

Embodied and Imaginative Dimensions in Naomi Klein's *No Logo*.

Streszczenie. Celem niniejszego referatu jest przedstawienie aparatu pojęciowego stylistyki kognitywnej, wywodzącej się z językoznawstwa kognitywnego i lingwistyki tekstu oraz pokazanie możliwości zastosowania go dla studiów tekstowych na przykładzie analizy fragmentów książki Naomi Klein „No Logo”.

Językoznawstwo kognitywne, łącząc uniwersalne i jednostkowe doświadczenie, ukazuje ucieleśniony (poprzez koncepty takie jak czas, przestrzeń, kolor, kształt) i imaginacyjny (poprzez zakorzenione w języku i myśli metafory i metonimie) wymiar znaczenia. Lingwistyka tekstu zajmuje się wieloma aspektami komunikacji, przede wszystkim w zakresie kontekstu i kodowania.

The aim of this paper is to present the potentiality of Cognitive Stylistics which can be exercised in textual-stylistic analysis. The approach focuses not only on the text itself but also on the mind reading it. “Cognitive Stylistics deals with how linguistic choices produce desired literary effects” (Skrzypczak 2006b: 1). According to Semino and Culpeper “Cognitive Stylistics is a rapidly expanding field at the interface between linguistics, literary studies and cognitive science. Cognitive Stylistics combines the kind of explicit, rigorous and detailed linguistics analysis of literary texts” (Skrzypczak 2006b: 2). Its interdisciplinary origins emerge from the ground shared by Text Linguistics and Cognitive Linguistics (grammar and semantics). Since Cognitive Stylistics uses the well-established apparatus they offer, I am going to define and describe the tools. Due to the limited scope of this article, however, I will glance at some tools and elaborate on the key notions of Cognitive Semantics, which I would like to exercise later in relation to some fragments in Naomi Klein's book *No Logo*.

1. COGNITIVE STYLISTICS

1.1. Text Linguistics

Text Linguistics, the term diffused with the important and influential work of Robert de Beaugrande and Wolfgang Dressler, *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, deals with diverse aspects of communication which have to do with the *mind*, the *context* and linguistic *coding*. Well-known and humorous examples showing the undividable relations between speakers' identities and contexts are sentences like: *The gastric ulcer wants a newspaper* and *The mushroom omelette left without paying*. Textual Linguistics distinguishes two groups of general principles that govern communication. The first group is known under the label of *regulative principles*. These are *efficiency* (minimum effort by participants), *effectiveness* (leaving impression and attaining a goal), *appropriateness* (agreement between setting and manner). The second group is called *constitutive principles*, in other words the seven *criteria of textuality*: *cohesion*, *coherence*, *intentionality*, *acceptability*, *informativity*, *situationality* and *intertextuality*. Cohesion deals with surface grammar: pro-forms, ellipsis, recurrence, parallelism and paraphrase. Coherence involves networks of concepts in the text against knowledge structures. Both intentionality and acceptability concern attitudes of the text's producer and receiver. Informativity concerns the degree of information accessible in communication. Situationality covers such components as time, place and participants, whereas intertextuality involves dependence of one text upon another (cf Skrzypczak: 2008).

Taking into account the principles mentioned above, we can appropriately decode the jocular sentences as uttered respectively by nurses in a hospital setting, and waiters in a restaurant setting.

1.2. Cognitive Linguistics

“We human beings have bodies. We are ‘*rational animals*’, but we are also ‘*rational animals*’, which means that our rationality is embodied” (Johnson: xix). The embodied and imaginative nature of meaning constitutes the basic principle of *Cognitive Linguistics*. Meaning and mind are *embodied* through the nature of our bodies, brains, physical and cultural functioning in the world, through crucial concepts like size, shape, spatial and temporal locations, colours and temperature which – thorough the bodies - structure human reason and concepts. “We are physical beings, bounded and set off from the rest of the world by the surface of our skins, and we experience the rest of the world as outside us. Each of us is a container, with a bounding surface and in-out orientation” (Lakoff, Johnson: 29).

The *imaginative* nature of meaning is based on metaphor and metonymy. According to Cognitive Linguistics, which contradicts the objectivist view on the matter, metaphor and metonymy do not reside in language and therefore belong only to poetic, literary discourse. They are pervasive in everyday life, not only in language but also in thought and actions. Metaphors are how we perceive, how we think and what we do. “The imaginative capacity is also embodied – indirectly – since the metaphors, metonymies, and images are based on experience, often bodily experience” (Lakoff: xiv). Cognitive Linguistics belongs to the school of *experiential realism* or *experientialism*, which emphasizes the idea that thought “fundamentally grows out of embodiment” (Lakoff: xv).

Not all the concepts, however, are physical in nature, many are abstract. Lakoff distinguishes two kinds of structure in our preconceptual experiences: “A: Basic-level categories defined by the convergence of our gestalt perception, our capacity for bodily movement, and our ability to form rich mental images. B: Image schemas – relatively simple structures that constantly recur in our everyday bodily experience. CONTAINERS, PATHS, LINKS, FORCES, BALANCE, and in various orientations and relations: UP-DOWN, FRONT-BACK, PART-WHOLE, etc.” (Lakoff: 267). The author explains that abstract concepts arise from these structures in two ways: by metaphorical projection from physical to abstract domain and by the projection to superordinate and subordinate categories (cf. Lakoff: 268).

1.3. Cognitive Grammar

Cognitive Grammar employs the principle notion of *categorisation*. It is basic to our thought and action, mechanical and subconscious. “Cognitive Grammar considers categorisation by *schema* and by *prototype* (Langacker) to be the fundamental mechanism organising perceptions, conceptions and linguistic units” (Skrzypczak 2006a: 107). Categorisation by *schema* relies on the range from highly generic and highly specific images, for example: substance > liquid > drink > Coke; to ingest > to drink > to sup. On the other hand, categorisation by *prototype* indicates those members of a class which are most frequent and customary to experience, natural environment and culture, the “best examples” (cf. Lakoff: 45). As far as central examples of a category of birds are concerned, a *sparrow* is a good one in Poland, a *cardinal* in Virginia, USA, a *yellowhammer* in Alabama, USA, a *willow goldfinch* in Washington, USA, whereas a *kiwi* in New Zealand.

Cognitive Grammar uses the notion of *dimensions of imagery*. The key ones are *scope* and *perspective*. Skrzypczak writes that *scope* “involves a portion of conceptual content relevant

for the characterisation of a given concept” (Skrzypczak 2006b: 5) and exemplifies it with the following: immediate scope and maximum scope [finger-nail] finger] hand] arm] body; zooming in/ zooming out – *virtual motion* – The camera on the desk in my room in the house across the road *vs.* In the house across the road in my study on the desk there is a camera.

Another important parameter is *perspective*. It also involves *virtual motion* and orientation, direction and point of access, which are activated by such interchangeable concepts as: *come* and *go*, *lend* and *borrow*, *diverge* and *converge*.

The general principle that lies behind these notions is the fact that *grammar* is understood *as image*, syntax seems highly iconic, whereas conceptualization takes place along the *figure-ground* alignment. “Grammatical structure is based on conventional imagery which reflects our ability to construe a conceived situation in alternate ways, therefore grammar is to be viewed with respect to imagery” (Skrzypczak 2006a: 106).

1.4. Cognitive Semantics

The principle tenets of *Cognitive Semantics*, the program triggered off with the influential book by Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, are metaphor and metonymy. Metaphor is no longer treated as a mere figure of speech, suggesting a likeness or implied comparison, it is primarily a way of comprehending one thing in terms of another (*cross-domain mappings*). Human conceptual system is fundamentally metaphorical in nature; metaphors in our language are possible because there are metaphors in our conceptual system.”To understand what is metaphorical, we must begin with what is not metaphorical. In brief, to the extent that a concept is understood and structured on its own terms – without making use of structure imported from a completely different conceptual domain – we will say that it is not metaphorical” (Lakoff, Turner: 57). The authors’ quotation is exemplified with the elucidation of our understanding of the word “dog”. Partially, our understanding of this concept is nonmetaphorical: four legs, cold, wet black nose, wagging tail. However, when we understand a dog as being “loyal” or perceive the wagging tail as a sign of joy, we see instinctive properties of the animal in terms of human personality features, hence we conceptualize a dog via metaphor.

Communication stems from the same conceptual system that we also employ in thinking and acting, therefore language reveals what the system is like. “Cognitive Semantics considers human thought to be (a) *embodied*, namely grounded in direct experience, (b) *imaginative*, that is relying on conceptual metaphor and metonymy, (c) *having gestalt properties*, which means that it is analog in nature and not digitally reduced to configurations of atomic abstract symbols, (d) *ecological* in the sense of being holistic-systemic” (Skrzypczak 2006a: 78).

I am now going to have a look at some examples: metaphors which prevail in our everyday life. The examples and interpretations come from the book *Metaphors We Live By*. Let’s begin with some *structural metaphors*.

ARGUMENT IS WAR

Your claims are *indefensible*.

He *attacked every weak point* in my argument.

You disagree? Okay, *shoot!*

We don’t only talk about arguments in terms of war; what we actually *do* in arguing is to certain degree structured by the concept of war. For instance, we can lose or win argument, we treat the person we are arguing with as an opponent, we plan and use strategies, attack the opponent’s position and defend our own. Our verbal battles are mirrored in the choice of verbs like attack, defend, counter-attack.

We use three metaphors when we conceptualize time. Because TIME IS MONEY, we say:

How do you *spend* your time?

That flat tire *cost* me an hour.

I've *invested* a lot of time in her.

You don't *use* your time *profitably*.

You need to *budget* your time.

In our culture TIME IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY, therefore we say:

Thank you for your time.

I *lost* a lot of time when I got sick.

Do you *have* much time *left*?

I don't *have* much time to *give* you.

We also approach TIME as A LIMITED RESOURCE, something we can use, run out of or have enough of.

Orientation metaphors, which are linked with spatial orientation: up – down, in – out, front – back, deep – shallow, central – peripheral, have basis in our physical experience. Drooping posture accompanies sadness and depression, while erect posture goes with a positive emotional state. This leads to HAPPY IS UP; SADNESS IS DWN metaphor and the following everyday expressions:

I'm feeling *up*. My spirit *rose*. I'm feeling *down*. My spirit *sank*.

Similarly, the fact that we sleep lying down and stand up when awaken contributes to CONSCIOUS IS UP; UNCONSCIOUS IS DOWN metaphor and the about to be mentioned phrases:

Get up. *Wake up*. He *fell* asleep. He's *under* hypnosis.

When we are seriously ill we are forced to lie down physically, hence HEALTH AND LIFE IS UP; SICKNESS AND DEATH ARE DOWN metaphor.

He's at the *peak* of his health. Lazarus *rose* from the dead. He *fell* ill. He came *down* with the flu. He *dropped* dead.

Spatial metaphors are systematic and coherent. HAPPY IS UP/ CONSCIOUS IS UP/ HEALTHY IS UP lead to GOOD IS UP (eg.: Things are looking *up*. We hit a *peak* last year, but it's been a *downhill* ever since.)

Ontological metaphors view events, activities, emotions or ideas as entities and substances, which allows us to deal with them rationally: refer to them, quantify them, identify particular aspects of them. For instance:

INFLATION IS AN ENTITY

We need to *combat inflation*.

Inflation is backing us into a corner.

THE MIND IS A MACHINE

My mind isn't *operating* today.

I'm a little *rusty* today.

Container metaphors define a territory in order to facilitate our understanding. For instance: There is a lot of land *in* Kansas. I put a lot of energy *into* washing the windows (container metaphor for action)

Both metaphors and metonymies are conceptual in nature and processed by us subconsciously and effortlessly. While metaphors are based on analogy and perform descriptive function, metonymies are based on contiguity and fulfill referential function. Metonymy (*intra-domain mapping*) means using one entity to refer to another that is related to it. For example:

He's *in dance*. (profession)

Mrs Grundy frowns on *blue jeans*. (the wearing of)

He bought a *Ford*. (producer for product)

The *buses* are on strike. (object used for user)

Although there is a limited number of basic conceptual metaphors and metonymies, our utterances are not totally predictable and mundane. Thanks to creativity – the wondrous phenomena which escapes the exact description and complicated mesh of networks set by cognitive psychology and neuroscience, the human mind is capable of producing new ideas through *blending*, a dynamic process of conceptual integration. Blending involves multidirectional mappings among *mental spaces*. Skrzypczak follows Lakoff's arguments and characterises mental spaces in the following way: "(a) mental space is a medium for conceptualisation and thought, (b) mental spaces are conceptual in nature, which means that they have no ontological status outside the mind, (c) mental spaces can hold: our immediate reality as understood, fictional situations (paintings, movies, stories), past and future situations as understood, hypothetical situations, abstract and conceptual domains (scientific concepts, theories, etc.)" (Skrzypczak 2006a: 95).

2. METAPHORS AND METONYMIES IN *NO LOGO*

Naomi Klein, the Canadian journalist, author and activist, well-known for her political and social analyses, as well as negative attitude towards globalization, writes about corporations and institutions as if she wrote about individuals directly responsible for their doings. In this way she exercises metonymy, whereas we can identify the kind of mapping and provide the full identification of the domain that contribute to it. Since all the quotations come from the book *No Logo*, I am only referring to the page number in brackets. Italicisations are mine. Let's look at a few examples:

Identification: METONYMY

Mapping: INSTITUTION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE

Expressions from *No Logo*:

corporations owned too much, employed too many people (4)

big spenders like *Procter and Gamble* and *Philip Morris* (14)

the *ad agencies* panicked when they saw ... (14)

the companies that had always understood (17)

Disney and *Mattel* have always known this (146)

McDonald's continues busily to harass small shopkeepers (177)

the *governments* are afraid (206)

Mapping: PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION:

the logic behind *Wall Street's* panic (12)

Wall Street declared death of the brand (13)

Cavite presents itself (203)

(the Cavite Export Processing Zone located ninety miles from Manila, in the town of Rosario)

Corporate Watch focuses on researching (325)

Mapping: PRODUCT FOR PRODUCER

brands that were watching (12)

Mapping: THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT

Bhopal = *Hiroshima* (336)

(graffiti on the wall in Bhopal, India, where a massive toxic leak killed many people in 1984)

Kader was the worst fire in industrial history (332)

(In May 1993 the Kader toy factory in Bangkok burned to the ground)

A multilayered METONYMY: smokestacks holding their breath (xiii)

Mapping: PART FOR WHOLE (smokestacks for factories)

Mapping: THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT (closed factories for strike/unemployment)

In accordance with her strong anti-corporate views she treats companies as adversaries. Making use of metonymy allows her to avoid Don Quixote's fate and his tilting at windmills. She doesn't ponder upon pure images when she writes about *the Swoosh*, *the Shell* and *the Arches* (365), which appropriately stand for the following companies: the Nike – sportswear industry, the Shell – petroleum, and McDonald's – fast food chain. She refers to people responsible for running the companies and profiting from them.

The book is not the bible for anti-corporate militancy in name only. *No Logo* abounds with war metaphors. An extension of ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor exemplified in *Metaphors We Live By*, we come across TRIAL IS WAR metaphor, as in:

“Aqua won the dispute but not because its case was any stronger than Negativland's or John Oswald's (...) but rather because, unlike these independent musicians, Aqua had behind it MCA's team of lawyers, willing to *fight tooth and nail* (...)” (180).

She perceives branding and competing in terms of war, hence phrases like:

aggressive lifestyle branding (181); using copyright and trademark laws as *effective tools to silence* all unwanted attention (181); *defenseless victims* of Bill Gate's payroll concoctions (252); *guerilla* artists (280); cultural *fascism* (287); *aggressive* sponsorship (360); *fight* for good jobs (365); *resistance* (445); necessity to *fight* everything and anything global (445). And whole sentences activating war metaphors in our conceptual systems: Jordan versus Nike, *a battle of the brand* (180); Anti-Shell campaigns were *breaking out* (387); After the first verdict, McDonald's was quick to *declare victory* (390); (young) people – mostly women – *sent off* to sweatshop factories the way previous generation of young men were *sent off to war* (214).

We may also trace other metaphors elucidated by Lakoff and Johnson in Klein's *No Logo*. There are other examples of *structural metaphors*. For instance IDEAS ARE FASHIONS: *these companies* didn't wear their image like a cheap shirt (16); My father would lose the *sandals* and get a *sharp, dignified suit* (144) – sandals standing for his hippie views which he abandoned for corporate lifestyle; the *old-fashioned idea* that a manufacturer is responsible for its own workforce (197); it's *passé* (200). SIGNIFICANT IS BIG: it looks as if *the giants* are getting bigger and bigger (p.4); advertising *giant* (p.198). EMOTIONAL EFFECT IS PHYSICAL CONTACT: this ambitious project makes the logo the central focus of everything it *touches* (29). There are instances of *container metaphors*: they could go *out into* the world (29); this goal didn't materialize *out of thin air* (p.147); brands are made *in* the mind (195); the company had pulled *out of* China (201). EMOTIONAL (nonmaterial) STATES ARE ENTITIES: the way they (brands) capture the spirit of individuality, athleticism, wilderness or community (195). There are also *orientational* metaphors: MORE IS UP, for example: the marketing world is always reaching a new *zenith* (8); the morning rush had *peaked* (244). And *ontological metaphors*: *what the Virgin case* clearly shows (148); *pushing the boundaries* to include ever more complete lifestyle packages (149).

Lakoff and Turner observe that taking into account the limited number of existing basic conceptual metaphors, writers can approach them in three ways. The first one involves automatic usage of remaining metaphors. The second one involves combining and extending the existing images. And the third one is an attempt to step outside the ordinary way of thinking (cf. Lakoff, Turner: 51). Klein produces some novel metaphorical expressions. We can see it, for example, in the title of one of the chapters: “Bad Mood Rising”, which contradicts the conventional GOOD IS UP; BAD IS DOWN metaphor. Another title, “Patriarchy Gets Funky”, extends IDEAS ARE FASHIONS metaphor, playing with it oxymoronically.

“To study metaphor is to be confronted with hidden aspects of one’s mind and one’s own culture” (Lakoff, Turner: 213). Using the tools offered by Cognitive Stylistics we may trace an author’s idiolect, the way he or she uses the language, the way he or she comprehends the world. Paraphrasing the popular maxim, we may say “Let me trace your metaphors, and I’ll tell you who you are”.

References:

- Johnson, Mark. 1987. *The Body in the Mind. The Bodily basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Klein, Naomi. 2001. *No Logo*. London, Flamingo.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Turner. 1989. *More than Cool Reason. A Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories reveal About the Mind*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Skrzypczak, Waldemar. 2006a. *Analog-Based Modelling of Meaning Representations in English*. Toruń, Nicolaus Copernicus University Press.
- Skrzypczak, Waldemar. 2006 b. *Cognitive Dimensions of Stylistic Novelty in Australian Literary Expression*. PLM 2006, Poznań 21 – 23 April 2006.
- Skrzypczak, Waldemar. 2008. *On Text Linguistics: A Survey of Terminological Distinctions*. An article available from the author.