

Universidad Nacional de La Pampa
Facultad de Ciencias Humanas
Departamento de Lenguas Extranjeras

Tesis de Licenciatura
en Lengua y Literatura Inglesa

**METAPHORIZATION IN CONTEMPORARY SONGS:
A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis of Four Songs of Avril Lavigne**

Aspirante: Rodrigo José LOYOLA MARTÍN
Directora: Dra. Lidia Raquel MIRANDA
Co-Directora: Mg. Sonia G. SUAREZ CEPEDA

Santa Rosa, March 2013

Contents Page

Contents Page	II
Abstract	IV
Introduction	1
1. Background	1
2. Hypothesis	1
3. Objectives	1
4. Methodology	2
5. Corpus Specifications	3
6. Thesis Structure	4
Chapter 1: Theoretical Background	5
1. The Ontology of Metaphor	5
2. The Cognitive Linguistic Approach to Metaphor	8
2.1. Metaphorical Mapping Structure	9
2.2. Types of Metaphors	9
2.3. Hiding and Highlighting	12
2.4. Cognition	13
2.5. Metaphor and the Myth of Objectivism, the Myth of Subjectivism and the Experientialist Synthesis.....	14
2.6. Metaphor and Form.....	17
Chapter 2: Lexical-Semantic Domain	21
1. A Cognitive Linguistic Approach to the Metaphors in the Songs	21
1.1. “Anything but Ordinary”	21
1.2. “My World”	33
1.3. “Nobody’s Fool”	45
1.4. “Sk8er Boi”	55
2. Metaphorization and Identity.....	63
2.1. Avril Lavigne’s Private Sphere.....	65
2.2. Avril Lavigne’s “Do-it-Yourself” Ethos of Punk Culture.....	66
2.3. Avril Lavigne’s Voice of the New Alternative Femininity.....	67
Chapter 3: Spelling Domain	70
1. Introduction	70
2. The Alphabet Vs. Non-Alphabetic Writing Systems.....	70
2.1. Non-Alphabetic Writing Systems and Iconicity.....	71
2.2. Written Language in the Context of Communication in Graphic Space.....	72

3. The English Writing System As a Source for Metaphorical Configuration	74
3.1. The Spelling Variation Metaphor.....	75
3.2 The Mapping of the Spelling Variation Metaphor.....	76
3.3. The Spelling Variation Metaphor and its “Foregrounding” Effect.....	78
4. The “Do-it-Yourself” Ethos and the Spelling Variation Metaphor.....	79
Conclusion	82
1. Main Findings.....	83
1.1. Lexical-Semantic Domain	83
1.2. Spelling Domain.....	87
2. Contributions and Limitations of the Study.....	87
Bibliography	90
1. Primary Sources	90
2. Secondary Sources	90
Appendices	96
Appendix 1: Primary Sources	96
Appendix 2: Sound-to-Spelling Correspondences	101

Abstract

The present study examines singer Avril Lavigne’s cognitive system operation in the metaphorical construal of reality in her songs. For this purpose four songs from her debut album *Let Go* (2002) were selected. In order to accomplish the thesis objectives I drew upon a qualitative study of the metaphors from the perspective of Lakoff and Johnson’s cognitive approach. This theory allowed me to detect and select the different linguistic elements through which metaphors are rendered to re-construct, at a linguistic level, the underlying conceptual schemes that motivate such lexical-semantic choices.

This thesis reveals the conceptual metaphors underlying the metaphorical expressions in the songs as well as the correspondences between the cognitive categories in the target and source domains.

The results of this project also suggest that metaphors can be created, not only by expressing one concept in terms of another one but also, by other means such as spelling variation.

Key words: metaphorization, cognitive linguistics, lexical domain, spelling domain

Man possesses the capacity of constructing languages, in which every sense can be expressed, without having an idea how and what each word means -- just as one speaks without knowing how the single sounds are produced. Colloquial language is a part of the human organism and is not less complicated than it. From it is humanly impossible to gather immediately the logical of language. Language disguises the thought; so that from the external form of the clothes one cannot infer the form of the thought they clothe, because the external form of the clothes is constructed with quite another object than to let the form of the body be recognized. The silent adjustments to understand colloquial language are enormously complicated.

Ludwig Wittgenstein Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus (1922)

Introduction

1. Background

Since ancient times metaphor was conceived as a stylistic device in which one concept was understood in terms of another concept in order to display “verbal beauty”. However recent studies have demonstrated that metaphors are not merely a rhetorical device but also a reflection of the working of the human cognitive system depicting different construals and points of view taken by its interpreter. Thus, language becomes a mirror for the mental processes providing with a way to understand how people conceive the world. In addition recent research has also proved that metaphors are not only created at the lexical level; rather other devices such as changes in the writing of words, phrases or sentences can be sources for metaphorical configurations.

2. Hypothesis

This thesis research is aimed at demonstrating that the metaphors expressed by different expressive means —lexical, semantic and graphemic— represent the text-producer’s own conception of reality. This research work critically examines how the singer Avril Lavigne thinks and understands the world through the use of metaphors.

The cognitive application of lexical-semantic analysis will allow me to study different linguistic elements to re-construct, at a linguistic level from the different expressive sources used by Lavigne, the underlying conceptual schemes that motivated such lexical-semantic choices. I also assume that the intended divergences from the standard spelling of some of the words in the lyrics are projected metaphors from the spelling system of the language, which create new meanings and representations.

3. Objectives

The main objective of this thesis research has been to analyse the metaphoric representations that arise through the cognitive-linguistic analysis of several linguistic elements of four songs of Avril Lavigne.

In this general framework, the specific objectives have been:

- To identify the metaphorical expressions in the corpus under analysis.
- To trace the linguistic elements used in the metaphorization process.
- To determine the conceptual schemes these metaphors refer to.
- To reconstruct the conceptual domains involved in the mapping of the metaphorical expressions.
- To determine the cultural characteristics of the metaphors.

4. Methodology

In order to demonstrate how the metaphorical expressions in the songs show the functioning of the cognitive system in the texts under analysis, I have analysed the data following a qualitative approach: I have detected and selected the metaphorical expressions found in the songs and then, according to Lakoff and Johnson’s cognitive linguistic approach (1980, 1991), I have described the expressions in terms of their source and target domains. Given the fact that I am also taking into account the spelling variation as a source for metaphorical configuration, I have made a distinction between those metaphors belonging to the lexical-semantic domain and those belonging to the spelling domain.

From this lexical and semantic perspective, the study of the texts has been contextualized as a part of a linguistic context to determine the cultural characteristics of their metaphors. To analyse the aspects aforementioned, the data have been studied following a qualitative approach, i.e. detection, selection, and description of the metaphorical expressions found. For the classification of the data I have followed three main criteria:

- Lexical-semantic domain: description of the metaphors in terms of their source and target domains. Implications of their meanings in the context.
- Spelling domain: description of spelling variations intendendly used by the singer to create a context whereby meaning is expressed through spelling alteration.

- Semiotics of the metaphors: at the metaphorical level of analysis, I have focused on the semiotics of the sign. I assume each metaphor can be analysed in terms of three general principles of relating forms and meanings: indexicality, iconicity and symbolicity, that underlie the structuring of language, being the last type of sign —the symbolic— the one I have analysed in terms of source and target domains.

5. Corpus Specifications

Avril Lavigne was born on 27 September 1984 in Ontario, Canada. She is a singer, songwriter, clothes designer and actress. Avril Lavigne’s musical styles have varied with each album she has released. Among her musical genres are distinguished pop-punk, pop-rock, alternative rock and post-grunge. The corpus under analysis will be limited to four songs (listed in the bibliography) which belong to Avril Lavigne’s debut album *Let Go* (2002), in which she identifies herself with the skater punk musical style. The skater punk (or pop punk) genre sets aside the political ideas of the punk rock to talk about topics related to adolescence, in a more melodic rhythm.

The texts I discuss are paradigmatic examples of how the expressive configuration provides data on the interlocutors (emotions, social rituals, politeness forms, rules violation patterns, etc.). In this sense, I consider that the metaphorization process, as I have described, is a resource intended to provide further information beyond the surface linguistic expressions. Therefore, this metaphorization process must be analysed as a particular sign construction both in its structure and its implicatures.

My proposal is focused on the lexical semantic resources which elaborate conceptual schemes, relative to personal and cultural experience in the form of metaphors. Besides, these lyrics show different patterns of spelling in some of the words that permits to broaden the study to the spelling field and demonstrate how these changes are also metaphorical expressions. To analyse these spelling variations it is compulsory to study the songs in their visual form and not in their sung version. For this purpose I have just examined the lyrics only in Avril Lavigne’s own handwriting just as they appear in the album booklet.

6. Thesis Structure

This thesis has been organized in the following way:

In the Introduction I provide details on the background of the study concerning the antecedents of metaphorical studies, the hypothesis, objectives, methodology, corpus specifications and the design of the thesis structure.

In Chapter 1 I discuss the theoretical framework for the analysis of the corpus. This chapter is divided into two main sections: section number one provides different viewpoints on the pre-Lakoffian conception of metaphor in relation to language and thought; and section number two elaborates on the Lakoff and Johnson’s cognitive approach to metaphor (1980, 1991).

Chapter 2 covers an in-depth analysis of the metaphors in the corpus. It focuses on the lexical domain of the metaphorical analysis. It also elaborates on the relationship between the metaphors in the songs and Avril Lavigne’s identity.

Chapter 3 centres on the spelling domain of the metaphorical analysis of the metaphors in the corpus.

In the conclusion I complete the study providing a review of the whole research and confirming the initial hypothesis.

The thesis is completed with the consulted bibliography, discriminated in primary and secondary sources, and two appendices containing the lyrics analysed and the sound-to-spelling correspondences.

Chapter 1: Theoretical Background

This chapter begins setting out the *status quaestionis* on the ontology of metaphors: the etymology of the word, different conceptions of the term, and its relation to language and thought. It will then go on to a special section dedicated to Lakoff and Johnson’s cognitive approach which expands on those previous conceptions establishing metaphor as a framework for thinking in language.

1. The Ontology of Metaphor

Among the figures of speech distinguished by the ancient Poetics, metaphor is the one that has undoubtedly awakened researchers’ interest due to the creativity of expression it offers.

The term ‘metaphor’ derives from the Latin word *metaphora* which comes from the Greek word *metaphorá*. *Metaphorá* is the noun for the Greek verb *metaphérein* which means “to carry to another place” and it is composed of two morphemes: *metá* “between” and *phérein* (*phéro*) “to bear”, “to carry”. As Lausberg (1974) argued, a metaphor (*translatio: metaphorá*) is the substitution of a *verbum proprium* (e.g. ‘knowledge’) for a word whose meaning has a similar relationship with that one of the substituted word (‘light’). Thus, the most common definition that holds for metaphor is that of a linguistic expression in which a word or group of words are transferred from their semantic context or basic domain to another one, and is used as a semantic extension for a referent in a new or different domain (e.g. *the hands* of the clock).

According to Vianu (1967: 9) a metaphor is a “manifest result of an assumed comparison” (my translation). In this sense, a term that substitutes another one in a metaphoric expression is both similar and different from it, for if there were an absolute identity between both, there would not be any reason for choosing one over the other. And if they were completely heterogynous, it would be impossible to compare them.

Among the ancients, Aristotle described the metaphor and its types in his *Arts Poetics*, but he took no account of the reasons that motivate the use of metaphorical expressions. For him, metaphor was a stylistic device that should show “verbal beauty”

(Bk. 3 2: 6-13). Cicero in *De Oratore*, III, 38 indicated that the metaphor began to be used as a result of the lack of expressions of the language for the notions that men’s growing experiences deemed indispensable. However, what seemed to have been originated by a necessity imposed by the lexical limitations of the language, later became an instrument of rhetorical taste.

In the eighteenth century, Giambattista Vico considered that the only means for the ancients to widen the lexical repertoire to express their growing experience was to assimilate the new objects to the data of their own body and soul experience. This is why, in his opinion, each metaphor is in essence a personification which attributes life and human-like passions to inanimate things, a linguistic property liable to be found in the origin of the most primitive sciences. Vianu equated metaphors to myths: “This is the way myths are formed, and among them, smaller myths called metaphors” (Vianu 1967: 11, my translation). Karl Marx (1845), on the other hand, stated that the mythological comprehension of the the world —well-known in every work of the ancient art— had its origin in the man’s need to express his relationship, as a human being, with the forces of nature.

All the speculations about the origins of the metaphor have heightened the need to update their issue. Nowadays, the use of modern research tools coming from ethnology, psychology and linguistics fields have provided new insights into the interpretation of metaphors.

Over the past century, the contributions of E. Cassirer (1946), A. J. Lacan (1971), L. Wittgenstein (1973) y a U. Eco (1990)¹ have plainly recovered the conception of the metaphor as an instrument of knowledge. Stephen Pepper (1961) defined a metaphor, for

¹ The philosophers’ prevailing attitude to metaphors as a way of gaining knowledge has been that of refusal. G. Vico initiates a revalorization of metaphors by criticizing the rationalist grammarians and by considering that the language rich in images from myths and poetry is an expression of poetic knowledge. J. J. Rousseau follows this line and appreciates the effective language of metaphors. H.–L. Bergson recommends us not to be taken in by the supposed rigour of scientific language in which an unconscious metaphor underlies and that the direct metaphor can indicate a direct vision (Rodríguez Rivera 2005). J. Ortega y Gasset considers the metaphor as an unavoidable mental instrument and as a way of scientific thinking: for the Spanish thinker “the metaphor constitutes a mental instrument indispensable for the construction of the representations of the reality, not only those which possess an aesthetic value and remain circumscribed to the literary field, but also those which are present in the scientific vocabulary and are involved in strictly cognitive values, such as the search for truth or, what is the same, a description of reality ‘adjusted’ to what reality is” (Zavadivker 2005: 1, my translation).

instance, as a part of common sense data drawn from ordinary life which stresses its state of uncertainty, and whose meaning can be achieved by the “multiplication” of experiences, repetition, and structural corroboration. Thus, basic presuppositions develop and acquire the unquestionable character of everyday life certainties (“world hypothesis”). According to Pepper, these hypotheses about the world are originated and structured around root-metaphors that supply a coherent image of the relationships condensed in them, and allow different observations to be fit in a coherent whole.

As Miranda (2007: 99-100) stated, nowadays, much work dealing with the role of metaphors in language, thinking and scientific knowledge has been done. By stating that A “is” B, the metaphor tacitly asserts an identity of a group of B-type characteristics with the group of A-type characteristics. This *traslatio* is precisely the nucleus of the metaphoric operation: actually, an object is not explained in terms of another, rather the intensification of the attributes included in this transmission is highlighted. That is to say, there is a cognitive mapping carried out by the subject that accomplishes the act of knowing. According to this point of view, a metaphor is a predicate that instantiates a cognitive process highlighting significant relevancies between two referents.

In the field of hermeneutics, P. Ricoeur (1995) dealt with the discursive roles of metaphors and symbols. He considered a metaphor as a “tension between two interpretations of the statements and not as something that occurs between two lexical terms of a sentence” (Alcalá Campos 2004: 115, my translation). In this way he rejected the idea of substituting a word for another one, and suggested that the metaphor creates its own sense—it says something new about reality—. M. Beuchot (2004) holds that metaphors are a type of analogy—referring to sign iconicity—and granted a privilege to its allegoric point of view.

From a similar perspective, Jean Paul Richter in his *Introduction to Aesthetics* (1812) had already considered metaphors as a linguistic event from the hypothesis that the energies that motivated the ancients to create these tentative conjectures should be kept active in the present. Therefore, the study of the language of metaphors could contribute with useful explanations to this field. Alfred Biese in *The Philosophy of Metaphors* (1893) explained that language is metaphorical par excellence, for it functions as an abridged and analogical image of the whole life. The nature of all the metaphorical units pertaining to a

language becomes clear enough when we observe, in the first instance, that all the abstract words have been formed by a process of metaphorization of some older and more concrete words, as Biese has exemplified in his study of words from German. The metaphoric nature of language is also related to the fact that every word is a synthesis of meaning and sound. According to Biese, the fact that the sound of the words exalts its meaning would prove that initially all the word-roots have been sonorous symbols and that all the words have been formed by a metaphoric transfer of some acoustic impressions.

The metaphoric nature of language was also observed by the French linguist Remy de Gourmont in *L'Esthétique de la langue française* (1899), who thought that in the European languages of his time most of the words were metaphors supporting his assertion with examples from Greek, Latin, French, Spanish and German.

2. The Cognitive Linguistics Approach to Metaphor

In the framework of modern linguistics, many linguists and philosophers like George Lakoff, Mark Turner and Mark Johnson have adopted a new approach to metaphor. These authors subscribed to the belief that metaphor, more than a rhetorical figure of speech, is a mental process that helps us understand everyday conceptual domains in terms of other more familiar conceptual domains. In *Metaphors we live by* (1980), Lakoff and Johnson declared that “metaphor is pervasive in our everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature” (1980: 3).

Moreover, in *More than cool reason* (1989), Lakoff and Turner spoke at length and gave the following definitions for the term:

- Metaphor is omnipresent: it infuses our thoughts regardless what we are thinking about;
- Metaphor is accessible to everyone: it is acquired since childhood;
- Metaphor is conventional: it is a part of our everyday language and its use is almost unconscious and automatic; and
- Metaphor is irreplaceable: it helps us to define concepts that no other modes of thoughts can.

2.1. Metaphorical Mapping Structure

Lakoff and Johnson defined metaphor as a mapping² between two conceptual domains: a target domain and a source domain. Metaphors are used to map certain aspects of the source domain onto the target domain, in order to produce a new understanding of that target domain. This mapping has a three-part structure: two endpoints (the source and target domain) and a bridge between them (the mapping). Let us consider for instance the concept ARGUMENT and one of its conceptual metaphors ARGUMENT is WAR. In this case, the concept ARGUMENT is structured by the concept of WAR. Some of the expressions for the ARGUMENT is WAR metaphor are:

“He *attacked every weak point* in my argument”

“I *demolished* his argument”

“I’ve never *won* an argument with him”

“If you use that *strategy*, he’ll *wipe you out*”.

In addition, it is important to highlight that this metaphorical mapping is unidirectional, that is to say, it occurs in one direction only, from the source domain to the target domain and not vice versa. In other words, the less concrete and vaguer concepts (e.g. the realm of emotions) are structured in terms of better understood and more concrete concepts which being closer to our physical experience are more adequately categorized through corporized schemes (such as space orientations and objects).

2.2. Types of Metaphors

Lakoff and Johnson distinguished three classes of metaphors according to the domain of experience they refer to. These are: Structural Metaphors, Orientational Metaphors and Ontological Metaphors.

² In cognitive linguistics, a metaphor is a *mapping* between two conceptual domains in the conceptual system. A mapping is, for its part, a network of correspondences between these domains. So a metaphoric expression (word, phrase, and sentence) is a realization (superficial) of this network of conceptual correspondences which is a metaphor (Rivano Fischer 1989 y 1991).

Structural Metaphors

A structural metaphor is a metaphor where one concept is expressed in terms of another structured and well-defined concept like the LOVE is a JOURNEY metaphor as it is expressed in the following sentences:

“We’re *at a crossroads*”

“We’ll just have to *go our separate ways*”

“I don’t think this relationship is *going anywhere*”

Oriental Metaphors

Oriental metaphors organize a whole system of concepts in terms of spatial orientations. Thus, concepts like states or emotions are oriented to an imaginary space such as:

UP or DOWN

IN or OUT

FRONT or BACK

ON or OFF

DEEP or SHALLOW

CENTRAL or PERIPHERAL

NEAR or FAR

For instance, the metaphors MORE is UP and LESS is DOWN are linguistically expressed in the following way:

“He is *underage*”

“His income *fell* last year”

“His draft number is *high*”

The ontology for the orientational metaphors is grounded in our body and its interaction with the physical environment: our bodies have a front and a back, an inferior

and a superior part, they walk in a vertical position, they can move in or out of different places and they can position near or far with respect to another entity.

Ontological Metaphors

An ontological metaphor is that one in which an abstraction like an activity, emotion or idea is materialized or turned into an entity and is used as if it was an object. In our everyday interaction we experience with objects and substances and this experience provides the basis for a lot of ontological metaphors. To put it another way, we categorize unbounded and unstructured events, activities, ideas and emotions as concrete entities and substances.

Ontological metaphors can be divided into four subcategories:

- **Container Metaphors**

In a CONTAINER metaphor a concept is represented as a container: it has an inside and an outside, and it is capable of holding something else.

E.g.: “Are you *in* the race on Sunday?”

In this sentence the race is metaphorically structured as a container having in it participants, events and the activity of running.

- **Entity Metaphors**

In an ENTITY metaphor a concept is represented as a concrete physical object.

E.g.: “My mind isn’t *operating* today”

In this sentence the concept of “mind” is metaphorically structured as a machine.

- **Substance Metaphors**

In a SUBSTANCE metaphor a concept is represented as material.

E.g.: “There was *a lot of good running* in the race”

In this sentence “running” is metaphorically structured as a substance contained in the race which at the same time is structured as a container.

- **Personification**

PERSONIFICATION is a kind of ontological metaphor in which a thing or abstraction is depicted as having human attributes.

E.g.: “*Inflation is eating up* our profits”

In this sentence the nonhuman abstraction (inflation) is attributed a human characteristic (eating).

In sum, we use ontological metaphors to understand events, actions, activities and states. Events and actions are metaphorically structured as objects, activities as substances and states as containers. Representing a concept as an entity or a substance allows us to accomplish different purposes such as referring, quantifying, identifying aspects, identifying causes, setting goals and motivating actions. Personification is a more general category that covers a wide range of metaphors, selecting different aspects of a human being. What these ontological metaphors share is the fact that they allow us to understand a phenomenon in the world in human terms.

2.3. Hiding and Highlighting

The systematicity that allows us to understand one domain of experience on the basis of another domain of experience involves both “*hiding*” and “*highlighting*”. In other words, when we focus on one aspect of the concept other aspects are downplayed. For example, the metaphor LIFE is a JOURNEY helps us comprehend some aspects of life in terms of a journey: it highlights the different stages of life like birth and death (birth is the starting point and death is the stopping point) while it hides other aspects of the concept like the different roles we play in the contexts we move (for instance, at home we could

play the role of children or parents, whereas at school we could play the role of students or teachers). All these aspects are not consistent with the LIFE is a JOURNEY metaphor but are highlighted in the LIFE is a PLAY metaphor. Consequently, we can see that metaphorical definitions are only partial: they only provide a definition of some aspects of a concept instead of giving a whole explanation of it.

2.4. Cognition

Lakoff and Turner explained that cognition plays an important role in the interpretation of metaphors for in order to structure and understand a target domain in terms of a source domain, one must have appropriate knowledge of the source domain. Lakoff and Turner stated that our knowledge is organized in schemas which

(...) constitute cognitive models of some aspects of the world, models that we use in comprehending our experience and reasoning about it. Cognitive models are not conscious models; they are unconscious and used effortlessly. We cannot observe them directly; they are inferred from their effects. (1980: 65-66).

These cognitive models can be acquired in two ways: through direct experience and through our culture. It is important to notice that metaphors cohere with our culture and personal experience, but that experience and culture vary from individual to individual, that is why we have different metaphorical groundings for the same concepts. For instance, the conception of FUTURE varies from culture to culture: for some cultures the concept of future is spatially oriented ahead in FRONT with respect to their bodies, while for other cultures the future is oriented BEHIND. These differences are grounded in the cultural conception of the passing of time.

Direct experience is mediated by our bodies, and this interaction with the world in experiencing is called “embodiment”. Raymond W. Gibbs in his book *Embodiment and Cognitive Science* (2006) explained the concept as follows:

People’s subjective, felt experiences of their bodies in action provide part of the fundamental grounding for language and thought. Cognition is what occurs when the body engages in the physical, cultural world and must be studied in terms of the dynamical interactions between people and the environment. Human language and thought emerge

from recurring patterns of embodied activity that constrain ongoing intellectual behavior. (2006: 9)

Lakoff and Johnson declared that our experiences are structured in “*Experiential Gestalts*” or “*Image-schemas*”. These image schemas are preconceptual knowledge structures based on recurring patterns of experience (emergent concepts).

Miranda *et al.* (2009) summarized the metaphoric models described by Lakoff in his work. Among all the models, there is the “*container*” scheme characterized, like the human body, by having an interior, a limit and an exterior; the “*whole-parts*” scheme (“the whole and its parts”); the “*link*” scheme is associated with the umbilical cord, for it allows A and B to be connected. The “*centre-periphery*” scheme implies an entity, a centre and a periphery. The “*source-path-goal*” scheme is characterized by representing a starting point (and a direction towards a destiny), a sequence of contiguous locations, and an end. These schemes can be placed in the group of ontological metaphors. Lakoff also mentioned other schemes such as “*up-down*”, “*front-back*”, and “*linear order*”, all of them motivated by similarities with structures from everyday life physical experience associated with an imaginary space, that is to say, they correspond with orientational metaphors.

To summarize, the human body and its experience constitute the source of the two types of metaphors. As regards the orientational metaphors, the human body divided into two equal halves provides an inferior and a superior part; and as regards the ontological metaphors, the human body can be seen as a recipient for abstract entities both from its own conception as a limit (interior-exterior) or from the focus on its different parts.

2.5. Metaphor and the Myths of Objectivism and Subjectivism and the Experientialist Synthesis

Lakoff and Johnson stated that truth is rooted in understanding. Due to the fact that truth is relative to a conceptual system that is metaphorical in nature, there is no objective and absolute truth.

From a different perspective, the philosophy of objectivism, created by the Russian American philosopher and novelist Ayn Rand, states that every object in the world has inherent properties independent of any cultural, social or psychological factor from the

people who experience them. When it comes to language, the objectivist view states that words, like other objects, have fixed clearly defined meanings that fit reality. In this way, metaphor and figurative language can be avoided since their meanings are not clear enough and do not fit reality straightforwardly.

The counterpart of objectivism is the philosophy of subjectivism which states that the most important things in our lives are our intuitions, aesthetic sensibilities, moral practices and spirituality. All these aspects are neither rational nor objective; instead, they are purely subjective. Art and poetry go beyond rationality and objectivity and get us closer to our feelings and intuitive insights. Figurative language which is highly imaginative is necessary for expressing our everyday experiences. To sum up, objectivity is equated to rationality whereas subjectivity is connected to the field of emotions and irrationality.

Lakoff and Johnson rejected the objectivist view that there is a unique absolute truth and opposed the subjectivist view that truth is obtainable via imagination unconstrained by external circumstances. Lakoff and Johnson proposed the experiential approach that fuses both the objective and subjective approach rejecting the existence of an absolute objectivism and absolute subjectivism as the only resources for truth. The experientialist view puts the emphasis on interaction and constructs coherence through experiential gestalts. For Lakoff and Johnson metaphor combines reason and imagination:

Reason, at the very least, involves categorization, entailment and inference. Imagination, in one of its many aspects, involves seeing one kind of thing in terms of another kind of thing—what we have called metaphorical thought. Metaphor is thus *imaginative rationality*. Since the categories of our everyday thought are largely metaphorical and our everyday reasoning involves metaphorical entailments and inferences, ordinary rationality is therefore imaginative by its very nature. Given our understanding of the poetic metaphor in terms of metaphorical entailments and inferences, we can see that the products of the poetic imagination are, for the same reason, partially rational in nature. (1980:193)

What the myths of objectivism and subjectivism do not take into account is that we understand the world by interacting with it. On the one hand, the objectivist view does not consider that truth is relative to a cultural conceptual system that is metaphorical in nature involving imagination to understand one thing in terms of another one. And on the other hand, the subjectivist view does not consider that our imagination is constrained by our interaction in the physical and cultural environment and also that metaphorical

understanding involves metaphorical entailment which is an imaginative form of rationality.

According to García Jurado (2003), cognitive linguistics does not constitute a close systematic corpus but a group of different approaches that dynamically configure and articulate a different way of viewing language. One of the basic aspects of this linguistic paradigm is the study of the conceptualization of abstract realities through sensitive experiential expressions. In this way, the recent approach in cognitive semantics has contributed to create a method that allows to acknowledge the empirical basis of cognition in a complete way and in all levels of language. The main principles of cognitive semantics, according to García Jurado (2003: 86) are:

1. The categorization through the data of experience, in opposition to the classic and closed categories (of Aristotelian formulation). The new categories are open and vague; they are composed by especially representative or prototypical elements, and they are organized through “idealized cognitive models” (ICMs) which arrange, in turn, the mental schemata (Lakoff 1987: 68-76).
2. The language iconicity or ability to imitate reality through mental schemata.
3. The emerging grammar, which allows for the study of the tendency of the lexical units to turn into systematic grammatical elements.
4. The subjectivation, which comes from the idea that linguistic change must be attributed to the constant intervention of the addressor in grammar, leading to new and valuable connotative implications of language.
5. The “metaphors we live by” (Lakoff 1987, Lakoff & Johnson 1980), which use the tangible reality experiences to express an abstract idea, and represent clear examples of “idealized cognitive models”.

In this general framework, as Miranda, Aristimuño y Rodríguez (2009) have synthesized, cognitive linguistics offers a new perspective for the study of a language and its use in different discourse types. The dimension of the analysis of metaphors is articulated with the lexical studies of the traditional semantics and the studies of the structural trend in an absolute compatibility. This view contributes with new instruments

for a better comprehension of any text at the time it allows to observe aspects that motivate lexical and phraseological creation which appear reflected at different levels of language. Complementarily, the semantic analysis entails a complex and language specific process of analysis whereby a certain language constitutes a unique system of concepts to be revealed.

Indeed, recent studies regarding the relationship between language and thought have shown the impact of language on the conceptualization of the world and cognition. This work is based on what Lucy has called the “weaker version” of the linguistic relativity hypothesis (Lucy 1992), which proposes that the language we speak influences our way of thinking and conceptualizing the world. Categorization is an essential element in cognition that allows reality and world experience to be organized in identifiable categories. Current research in the field of cognitive psychology has noted that our categorization of the world is based on lexical categories available in our language to direct attention to those properties encoded in it.

From the point of view of language production, the grammatical categories expressed in the syntax, the morphosyntactic markers and the lexical components are devices that allow language to encode our experience and therefore conceive the reality in certain ways.

2.6. Metaphor and Form

Lakoff and Johnson did not just focus on how one concept is understood in terms of another concept but also took into consideration how form affects the content of a word, phrase or sentence in order to convey metaphorical meaning. Here the term *form* refers to the grammatical structure of a language, that is to say, the set of morphological, phonological, syntactical and spelling rules as well as orthographic devices governing the configuration of sentences, phrases and words.

In *Metaphors we live by* (1980), Lakoff and Johnson explained how metaphor gives meaning to form. They declared that:

Because we conceptualize linguistic form in spatial terms, it is possible for certain spatial metaphors to apply directly to the form of a sentence, as we conceive of it spatially. This can provide automatic direct links between form and content, based on general metaphors in our conceptual system. Such links make the relationship between form and content anything

but arbitrary, and some of the meaning of a sentence can be due to the precise form the sentence takes. (1980:126).

To illustrate this concept Lakoff and Johnson brought up what the American linguist Michael Reddy coined the “Conduit Metaphor”. Reddy said that language “functions like a conduit, transferring thoughts bodily from one person to another” (Reddy 1979: 170). Therefore, people “insert thoughts or feelings in the words”, the words are transferred from the addressor to the addressee, and the addressee(s) “extract the thoughts and feelings again from the words” (Reddy 1979:170). Lakoff and Johnson showed the mapping of the Conduit Metaphor in this way:

Conduit Metaphor

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Ideas or meanings	Objects
Linguistic expressions	Containers
Communication	Sending

Through these mappings they illustrated how this complex metaphor establishes a relationship between the form and the content of a sentence. They stated that big containers have big content and, conversely, small containers have small content. For example the lengthening on the vowel “i” in the spelling of the word “*biiiiig*” implies that the entity to which that characteristic is attributed is not only big but more than big. Hence, Lakoff and Johnson proposed the general principle that MORE OF FORM is MORE OF CONTENT and demonstrated how metaphors not only interact with the lexical items but also with the grammatical structure of a sentence.

Apart from Lakoff and Johnson, other linguists also focused on the relationship between form and metaphorization.

In *The Language of Metaphors* (1997), Andrew Goatly explained that orthographic devices are also signals of metaphorical terms. He stated that in newspapers and

advertisements it is common to use inverted commas to mark off V-Terms³. For example in the sentence “*some Western observers suspect that many figures had been ‘padded’ for so long*”, the inverted commas in the word *padded* are signalling a metaphor from the literal language.

Goatly mentioned other devices that outline metaphorical marking such as punctuation and the use of white space. For instance, in the phrase “*Stilton. Enjoy it all the year. Round*”, the full-stop and the following gap break the idiomatic phrase “*all the year around*” to express that Stilton cheese keeps its round shape throughout the whole year. Another example is the use of exclamation marks which make the reader take a second look for the pun. For example, in the phrase “*Lose yourself – Find yourself!*” the juxtaposition of superficially antonymous idioms, “*lose yourself*” (become absorbed in) and “*find yourself*” (discover your true identity), works along with the exclamation mark to disturb our automatic processing.

In *Grammatical Metaphor: A view from systemic functional linguistics* (2003), Miriam Taverniers summarized Halliday’s ideas on metaphor. For Halliday a metaphor is a variation in the expression of a given meaning. A certain meaning (e.g. “*many people protested*”) can be expressed using a congruent form (“*a large number of protests*”) or using a metaphorical form (“*a flood of protests*”). Halliday (1985) stated that “we recognize that lexical selection is just one aspect of lexicogrammatical selection, or ‘wording’; and that metaphorical variation is lexicogrammatical rather than simply lexical”

Halliday demonstrated that the expression “*protests flooded in*” can be expressed in several ways such as:

- a) “*Protests came in in large quantities*”,
- b) “*Protests were received in large quantities*” or
- c) “*Very many people protested*”

³ Andrew Goatly defines metaphor in the following way: “metaphor occurs when a unit of discourse is used to refer unconventionally to an object, process or concept, or colligates in an unconventional way. And when this unconventional act of reference or colligation is understood on the basis of similarity, matching or analogy involving the conventional referent or colligates of the unit and the actual unconventional referent or colligates. [...] The conventional referent of the unit is the Vehicle, the actual unconventional referent is the Topic and the similarities and/or analogies involved are the Grounds” (1998: 8-9). In Lakoff and Johnson terminology the Topic Term (T-Term) is the target domain, the Vehicle Term (V-Term) is the source domain and the Ground Term (G-Term) is the mapping.

As we can see, in none of these sentences variation is merely lexical for there are also differences in the grammatical structure. These differences in the grammatical configuration are called by Halliday “Grammatical Metaphor”.

Halliday put the variations between different expressions for the same meaning in a scale of congruency where the metaphorical variants are labelled as “*incongruent*” and the non-metaphorical variants are labelled as “*congruent*”. This notion of congruency is based on *markedness*: the non-metaphorical (congruent) forms are the *unmarked* expression of a given meaning conforming to “the typical way of saying things” and the metaphorical (incongruent) forms are the *marked* expression.

In the following chapters, I will analyse songs by Avril Lavigne following the Lakoff and Johnson’s cognitive approach to metaphor to prove how the metaphorical expressions represents the singer’s way of conceptualizing the world.

Chapter 2: Lexical-Semantic Domain

This chapter covers an analysis of the lexical items in the songs and the metaphorical expressions associated with them. It also describes the conceptual metaphors underlying these metaphorical expressions in terms of their source and target domains. In this analysis I will use charts to represent the mapping between the target domain and the source domain and I will write the concepts belonging to these categories in capital letters to follow Lakoff and Johnson’s metaphorical description model. The analysis is also enriched with the origins of some the conceptual metaphors in the instances it was possible for me to track them.

At the end of the chapter, in the section “Metaphorization and Identity”, I refer to the notion of identity and its link to metaphors; specifically I will describe Avril Lavigne’s private sphere and her background in punk culture and how these issues interact among themselves in the process of metaphorization.

1. A Cognitive Linguistic Approach to the Metaphors in the Songs

1.1 Anything but Ordinary

First Stanza

*Sometimes I get so weird
I even FREAK myself out
I laugh myself to sleep
It's my lullaby
Sometimes I drive so fast
Just to feel the danger
I want to scream
It makes me feel alive*

The song opens up with Avril Lavigne’s⁴ perception of her weird emotional upset. These feelings of weirdness are rendered by four metaphorical expressions:

⁴ In modern literary criticism, as opposed to romantic criticism, the poem’s poetic voice cannot be directly associated to the author’s voice. In this analysis, however, I have made such association for the reasons I have stated further in this chapter.

- 1) “I even freak myself out”
- 2) “I laugh myself to sleep. It’s my lullaby”
- 3) “Sometimes I drive so fast just to feel the danger”
- 4) “I want to scream. It makes me feel alive”

Metaphor number 1, “I even freak myself out”, is an instance of the ontological metaphor COMPLETION is OUT. This is due to the fact that “out”, when added to some verbs, functions as a manner adverb which means “completely” or “to the fullest degree or extent”. Here the addition of “out” to the verb “freak” modifies the manner in which the action is accomplished: Avril Lavigne is not just “freaking” but “freaking to the fullest extent”.

COMPLETION is OUT

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Completion	Out

Metaphor number 2, “I laugh myself to sleep. It’s my lullaby”, is a structural metaphor in which LAUGHING is conceptualized as SINGING A LULLABY. The metaphorical mapping between both domains can be expressed like this:

LAUGHING is SINGING A LULLABY

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Laugh: sounds and movements that express lively amusement and also derision.	Lullaby: a soothing song sung to send a child to sleep

The projection of the source domain LULLABY on to the target domain LAUGH may sound rather contradictory because although both domains refer to sounds, these ones are not compatible with each other for noise prevents falling asleep. Thereby, the metaphor

activates two opposing references that render the speaker’s emotional upset and create a fertile ground for the two other metaphorical expressions that follow.

Metaphor number 3, “Sometimes I drive so fast just to feel the danger”, is the third weird thing the singer itemizes to picture her state of being out of her mind already expressed in the previous metaphors. In this case “to feel the danger” is an ontological metaphor, activated by the verb “feel”, which structures DANGER as a CONCRETE ENTITY that can be perceived and examined by the senses.

ABSTRACTION is a CONCRETE ENTITY

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Danger	Concrete entity

Metaphor number 4, “I want to scream. It makes me feel alive”, is the last example of the strange actions depicting Avril Lavigne’s state of havoc. The “it” pronoun makes reference to the act of screaming as the cause why the singer feels alive. From this linguistic expression two metaphors emerge: the EVENTS are ACTIONS metaphor and the PERSONIFICATION inherent to the previous one. As regards the EVENTS are ACTIONS metaphor Lakoff and Turner (1989: 37) explained that “the ‘Events are Actions’ metaphor imputes some agency to something causally connected to the event” and by imputing the agency “we can personify the agent as the actor who causes the event”.

The working of the EVENTS are ACTIONS metaphor can be better explained through Len Talmy’s “Force dynamics theory” (2000: 409). Talmy held that force-dynamic thinking is a pervasive central structure. This theory states that: 1) there are two opposing entities (the agonist & the antagonist); 2) one entity (the antagonist) exerts force on the other (the agonist); and 3) the force can be exerted towards action or towards inaction.

Following Talmy’s force-dynamic model, the metaphorical mapping of “I want to scream. It makes me feel alive” can be expressed like this:

PERSONIFICATION: ACTION is AGENT

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Avril Lavigne’s act of screaming	Agent

“I want to scream. It makes me feel alive” entails that Avril Lavigne is both the agent and patient of the action: she produces the screaming and she is affected by it. However, “it makes me feel alive” creates a metaphor in which the act of screaming becomes the agent/ personified antagonist that acts upon the speaker, the patient/agonist. The use of this metaphor allows the singer to highlight the cause or, in Talmy’s words, the “force” that leads her to feel alive.

Second Stanza

Is it enough to love?

Is it enough to breath?

Somebody rip my heart out

And leave me here to bleed

Is it enough to die?

Somebody save my life

I'd rather be anything but ordinary please

In the previous stanza Avril Lavigne has created an atmosphere in which she seems to be out of her mind itemizing actions which could look weird or dangerous to most of ordinary people. In the second stanza she wanders about the importance of loving, breathing and dying in life. She asks three rhetorical questions which at the same time constitute three ontological metaphors:

- 1) “Is it enough to love?”
- 2) “Is it enough to breath?”
- 3) “Is it enough to die?”

These three rhetorical questions embody three ontological metaphors where ACTIONS such as “to love”, “to breathe” and “to die” are perceived metaphorically as SUBSTANCES whose size can be measured. Here, Avril Lavigne combines the schema from the physical domain (to breath and to die) and the schema from the emotional domain (to love) to make them work as an equation for life. The use of the quantifier “enough” in the three rhetorical sentences introduces the singer’s negative perspective on life unveiling that she needs more than that to feel alive, being, perhaps, this fact the reason why she does all the weird actions mentioned in stanza number 1.

ACTIONS are SUBSTANCES

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
To love	
To die	Substances
To breathe	

After stating her not being satisfied with life Avril Lavigne makes clear that she would rather be dead instead of continuing with her meaningless life and asks “Somebody rip my heart out and leave me here to bleed”. This imperative sentence encompasses different metaphors interacting with one another. The first metaphor is activated by the verb “rip out” which is another instance of the metaphor COMPLETION is OUT (like the verb “freak out” I have analysed in the first stanza).

The other metaphors are activated by the noun “heart”. The HEART is the source domain for many metaphors. Since ancient times the heart has been conceived metaphorically as a CONTAINER for human emotions and life. This conception has extended over the times and, perhaps, that is the reason why that organ was chosen to be wounded instead of another part of the body. Aristotle stated that the heart is the primary organ and that is why it is situated in the front and centre of the body. In “*On the parts of animals*” (book III, part 4), Aristotle explained that the heart “is the principle of life and the source of all motion and sensation”; he based his explanation on the fact that when an embryo is formed “the heart is the first of all the parts to be formed; and no sooner it is formed than it contains blood. Moreover, the motions of pain and pleasure, and generally of all sensation, have their source in the heart, and find in it their ultimate termination”.

If we consider the HEART as the CONTAINER of life, then the blood that is contained within will have the function of taking life to every inch of the body. Following this line of thought, we get the metaphor LIFE is a SUBSTANCE/ DEATH is LOSS OF SUBSTANCE as expressed in the phrase “leave me here to bleed”.

In this way we can notice how both metaphors HEART is A CONTAINER OF LIFE AND EMOTIONS and LIFE is a SUBSTANCE/ DEATH is LOSS OF SUBSTANCE interface with one another:

HEART is A CONTAINER / BLOOD is LIFE AND EMOTIONS / LIFE is a SUBSTANCE / DEATH is LOSS OF SUBSTANCE

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Heart	Container
Blood	Life and emotions
Life	Substance
Death	Loss of substance

Third Stanza

*To walk within the lines
Would make my life so boring!
I want to know that I
Have been to the extreme
So knock me off my feet
Come on now give it to me
Anything to make me feel alive*

In this stanza Avril Lavigne delves into her dissatisfaction with life structuring LIFE in terms of a JOURNEY⁵ by these linguistic expressions:

“To walk within the lines would make my life so boring”

“I have been to the extreme”

These two sentences are instances of the structural metaphor LIFE is a JOURNEY in which the source-path-goal schema is activated as a source domain for life. What is highlighted in this metaphor is the path of the journey. The same way a path, a road or a street have signals for proper traffic movement so does life: there are rituals, conventions, and norms that everybody has to follow as a member of society. Through this metaphor the singer personifies the ACTION “To walk within the lines” as the AGENT that causes her life to

⁵ Just as the heart is a source of metaphors from the ancient times, the topic of life as a journey can also be traced in a wide range of literary works, especially in the Antiquity and the Middle Ages (for further details, see Miranda 2011).

be boring. Following Talmy’s Force dynamic model “to walk within the lines” is the agent that acts upon the patient (Avril Lavigne) to provoke a certain reaction on her.

PERSONIFICATION: ACTION is AGENT

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
To walk within the lines	Agent

As walking “within the lines” makes Avril Lavigne feel bored, she prefers to walk on “the extremes”. The word “extreme” activates in our minds the centre-periphery schema which highlights the importance of the “centre” and downplays “the peripheries”. Following with the metaphor LIFE is A JOURNEY the extremes of a path are to be avoided due to the fact that they are dangerous. For instance when driving up a hill we cannot drive too close to the extremes because we are likely to fall down. Nevertheless, in this song, Avril Lavigne de-centres the centre-periphery schema and makes “the peripheries” (the dangerous and avoidable extremes) her centre of attention downplaying the “centre” (the safe road).

As a conclusion, the use of the LIFE is A JOURNEY metaphor works as a call for social deviation: a request for running away from the social norms. Social norms are the rules that every human being has to follow and adjust as a member of a society. However, some of these rules are not accepted by all the members of the society due to the fact that they do not match their individual thinking or cosmology. This social deviation or “going to the extremes” for the part of a group of people causes the emergence of subcultures such as the punk one.

According to my analysis the metaphorical mapping for the LIFE is a JOURNEY metaphor is the following:

LIFE is a JOURNEY

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
We	Travellers
Social norms	The lines
Social deviation	The extremes

After communicating her desire to withdraw from the rules of the society Avril Lavigne expresses her longing for something that makes her feel alive. This fact becomes evident when she asks “So knock me off my feet. Come on and give it to me. Anything to make me feel alive”.

The imperative phrase “knock me off my feet” is a linguistic expression for the structural metaphor EVENT is a NATURAL FORCE.

EVENTS are NATURAL FORCES

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Event	Natural force

This metaphor can also be analysed using Talmy’s force-dynamics theory. The EVENT Avril Lavigne is waiting for to happen is regarded as a NATURAL FORCE (agent/antagonist) so powerful, amazing and overwhelming that can knock her down and make her lose consciousness and balance. The plea “knock me off” is reinforced at the end of the stanza by the phrase “Give it to me. Anything to make me feel alive”. In this case the “it” and “anything” pronouns refer to an event (knocking her off or anything else) that makes the singer feel active and alive such as the examples given in the first stanza (driving fast and screaming). That EVENT is metaphorically structured on two ways: firstly it is structured as a CONCRETE ENTITY that can be manipulated as expressed in the phrase “give it to me”, and secondly it is once again personified as a NATURAL FORCE with the power to cause someone “feel alive”.

EVENT is a CONCRETE ENTITY / EVENT is a NATURAL FORCE

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Event	Concrete entity
	Natural force

Fourth Stanza

Let down your defenses

Use no common sense

The fourth stanza marks a turning point in the song. Here, Avril Lavigne sets aside her state of mental turmoil about life and what she does to feel alive focusing on giving some advice on the subject.

The linguistic expression “let down your defenses” considers LIFE as WARFARE. Via the LIFE is WARFARE metaphor, the singer structures everyone as soldiers who have to constantly put up their defences to protect themselves from the challenges and threatens of daily life.

LIFE is WARFARE

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Life	Warfare
We	Soldiers
Challenges	Attacks

“Use no common sense” is an ontological metaphor in which COMMON SENSE is perceived as a CONCRETE ENTITY.

ABSTRACTION is a CONCRETE ENTITY

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Common sense	Concrete entity

By stating “use no common sense” Avril Lavigne rejects what most people think as regards a particular issue. In more general terms, it could be said that the singer is reiterating her refusal to abide by the social norms from which she wants to deviate as it was expressed in the previous stanza in the LIFE is A JOURNEY metaphor.

Fifth Stanza

*If you look you will see
That this world is a beautiful
Accident, turbulent, succulent
Opulent permanent, no way
I wanna taste it
Don't wanna waste it away*

This stanza changes the mood of the song into a more positive one. Here, Avril Lavigne justifies her actions, her feelings and the reason why she needs to be to the extremes to feel alive.

The stanza starts with the conditional sentence “if you look you will see”, and each part of the clause, the if-clause and the main clause, are instances of different structural metaphors. The if-clause, “if you look”, corresponds to the TRYING TO UNDERSTAND is LOOKING metaphor; and the main clause, “you will see”, corresponds to the TO UNDERSTAND/KNOW is TO SEE metaphor. Although these statements have a slight difference in meaning both refer to the cognitive and perceptual process. So the two expressions can be gathered together and be analysed under the more general metaphor COGNITION is PERCEPTION.

Andrew Goatly explains how the emergent concepts of the COGNITION gestalt cohere with the emergent concepts of the PERCEPTUAL gestalt: “the sensor, perceptual process and phenomenon become an analogy for thinker, cognitive process, and idea, or for feeling subject, affective process, and emotion” (1997:53)

The following chart shows how the categories of COGNITION are mapped onto the categories of PERCEPTION.

COGNITION is PERCEPTION

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Thinker	Senser
Cognitive process	Perceptual process
Idea/Emotion	Phenomenon

By using this conditional sentence the singer declares that we will not understand the world unless we try (to make an effort) to understand it. Then she proceeds with a description of her own vision of the world by using four different metaphors.

“this world is a beautiful

Accident, turbulent, succulent

Opulent, permanent, no way.

I wanna taste it

Don't wanna waste it away”⁶

- 1) **THE WORLD is AN EVENT:** the sentence “this world is a beautiful accident” depicts the world as an unfortunate event; however, the adjective “beautiful” modifies the whole meaning of the word “accident” making it something to experience pleasingly
- 2) **THE WORLD is a SUBSTANCE:** the word “turbulent” conceives the world as an irregular and not calm flow of fluids.
- 3) **THE WORLD is A RESOURCE:** The word “opulent” and the exclamation “don't wanna waste it away” structure the world as a rich opulent resource from which there is much to take and nothing to take for granted.
- 4) **THE WORLD is FOOD:** the word “Succulent” and the expression “I wanna taste it” structures the world as nourishing food.

⁶ In these metaphorical expressions it is important to notice the use of the “consonance” and “assonance” stylistic device in the words “accident”, “turbulent”, “succulent”, “opulent” and “permanent”. These rhetorical devices create the effect of providing emphasis to the words making them more memorable.

THE WORLD is an EVENT, a SUBSTANCE, a RESOURCE and FOOD

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
World	Event
	Substance
	Resource
	Food

The use of different metaphors such as THE WORLD is an EVENT, THE WORLD is a SUBSTANCE, THE WORLD is a RESOURCE, and THE WORLD IS FOOD, as well as the use of contradictory adjectives and expressions such as “permanent” and “turbulent”, and “beautiful accident” are used by the singer to indicate that the world has numerous options to please everybody, which she does not want to waste away. The adverb “away”, when added to some verbs, signal the continuation of the action. Therefore, the expression “Don’t wanna waste it away” is an orientational metaphor which implies not just “to waste” but “to waste continuously”

CONTINUATION is AWAY

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Continuation	Away

Concluding the analysis of this lyric, I can say that the metaphors I have analysed have demonstrated the text producer’s wish for an adventurous and exciting life away from the conventions and regularities of mainstream society. She longs to be an ordinary person who enjoys everything the world has to offer, even the weirdest things, because that is what amuses her and makes her feel alive.

1.2. My World

First Stanza

*“Please tell me what is taking place?
'Cause I cant seem to find a trace
Guess it must have got erased somehow
Probably 'cause I always forget
Every time someone tells me their name
It's always gotta be the same”*

The first stanza opens up describing one of Avril Lavigne’s personal traits: her forgetful behaviour. Her tendency to forget things (even the simplest ones such as people’s names) is manifested by the fact that she had an idea or thought that has slipped her mind. Via an ontological metaphor the singer refers to that ABSTRACTION as a CONCRETE ENTITY that “takes place”, “leaves traces” and finally “got erased”.

ABSTRACTION is a CONCRETE ENTITY

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
A thought or idea	Concrete entity

Second Stanza

*Never wore cover-up
Always beat the bois up
Grew up in a 5,000 population town
Made my money by cutting grass
Got “FIRED” by a fried chicken ASS!
All in a small town “NAPANEE”*

In the previous stanza Avril Lavigne has introduced her low level of attention. In the second stanza she speaks about the place where she grew up and what she did there. The phrasal verb “grew up” is an instance of the orientational metaphor MORE is UP. This metaphor has its basis on the fact that growing implies an increase in size, therefore when our bodies grow, they go up.

MORE is UP

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
More	Up

When Avril Lavigne concentrates on her relationship with boys she states that she “always beat the bois up”. The phrasal verb “beat up” is an orientational metaphor which configures COMPLETION as having an UPWARD ORIENTATION. The adverb “up” (like “out”), when added to some verbs, projects the meaning of “completely” or “thoroughly”.

COMPLETION is UP

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Completion	Up

The singer also deals with her place of residence and what she did to earn some money. As regards her jobs she expresses that she made her money by cutting grass until she “got ‘FIRED’ by a fried chicken ASS”. The latter linguistic expression can be divided into two parts: the action “got FIRED” and the agent “fried chicken ASS”.

The action “got FIRED” is a structural metaphor that structures the action of DISMISSING somebody in terms of FIRING somebody.

TO BE DISMISSED is TO BE FIRED

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
To be dismissed	To be fired

Although this is an old common metaphor difficulties arise when tracing its origins for at least three cultural groundings can be suggested:

- 1) It comes from the comparison of discharging a gun. The same way a bullet is discharged from a gun so is a person discharged from a job (or fired).

- 2) Long ago, in the medieval times, when people wanted to get rid of someone without killing them, they set their house on fire, burning down all their possessions inside.
- 3) The metaphor has its cultural base on the Mendip Mining Laws which date from the 17th and 18th centuries. The sixth mining item states:

That if any man of that occupation doth pick or steal any lead or ore to the value of thirteen pence half-penny, the lord or his officer may arrest all his lead works, house, and earth, with all his groofs and works, and keep them as safely to his own use; and shall take the person that hath so offended, and bring him where his house is, or his work, and all his tools or instruments which to the occupation belongs, as he useth, and put him into the said house, and set fire on all together about him, and banish him from that occupation before the miners for ever (William Phelps, 1839).

The phrase “fried chicken ASS” is another structural metaphor that equates the AGENT of the dismissal to a FRIED CHICKEN ASS. The cultural grounding of this metaphor stems from the history of Quebec. Quebec is a province in east-central Canada whose inhabitants are mostly French-speaking, being French their official language at a provincial level. Many political conflicts between France and Quebec have caused many people from Quebec to dislike people from France and vice versa. The French and the Québécois insult each other by the way they speak the French language. For instance people from France say that the Québécois speak as if their mouth is full of marbles; and people from Quebec say that the French speak as if their mouths are puckered up like the ass of a chicken. So, a typical insult towards the French is “Cul de poule!” (French) which means “Chicken ass”.

FRENCH-SPEAKING PERSON is a FRIED CHICKEN ASS

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
French-speaking person	Chicken ass

Avril Lavigne sets the context for all these experiences, and others mentioned later in the song, in the city of Napanee. The prepositional phrases “in a small town NAPANEE” and “in a 5.000 population town” are ontological metaphors in which the CONTAINER

image-schema is mapped on to the concept of a TOWN. The preposition “in” indicates containment and the noun phrases “a small town NAPANEE” and “a 5.000 population town” indicate the container. At the same time, this metaphor also entails that, given the fact that the place is structured as a container, all the singer’s ACTIVITIES and LIFE EXPERIENCES are conceptualized as contained CONCRETE ENTITIES.

PLACE is a CONTAINER / LIFE EXPERIENCES are CONCRETE ENTITIES

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Town Napanee	Container
Life experiences	Concrete entities

Third Stanza

*You know I always stay up without sleeping
And think to myself
Where do I belong forever
In whose arm the time and place*

In the third stanza Avril Lavigne focuses on her sense of belonging. And not only does she wonder about the place where she belongs to but also the time and the person (represented by the arms). By the use of a containment-based metaphor the concepts of TIME, PLACE and ARMS are deemed as CONTAINERS that hold the singer and give her a sense of belonging. The preposition “in” designate containment and the nouns “arm”, “time” and “place” specify the container.

ARMS, TIME and PLACE are CONTAINERS

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Arms	
Time	Containers
Place	

At the beginning of the stanza Avril Lavigne tells that she thinks about this issue every time she is awake. Through the expression “I always stay up without sleeping” the

singer makes two metaphors interface with one another: the orientational metaphor CONSCIOUS is UP and the ontological metaphor SLEEPING is a CONCRETE ENTITY.

CONSCIOUS is UP

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Consciousness	Being/Standing up

In this orientational metaphor vertical orientation, represented by the adjective “up”, is mapped onto a state (being awake). The physical basis for this concept is rooted in the idea that humans like other mammals lie down when they are sleeping and stand up when they are awake. Since being conscious requires wakefulness and being awake is being up we get the entailment CONSCIOUS is UP.

The other metaphorical expression referring to consciousness projects the source domain CONCRETE ENTITY onto the target domain SLEEPING. Here the use of the preposition “without” entails that if we hold this “sleeping” entity (if we are *with* it) we are asleep and unconscious and, if we do not hold it (we are *without* it) we are awake and conscious.

SLEEPING is a CONCRETE ENTITY

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Sleeping	Concrete entity

Fourth Stanza

*Cant help it if I space in a daze
My eyes tune out the other way
I may switch off and go in a daydream
In this head my thoughts are deep
Sometimes I can't even speak
Would someone be and not pretend, I'm off again in my world*

The fourth stanza is the chorus of the song. It reintroduces the topic at the end of the previous stanza providing metaphorical expressions relating to unconsciousness such as:

“I space in a daze”

“My eyes tune out the other way”

“I may switch off and go in a daydream”

“In this head my thoughts are deep”

“I’m off again in my world”

“I space in a daze” is an ontological metaphor which structures an EMOTIONAL STATE as a CONTAINER. The use of the preposition “in” indicates containment and the noun “daze” designates the container.

EMOTIONAL STATES are CONTAINERS

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Daze (a stunned or bewildered condition)	Container

This way the metaphorical expression “space in a daze” entails that if a subject feels amazed or bewildered he or she is *contained* in such emotional state.

The following sentence, “My eyes tune out the other way”, is a structural metaphor that equates PEOPLE to a MACHINE (in this case a radio receiver) as regards their functioning. Through this metaphor Avril Lavigne configures the source domain RECEIVERS on to the target domain EYES.

PEOPLE are RADIO RECEIVERS

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Eyes	Receivers

Here the image of the receiver is built by the use of the verb “tune” which means “to adjust a receiver”. In the field of electronics, a receiver is a piece of a radio that receives radio signals and turns them to perceptible forms. When a receiver is tuned in it is adjusted so as to get a maximum response to a given signal or frequency whereas when it is tuned out it is adjusted so as not to get a particular signal. The eyesight is one of the senses whereby we

percept the world. In structuring her eyes as receivers that tune out, Avril Lavigne entails that she is in an unconscious state without receiving any information at all.

“I may switch off” is another instance of the previous metaphor which configures PEOPLE in terms of a MACHINE. The configuration of the electronic schema is activated by the verb “switch on/off”; the same way a machine is working when it is “on” and it is not working when it is “off”, the singer is conscious when she is “on” and unconscious when she is “off”. In *Metaphors we live by* (1980), Lakoff and Johnson also dealt with expressions that are instances of the machine metaphor and they concluded that the “machine metaphor gives us a conception of the mind as having an on-off state, a level of efficiency, a productive capacity, an internal mechanism, a source of energy, and an operating condition.”(1980: 28).

“Go in a daydream” is an ontological metaphor, like “I space in a daze”, where a STATE is regarded as a CONTAINER. The source domain is activated by the use of the motion verb “go” and the “preposition “in” which indicate a change of location (moving inside something). The STATE of being “daydreaming” is the CONTAINER or place where Avril Lavigne goes in order to daydream.

STATES are CONTAINERS

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Daydream	Container

“In this head my thoughts are deep” is another ontological metaphor which considers the MIND as a CONTAINER. The preposition “in” indicates containment and the noun “head” represents the container whose size is emphasized by the adjective “deep”. In picturing the mind as a deep container the singer entails that in her head there is space for a lot of thoughts and ideas which, at the same time, are rendered as contained entities.

MIND is a CONTAINER / THOUGHTS are CONCRETE ENTITIES

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Mind	Container
Thoughts	Concrete entities

The next expression, “I’m off again in my world”, contains both a structural and an ontological metaphor. On the one hand, the structural metaphor is created by Avril Lavigne conceiving her MIND as a whole WORLD apart, and on the other hand that inner WORLD is structured as a CONTAINER where she goes into. This locative change into the singer’s own world is marked by the preposition “off” which acts as an indicator of displacement, and by the preposition “in” which indicates containment.

MIND is A WORLD / A WORLD is A CONTAINER

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Mind	World
World	Container

Fifth Stanza

*I never spend less than a hour
Washing my hair in the shower
It always takes 5 hours to make it strait
So I'll braid it in a Zillion braids
Though it may take a friggin' day
There's nothing else better to do anyway!*

In this stanza Avril Lavigne leaves the topic of her absent-minded habit and concentrates on what she does to spend the time. Here we learn that as “there’s nothing else better to do” the singer takes care of her hair washing it, making it straight and braiding it. The expressions “Washing my hair in the shower” and “I’ll braid it in a Zillion braids” are two ontological metaphors in which the SHOWER and the BRAIDS are deemed as CONTAINERS both introduced by the preposition “in”. The shower is the container where the hair is washed and the braids are the container where the hair goes to “acquire” its shape.

SHOWER and BRAIDS are CONTAINERS

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Shower	
	Containers
Braids	

In this stanza Avril Lavigne also informs how much time she needs to take care of her hair, as it is illustrated by the following phrases: “I never spend less than an hour washing my hair in the shower”, “It always takes 5 hours to make it strait” and “it may take a friggin’ day”.

“I never spend less than an hour washing my hair in the shower” is an instance of the structural metaphor TIME is MONEY activated by the verb “spend”.

TIME is MONEY

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Time	Money

As for the other two sentences, “It always takes 5 hours to make it strait” and “it may take a friggin’ day”, they are instances of a PERSONIFICATION. Through the use of this kind of metaphor the activity in which the time is spent becomes personified as the AGENT who actually spends the time.

PERSONIFICATION: ACTIVITY is an AGENT

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Hair washing	
	Agent
Hair straightening	

Sixth Stanza

When you're all alone in the lands of forever

Lay under the milkyway

On + on it's getting to late out

I'm not in love this time, this night

In the sixth stanza Avril Lavigne takes up again the topic of being in her own world referring to it as THE LANDS OF FOREVER. “The lands of forever” (or “foreverland”) is a term often used to refer to paradise: a place where life is timeless and joyful. As the conception of paradise is a place where time does not exist, its existence is everlasting thus becoming the land of “forever”⁷. The reason I dare say that “the lands of forever” may be a reference to her own mental world is based on the fact that when the singer “switches off” to daydream it seems that the flux of time stops: being immersed in her deep pleasant thoughts makes her not aware of the passing of time making her mind timeless.

THE MIND is THE LANDS OF FOREVER

TARGET DOMAIN

Mind

SOURCE DOMAIN

The lands of forever

At the end of the stanza Avril Lavigne makes a sudden turn of topic and speaks about love stating that she is not in love with anyone. The expression “I’m not in love” is an ontological metaphor that structures an ABSTRACTION or state in terms of a CONTAINER. The preposition “in” indicates containment and the abstract noun “love” represents the container.

ABSTRACTION is a CONTAINER

TARGET DOMAIN

Love

SOURCE DOMAIN

Container

⁷ For further information on the characterization of Paradise as a primordial space outside historical time, see Eliade (1985: 87) and Miranda (2011: 27).

Seventh Stanza

Take some time

Mellow out

Party up

But don't fall down

Don't get caught

Sneak out of the house

In the last stanza Avril Lavigne stops speaking about herself and gives a final advice as regards how to move on with our lives. She utters five imperatives sentences which correspond to four different metaphors.

“Take some time” is an ontological metaphor in which TIME is regarded as a CONCRETE ENTITY that can be handled.

ABSTRACTION is a CONCRETE ENTITY

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Time	Concrete entity

“Mellow out” is an instance of the structural metaphor MOOD is a SURFACE. This metaphor configures CALMNESS as MELLOWNESS and ANGER as HARDNESS; therefore CALM is MELLOW and ANGRY is HARD. This metaphor also interfaces with the orientational metaphor COMPLETION is OUT activated by the adverb “out”. (Similarly, in the next line, “party up”, depicts the metaphor COMPLETION is UP activated by the adverb “up”).

MOOD is A SURFACE

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Calm	Mellow
Angry	Hard

“Don’t fall down” and “Don’t get caught” are metaphorical expressions for the LIFE is a GAME metaphor. This metaphor equates LIFE to a playground GAME like the

“Tag”. In this game a player is selected to be called “it” and he has to chase the other players to touch them while they try to escape. Through this metaphor Avril Lavigne entails that the same way a player has to avoid “falling down” and “getting caught”, in our life we have to avoid falling down and getting caught by people or any situation that harms us.

LIFE is a GAME

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Life	Game

“Sneak out of the house” is an ontological metaphor that the singer uses to regard our HOUSES as CONTAINERS from where we have to leave. The preposition “out of” indicates containment and the noun “house” represents the container. The choice of the verb “to sneak out” to structure the container schema is significant here, for it implies “to leave stealthily and furtively”. By walking in this way a person does not risk being discovered and having to give explanations for his departure.

PLACE is a CONTAINER

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
House	Container

As a concluding remark, I can say that this is an autobiographical song that provides and deals with information about Avril Lavigne’s life: her origins, jobs, inner feelings, and hobbies. This lyric can also be analysed as a large-scale structural metaphor in which the SINGER’S LIFE is structured as a whole WORLD APART she goes into every time her mind goes blank. At the same time this WORLD APART is conceptualized as a CONTAINER with well-defined boundaries in which activities, emotions, dreams and hopes are contained.

1.3. Nobody’s Fool

First Stanza

*Fall back take a look @ me
And you'll see I'm for real
I'll feel what only I can feel
And if that don't appeal to ya
Let me know
And I'll go
'Cause I flow
Better when my colors show
And that's the way it has to be
Honestly
'Cause creativeity could never bloom
In my room
I'd throw it all away before I'd lie
So don't call me with a compromise
Hang up the phone
I got a backbone stronger than yours*

In the first stanza Avril Lavigne addresses directly to a specific person that I will call “addressee” due to the fact that the song does not provide enough information of his or her identity. The singer opens the song uttering two imperatives, “fall back” and “take a look @ me”, in order to express her long for attention on the addressee’s part. The imperative “fall back” is a structural metaphor which configures the act of MOVING BACK as FALLING BACK.

MOVING BACK is FALLING BACK

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Moving back	Falling back

The use of the adverb “back” brings about the front-back image schema to express the position of the addressee with respect to the addresser. In a way Avril Lavigne thinks that if her addressee is some steps back he or she will have a wider angle to take a look at her.

The next imperative “Take a look @ me” is an ontological metaphor in which an ABSTRACTION (look) is structured as a CONCRETE ENTITY capable of being manipulated as expressed by the verb “take”.

ABSTRACTION is a CONCRETE ENTITY

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Look	Concrete entity

After appealing for attention, Avril Lavigne states that once her addressee has moved back and taken a look at her he or she will realize that she is real. And then she threatens to go away if her interlocutor does not like her attitude stating “I flow better when my colors show”. In this sentence two more metaphorical expressions are introduced: “I flow” and “when my colors show”.

The first phrase “I flow” entails an ontological metaphor in which a PERSON is deemed as a LIQUID SUBSTANCE that flows.

PEOPLE are SUBSTANCES

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
People	Substances

It is important to notice that this metaphorical expression brings about other metaphors such as LIVING is FLOWING and THE WORLD is a CONTAINER. This is due to the fact that a substance often flows in a container and if we are a substance flowing in a container then, the world in which we are living in (or flowing) would be the container through where we flow. Although the word “flow” involves moving steadily and continuously, this is not always so; for sometimes there are impediments that hamper the good flowing. The same way a fluid comes across obstacles that can stop its steady and continuous flowing so do our lives: we can come across hindrances and stumbling blocks that halt our good living, or in metaphorical terms our good “flowing”. Here when Avril

Lavigne longs for a good flowing means that, in fact, she yearns for a way of living in which she can be herself. This be-yourself conception is conveyed by the next metaphorical expression “when my colors show”.

As I stated in the previous paragraph “when my colors show” is a metaphorical expression that makes reference to the singer’s personality. Via this structural metaphor PERSONALITY TRAITS are configured as a palette with a wide range of COLOURS.

PERSONALITY TRAITS are COLOURS

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Personality traits	Colours

This metaphor has a nautical cultural grounding being “the colors” a term used to describe the flag in a ship that indicates its nationality. In the past, ships used to take flags from different nations so as to deceive the enemy. For example pirates, quite often, used to sail with a false flag in order to attract their victims. When their enemies were too close to escape, pirates hoisted their true flag, their “true colours”, in order to unveil who they really were.

After speaking about her personality Avril Lavigne concentrates on her creative spirit declaring “creativity could never bloom in my room”. This sentence is a metaphorical expression in which CREATIVITY is regarded as a PLANT.

CREATIVITY is a PLANT

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Creativity	Plant

The verb “bloom” makes the metaphor highlight the growing process of a plant. The same way certain plants need to be in a specific environment and container to grow and bloom (some of them have to be in the inside, outside, etc.), the singer’s creativity also needs to be in a certain context where it can develop: in this case outside her room. The

preposition “in” creates a metaphor whereby the singer’s ROOM is regarded as a CONTAINER or “pot” not suitable for her creativity to bloom.

PLACE is a CONTAINER

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Room	Container

The following line, “I’d throw it all away before I lie”, reinforces once again the idea of “showing the true colours”. Here Avril Lavigne declares that before lying and not showing herself just the way she is, she would get rid of everything she possesses and that is important to her. Through this linguistic expression the singer configures the act of GETTING RID as THROWING AWAY.

TO GET RID is TO THROW AWAY

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
To get rid	To throw away

This structural metaphor entails other metaphors and image schemas. On the one hand, if, among all the possessions the singer would get rid of, we include ABSTRACT CONCEPTS (such as personal relationships, likes and dislikes, etc.) they all would be structured as CONCRETE ENTITIES capable of being manipulated and therefore thrown away. On the other hand, the adverb “away”, attached to the verb “throw”, brings about the centre-periphery schema which entails that what is IMPORTANT is CENTRAL and what is UNIMPORTANT is PERIPHERAL or “away”.

At the end of the stanza, Avril Lavigne rules out any possibility of making a compromise with her interlocutor ordering him or her not to call her with a compromise. The linguistic expression “don’t call me with a compromise” is an ontological metaphor in which an ABSTRACTION is configured as a CONCRETE ENTITY that can be possessed. The preposition “with” indicates possession and the noun “compromise” signals the concrete object.

ABSTRACTION is a CONCRETE ENTITY

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Compromise	Concrete entity

Avril Lavigne also declares assertively “I got a backbone stronger than yours”. Here she compares herself with her addressee in terms of strength via an ontological metaphor in which once again an ABSTRACTION is configured as a CONCRETE ENTITY.

ABSTRACTION is a CONCRETE ENTITY

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Strength	Concrete entity

This “backbone” metaphor is used to describe strength: for in all vertebrate animals the backbone is what sustains them and gives them strength otherwise their bodies fall down. Its use is very common and can be found in phrases like “we are the backbone of the country”, “libraries are the backbone of civilized societies”, etc.

To sum up, in the stanza I have just analysed, Avril Lavigne has dealt with the significance of her personality, creative spirit and inner strength and how important is for her to be true to herself and to show herself just the way she is.

Second Stanza

*If you trying to turn me into someone else
Its easy to see I'm not down with that
I'm not nobodyies fool
If you trying to turn into something else
I've seen it enough and I'm over that
I'm not nobody's fool
If you wanna bring me down
Go ahead and try
Go ahead and try*

The second stanza is the chorus of the song. The whole chorus has a parallel structure that consists of three conditional sentences. The if-clause of the first and the second conditional sentences are metaphorical expressions about changing: “if you trying

to turn me into someone else” and “if you trying to turn me into something else”. Both phrases are structural metaphors in which Avril Lavigne considers CHANGING as TURNING.

CHANGING is TURNING

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Changing	Turning

One of the many origins of the word “turn” comes from the Latin expression “tornare” “turn on a lathe”. The expression to turn (something) into (something else) has the original sense of “to shape on a lathe”. If you turn something into something else you are changing its form. Thus, the singer backs up the idea of not being willing to change and act like another person or even worse like an inanimate “thing”.

The main clauses of the first and second conditional sentences state that if the addressee pretends to change Avril Lavigne into someone or something, she is “not down with that” and “over that”. The phrase “I’m not down with that” is an orientational metaphor in which DISAPPROVAL is oriented DONWARDS by the use of the preposition “down”.

DISAPPROVAL is DOWN

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Disapproval	Down

This metaphor is also grounded in the interaction with our bodies. The origin of the gesture is uncertain but different theories have been proposed. One the theories states that it comes from the gladiatorial combats in the ancient Rome. After a gladiator fought on the arena he stared at the crowd who were in charge of passing judgment on his performance. If they approve him they put their thumbs up and his life was spared but if they do not they put their thumbs down and the gladiator was killed. His fate depended on the crowd.

The linguistic expressions “I’m over that” and “if you wanna bring me down go ahead and try” are instances of the orientational metaphor HAVING CONTROL is UP (activated by the adverb “over”) and NOT HAVING CONTROL is DOWN (activated by the verb “bring” and the adverb “down”).

HAVING CONTROL is UP / NOT HAVING CONTROL is DOWN

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Having control or force	Up
Not having control or force	Down

Lakoff and Johnson (1980:15) explained that “physical size typically correlates with physical strength, and the victor in a fight is always on top”. In this way Avril Lavigne declares that she is strong enough to be in control of the situation and will not let anyone bring her down.

Third Stanza

*Don't know
You think you know me like yourself
But I fear
That you're only telling me what I want to hear
Do you give a damn
Understand
That I can't not be what I am
I'm not the milk and cheerios in your spoon
Its not a simple here we go not so soon
I might of fallen for that when I was 14
And a little more green
But its amazing what a couple of yrs can mean*

In this stanza Avril Lavigne complains about her addressee’s lack of interest in her feelings stating “you think you know me like yourself but I fear that you’re only telling me what I want to hear”. She knows that her feelings are not important for the addressee as it is expressed in the phrase “Do you give a damn”. This expression is an instance of the structural metaphor IMPORTANT is EXPENSIVE and UNIMPORTANT is CHEAP which is activated by the word “damn”.

IMPORTANT is EXPENSIVE / UNIMPORTANT is CHEAP

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Important	Expensive
Unimportant	Cheap

In his book *Watch your language!: mother tongue and her wayward children* (1994), Robert M. Gorrel informs that a dam was a small Indian copper coin and states that the phrases “I don’t care a dam” or “I don’t give a dam” reflect the worthlessness of the coin. However, Gorrel explains that the expressions “don’t care a curse” and “not worth a curse” were also common in the language by the 15th century; so it was logical that the word “*damn*”, as a specific curse, should be present in such phrases. The heterographic homophony⁸ produced in the words “dam” and “damn” makes possible to use damn instead of dam as something that is worthless while, at the same time, adding the emotive force of an expletive.

Avril Lavigne asserts again her unwillingness to change and states “I can’t not be what I am” and “I’m not the milk and cheerios in your spoon”. The last expression is a structural metaphor in which the source domain FOOD is mapped on to the target domain PEOPLE. By using this metaphor the singer declares once again her reluctance to suffer any kind of transformation like the milk and cheerios do when they are eaten: they are bitten, transformed into an alimentary bolus and finally swallowed.

PEOPLE are FOOD

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Avril Lavigne	Milk and cheerios

⁸ For further information about this concept refer to chapter 3 of this thesis.

After asserting her opposition to change, Avril Lavigne states that she “might of fallen for that when I was 14 and a little more green”. The expression “I might of fallen for that” is a structural metaphor that regards BE ATTRACTED (by somebody or something) as FALL (for somebody or something).

BE ATTRACTED BY STH/SB is FALL FOR STH/SB

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Be attracted by sth/sb	Fall for sth/sb

“A little more green” is another structural metaphor that structures PEOPLE as FOOD, in this case fruits. This metaphor highlights the growing process of a fruit. When a fruit is green and does not acquire its colour yet it means that it is not ripe. In using this metaphor the singer expresses that now she is mature she will not let herself be deceived as it could have occurred at another stage in her life.

PEOPLE are FOOD

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Avril Lavigne	Food

Fourth Stanza

*Go ahead and try
Try to look me in the eye
But you'll never see inside
Until you realize, realize
Things are trying to settle down
Just trying to figure out
Exactly what I'm about
If it's with or without you
I don't need your doubt in me*

In the last stanza Avril Lavigne takes up the topic of the first stanza defying her addressee to look at her to see how she really is. The expression “try to look me in the eye but you’ll never see inside” is a structural metaphor that deems the EYES as

CONTAINERS for her emotions and personality traits. The container schema is activated by the preposition “in” signalling containment and the noun “eye” indicating the container.

EYES are CONTAINERS

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Eyes	Containers

The phrase “things are trying to settle down” is another ontological metaphor which structures Avril Lavigne’s personality as a CONCRETE ENTITY. The noun “things” stands for the singer’s independent and self-confident personality and the phrasal verb “settle down” configures those personality traits as a concrete entity that has established firmly.

ABSTRACTION is a CONCRETE ENTITY

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Avril Lavigne’s personality	Concrete entity

Finally, at the end of the stanza, Avril Lavigne declares that she can go on in life with or without the addressee and his/her acceptance of what she thinks and does. The expression “I don’t need your doubt in me” is an ontological metaphor that structures the BODY as a CONTAINER. The preposition “in” indicates containment and the noun “body” signals the container. Via this metaphorical expression the body is not only the container for the singer’s emotions and essence, but also the container for the feelings the addressee has towards her.

BODY is a CONTAINER

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Body	Container

The lines of this song are as autobiographical as those of “My world”. Here Avril Lavigne keeps unveiling her personality traits depicting herself as a self-assertive, strong girl who hangs tough and who will not let herself be picked on by anyone who dares change her attitude and vision of the world.

1.4. Sk8er Boi

This is a narrative song that chronicles a love story, and its subsequent break-up, between a boy and a girl who belong to two different social groups.

First, Second and Third Stanza

*He was a boi, she was a girl
Can I make it anymore obvious?*

*He was a punk, she did ballet
What more can I say?*

*He wanted her, she'd never tell
Secretly she wanted him as well.*

In these stanzas Avril Lavigne introduces the characters of the story and gives some background information on their lives: he was a punk boy and she was a ballet girl. After this description the singer pronounces the rhetorical question “can I make it anymore obvious?” This question is a structural metaphor that configures a MENTAL PROCESS as a MATERIAL PROCESS.

MENTAL PROCESSES are MATERIAL PROCESSES

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Mental processes	Material Processes

Andrew Goatly (1997) explains that “in order to describe our mental activities we have to make raids on the verbs used for material process”. Thus, material processes verbs (verbs expressing doings and happenings) like “make” are used as source domains for verbal processes verbs (verbs of saying).

Fourth Stanza

All of her friends stuck up their nose

They had a problem with his baggy clothes.

The fourth stanza accounts that one of the problems that triggered off the couple break-up was the negative attitude the girl’s friends had towards her boyfriend as it is expressed in the sentences “all of her friends stuck up their nose. They had a problem with his baggy clothes”

The expression “All of her friends stuck up their nose” is an orientational metaphor in which VERTICAL ORIENTATION is mapped onto the concept of IMPORTANCE.

IMPORTANCE is UP

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Importance	Up

This metaphor has its basis on the fact that those who are in a high social status are considered to be more important to those who are in a lower social scale. People who are in a high social scale often use different disdainful gestures towards those who are in a lower position. Aristocrats, for example, expressed their disdain through nasal position: they literally “stuck up their noses” in front of other citizens who were below them in the social scale to show that they were not worth paying attention.

Avril Lavigne also details that the girl’s stuck-up friends “had a problem with his [the skater’s] baggy clothes”. This sentence is an ontological metaphor that regards an ABSTRACTION as a CONCRETE ENTITY that can be possessed. The verb “had” indicates possession and the noun “problem” signals the concrete object.

ABSTRACTION is a CONCRETE ENTITY

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Problem	Concrete entity

It is important to notice Avril Lavigne’s use of the metonymy in the words “baggy clothes”. “Baggy clothes” stands for the punk culture; a culture where its members are characterized by wearing that kind of outfit. Hence, the singer shows that the stuck-up friends not only had a problem with the girl’s boyfriend but also with the subculture he belongs to; namely the punk culture.

Fifth Stanza

He was a sk8er boi, she said see you later boi

He wasnt good enough for her

She had a pretty face, but her head was up in space

She needed to come back down to “earth”

The fifth stanza is the first chorus of the song and it introduces the final break-up between the skater boy and the girl. As regards this issue Avril Lavigne explains that the skater boy “was not good enough for her”. This linguistic expression is an ontological metaphor that considers GOODNESS as a SUBSTANCE that can be measured as it is expressed by the adverb “enough”.

ABSTRACTION is a SUBSTANCE

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Goodness	Substance

By using this metaphor the narrator implies that the boy did not have an enough level of “goodness” (probably with reference to social position, fashion, etc.) to satisfy what the girl deserves.

Avril Lavigne now explains that although the girl had a pretty face “her head was up in space” and that “she needed to come back down to earth”. Both expressions “to be up in space” and “to come back down to earth” are orientational metaphors that structure the concept of REAL and UNREAL in terms of VERTICAL ORIENTATION. The preposition “up” indicates upward orientation, and the phrasal verb “come back” along with the preposition “down” signal downward orientation. It is also important to notice how this

orientational metaphor interface with the ontological metaphor which regards SPACE as a CONTAINER for what is “unreal” and EARTH as a CONTAINER for what is “real”.

UNREAL is UP / MUNDANE REALITY is DOWN

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Unreal	Up
Mundane reality	Down

SPACE and EARTH are CONTAINERS

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Space and earth	Containers

Both the orientational and the ontological metaphors are based on the fact that the closer we are to an object the more likely we are to prove its reality whether by smelling, seeing or touching it. Conversely, if we are far away from an object we have fewer probabilities to experience with it and check its reality. So given the fact that the girl’s head is “up in space” and her attitude is quite shallow she cannot see the real essence hiding underneath her boyfriend’s clothes.

Sixth and Seventh Stanza

5 years from now, she sits at home

Feeding the baby

She's all alone

She turns on tv

Guess who she sees

Sk8er boy rockin' up MTV.

These stanzas mark a break in time. It has been five years since the boy and the girl have broken up and their lives have changed completely: the girl has become a mother who is now all alone feeding her baby and the skater boy has become a superstar who appears on MTV channel. Through the use of an ontological metaphor the girl’s HOME and the

MTV CHANNEL are regarded as CONTAINERS which represent the different walks of life each character has chosen. The girl is a single mother taking care of her baby and the boy is a musician who is rocking up MTV. The phrasal verb “rock up” brings about the metaphor COMPLETION is UP which entails that the boy is not just rocking the MTV, but rocking it completely.

PLACES are CONTAINERS

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Home and the MTV channel	Containers

Eighth and Ninth Stanza

*She calls up her friends, they already know
And they've all got tickets to see his show*

*She tags along stands in the crowd
Looks up at the man that she turned down.*

In this stanza we can see that after the girl watched her ex-boyfriend on the MTV, she called up her friends to go with her to see his show. Once they arrived they stayed in the crowd and the girl looked up at the man that she had turned down.

Via an ontological metaphor Avril Lavigne considers the CROWD as a CONTAINER where all the people who go to see the concert are contained. The preposition “in” indicates containment and the noun “crowd” represents the container.

CROWD is a CONTAINER

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Crowd	Container

The linguistic expression “She looks up at the man that she turned down” is an orientational metaphor that configures DISAPPROVAL as DOWN, and APPROVAL as

UP. The groundings for this type of metaphor have already been explained in the second stanza of the song “Nobody’s Fool”.

DISAPPROVAL is DOWN / APPROVAL is UP

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Disapproval	Down
Approval	Up

Tenth Stanza

*He was a sk8er boi, she said see you later boi
He wasn't good enough for her
Now he's a super star
Slamin' on his guitar
Does your pretty face see what he's worth?*

This stanza is the second chorus of the song. The first two lines are the same as in the fifth stanza and the other lines inform that, after the break-up, the boy has become “a super star”. This linguistic expression is a structural metaphor that equates a FAMOUS PERSON to a STAR.

A FAMOUS PERSON is A STAR

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
A famous person	Star

The cultural basis for this stellar metaphor is uncertain, but some people agree that it stems from the English cricketer and writer John Nyren who in his book *The cricketers of my time* (1833) referred to the cricketer John Small in this way: “the name of John Small, the elder, shines among them (the contemporary players) in all the luster of a star of the first magnitude”.

Eleventh and Twelfth Stanza

Sorry girl but you missed out

Well tough luck that boi's mine now

We are more than just good friends

This is how the story ends

This stanza marks another turning point in the story for it introduces Avril Lavigne as a character in the story she is narrating. The lines “sorry girl but you missed out” and “well tough luck that boi's mine now” shows that after the girl and the boy broke up the singer and the boy began dating.

The line “sorry girl but you missed out” is a structural metaphor that structures LOVE as a COMPETITION⁹.

LOVE is a COMPETITION

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Love	Competition

This metaphor entails that love is a competition where the girl and Avril Lavigne are competing for the boy's love. In this game of love the boy's ex-girlfriend was unlucky and “missed out” whereas the singer won the boy's love and now they are “more than just good friends”.

Thirteenth and Fourteenth Stanza

Too bad that you couldn't see

See that man that boi could be

There is more than meets the eye

I see the soul that is inside

⁹ For further information on the conceptualization of love as a competition or fight, remit to Popadicht 2004, and Miranda, Ariztimuño and Rodríguez 2009.

In the thirteenth stanza Avril Lavigne repeats once again that the girl did not see “that man that boi could be”; and in the fourteenth stanza she tells the moral of the story “there is more than meets the eye. I see the soul that is inside”. This linguistic expression is an instance of the metaphor BODY is a CONTAINER (like the phrase I have analysed in the fourth stanza of the song “Nobody’s Fool” “try to look me in the eye but you’ll never see inside”). Here Avril Lavigne reiterates that what is important is not what the person is like externally, but his or her emotions, skills, capacity which are conceived to be inside the body.

BODY is a CONTAINER

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Body	Container

Fifteenth and Sixteenth Stanza

*He's just a boi, and I'm just a girl
Can I make it anymore obvious?*

*We are in love, haven't you heard
How we rock eachothers world*

The beginning of the fifteenth stanza, “he’s just a boi, and I’m just a girl” is similar to the first stanza except that the boy is now dating the narrator of the story and not the ballet girl.

In the sixteenth stanza Avril Lavigne says that she and the boy are “in love” and they “rock each other’s world”. The metaphorical expression “to be in love” was already analysed in the song “My world”. As regards the phrase “we rock each other’s world”, it is a structural metaphor that equates EMOTIONS to NATURAL FORCES.

EMOTIONS are NATURAL FORCES

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Love	Natural force

Through this structural metaphor emotions such as love are configured as natural forces (such as earthquake, storm, etc.) that change the lives of the boy and the girl which are conceptualized as a WORLD as in the song “My world”.

Seventeenth Stanza

*I'm with the sk8er boi, I said see you later boi
I'll be back stage after the show
I'll be at out studio
Singing the song we wrote
About the girl you used to know*

This stanza is the third chorus of the song and marks the end of the narrative song. Avril Lavigne tells her boyfriend that she will be at out the studio singing the song they wrote about his ex-girlfriend. The expression “out studio” is an ontological metaphor which structures the STUDIO as a CONTAINER. The preposition “out” signals containment and the noun “studio” represent the container.

PLACE is a CONTAINER

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Studio	Container

Unlike the previous songs I have dealt with “Sk8ter boi” is a narrative text. Although Avril Lavigne is the narrator of the story and she introduces herself into the love triangle there is not much evidence as to state that the story is real. However, her descriptions of the ballet girl and her getting along with the skater boy have revealed her affinity with the punk culture at least in terms of music and clothing.

2. Metaphorization and Identity

As stated earlier in chapter 1, the mappings of conceptual metaphors are motivated by human experience and cultural identity, which vary from individual to individual. Although the purpose of this thesis is to study the process of metaphorization in Avril Lavigne’s songs in order to understand how she conceives the world, I would also like to

complete the study providing some information about her social background in an attempt to elaborate on the motivations that could have led her to choose such metaphorical expressions.

Knowing that these songs are autobiographical, the first attempt that anyone would make is to equate the identity of the speaker voice to the extratextual referent: the author (Avril Lavigne). However, although this inference may seem rather obvious it is not always the case. Laura Scarano (2000) stated that “there is theoretical coincidence in which the “I” in the poem cannot be understood as representing the author” (my translation). Susana Reiz (1985), for her part, expressed the same idea when she declared “it is not a real self that is expressed but a fictional self” (my translation).

Philippe Lejeune (1994) tackled this problem and proposed to make a “verification” to check the likeness between the poetic voice and the person who is speaking through it. If we assume Lejeune’s verification process as a valid route to understand Avril Lavigne’s motivations it could be said that her life and background may correlate with the life and vision of the world of the speaker’s voice in the songs. Thus, throughout the analysis of the metaphors present in the songs, I assumed Avril Lavigne as the poetic voice that projects its own conceptualization of reality.

In this way, when the author expresses herself, she not only gives autobiographical references but also voices the culture in which her language is embedded. So, now the question to deal with is whether the author’s conceptual and cultural schemata are actually projected in the songs and how. In *What is an author* (1969: 58), Foucault answers this question declaring that the term author “does not refer purely and simply to a real individual, since it can give rise simultaneously to several selves, to several subjects positions that can be occupied by different individuals”. Knowing that Avril Lavigne was a skater girl whose music has been partly influenced by the punk culture, I can say that at least three voices are represented in the metaphors I have analysed: the voice of the author, the voice of women and the voice of punk culture; each one giving insights about its background and cultural identity.

2.1. Avril Lavigne’s Private Sphere

The song that provides us with enough information about the author’s private sphere is “My World”. In the narrative line, the singer gives us a brief review of what her early life has been like: where she comes from, her jobs and some personality traits. We learn that the place where she has lived is a “five-thousand population town” “called Napanee”. Although she was born in Boneville, Canada she moved to Napanee when she was five years old; so this town is the place where she resided most of her life and is presented as the container where all her main experiences are set: her jobs, her thoughts and love stories.

In “My world” the metaphorical expressions “I space in a daze”, “My eyes tune out the other way”, “I may switch off” and “I’m off” are all metaphors about daydreaming. This trait is quite recurring in Lavigne’s songs and not only does she speak about it in her writings but also in interviews with the press. In an exclusive interview that she gave to Jane Pauley for the NBC News, she stated: “I’ve known all my life that this is what I was supposed to do [...] thinking all the time what it would be like to have so many people around. Visualizing like what it would be like to be famous with my music. And always just daydreaming, always daydreaming”¹⁰.

Another trait that is exposed in the songs is her taste for danger and adventure brimming with adrenaline. This characteristic reveals itself in many of the metaphorical expressions from the song “Anything but Ordinary” such as “feel the danger” and “I want to know that I have been to the extreme”.

When it comes to love, the focus is on people’s feelings rather than their physical appearance. The author deals with this issue in the song “Sk8er boi” where she disapproves the girl’s attitude of rejecting her boyfriend because of his punk style. The idea transmitted in the song is well summarized in the fourteenth stanza by the proverb “There is more than meets the eye. I see the soul that is inside.”

I have mentioned some examples of how the process of metaphorization can leave traces of the private sphere: the origins, the past experiences and the thoughts. However, for a more comprehensive conclusion, it would be necessary to further examine how different

¹⁰ Pauley, Jane (9 December 2003). “All about Avril Lavigne”. MSN. Retrieved 22 September 2011

voices (others than the author’s), such as the voice of the punk culture and feminism, emerge through the metaphors in the song.

2.2. Avril Lavigne’s “Do-it-Yourself” Ethos of Punk Culture.

As I stated in the Introduction, Avril Lavigne’s musical styles have varied with each album she has released. Among her musical genres are distinguished pop-punk, pop-rock, alternative rock and post-grunge. In her debut album *Let Go* (2002), Lavigne identifies herself with the skater punk musical style or to be more specific, with the pop punk style which is a variant of the skater punk that sets aside the political ideas of the punk rock to talk about topics related to adolescence, in a more melodic rhythm. However, no matter which musical category we place Avril Lavigne in part of the punk influence is always present.

Punk is a musical genre that emerged between 1974 and 1976 in United States, the United Kingdom and Australia. Matt James Mason declared that “Punk was an angry outburst, a reaction to mass culture, but it offered new ideas about how mass culture could be replaced with a more personalized, less centralized worldview” (2008: 12). This punk more personalized and less centralized worldview is summarized in the “Do it Yourself” (DIY) ideology.

According to Pam Nilan and Carles Feixa (2006), the concept DIY refers to self-management and members of the punk culture refer to it as “attitude”, “ethos”, “culture” and “philosophy”. Following Irena Guidikova (2001), the DIY ethic is “creating your own alternative”, “being in charge of your own life”, “independence”, and “realizing your own (creative) possibilities”. So, that DIY ethics emerged as a response to the belief that for musical creation to be successful money, education and influence were needed. Guidikova told that when the music industry lost its interest in punk in 1980, the punk bands did not have other choice than being in charge of their own records. “The idea that you don’t need some entity from outside of the (punk) world to put out your record and that you can do it yourself, or with the help of friends from within the hardcore scene is a common idea within punk culture” (2001:68). Thus, we notice that the DIY ethics was born out of necessity.

In the metaphors I have analysed in this chapter there are many instances of this punk vision of the world. For example, in the song “Nobody’s fool”, I demonstrated how the linguistic expressions “to walk within the lines would make my life so boring. I want to know that I have been to the extreme” were a call for social deviation. “The lines” represented the social norms (or “common sense” as it was later expressed in the song) that every member of a society should follow, and “the extremes” represented individual thinking or cosmology. This withdrawal from the conventions of the mainstream society towards a more independent life is also reinforced by the imperatives “don’t get caught” and “don’t fall down” in the last stanza of “My world”.

The punk idea of creating your own possibilities and being creative are also exemplified in the lyrics of “Nobody’s fool” by the phrases “I flow better when my colors show” and “creativity could never bloom in my room”. As I have examined earlier in this chapter these expressions state the importance of showing our own personality above all things as well as letting our creativity bloom like a plant no matter where we have to go to look for inspiration.

Thus, through the analysis of the cultural background of the metaphors, we can see that in the lyrics I have explored the voice of the singer is not the only one that is speaking, but also the voice and the ideals of a musical style. In the following section, I will refer to the relation between this punk culture and the emergence of a new, alternative femininity, a trend to which Avril Lavigne seems to adhere.

2.3. Avril Lavigne’s Voice of the New Alternative Femininity

Among the cultural and conceptual schemata, the voice of gender and sexual identity also stands out. The feminist movement of the 60’s and 70’s proposed the existence of a unique model of womanhood in which woman sexuality is manifested in an affectionate and romantic way. This model of womanhood also involves women’s nature and interpersonal relationships due to their capacity of motherhood. However, during the 90’s a new wave of feminism arose which acknowledged the existence of different types of women or a different way of feminism called “alternative femininities” or “post feminism”. This new wave of feminism rejected what the Australian sociologist Raewyn Connell

(1987) called “Emphasized Femininity”, a form of femininity based on women’s subordination to men.

McRobbie (1993) also argued that in recent decades there has been a change in the concept of femininity. Sheila Whiteley (2000) also expanded on this issue and stated that the concept of “post” (postmodernism, post feminism) implies a process of change and, for feminists, this is characterized by a conceptual shift from “equality” to “difference”, “otherness” and “plurality” where gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, age and class, are all recognized as relevant in the formation of social identity. Therefore, the “ideology of romance”, whereby, young women interpret their sexuality in romantic terms and values such as commitment, loyalty or sacrifice, no longer has the same importance as in earlier times. This is because women have developed an intimate conviction that impels them to put more attention on themselves and less attention on men, and also impels them to give men a different focus that is not strictly romantic.

During the last decades of the 20th century, new subcultures have explored these “alternative femininities” which do not follow the traditional models of womanhood. One example is the punk subculture (which, I said, influenced Avril Lavigne and her music).

In the songs I have analysed there are several metaphors showing Avril Lavigne’s resistance to this “Emphasized Femininity”. Expressions such as “I got a backbone stronger than yours”, “I’m not the milk and cheerios in your spoon”, “always beat the boys up” and the defiant phrase “if you wanna bring me down go ahead and try” show a woman with determination and a self-assertive spirit who is far from being dominated by a male figure.

This reaction against emphasized femininity is also supported by Avril Lavigne tomboyish image. A tomboy is a girl that behaves like a boy: she uses clothes typically worn by boys and engages in activities belonging to the boys’ sphere. As regards clothing, the typical outfit is baggy clothes, skater shoes, and accessories such as wristbands and ties. In the song “My World” Avril Lavigne makes reference to her *sagging* (wearing your trousers lower than the waistline to show your underwear) way of dressing and declares “never wore cover-up”. A cover up is a shirt much bigger than one’s size to cover our underwear when we are sagging our trousers.

Not only did Avril Lavigne get inside the boy’s sphere with her appearance but also with her engaging in skateboarding, an activity where “most skaters are young teenage boys

who think they are kings and world sits below them” (Pomerantz *et al* 2004: 550). This activity which often involves being physically injured is said to belong to the men’s sphere due to the fact that men are considered to have more strength and power.

However, although women had found a place to express their new vision of femininity within the subculture they adopted, they had to struggle to fight for a place within the subculture itself which was male-dominated. As we can notice, new alternative femininities have emerged, but they are built in a male-dominated context in which women are subordinate to men. Samantha Holland (2006) explained that even within the subculture women have peripheral roles, being marginalized, invisible or semi-visible: in this way women are contained within the subculture but they do not shape the subculture. Mc Robbie and Garber (1994) gave a similar opinion on the subject stating that in male-dominated subcultures girls are like “backdrop characters” with no status or legitimation at all.

In this way, in analysing Avril Lavigne’s use of metaphors in her songs in relation to her personal identity, we can notice how the metaphorization processes have served as a strategy to express some information about her private sphere, her belonging to the punk sub-culture and her feelings about being a woman in that subculture, where women are “contained” but not allowed to participate in the shaping of their subjectivity. Thus, women not only have to contend with the dominant culture but they also need to resist the male-oriented structures of the subculture in which they participate. It is important to note that these are only preliminary conclusions that I have observed in my analysis. It is necessary an in-depth study from a critical discourse perspective to shed some light on the issue of subjectivity and discourse. It is not my intention to analyse or draw conclusive remarks from such point of view in this thesis.

Chapter 3: Spelling Domain

1. Introduction

The analysis I carried out in the previous chapter was concerned with the lexical domain, more precisely I have focused on how one concept in the songs is understood in terms of another concept. I also referred to the cultural background of these metaphorical expressions their relation to the punk culture and the new alternative femininity, a movement of which Avril Lavigne’s is a representative voice. In the present chapter, I will make a shift from content to form, and I will concentrate on how form affects the content of a word, phrase or sentence in order to convey metaphorical meaning. As I stated in chapter 1, in this investigation the term *form* refers to the grammatical structure of the language, that is to say, the set of rules that govern the configuration of sentences, phrases and words. In this chapter I will revise some theory as regards how different choices of form convey metaphorical meaning; and I intend to demonstrate how the divergence from the conventional graphological representation of the words can be used as source domains to create new metaphorical meanings and representations. I will first discuss the notions of alphabetic writing and non-alphabetic writings and its relation with the iconic representation in writing as a representational form. I will then refer to the spelling variation metaphor and its relation to the English language writing systems. In this respect, I will just centre on the English spelling system and its rules governing the ordering of graphemes and their relationship to one another. The reason I will analyse this issue is due to the fact that there is a notable spelling variation in many of the words that compose the songs under analysis. Although these variations are not present in every word, the degree of occurrence is quite significant so as to catch the reader’s attention. Some examples of this phenomenon are the use of “@”, “yrs”, and “of” in representation of “at”, “years” and the weak form of “have” respectively.

2. The Alphabet Vs. Non-Alphabetic Writing Systems

Twentieth-century linguistics, influenced by structuralist thinking, treats speech as the primary and main phenomenon of language. Written language, on the other hand, is

assigned a secondary status as a mere way of recording speech by visible symbols (cf. Bloomfield 1933). This concept of the primacy of speech is closely related to the dominant writing system of major European languages, the alphabet. It is assumed that ideally there should be a one-to-one correspondence between alphabetic symbols and the sounds they represent. Although no existing alphabetic systems have yet ‘achieved’ this ‘ideal’ level, it is precisely in this tradition that modern linguistics has developed.

2.1. Non-Alphabetic Writing Systems and Iconicity

In the Western tradition it has been widely believed that the history of writing has progressed from pictograms to ideograms, ideograms to logographs, logographs to phonographs, phonographs to the alphabet. This European ethnocentric view of writing systems eventually degrades non-alphabetic writing systems, particularly non-phonographic systems, as being primitive (Harris 1986).

One cannot say that non-alphabetic writing systems are less advanced than the alphabetic system; but it is often in this context that iconicity is discussed in relation to writing systems, as a way to define the representation of pictographic and ideographic systems (Yule 1985: 162, Finegan 1994: 7–8, 480).² In the pictographic system, the pictograms are mimetic to the objects they denote. Hence, pictographic signs for human beings, body parts, animals and everyday objects in the early Minoan period in Crete (cf. Driinger 1968), for example, resembled actual physical images of human beings, body parts, animals and other objects. Ideograms, on the other hand, refer directly to notions.

A modern adaptation of pictographic and ideographic systems abounds in road signs, industrial design, and in electronic communications. For example, the telephone receiver sign resembles the actual object of a telephone receiver to be put vertically; and hence, it signifies where the telephone set is located by way of metonymy. Likewise, the sign of a lit cigarette is mimetic to an actual image of a lit cigarette, and it stands for an area in which smoking is allowed. Pictograms are highly abstract, conventional, context-dependent and culture-specific. But they are all iconic to the objects they depict.

In the same way, over the past decade, electronic communication has spread out rapidly into the daily life of many people new icons (*smileys* or emoticons) that could be understood as an illustration of modern ideograms mainly used in Internet and e-mail

communications. Hundreds of smileys have been invented and are widely used in order to convey positive and negative feelings: the colon represents the eyes, the dash the nose, and the right or the left parenthesis the mouth, as shown in the following diagram:

: ' - (Crying
: -)	Happy
: - *	Kiss
: - (Sad
: - V	Shouting
, -)	Winking happy

Modern ideograms¹¹

Considering the fact that modern cultures use pictograms and ideograms extensively in linguistic and non-linguistic communication, we should regard pictograms and ideograms as iconic signs for communication in graphic space. In the next section I will try to show how metaphor and iconicity are related to the issue of written language in the context of visual graphic communication.

2.2 Written Language in the Context of Communication in Graphic Space

This section considers the status of written language as a broader linguistic issue for the purpose of providing an extended definition of written language in the context of communication in graphic space. My intention is to extend the definition of written language to include various different uses of written signs for communication in graphic space and to show how metaphor and iconicity are related in the context of visual graphic communication.

For the purpose of my analysis, I will first assume that written and spoken language are two separate systems that coexist independently of each other, but related in form and

¹¹ James and Jansen 1995-2000. Captured from <http://www.netlingo.com/smily.cfm>.

meaning. I will not consider the Saussurean's perspective of the primacy of speech doctrine, which inevitably sees language as a system of arbitrary symbols. There is little room left for a discussion of iconicity in this tradition, in spite of the fact that there has been a lot of experimental psycholinguistic research done on sound-symbolism (Brown et al. 1955, Brown and Nuttall 1959, Miron 1961, Weiss 1963, Tanz 1971, Ultan 1978).

I will follow the approach proposed by Harris (1998) who proposes a definition of writing from the integrational linguistic perspective by saying that 'writing as a form of communication shares many features with drawing, painting and others which typically involve the marking of surfaces and the organization of spatial relations' (1998: 121-3). Writing is a mode of communication based on the use of spatial relations, which can be reprocessed over time. On this basis, Harris differentiates writing from gesture and from drawing. The main factor that distinguishes writing from gesture is that the written forms have a temporal duration, which allows for reprocessing. In the same way, writing is distinguished from drawing because the sign is processed in a specific order or relationship in writing, but not in drawing.

As a result, writing entails an integration of two sets of writings: a discursive representation and presentational representation. By discursive representation writing, Harris refers to the verbal writing in the sense most commonly used. It is identified with any forms of writing, ranging from alphabetic writing to logographic writing (cf. Harris 1995: 59). Presentational representation is all other written signs (for example, symbols and characters in mathematical texts, etc.), which can be interpreted as meaningful signs in the context in which they are used. Both forms can be combined: presentational forms such as $=, +, -, \pi, \backslash$, are combined with discursive representation in alphabetic writing such as X,Z,Y in mathematical writings.

In her work on symbolism, Langer (1957:88) also presents a distinction between the discursive and the presentational modes and claims that there exists a non-discursive or 'presentational' symbolism. By analysing various symbolic forms in culture such as metaphor, myth, ritual, music and other art forms, she maintains that presentational symbolism is a normal and prevalent vehicle of meaning, and that it must be recognized as such along with discursive symbolism. She thinks that language is a primary example of the discursive mode of representation. In the same line of thought as Harris (1998), I assume

that *Smileys* or emoticons are examples of a blend of discursive and non-discursive modes of representation, according to Langer. They are used in a linear discursive fashion in a sentence, written as a discursive representation (in terms of Harris) and combined with the other alphabetic words. However, for Langer, the make-up of *smileys* themselves is non-discursive, rather, they are presentational because they involve a visual structure that is processed by the visual system.

Following this approach, which I assume as valid for my analysis, written forms, such as @, numbers, *smileys*, etc. are more presentational than discursive. In this way, we can say that iconicity correlates more with presentational representation than with discursive representation and it is one of the crucial motivations of written language, which I assume as a means of communication in graphic space. That is why my analysis of these symbolic and iconic representations bears significance at the level of images used to communicate sounds (in the case of numbers) or words, in the case of @.

In the following section I will refer to the English writing system and its idiosyncratic spelling correspondence. I will refer to presentational representations that can also be used to express ideas. I will then refer to the Spelling Deviation Metaphor to account for my findings in Avril Lavigne’s songs.

3. The English Writing System As a Source for Metaphorical Configuration

To convey such metaphorical meaning using spelling variations the producer of a text has to be aware of the writing system rules functioning in order to respell the lexical items without altering the meaning or concepts these unit remit to.

The English writing system belongs to the category of alphabetic or segmental writing system. This type of system consists of a set of letters (graphemes) each representing a phoneme, punctuation marks and logograms (graphemes representing a word or a morpheme) such as numbers, the @ symbol, the & symbol, etc. As regards phonemes, English has 24-27 consonant phonemes (depending on the dialect) and 14-20 vowel phonemes (depending on dialect) whereas as regards graphemes the English alphabet has only 26 graphemes. Therefore, there is not one-to-one relationship between letters (graphemes) and sounds (phonemes). This issue brings up some discrepancies in the system: on the one hand, for each sound there are different spelling patterns (graphemes), a

characteristic that is called heterographic homophony; and, on the other hand, for most patterns there are different pronunciations, that is, a heterophonic homography¹².

Thus, we can see that it is this heterographic homophony characteristic of the English writing system residing in English speakers’ linguistic competence the one that provides them with a wide range of possibilities to express the same concept graphically. This internal change in the word structure consists of substituting one or more graphemes for other ones. It is important to highlight that in the songs I have studied not only alphabetic letters are used but also logograms or presentational representations such as numbers, and other symbols as in the case of “sk8er”.

3.1. The Spelling Variation Metaphor

As stated in the theoretical background, and in the context of discursive representation, many linguists have written about the importance of form in conveying meaning and how a different choice in form whether it is syntactical, morphological, phonological or graphological affects the content of a statement. Those investigations provide evidence on how variations in the grammatical structure can also convey metaphorical meaning.

Lakoff and Johnson stated that the lengthening of the vowel “i” in the word “*biiiiig*” is an instance of the conceptual metaphor MORE OF FORM is MORE OF CONTENT. The repetition of the grapheme “i” entails that whatever the word “*biiiiig*” is making reference to is not only “big” but “more than big”.

In the songs I have studied there is not any instance of the conceptual metaphor MORE OF FORM is MORE OF CONTENT due to the fact that there is not any repetition of graphemes. However, another phenomenon takes place in which some words are respelled with unconventional patterns of spellings; for instance the words “boy”, “straight” and “skater” are respelled in the variants “boi”, “strait” and “sk8er”. Following Lakoff and Johnson’s line of thought for the conceptual metaphor MORE OF FORM is MORE OF CONTENT, I can establish that the variants “boi”, “strait” and “skater” are instances of what I will call the Spelling Variation Metaphor, which establishes that DIFFERENT

¹² For sound to spelling correspondences in English refer to Appendix 2

FORM is MORE OF CONTENT. In the case of “sk8er”, it is interesting to observe how the use of a presentational representation (number 8) in the context of a discursive representation (a word) is not intended to operate as an iconic reference but as a sound-grapheme mapping for [eit]. As I mentioned in the previous section, the co-occurrence of both presentational and discursive systems are part of an integrated mode of writing that are processed at a visual, phonological and contextual level. And this activation is the result of a mapping between two domains that are related. In the following section I discuss this notion in terms of metaphorical representation.

3.2. The Mapping of the Spelling Variation Metaphor

Following Lakoff’s Spelling Variation Metaphor, I assume that the divergence from the conventional patterns of spelling allows us to distinguish two well-defined domains for the metaphorical mapping of the Spelling Variation metaphor: the STANDARD SPELLING (target domain) and the NON-STANDARD SPELLING (source domain).

Spelling Variation Metaphor

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Standard spelling	Non-standard spelling

To understand the difference between the standard and non-standard spelling it is necessary to study the definition of standard and non-standard languages. According to Hudson (1999) the notion of standard language is imprecise. However, a typical standard language must pass through the following processes: selection (a specific variety of the language has to be selected as the standard one), codification (there must be grammar books and dictionaries which explain the correct and incorrect forms of the language), elaboration of function (it must be possible to use the language in all the functions associated with central government and with writing), and acceptance (the variety has to be accepted as the national language). All the varieties of a language that does not pass through this standardization process fall into the category of non-standard language.

The chart below enlarges the previous table by adding some linguistic expressions, taken from the lyrics, which are instances of the Spelling Variation metaphor. In the first column, under the heading “target domain”, I place the linguistic expressions in their standard spelling (the one from which they were deviated); and in the second column, under the heading “source domain”, I will put the linguistic expressions in their non-standard spelling (the one used by Avril Lavigne in her songs).

Spelling Variation Metaphor

<u>TARGET DOMAIN</u>	<u>SOURCE DOMAIN</u>
Standard spelling	Non-standard spelling
Want to	Wanna
Got to	Gotta
Boy	Boi
Straight	Strait
Frigging	Friggin´
At	@
You	Ya
Nobody´s	Nobodyies
Have	Of
Years	Yrs
Skater	Sk8er

This chart evinces the correspondences between categories in the source and categories in the target domain and demonstrates that the mapping or point of similarity is the same concept they remit to.

For example:

TARGET DOMAIN: skater boy

SOURCE DOMAIN: sk8er boi

MAPPING: a male youth who rides a skateboard

Nevertheless, the concept denoted by both domains is not exactly the same; for as the Spelling Variation metaphor states DIFFERENT FORM is MORE OF CONTENT. This plus in meaning is called the “foregrounding” effect. In the following section, I define the notion of “foregrounding” and its linguistic function in the process of metaphorization.

3.3. The Spelling Variation Metaphor and the “Foregrounding” Effect

Foregrounding is a stylistic device which can occur in all levels of language (morphology, graphology, phonology, grammar, etc.), and whose purpose is to make a piece of information stand out from the rest. In his essay “Linguistics and the Figures of Rhetoric” (1966), Geoffrey Leech discussed two types of foregrounding: parallelism (unexpected regularity of words, phrases, syntactic structures, etc.) and deviation from norms (unexpected deviations from norms and conventions such as the spelling variations I am concerned with in this thesis).

Andrew Goatly also spoke about this foregrounding effect declaring that “they are attempts to attract attention, with the result that they contribute to foregrounding” (1997: 165). For instance, in the respelled nominal phrase “sk8er boi” the occurrence of “8” and “i” involves more processing effort as its interpretation is mediated by the representational role of a number and a changed grapheme. As a result of this manipulation of icons, its meaning is accessed in a less straightforward manner thus activating different insights and sensations on the reader.

As regards this unpredictable occurrences, Goatly explained that according to the information theory, the more predictable an item is, the less informative it is and vice versa. In this way the respelled words become informatively loaded comprising many ideas in a short space. Some of these ideas emerging from these meaningful choices could be the construction of an individual identity or the membership to a specific social group. In his article “Language in urban society”, Michael Halliday (1978) centred on different varieties of language in different contexts and he explained that the use of an incongruent variety of language creates a “foregrounding effect”. Halliday related the idea of congruence to metaphor in another article dealing with “Anti languages” (Halliday 1978). An antilanguage is a variety of language created by an antisociety¹³ as a way of resistance. An

antilanguage has its own coding which functions as a conscious variety of the standard language. These varieties can affect different levels of language: phonology, morphology, graphology, syntax, semantics, etc. Halliday named these variants “metaphorical variants”. Given the fact that these variants occur at different levels of language, we can find phonological metaphors, morphological metaphors, graphological metaphors, syntactical metaphors, semantic metaphors, etc.

As we can see the foregrounding effect arising from the Spelling Variation metaphor involves more than just an attempt to attract the readers’ attention. It speaks of a construction of an identity in a social group. However this issue requires separate considerations in a separate research paper; they should also be approached from a more comprehensive perspective, that of discourse analysis, which takes into account the singer socio-cultural context that leads such meaningful choices.

For the purposes of my thesis, whose main goal is to analyse on what terms Avril Lavigne structures her vision of the world and life, it suffices to say that variations in spelling are a source to convey metaphorical meaning in which concepts activated by lexical items written in a standard spelling are expressed with items written in a non-standard spelling. These spelling variations create a foregrounding effect on the respelled words making them stand out in the text. In the next section, I will consider these spelling variations, intended to create a foregrounding effect as part of a spelling metaphor, an alternative way of communication motivated by the “Do It Yourself” punk philosophy.

4. The “Do-it-Yourself” Ethos and the Spelling Variation Metaphor

The DIY punk philosophy did not only affect the punk musical creation, rather it extended over different domains of life where language was not an exception; for as Irena Guidikova stated “culture is a process of meaning making [...] People attach meaning to all kinds of material and immaterial phenomena, they have opinions, beliefs and ideologies that they constantly evaluate. Meaning-making must be searched for in many places and moments” (2001:64). Jannis K. Androutsopoulos (2000) focused on how punks attached

¹³ “An antisociety is a society that is set up within another society as a conscious alternative to it. It is a mode of resistance, resistance which may take the form either of passive symbiosis or of active hostility and even destruction” (Halliday 1977: 165).

sociocultural meanings to the lexical items by analysing how standard spelling was distorted towards a non-standard one in German punk fanzines¹⁴. In his investigations he dealt with graphemic modifications and representations of the spoken language just as the ones I have tracked down in the lyrics. Hence, by deviating from the conventional spelling of words punks exalt both their rejection of norms to look for alternatives, as well as the DIY ethos which encourages them to construct a new alternative model. This coincides with Hudson’s idea that

Some individuals reject the model [...], since this is probably because they are conforming to a different model [...] rather than to no model at all. There may also be individual differences in willingness to create new vocabulary or to use language metaphorically, in which case the creative individual would be going beyond the accepted norms. (1999:13)

This way we learn that the “Do it Yourself” philosophy constitutes the cultural grounding for the graphological deviation metaphor. This “new” writing system—which coincidentally some people call “punk script”—works as a metaphor to express that the urge to look for the alternatives has extended over different domains of experience especially language. Punks have taken the writing system and used it for their purposes. Not only have they expressed their worldviews by the use of specific vocabulary and expressions but also by the *way* they write what they say. The standard spelling of some words has been replaced by the non-standard spelling in order to create new layers of meaning. Along with each word in itself they have attached their ideology and philosophy of life. In the songs I have studied, in substituting the conventional graphemes, (such as “sk8er” for “skater”, “of” for “have”, “@” for “at”, etc.), Avril Lavigne has broken the rules in order to attach and foreground the “Do it Yourself” ethos.

In sum, through this analysis I have tried to demonstrate that the “Do it Yourself” philosophy is both the cause and the effect of this metaphor based on graphological deviation. On the one hand, its withdrawal and reaction against mainstream society values and norms have made the punk subculture an “antisociety”. Their reactionary attitude is not only present in their musical style and clothing, but also in the way they write using a non-standard variant of the English writing system. On the other hand, these variants work as a

¹⁴ Fanzines is a blending of the words “fans” and “magazines”.

metaphor for everyday language as they are an alternative way of conveying the same meaning but with the plus of a foregrounding effect: in changing one grapheme for another grapheme or logograph Avril Lavigne deviates from the convention of the writing system and foregrounds the Punk “Do it yourself” ethos.

It is important to notice how crucial the analysis of the grounding of metaphors is; for if we had not studied the punk philosophy and its influence on language, we would have taken for granted this graphological deviation or we would have taken it as something the singer did just for the sake of it. The knowledge of this cultural background backs up Andrew Goatly’s assertion that unpredictable items comprise and foregrounds big ideas and therefore are more informative. When it comes to analysing a lexical item there is more than just a group of letters representing sounds, as Lakoff and Johnson (1989) stated:

[...] words evoke in the mind much more than they strictly designate. What is meaningful are not the words, the mere sound sequences spoken or letter sequences on a page, but the conceptual content that the words evoke. (1989: 130).

Conclusion

Taking into consideration the source I have used for the research, the following tasks have been accomplished in agreement with the methodological design:

a) Delimitation of the field of study: the field of study has been divided into two main phases. The first stage consisted in reviewing the available bibliographic data with respect to the object of study; the second stage involved the choice of the theoretical framework and the establishment of the corpus of analysis.

b) Design of the research development: this part was concerned with the choice of a methodology for the study as well as the order in which the tasks would be done.

c) Metaphorical analysis: this phase was divided into three stages: detection, selection and description of the metaphorical expressions in the corpus. Firstly, each song was analyzed separately and then the results drawn from each song were compared in order to elaborate on my general conclusions.

My interest in metaphor analysis that motivated this thesis lies in the fact that this figure of speech has occupied a central place as a matter of debate and has given origin to a varied and rich literature from various perspectives and disciplines, among them cognitive linguistic studies. The reviewed bibliography clearly shows that metaphors are not merely a linguistic phenomenon but are also part of the domain of everyday experience and the symbolic imagination flow, in which the conceptualization of word and culture have a prominent space. This link provides some significant results: metaphors and their scope in meaning are limitless for they open up the cognitive space of the word, expanding it into a more intentional and relevant field of analysis, whose scope has not yet been fully studied.

The cognitive-linguistic analysis in the four songs of Avril Lavigne confirms the initial hypothesis that metaphors expressed by different expressive means, such as lexical, semantic and graphemic, represent the text-producer's own conception of her life and vision of the world.

The cognitive-linguistic study has been guided by a qualitative approach which has allowed me to identify the metaphorical representations in the corpus, to determine the conceptual schemes those metaphors refer to and to reconstruct the conceptual and cultural domains involved in the mapping of the metaphorical expressions.

The corpus selected to test the hypothesis made it possible to study metaphors from two different perspectives: on the one hand, I examined the process of metaphorization at the lexical-semantic domain of the language, whose nature is based on the concepts expressed by the lexical items; and on the other hand I focused on the spelling domain of the language to demonstrate how metaphors can be created through different patterns of spelling. Thus, the analysis has been divided into two main domains: the lexical-semantic domain and the spelling domain.

1. Main Findings

1.1. Lexical-Semantic Domain

In chapter 2, I examined how metaphorical expressions were created by understanding one concept in terms of another concept expressed by different words or phrases. Through this analysis I could reconstruct the conceptual metaphors and the cognitive categories underlying the metaphorical expressions. In this instance two main aspects have been considered: expression and content.

In terms of the expression, we must differentiate between a strictly lexical study of the forms which express concepts and a cognitive semantic study which analyses the various expressions motivated by mental schemas that coalesce around these concepts. This distinction is to understand that a cognitive semantic study like the one I have accomplished in this paper broadens the possibilities to analyze lexical material since it focuses on the different levels of language, ranging from word formation to the phraseological levels of language, though I have centered my work on the lexical-semantic and spelling domain, namely. Regarding the contents, the conceptualization of reality is defined from the cognitive point of view by the structural, orientational, and ontological metaphors, a term used to explain how concepts are structured in terms of other better-defined concepts which include spatial orientations, and substances, concrete objects and containers. Such schemes are not entirely arbitrary, rather they are based on a series of analogies with the sensible reality that allow a coherent structure. In this regard, various schemes can be combined or amalgamated between them, which give sample of this internal consistency:

a) One-to-one domain mapping: this mapping shows how one single source domain is mapped onto one single target domain such as:

LAUGHING is SINGING A LULLABY

COGNITION is PERCEPTION

FRENCH-SPEAKING PERSON is a FRIED CHICKEN ASS

CONTINUATION is AWAY

DISMISSING is FIRING

PERSONALITY TRAITS are COLORS

A FAMOUS PERSON is A STAR

MOOD is a SURFACE

CREATIVITY is a PLANT

b) One-to-many domain mapping: in this mapping one source domain is mapped onto several target domains. Some examples are the source domains CONTAINER, UP and DOWN being mapped onto several target domains:

PLACES are CONTAINERS

EYES are CONTAINERS

BODY is a CONTAINER

CROWD is a CONTAINER

HEART is a CONTAINER

ARMS are CONTAINERS

TIME is a CONTAINER

EMOTIONAL STATES are CONTAINERS

BRAIDS are CONTAINERS

MORE is UP

COMPLETION is UP

CONSCIOUS is UP

APPROVAL is UP

HAVING CONTROL is UP

IMPORTANT is UP

UNREAL is UP

NOT HAVING CONTROL is DOWN

UNIMPORTANT is DOWN

MUNDANE REALITY is DOWN

c) Many-to-one domain mapping: this mapping demonstrates how several source domains are mapped onto one target domain as in the case of the target domains THE WORLD, LIFE and PEOPLE.

THE WORLD is an EVENT

THE WORLD is a FLUID

THE WORLD is a RESOURCE

THE WORLD is FOOD

LIFE is a JOURNEY

LIFE is WARFARE

LIFE is a GAME

LIFE is a WORLD APART

LIFE is a SUBSTANCE

PEOPLE are RADIO RECEIVERS

PEOPLE are FOOD

PEOPLE are SUBSTANCES

These mappings prove the richness of metaphor for the creation of meaning given the fact that categorical correspondences are not fixed but open to interplay with other categories. This fact permits to create different mappings and therefore achieve different meanings as long as there is a correspondence between the categories in both the target

domain and the source domain. What is more, these mappings also reflect how certain categories are articulated quite symmetrically surrounding one or another idea such as the case of IMPORTANT is UP, CENTRAL and EXPENSIVE whereas UNIMPORTANT is DOWN, PERIPHERAL and CHEAP. These oppositions are to be studied from a semantic-structural point of view, a task I have not embarked on this work but it is worth mentioning for a future research paper.

In the section “Metaphorization and Identity” I attempted to elaborate on the author’s culture and personal experience that could have led her to choose such metaphorical mappings. The main idea is that Avril Lavigne’s conception of the world and expected life is inseparable from an idea of an alternate, opposite or different world and life in which the taste for danger and adventure and going to the extremes is always present. Although there is not always a direct or explicit correspondence, in fact, most of the schemas analyzed are articulated quite symmetrically around these ideas. Most of these values belong to the Punk culture which stands for alternative ways of expression and independence, in opposition to the traditional values of society. In this section I also took into account how the notion of femininity is also present in the process of metaphorization. For not only does Avril Lavigne speak from the point of view of a punk but also from the point of view of a punk woman. In this respect, this “alternative femininity” is also depicted in some metaphorical expressions in which the singer does not show herself as a caring and loving but as a tough and strong girl who even beats men.

Thus, the cognitive approach to analyze Avril Lavigne’s perspective on reality and English culture has made it possible to arrange linguistic material according to image schemas and lexical structures. The analysis also has provided an interesting theoretical discussion such as the evaluation of the fact that although we do not have a term in a given language for several concepts, we do resort to metaphorical schemes that let us, through different periphrasis and phraseological applications, voice what might remain “unsaid” at a pure linguistic level. Metaphorical language serves this purpose perfectly, as I have tried to show in my work.

1.2. Spelling Domain

In Chapter 3, I attempted to broaden the scope of analysis concentrating on the spelling domain of language to show how changes in the graphological representation of lexical items are ways of creating metaphors thus expanding on the possibilities of different levels of analysis ranging to the text level to the grapheme level. I have studied how the sound-to-spelling correspondences rules of the English language allow the use of a non-standard spelling as a source domain to represent the same concept a standard spelling denotes. Words in the songs written in a non-standard spelling are constructed by discursive representations (alphabetic letters) as well as presentational representations (numbers and other symbols). These spelling variations create a “highlighting” effect to the concept due to its disturbing of the automatic process of the cognitive process of symbol decoding. In this chapter I also studied how these non-standard representations are motivated by the punk Do It Yourself philosophy which exalts the rejection of norms and the search for alternatives, and here, as an alternative way of writing. Thus, it is evinced that metaphor is neither a mere figure of speech nor just a mapping of concepts across domains; rather it is a complex interplay among content, linguistic form, culture and thought. In this chapter I have tried to show that this deviation from the written norm, this “new” writing system—or “punk script”—works also as a metaphor to express their worldviews by resorting to the graphological deviation, which springs from their need to look for alternatives means of expression, that transcend the standardized form. The standard spelling of some words has been replaced by the non-standard spelling in order to create new layers of meaning which, combined with the use of specific vocabulary and expressions, constitutes the cultural grounding for the deviation metaphor. Punks have taken the writing system and subverted it for their purposes. And in doing so, they have attached to it their “do-it-yourself” philosophy.

2. Contributions and Limitations of the Study

One of the most notable contributions is this thesis is to put in evidence how the use of language is highly motivated by the reciprocity between the body and space representations and the metaphorical projections arising from them. This declaration asserts that metaphorical statements, at different levels, manifest a level of iconicity in language

which is likely to be expressed in the lexical-semantic field. Thus, metaphorical expressions constitute a clear and precise image to express more abstract notions whose degree of iconicity is vague. As mentioned before, the corpus under analysis is undoubtedly limited and needs to be expanded to ratify the conclusions. However, I can say that the metaphorical projections constitute a clear and precise, almost concrete image which allows the speaker to express notions that have an abstract character, or at least, more diffuse regarding its iconicity and, that is why, the linguistic elements that intervene in the metaphorization process are basically creative forms of the language. The presence of metaphorization in English does not exhaust the problem —since the speakers of other languages may not resort to this type of metaphorical projections—; however, it is an indication that it could occur the same in other languages and that this similarity is likely to be exploited in the methodological frameworks of those who are dedicated to language teaching and translation.

This research paper has also contributed to recognize how metaphors are not only created from mappings between lexical items but also from other sources such as the graphological alteration in the representation of the words. This is a booster to analyze the metaphorization process taking into account other features than the mere lexical items and the concepts they denote. It is interesting to widen the scope of analysis considering choices in grammatical form, punctuation, register and style as source of metaphorization.

However, the results of the investigation have some limitations. One of them is the fact, such as I have just said, that the study was limited to four songs from the first album by Avril Lavigne, thus, delimiting the singer’s material to one stage in her life and career. In this way, although the results of this thesis have fulfilled the research problem, the same principles can be picked up again with a larger corpus by the same singer or other authors in order to draw comparative results.

In this paper I have only investigated the cross-domain mappings beneath the conceptual metaphors in the corpus in order to show on what terms Avril Lavigne structures her conceptualization of life and the world. However, further research is needed to delve into the sociological and cultural motivation that might have led the singer to select the specific words, phrases and type of language in order to create such cross-domain mappings; for language (and therefore metaphors) is used and interpreted according to the

social and cultural background of every single individual. I hope this is a suggestion for another project where an in-depth study on the issue can be carried out.

As I have previously stated in the introduction, metaphorization is both a motivating force for meaning creation and interpretation in spoken and written language, and an evolution of the linguistic forms, which is common in the 21st century. From this point of view, it would also be very fruitful to analyze the metaphor following the methodology of diachronic linguistics, for linguistic changes must be attributed to the constant intervention of the addressor in grammar, leading to new and valuable connotative implications of language.

Bibliography

1. Primary sources

LAVIGNE, A. (2002). Anything but ordinary. in: *Let Go* [CD]. USA: Arista records, Inc.

LAVIGNE, A. (2002). My world. in: *Let Go* [CD]. USA: Arista records, Inc.

LAVIGNE, A. (2002). Nobody’s fool. in: *Let Go* [CD]. USA: Arista records, Inc.

LAVIGNE, A. (2002). Sk8er boi. in: *Let Go* [CD]. USA: Arista records, Inc.

2. Secondary sources

ALCALÁ CAMPOS, Raúl (2004). “Algunos paradigmas de la hermenéutica” in: IRIGOYEN TROCONIS, Martha Patricia (comp.). *Hermenéutica, analogía y discurso*. México: UNAM: 103-122.

ANDROUTSSOPOULOS, J. K. (2000). *Non-standard spellings in media texts: The case of German fanzines*. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4:514-533. doi: 10.1111/1467-9481.00128

BEUCHOT, Mauricio (2004). “Sobre la oportunidad y necesidad de una hermenéutica analógico-icónica” in: IRIGOYEN TROCONIS, Martha Patricia (comp.). *Hermenéutica, analogía y discurso*. México: UNAM: 123-141.

BLOOMFIELD, Leonard. (1933). *Language*. New York: Holt.

BROWN, Roger W.; BLACK, Abraham H. and HOROWITZ, Arnold E. (1955) ‘Phonetic Symbolism in Natural Languages’. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 50:388–93.

BROWN, Roger and NATTALL, Ronald (1959) ‘Method of Phonetic Symbolism Experiments’. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 59: 441–5.

BYBEE, Joan L. (1985) ‘Diagrammatic Iconicity in Stem-Inflection Relations.’ in: John, HAIMAN (ed.) *Iconicity in Syntax*, (pp 11–47). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

CHAMORRO MIRANDA, Diana, Jorge MIZUNO HAYDAR y Guillian MOSS (2003). “Tergiversaciones y correspondencias: la metáfora y sus bemoles”. *ALED. Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios del Discurso*. Vol. 3 (1): 29-47.

CONNEL, R. W. (1987) *Gender and power*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION (2007). Letters and Sounds: principles and practice of high quality phonics. [Available on <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110202093118/http://nationalstrategies.standards.dcsf.gov.uk/node/84969>] Ref: 00281-2007

DIRINGER, David (1968). *The Alphabet: a Key to the History of Mankind*. Vol 2. 3rd edition. Completely revised with the collaboration of Reinhold Regensburger. London: Hutchinson.

ELIADE, Mircea (1985). *El mito del eterno retorno*. Barcelona: Alianza/Emecé.

Tesis de Licenciatura en Lengua y Literatura Inglesa: “Metaphorization in Contemporary Songs. A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis of Four Songs of Avril Lavigne”

Aspirante: Rodrigo Loyola Martín

FEIXA, Carles and NILAN, Pam (eds.) (2006). *Global Youth?: Hybrid Identities, Plural Worlds*. USA and Canada: Routledge.

FERRATER MORA, J. (1984). *Diccionario de Filosofía* (4 volumes), Barcelona: Alianza Dictionaries.

FINEGAN, Edward and BESNIER, N. (1994). *Language: Its Structure and Use*. 2nd edition. Fort Worth/ New York: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

FOUCAULT, Michael. (1969). “What is an Author” in: HARAI, Josué V (1979). *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

FOWLER, Roger (1986). *Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

GARCÍA DA SILVA, Denize Elena (2003). “Discurso y cognición social en la “red” de las metáforas”. *ALED. Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios del Discurso*. Vol. 3 (1): 49-69.

GARCÍA JURADO, Francisco (2000). “Las ‘metáforas de la vida cotidiana’ (‘Metaphors we live by’) en latín y su proyección etimológica en castellano”. *Congreso Internacional de Semántica (Universidad de La Laguna)*. Madrid. Ediciones Clásicas, vol. II: 1571-1584.

GARCÍA JURADO, Francisco (2001). “Semántica cognitiva del latín (I): los preverbios latinos como ‘metáforas de la vida cotidiana’”, in: MOUSSY, Cl. (ed.) *De Lingua Latina novae quaestiones*. Paris-Louvain. Peeters: 755-770.

GARCÍA JURADO, Francisco (2003). *Introducción a la semántica latina. De la semántica tradicional al cognitivismo*. Madrid: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad Complutense. Cuadernos de Filología Clásica - Estudios Latinos. Serie de monografías. Anejo I.

GARCÍA JURADO, Francisco (2004). “La expresión de la idea de ‘problema’ en el latín de Plauto. Análisis de Semántica Cognitiva”. *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica. Estudios Latinos*, 24, núm. 2: 203-223.

GARCÍA JURADO, Francisco y Rosario LÓPEZ GREGORIS (1995). “Las metáforas de la vida cotidiana en el lenguaje plautino como procedimiento de caracterización de los personajes”. *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 13: 233-245.

GASS, S. & SELINKER, L. (2001). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. 2nd edition. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

GIBBS, Raymond W. (2006). *Embodiment and Cognitive Science*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

GOATLY, Andrew (1997). *The Language of Metaphors*. London and New York: Routledge.

GORREL, Robert M. (1994). *Watch your Language!: mother tongue and her wayward children*. Nevada: University of Nevada Press.

Tesis de Licenciatura en Lengua y Literatura Inglesa: “Metaphorization in Contemporary Songs. A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis of Four Songs of Avril Lavigne”

Aspirante: Rodrigo Loyola Martín

HALLIDAY, M.A.K. (1977). *Language as Social Semiotics*. Baltimore: University Park Press.

HARRIS, Roy. (1998). *Introduction to Integrational Linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon. HARRIS, Roy. (1984). ‘*The Semiology of Textualization*’. *Language Sciences*, 6(2):271–86.

HARRIS, Roy. (1995). *The Signs of Writing*. London: Routledge.

HIRAGA, Masako K. (2005). *Metaphor and iconicity: a cognitive approach to analyzing texts*. UK: Palgrave, MacMillan.

HOLLAND, Samantha (2006). *Alternative Feminities: Body, Age, and Identity. Dress, Body, Culture*. New York: Berg.

HUDSON, Richard A. (1999). *Sociolinguistics (2nd edition)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

JAMES, Vincent and JANSEN, Erin (1995-2000). *The Internet Language Dictionary*. NetLingo Inc. (<http://www.netlingo.com>)

JOHNSON, Mark (1991). *El cuerpo en la mente*. Madrid: Debate.

KERBRAT-ORECCHIONI, Catherine (1987). *La enunciación. De la subjetividad en el lenguaje*. Buenos Aires: Hachette.

LAKOFF, George (1993) ‘The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor.’ in: ORTONY, Andrew (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

LAKOFF, George (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things. What Categories reveal about Mind*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

LAKOFF, George y Mark JOHNSON (1991). *Metáforas de la vida cotidiana*. Madrid: Cátedra.

LAKOFF, George y Mark JOHNSON (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

LAKOFF, George y Mark TURNER (1989). *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

LANGER, Susanne K. (1957) *Philosophy in a New Key: a Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite, and Art*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

LAUSBERG, Heinrich (1974). *Manual de Retórica literaria. Fundamentos de una ciencia de la literatura*. Madrid: Gredos.

LE PAGE, Robert B. and TABOURET-KELLER, Andrée (1985). *Acts of Identity: Creole-based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

LEJEUNE, Philippe (1994). *El pacto autobiográfico y otros estudios*. Madrid: Megazul-Endymion.

LEONARD, Marion (2007). *Gender in the music industry: Rock, Discourse and Girl Power*. England: Ashgate Publishing Group.

LUCY, John (1997). “The scope of linguistic relativity: an analysis and review of empirical research.” in: John J. GUMPERZ & S. C. LEVINSON (Eds.) *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*, (pp 37-69). Cambridge, MA: CUP.

Tesis de Licenciatura en Lengua y Literatura Inglesa: "Metaphorization in Contemporary Songs. A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis of Four Songs of Avril Lavigne"

Aspirante: Rodrigo Loyola Martín

- MAFLA BUSTAMANTE, Cecilia (2004). *Arí-Sí-Yes: Análisis Lingüístico y Evaluación de las traducciones de Huasipungo al Inglés*. Abya Yala Publicaciones
- MARAFIOTI, Roberto (comp.) (2001). *Recorridos semiológicos. Signos, enunciación y argumentación*. Buenos Aires. Eudeba.
- MASON, Matt (2008). *The Pirate's Dilemma: How Youth Culture is Reinventing Capitalism*. New York. Free Press.
- MCRobbie, Angela (1993). "Shut up and dance: Youth culture and changing modes of femininity". *Young May* 1993, 1: 13-31.
- MIRANDA, L. R., ARISTIMUÑO, L. y RODRÍGUEZ CHAVES, D. (2009). "Verbos de movimiento y metáforas de la vida cotidiana. Un enfoque cognitivo para el estudio del léxico". *Actas de las XIX Jornadas de Investigación de la Facultad de Ciencias Humanas de la UNLPam*. Santa Rosa: EdUNLPam (CD).
- MIRANDA, L. R., REGÚNAGA, M. A. y SUÁREZ CEPEDA, S. G. (2010). *Español-inglés en clave contrastiva. Volumen I*. Santa Rosa: EdUNLPam.
- MIRANDA, Lidia Raquel (2007). Capítulo III de *Amor, retórica y vida urbana en tres obras elegíacas de Ovidio*. Tesis de Maestría en Estudios Sociales y Culturales. Facultad de Ciencias Humanas de la Universidad Nacional de La Pampa (inédita).
- MIRANDA, Lidia Raquel (2011). "Sentido y alcances de la descripción del paraíso en la Introducción de los Milagros de Nuestra Señora de Gonzalo de Berceo". *Mirabilia* 12: "Paraíso, Purgatorio e Inferno: a Religiosidade na Idade Média". UFES (Brasil): 20-37 (www.revistamirabilia.com). [accessed 22/4/2011]
- MIRON, Murray S. (1961) "A Cross-Linguistic Investigation of Phonetic Symbolism". *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 62: 623-30.
- NYREN, John (1998). *The Cricketers of my Time*. (ed. Ashley Mote). USA: Robson.
- OCHOA SANTOS, Miguel G. (1997). "Metáfora y relato visual". *Espéculo. Revista de Estudios Literarios*. N° 6. Madrid (julio-octubre). (<http://www.ucm.es/OTROS/especulo/numero6/metafora.htm>) [accessed 18/2/2011]
- OLNEY, James (ed.) (1972). *Metaphors of Self. The Meaning of Autobiography*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- PARRET, Herman (1983). "L'énonciation en tant que déictisation et modalisation". *Langages*, 70.
- PARRET, Herman (1995). *Las pasiones. Ensayo sobre la puesta en discurso de la subjetividad*. Buenos Aires. Edicial.
- PHELPS, William (1839). *The history and antiquities of Somersetshire. Vol. II*. London: printed for the author, by J. B. Nichols and son.
- POMERANTZ, S. et al (2004). *S8er Girls: Skateboarders, Girlhood and Feminism in motion*. *Women's Studies International Forum* 27 (2004) 547-557.

Tesis de Licenciatura en Lengua y Literatura Inglesa: “Metaphorization in Contemporary Songs. A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis of Four Songs of Avril Lavigne”

Aspirante: Rodrigo Loyola Martín

- POPADITCH, Irina (2004). “Metaphors of Love in English and Russian”. Mid Sweden University: 1-22. (<http://dooku.miun.se/engelska/englishC/C-essay/HT03/Final/Irina%20Popaditch.pdf>) [accessed 23/3/2011]
- RAVELLI, Louise ; SIMON-VANDENBERGEN, Anne Marie ; TAVERNIERS, Miriam (2003). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- REDDY, Michael (1979). “The Conduit Metaphor”. in: ORTONY, A. (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- REISZ DE RIVAROLA, Susana (1985). “¿Quién habla en el poema?”. *Filología XX*. Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- RIVANO FISCHER, Emilio (1989). “Persons, interactions, proximity, and metaphorical grammaticalization in Mapudungu”. *Working Papers 35*. Lund: Lunds Universitet. Allmän Språkvetenskap.
- RIVANO FISCHER, Emilio (1991). *Topology and Dynamics of Interactions: with special reference to Spanish and Mapudungu*. Lund: Lund University Press.
- RODRÍGUEZ DE RIVERA, José (2005). “Metáfora”. ([//www2.uah.es/estudios_de_organizacion/epistemologia/metafora.htm](http://www2.uah.es/estudios_de_organizacion/epistemologia/metafora.htm)) [accessed 25/6/2011]
- ROGERS, Henry. (2005). *Writing Systems: A Linguistic Approach*. USA, UK and Australia: Blackwell Publishing.
- RUSSELL, B. (1959). *El conocimiento humano: su alcance y sus limitaciones*. Madrid: Taurus.
- SCARANO, Laura. (2000). *Los Lugares de la Voz: Protocolos de la Enunciación Literaria*. Mar del Plata, Argentina: Melusina.
- SCHAFRAAD, Pytrik. (2000). “More than Music: Punk as a Counterculture?”. in: *Transitions of Youth Citizenship in Europe: Culture, Subculture and Identity*. Spain: Council of Europe Publishing.
- STEVENSON, Daniel and WEB ATOMICS. *On the Parts of Animals by Aristotle*. The Internet Classics Archive (http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/parts_animals.mb.txt) [accessed 26/5/ 2011]
- TALMY, Leonard. (2000). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Vol 1. Concept Structuring Systems*. Cambridge: The MIT Press: 409-470.
- TANZ, Christine (1971) ‘Sound Symbolism in Words Relating to Proximity and Distance’. *Language and Speech*, 14: 266–76.
- TURNER, Chérie (2001). *Everything you need to know about the riot grrrl movement: the feminism of a new generation*. New York: The Rosen Publishing Group.
- ULTAN, Russell (1978) ‘Size-Sound Symbolism.’ In: GREENBURG, Joseph H. (ed.) *Universals of Human Language*, (pp 525–68). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Tesis de Licenciatura en Lengua y Literatura Inglesa: “Metaphorization in Contemporary Songs. A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis of Four Songs of Avril Lavigne”

Aspirante: Rodrigo Loyola Martín

- VAINIKKALA, Erkki (1989). “Concretization and connotation: metaphorical and ideological structures in the process of reception”. *Literature as communication. Julkaisu 18*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä: 73-90.
- VANVALIN, R. D. & R. LA POLLA (1997). *Syntax, Structure, Meaning and Function*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- VIANU, Tudor (1967). *Los problemas de la metáfora*. Buenos Aires: EUDEBA.
- WEISS, Jonathan H. (1963) ‘Role of “Meaningfulness” Versus Meaning Dimensions in Guessing the Meanings of Foreign Words’. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66: 541–6.
- WHITELEY, Sheila (2000). *Women and popular music: sexuality, identity and subjectivity*. New York: Routledge.
- YULE, George (1985). *The Study of Language: an Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ZAVADIVKER, María Natalia (2005). “La metáfora como recurso epistémico”. *A Parte Rei. Revista de Filosofía*. 40 (julio): 1-9.

Appendices

APPENDIX 1: Primary sources¹⁵

1. Anything but ordinary

Sometimes I get so weird
I even FREAK myself out
I laugh myself to sleep
It's my lullaby
Sometimes I drive so fast
Just to feel the danger
I want to scream
It makes me feel alive

Is it enough to love?
Is it enough to breath?
Somebody rip my heart out
And leave me here to bleed
Is it enough to die?
Somebody save my life
I'd rather be anything but ordinary please

To walk within the lines
Would make my life so boring!
I want to know that I
Have been to the extreme
So knock me off my feet
Come on now give it to me
Anything to make me feel alive

Let down your defenses
Use no common sense

If you look you will see
That this world is a beautiful
Accident, turbulent, succulent
Opulent permanent, no way
I wanna taste it
Don't wanna waste it away

¹⁵ The songs are transcribed as they appear in Avril Lavigne's *Let Go* cd booklet (2002).

2. My world

Please tell me what is taking place?
'Cause I can't seem to find a trace
Guess it must have got erased somehow
Probably 'cause I always forget
Every time someone tells me their name
It's always gotta be the same

Never wore cover-up
Always beat the bois up
Grew up in a 5,000 population town
Made my money by cutting grass
Got "FIRED" by a fried chicken ASS!
All in a small town "NAPANEE"

You know I always stay up without sleeping
And think to myself
Where do I belong forever
In whose arm the time and place

Can't help it if I space in a daze
My eyes tune out the other way
I may switch off and go in a daydream
In this head my thoughts are deep
Sometimes I can't even speak
Would someone be and not pretend, I'm off again in my world

I never spend less than a hour
Washing my hair in the shower
It always takes 5 hours to make it strait
So I'll braid it in a Zillion braids
Though it may take a friggin' day
There's nothing else better to do anyway!

When you're all alone in the lands of forever
Lay under the milkyway
On + on it's getting to late out
I'm not in love this time, this night

Take some time
Mellow out
Party up
But don't fall down
Don't get caught
Sneak out of the house

3. Nobody's Fool (IF)

(step up!)

Fall back take a look @ me
And you'll see I'm for real
I'll feel what only I can feel
And if that don't appeal to ya
Let me know
And I'll go
'Cause I flow
Better when my colors show
And that's the way it has to be
Honestly
'Cause creativeity could never bloom
In my room
I'd throw it all away before I'd lie
So don't call me with a compromise
Hang up the phone
I got a backbone stronger than yours
La la la la la la
La la la la la la la
La la la la la la

[chorus]

If you trying to turn me into someone else
Its easy to see I'm not down with that
I'm not nobodyies fool
If you trying to turn me into something else
I've seen it enough and I'm over that
I'm not nobody's fool
If you wanna bring me down
Go ahead and try
Go ahead and try

Don't know
You think you know me like yourself
But I fear
That you're only telling me what I want to hear
Do you give a damn
Understand
That I can't not be what I am
I'm not the milk and cheerios in your spoon
Its not a simple here we go not so soon
I might of fallen for that when I was 14
And a little more green
But its amazing what a couple of yrs can mean

La la la la la la
La la la la la la la
La la la la la la

[chorus]

Go ahead and try
Try to look me in the eye
But you'll never see inside
Until you realize, realize
Things are trying to settle down
Just trying to figure out
Exactly what I'm about
If it's with or without you
I don't need your doubt in me

[chorus]

La la la la la la
La la la la la la la
La la la la la la

4. Sk8er boi

He was a boi, she was a girl
Can I make it anymore obvious?

He was a punk, she did ballet
What more can I say?

He wanted her, she'd never tell
Secretly she wanted him as well.

All of her friends stuck up their nose
They had a problem with his baggy clothes.

He was a sk8er boi, she said see you later boi
He wasn't good enough for her
She had a pretty face, but her head was up in space
She needed to come back down to “earth”

5 years from now, she sits at home
Feeding the baby
She's all alone

She turns on tv
Guess who she sees
Sk8er boy rockin' up MTV.

She calls up her friends, they already know
And they've all got tickets to see his show

She tags along stands in the crowd
Looks up at the man that she turned down.

He was a sk8er boi, she said see you later boi
He wasn't good enough for her
Now he's a super star
Slamin' on his guitar
Does your pretty face see what he's worth?

Sorry girl but you missed out
Well tough luck that boi's mine now

We are more than just good friends
This is how the story ends

Too bad that you couldn't see
See that man that boi could be

There is more than meets the eye
I see the soul that is inside

He's just a boi, and I'm just a girl
Can I make it anymore obvious?

We are in love, haven't you heard
How we rock each other's world

I'm with the sk8er boi, I said see you later boi
I'll be back stage after the show
I'll be at our studio
Singing the song we wrote
About the girl you used to know

APPENDIX 2: Sound to spelling correspondences¹⁶

CONSONANTS		
PHONEME	GRAPHEME(S)	EXAMPLES
/p/	p, pp	pin, puppet
/b/	b, bb	baby, bubble
/t/	t, tt, th, bt, -ed (word-final – ed morpheme after a voiceless sound)	top, potter, Thomas, debt, worked
/d/	d, dd, ed (word-final –ed morpheme after a voiced sound)	door, paddle, played
/g/	g, gg	wagon, mugger
/k/	c, k, ck, ch, qu	cat, key, duck, school liquor
/m/	m, mm, mb, mn	mouse, common, comb, hymn
/n/	n, nn, gn, kn, ngue	nose, sunny, gnome, knee, tongue
/ŋ/	ng, n (before k)	long, pink
/r/	r, rr, wr, rh	rice, carrot, wrap, rhetoric
/f/	f, ff, ph, gh	family, staff, photo, tough
/v/	v, f	van, of
/θ/	th	thick
/ð/	th, the	without, breathe
/s/	s, ss, c, sc, st	soap, mess, ceiling, science, fasten

¹⁶ These tables are not exhaustive; they just show some of the many spelling patterns used to denote each sound. It is important to mention that charts depicting grapheme-phoneme correspondences vary from author to author. These tables are of my own elaboration and for its construction I have consulted the following bibliography: Miranda, Lidia Raquel; Regúnaga, María Alejandra y Suárez Cepeda, Sonia G. (2010). *Español-inglés en clave contrastiva. Volumen I*. Santa Rosa: EdUNLPam.; *Letters and Sounds: principles and practice of high quality phonics*. [this publication is only available for download on <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110202093118/http://nationalstrategies.standards.dcsf.gov.uk/node/84969>] Ref: 00281-2007

/z/	z, zz, s, ss, x, se, ze	zip, fuzzy, president, scissors, xylophone, please, squeeze
/ʃ/	sh, s, ss, ci, ch, ce, t (before -ion and -ial)	shine, sugar, issue, special, chef, ocean, motion, partial
/ʒ/	s (before -ion and -ure), su, ge	vision, measure, usual, beige
/tʃ/	ch, tch	chip, pitch
/dʒ/	j, g, dg	jungle, general, judge
/h/	h, wh	high, who
/j/	y, i	yes, onion
/l/	l, ll	lamp, ball
/w/	w, u	want, queen

VOWELS		
PHONEME	GRAPHEME(S)	EXAMPLE
/i:/	ee, ea, e, ie, eo	week, pea, he, chief, people
/ɪ/	i, y, o, u,	pin, myth, women, busy
/u:/	oo, ew, ue, u-e, ough	school, grew, true, rule, through
/ʊ/	oo, u, ou	book, put, would
/ɔ:/	or, aw, au, ore, al, ought, aught	for, paw, Paul, more, walk, bought, caught
/ɒ/	o, a	lock, was
/ɑ:/	ar, a, al, au, ear	car, father, palm, aunt, heart
/æ/	a	hand
/ʌ/	u, o, o-e, ou, oe,	cup, brother, come, young, does
/ɜ:/	ur, er, ir, or (after w)	fur, her, bird, work
/e/	e, ea, ai, ie	leg, head, said, friend
/ə/	a, o, ou	another, cotton, famous,

/eɪ/	ai, ay, a-e, aigh	main, day, mate, straight
/eə/	air, are, ear	fair, care, cheer
/aɪ/	igh, ie, y, i-e, i	fight, pie, my, like, kind
/aʊ/	ow, ou, ough	cow, found, drought
/əʊ/	oa, ow, o, oe, o-e	coat, low, go, toe, mole
/ɔɪ/	oi, oy	coin, toy
/ɪə/	ear, e-r, ere	dear, beer, mere
/ʊə/	u-e, oor, our	sure, poor, tour