Medieval World*. The Boydell Press. Woodbridge.
- Koch, Peter (2008). Cognitive Onomasiology and Lexical Change: Around the Eye. *From Polysemy to Semantic Change: Towards a Typology of Lexical Semantic Associations*. Ed. M. Vanhove. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 107–137
- Koivisto-Alanko, Päivi, and Heli Tissari (2006). Sense and Sensibility: Rational Thought Versus Emotion in Metaphorical Language. *Corpus-Based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy*. Ed. A. Stefanowitsch, and S. Thomas Gries. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 191–213.
- Kövecses, Zoltan (2003). *Metaphor And Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2005). *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltan (2010). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- La Fontaine, J. S. (1985). Person and individual: some anthropological reflections. See Carrithers, Michael, Steven Collins and Steven Lukes (1985). 123–140.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George (1996). Sorry, I'm Not Myself Today: The Metaphor System for Conceptualizing the Self. Eds. G. Fauconnier, and E. Sweetser. *Spaces, Worlds, and Grammars*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lakoff, George, and Zoltán Kövecses (1987). The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English. In Dorothy Holland and Naomi Quinn, eds., *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*, 195–221. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Le Goff, Jacques (1993). *Srednjovjekovni imaginarij*. Transl. Inja Svetl. Zagreb: Izdanja Antibarbarus. Zagreb.



- Le Goff, Jacques (1998). *Civilizacija srednjovjekovnog Zapada*. Transl. Gordana V. Popović, afterword Igor Fisković. Zagreb: Golden marketing.
- Niemeier, Susanne (2000). 'Straight from the Heart' – Metonymic and metaphorical explorations. *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads. A Cognitive Perspective*. Ed. A. Barcelona. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 195–213.
- Parizoska, Jelena (2009). Idiom variability in Croatian: the case of the CONTAINER schema. *Études Cognitives* 9. 171–180.
- Raffaelli, Ida (2009). *Značenje kroz vrijeme. Poglavlja iz dijakronijske semantike*. Zagreb: Disput.
- Schmitt, Jean-Claude (1991). The Rationale of Gestures in the West: Third to Thirteenth Centuries'. *A Cultural History of Gesture: From Antiquity to the Present Day*. Eds. J. Bremmer and H. Roodenburg. Ithaca. 59–70.
- Sweetser, Eve (1990). *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sweetser, Eve (2004). The suburbs of your good pleasure: Cognition, culture and the bases of metaphoric structure. *The Shakespearean International Yearbook*, vol. 4: Shakespeare studies today. Eds. G. Bradshaw, T. Bishop, and M. Turner. Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing. 24–55.
- Šarić, Ljiljana (2008). *Spatial Concepts in Slavic. A Cognitive Linguistic Study of Prepositions and Cases*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag.
- Tissari, Heli (2001). Metaphors we love by: on the cognitive Metaphors of *love* from the 15<sup>th</sup> Century to the Present. *Studia Anglia Posnaniensia* 36. 217–242.
- Trim, Richard (2007). *Metaphor Networks: The Comparative Evolution of Figurative Language*. Basingstoke. U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wierzbicka, Anna (1999). *Emotions Across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wierzbicka, Anna (2010). The 'History of Emotions' and the Future of Emotion Research, *Emotion Review* 2(3). 269–273.
- Winters, Margaret E., Heli Tissari, and Kathryn Allan (ed.) (2010). *Historical Cognitive Linguistics*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Žic Fuchs, Milena (1991). Metafora kao odraz kulture, *Prožimanje kultura i jezika* (Zbornik radova). Ed. M. Andrijašević, and Y. Vrhovac. Zagreb. 27–33.
- Žic Fuchs, Milena (1992–1993). Konvencionalne i pjesničke metafore, *Filologija* 20/21. Zagreb: HAZU. 585–593.

## 6. Sources

### a) Books/articles

- HSP = Kapetanović, Amir, Malić, Dragica, Štrkalj Despot, Kristina (2010). *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovno pjesništvo: pjesme, plačevi i prikazanja na starohrvatskom jeziku*. Biblioteka Hrvatska jezična riznica. Niz Starohrvatska vrela. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. [Abbreviations: JMGZ Bč5 = Ja, Marija, glasom zovu, Berčićev zbornik br. 5; čsVMž Tk = čuj se vsaki moćno žene; MP Pic = Marijin plač, Picićeva pjesmarica; MP K1 = Marijin plač, Klimantovićev zbornik I.; MP K2 = Marijin plač, Klimantovićev zbornik II.; MP Zdš = Marijin plač, Zbornik duhovnoga štiva; MSN = Muka Spasitelja našega, Zbornik prikazanja; M Tk = Muka, Tkonski zbornik; PoMH = Pesan ot muki Hrstovi, Pariška pjesmarica; Uskr = Uskrnutje Isusovo, Tkonski zbornik; MsM Fir = Muka sv. Margarite, Firentinski zbornik; MsM Zad = Muka sv. Margarite, Zadarski rukopis.]
- Ivšić, Stjepan (1949). Prijevod 'Lucidara' Honorija Augustodunensisa u prijepisu Gverina Tihića iz godine 1533. *Starine Jugoslavenske akademije* 42. Zagreb: JA. 105–259. [Abbreviation: Luc Tih.]





- Kapetanović, Amir (2010). *Lucidarij iz Petrisova zbornika. Građa za povijest književnosti hrvatske* 37. 1–32. [Abbreviation: Luc Pz.]
- Malić, Dragica (1997). *Žiđa svetih otaca: Hrvatska srednjovjekovna proza*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska – Institut za hrvatski jezik. [Abbreviation: ŽSO.]
- Maretić, Tomo (ed.) (1885). *Lekcionarij Bernardina Splječanina po prvom izdanju od god. 1495*. Djela JAZU 5. Zagreb. [Abbreviation: BL = Bernardinov lekcionar.]
- Najstariji hrvatski latinički spomenici (do sredine 15. stoljeća)* (2004). Ed. Dragica Malić. Stari pisci hrvatski XLIII. Zagreb: HAZU. [Abbreviations: ADM = Akademijin dubrovački molitvenik; ZL = Zadarski lekcionar.]
- Nazor, Anica (2001). Prijevod 'Lucidara' Honorija Augustodunensisa u glagoljskom prijepisu, *Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet "Sv. Kliment Ohridski"*, Sofija: Cent'r za slavjano–vizantijski proučavanja "Ivan Dujčev" 89(8) / 1997. 85–112. [Abbreviation: Luc Sien.]
- Rešetar, Milan (ed.) (1926). *Libro od mnogijeh razloga: dubrovački ćirilski zbornik od g. 1520*. Zbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost srpskog naroda 15. Sr. Karlovci: Srpska kraljevska akademija. [Abbreviation: Cvet Libro.]
- Štefanić, Vjekoslav and assistants Biserka Grabar, Anica Nazor, Marija Pantelić (eds.) (1969). *Hrvatska književnost srednjega vijeka: Od XII. do XVI. stoljeća*. Pet stoljeća hrvatske književnosti 1. Zagreb: Zora – Matica hrvatska. [Aleksandrida.]

#### b) From the Internet

<http://riznica.ihji.hr/> (Hrvatska jezična riznica = Croatian Language Repository > Hrvatski jezični korpus = Croatian Language Corpus, Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje = Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics)



### *Potruga za drevnim spremnicima u starohrvatskom jeziku: tijelo i emocije kao spremnici*



Uz pomoć kognitivne teorije metafore u članku se iz dijakronijske perspektive analizira poimanje tijela i emocija kao spremnika i dokumentira se zrcaljenje dviju različitih konceptualnih metafora u starohrvatskom i suvremenome standardnom hrvatskom jeziku u kojima se projicira predodžbena shema spremnika (TIJELO JE SPREMNIK ZA EMOCIJE i EMOCIJA JE SPREMNIK). Osim toga, upozorava se na veoma staro poimanje emocija kao tekućina (EMOCIJA JE TEKUĆINA U SPREMNIKU) i kako emocija i u srednjovjekovnim i u suvremenim hrvatskim tekstovima može biti supstancija u spremniku i spremnik supstancija. U posljednjem poglavlju samo se naoko udaljavamo od teme jer analizom opisa davaljega tijela u srednjovjekovnim tekstovima potvrđujemo primjenu predodžbene sheme spremnika i na imaginarna bića. U istraživanju ove teme iskorištena je mogućnost računalnoga pretraživanja tekstova u internetski dostupnom korpusu hrvatskoga jezika (tekstovi 19. i 20. st.) i zasad još javno nedostupnoga računalnoga arhiva starohrvatskih tekstova (zasad ih čine tekstovi nastali u 14. i 15. stoljeću). Ovaj članak prilog je dijakronijskim istraživanjima konceptualnih metafora i pokušaj primjene kognitivne teorije metafore u onim medievističkim istraživanjima koja nastoje razotkriti temeljna poimanja srednjovjekovnoga čovjeka. Zaključuje se da višestoljetna hrvatska pisana baština čuva tragove vrlo starih (univerzalnih) koncepata, koji su stabilni unatoč izmjenama epoha.

**Key words:** cognitive metaphor theory, medieval studies, body, emotions, container image schema, conceptual metaphor, Old Croatian

**Ključne riječi:** kognitivna teorija metafore, medievistika, tijelo, emocije, predodžbena shema spremnika, konceptualna metafora, starohrvatski jezik

