

**A STUDY OF METAPHORIC AND METONYMIC EXPRESSIONS OF
BODY PART TERMS HAND AND HEAD IN HAUSA**

YUSUF AHMED GWARZO

**FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR
2015**

**A STUDY OF METAPHORIC AND METONYMIC EXPRESSIONS
OF BODY PART TERMS HAND AND HEAD IN HAUSA**

YUSUF AHMED GWARZO

**A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF LINGUISTICS**

**FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR**

2015

UNIVERSITI MALAYA
ORIGINAL LITERARY WORK DECLARATION

Name of Candidate: Yusuf Ahmed Gwarzo

(Passport No.: A03845033)

Registration/Matric No.: TGC 120081

Name of Degree: Master of Linguistics

The Title Dissertation (“this Work”): A Study of Metaphoric and Metonymic Expressions of Body Part Terms Hand and Head in Hausa.

Field: Cognitive Linguistics

I do solemnly and sincerely declare that:

- (1) I am the sole author/writer of this work;
- (2) This work is original;
- (3) Any use of any work in which copyright exists was done by way of fair dealing and for permitted purposes and any excerpt or extract form, or reference to or production of any copyright work has been disclosed expressly and sufficiently and the title of the work and its authorship have been acknowledged in this work;
- (4) I do not have any actual knowledge nor do I ought reasonably to know that the making of this work constitutes an infringement of any copyright work;
- (5) I hereby assign all and every rights in the copyright to this work to the University of Malaya (“UM”), who henceforth shall be owner of the copyright in this work and that any reproduction or use in any form or by any means whatsoever is prohibited without the written consent of UM having been first had and obtained;
- (6) I am fully aware that if in the course of making this work I have infringed any copyright whether intentionally or otherwise, I may be subject to legal action or any other action as may be determined by UM.

Candidate’s signature

Date:

Subscribed and solemnly declared before,

Witness’ Signature

Date:

Name: Dr. Toshiko Yamaguci

Designation: Supervisor

ABSTRACT

Numerous studies have been conducted on metaphor and metonymy on body part terms across the languages. Within the conceptual metaphor and metonymy theory of Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Lakoff (1987), Radden and Kövecses (1999) and Radeen and Dirven (2007), the present research investigates the conceptualizations of body part terms in Hausa language. The research only investigates the conceptualizations of *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’ in the Hausa language. The study is aimed at identifying the metaphorical and metonymical expressions of both *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’ in the Hausa language. The study also examines how the idealized cognitive models (ICMs) are operating for the creations of *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’ metaphors and metonymies.

The Analysis of the investigation found that metaphorically *hannu* ‘hand’ is conceptualized as HAND IS CONTROL, HAND IS POSSESSION, HAND IS ATTENTION and HAND IS COOPERATION. Metonymically, *hannu* ‘hand’ is conceptualized as HAND STANDS FOR ACTIVITY, HAND STANDS FOR PERSON, HAND STANDS FOR SKILL, HAND STANDS FOR CONTROL, HAND STANDS FOR PERSONALITY, HAND STANDS FOR SIDE and HAND STANDS FOR GIVEN. The analysis further found that the metaphorical expressions of *kai* ‘head’ as HEAD IS A CONTAINER OF INTELLIGENCE, HEAD AS A TOP OF THING, HEAD AS A TIP OF THING, HEAD AS BEGINNING OF THING, HEAD AS MOVING OBJECT, HEAD AS INDEPENDENCE OF AN OBJECT and HEAD AS SUFFICE OF AN OBJECT. Metonymical expressions of *kai* ‘head’ identified include HEAD STANDS FOR PERSON, HEAD STANDS FOR INTELLIGENCE, HEAD STANDS FOR INDEPENDENCE, HEAD STANDS FOR COOPERATION, HEAD STANDS FOR LENGTH and HEAD STANDS FOR AGREEMENT. Analysis also revealed that the containment ICM, human being ICM, non-human ICM, and part-whole ICM are ICMs that are involved in the creation of the metaphorical and metonymical expressions of *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’ in the Hausa language.

The findings revealed that the speakers of Hausa language make use of body part terms *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’ to evoked figurative conceptualizations and both *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’ plays a significant role in Hausa language and culture, describing various activities, functions and the human experience. The findings also revealed that the conceptualizations of both *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’ were as a result of their general function in the human body and some time specific cultural beliefs that have root in the language traditions.

ABSTRAK

Pelbagai kajian telah dijalankan tentang metafora dan metanomi berdasarkan istilah anggota badan merentasi pelbagai bahasa. Dalam konsep teori metafora dan metanomi oleh Lakoff dan Johnson (1980), Lakoff (1987), Radden dan Kövecses (1999) serta Radeen dan Dirven (2007, kajian semasa ini menyiasat tentang konseptualisasi istilah anggota badan dalam bahasa Hausa. Kajian ini hanya menyelidik tentang konseptualisasi perkataan *hannu* ‘tangan’ dan *kai* ‘kepala’ dalam bahasa Hausa. Kajian tersebut bertujuan untuk mengenal pasti ungkapan metafora dan metanomi tentang kedua-dua perkataan *hannu* ‘tangan’ dan *kai* ‘kepala’ dalam bahasa Hausa. Kajian tersebut juga mengkaji bagaimana model ideal kognitif (ICM) beroperasi bagi menghasilkan metafora dan metanomi berdasarkan *hannu* ‘tangan’ dan *kai* ‘kepala’.

Analisis penyiasatan tersebut telah mengenal pasti bahawa secara metaforanya, *hannu* ‘tangan’ dikonseptualisasikan sebagai TANGAN ADALAH KAWALAN, TANGAN ADALAH PEMILIKAN, TANGAN ADALAH PERHATIAN dan TANGAN ADALAH KERJASAMA. Manakala, secara metanominya, *hannu* ‘tangan’ dikonseptualisasikan sebagai TANGAN BERMAKSUD AKTIVITI, TANGAN BERMAKSUD ORANG, TANGAN BERMAKSUD KEMAHIRAN, TANGAN BERMAKSUD KAWALAN, TANGAN BERMAKSUD PERWATAKAN, TANGAN BERMAKSUD SOKONGAN dan TANGAN BERMAKSUD PEMBERIAN. Analisis tersebut mengenal pasti dengan lebih dalam ungkapan metafora *kai* ‘kepala’ sebagai KEPALA ADALAH SEBUAH KONTENA KEBIJAKSANAAN, KEPALA SEBAGAI SEBUAH PUNCAK PERKARA, KEPALA SEBAGAI PENGHujung PERKARA, KEPALA SEBAGAI SEBUAH PERMULAAN PERKARA, KEPALA SEBAGAI OBJEK BERGERAK, KEPALA SEBAGAI KEBEBASAN SESUATU OBJEK dan KEPALA SEBAGAI PERMUKAAN SESUATU OBJEK. Sementara itu ungkapan metonomi bagi *kai* ‘kepala’ telah dikenal pastikan sebagai KEPALA BERMAKSUD ORANG, KEPALA BERMAKSUD KEBIJAKSANAAN, KEPALA BERMAKSUD KEBEBASAN, KEPALA BERMAKSUD KERJASAMA, KEPALA BERMAKSUD KEPANJANGAN dan KEPALA BERMAKSUD PERSETUJUAN. Analisis tersebut menunjukkan bahawa ICM

pengawalan, ICM manusia, ICM bukan manusia dan ICM separuh-keseluruhan merupakan ICM yang beroperasi bagi menghasilkan ungkapan metafora dan metanomi berdasarkan *hannu* ‘tangan’ dan *kai* ‘kepala’ dalam bahasa Hausa.

Hasil kajian tersebut menunjukkan bahawa penutur bahasa Hausa tersebut menggunakan istilah anggota badan *hannu* ‘tangan’ dan *kai* ‘kepala’ untuk menunjukkan konseptualisasi kiasan dan kedua-dua *hannu* ‘tangan’ dan *kai* ‘kepala’ memainkan peranan penting dalam budaya dan bahasa Hausa, menghuraikan pelbagai aktiviti, fungsi dan pengalaman manusia. Hasil kajian tersebut juga mendedahkan bahawa konseptualisasi kedua-dua *hannu* ‘hand’ dan *kai* ‘head’ merupakan hasil daripada fungsi umum mereka dalam tubuh manusia dan kadangkala kepercayaan budaya tertentu yang mempunyai asal-usul dalam tradisi bahasa

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All praises to Allah for the strengths and His blessing in completing this dissertation. I am deeply indebted to my dissertation supervisor Associate Professor Dr. Toshiko Yamaguchi for her professional expertise, insightful comments and stimulating encouragement. Her great care and patience in reading, correcting and embellishing my dissertation draft from chapter to chapter has made me feel more and more confident in my dissertation and always at ease along my writing path. I truly believe that this dissertation would never have a chance to be completed without her guidance.

I will like to express my sincere gratitude to my late father, Ahmed Gwadabe and my mother Safiya for their support, love and encouragement, may Allah reward them with Jannatul Firdaus Amin. Similarly, my brothers, sisters and friends the support and kindness you give to me is really nice and grateful.

Moreover, I will like to thanks all my lectures and staff from the faculty of languages and linguistics for the knowledge, patience and guidance they share with us. I prayed to God to reward them abundantly. My special thanks to Dr. Fransisco Doming Perlas and Professor Maya David their ideas at the beginning of the dissertation was very useful, I really appreciate and grateful. Special gratitude goes to his Excellency the Governor of Kano State Engr. Dr. Rabi'u Musa Kwankwaso for awarding me the scholarship to study at University of Malaya, may Allah reward him accordingly.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

University Malaya	ii
Abstract	iii
Abstrak	v
Acknowledgment	vii
Table of Contents	viii
List of Tables	xii
List of Abbreviations	xiii
List of Appendixes	xiv
Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Overview	1
1.2 Background of the Hausa Language	2
1.2.1 Hausa Language	2
1.2.2 Hausa Language Structure	2
1.3 Background of the Study	3
1.3.1 Hand Embodiment	5
1.3.2 Head Embodiment	5
1.4 Statement of Problem	6
1.5 Research Objectives	6
1.6 Research Questions	7
1.7 Significance of the Study	7
1.8 Scope and Limitations of the Study	8
1.9 Operational Definition of Terms	8
Chapter 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 Non-cognitive Approach to the Study of Metaphor and Metonymy	9
2.2.1 Non-cognitive Approach of Metaphor	10

2.2.2	Non-cognitive Approach of Metonymy	12
2.3	Cognitive Approach to the Study of Metaphor and Metonymy	13
2.3.1	Cognitive Approach of Metaphor	13
2.3.1.1	Definition of Metaphor	14
2.3.1.2	Metaphor and Human Body	16
2.3.1	Cognitive Approach of Metonymy	17
2.3.1.1	Definition of Metonymy	17
2.3.1.2	Metonymy and Human Body	19
2.4	Past Studies on Body Part Terms in Hausa Language	20
2.5	Past Studies on Body Part Terms across Languages	23
2.5.1	European Languages	23
2.5.2	Asian Languages	25
2.5.3	Middle East Languages	27
2.6	Past Studies on Body Part Terms Hand and Head across Languages	29
2.6.1	European Languages	29
2.6.2	Middle East Languages	33
Chapter 3	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	35
3.1	Introduction	35
3.2	Theoretical Framework	35
3.2.1	Conceptual Metaphor Theory	35
3.2.2	Conceptual Metonymy Theory	36
3.2.3	Idealized Cognitive Models (ICMs)	36
3.2.4	Conceptual Shift	37
3.3	Research Design	41
3.4	Source of the Data Collection	42
3.4.1	Dictionaries	42

3.4.1	Leadership Hausa Newspaper	43
3.4.1	Aminiya Newspaper	43
3.5	Data Collection Procedure	43
3.6	Data Analysis Procedure	44
Chapter 4	DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION	45
4.1	Introduction	45
4.2	Metaphorical Expressions of <i>Hannu</i> ‘Hand’	46
4.2.1	HAND IS A CONTROL	46
4.2.2	HAND IS A POSSESSION	47
4.2.3	HAND IS COOPERATION	48
4.2.4	HAND IS ATTENTION	49
4.3	Metonymical Expressions of <i>Hannu</i> ‘Hand’	49
4.3.1	HAND STANDS FOR ACTIVITY	50
4.3.2	HAND STANDS FOR PERSON	51
4.3.3	HAND STANDS FOR SKILL	52
4.3.4	HAND STANDS FOR CONTROL	52
4.3.5	HAND STANDS FOR PERSONALITY	53
4.3.6	HAND STANDS FOR SIDE	54
4.3.7	HAND STANDS FOR GIVING	55
4.4	Metaphorical Expressions of <i>Kai</i> ‘Head’	56
4.4.1	HEAD AS A CONTAINER OF INTELLIGENCE	56
4.4.2	HEAD AS A TOP OF THING	57
4.4.3	HEAD AS A TIP OF THING	57
4.4.4	HEAD AS BEGINNING OF THING	58
4.4.5	HEAD AS A BUNDLE	59
4.4.6	HEAD AS A MOVING OBJECT	60

4.4.7	HEAD AS SIZE OF AN OBJECT	61
4.4.8	HEAD AS INDEPENDENCE OF AN OBJECT	61
4.4.9	HEAD AS SUFFICE OF AN OBJECT	62
4.5	Metonymical Expressions of <i>Kai</i> ‘Head’	63
4.5.1	HEAD STANDS FOR PERSON	63
4.5.2	HEAD STANDS FOR INTELLIGENCE	64
4.5.3	HEAD STANDS FOR INDEPENDENCE	65
4.5.4	HEAD STANDS FOR COOPERATION	66
4.5.5	HEAD STANDS FOR LENGTH	67
4.5.6	HEAD STANDS FOR AGREEMENT	67
4.6	Idealized Cognitive Models (ICMs)	68
4.6.1	Containment ICM	68
4.6.2	Human being ICM and Non-Human being ICM	70
4.6.3	Part-whole ICM	71
Chapter 5	CONCLUSION	72
5.1	Introduction	72
5.2	Findings	72
5.2.1.	Answering Research Question One	73
5.2.2.	Answering Research Question Two	75
5.2.3.	Answering Research Question Three	76
5.3	Future Research	77
Reference		79

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	Hausa pronouns	3
Table 4.1	Summary of the compiled data	45
Table 4.2	Frequency of <i>hannu</i> ‘hand’ metaphors and metonyms	45
Table 4.3	Frequency of <i>kai</i> ‘head’ metaphors and metonyms	46
Table 4.4	Frequency of metaphorical expressions of <i>hannu</i> ‘hand’	46
Table 4.5	Frequency of metonymical expressions of <i>hannu</i> ‘hand’	50
Table 4.6	Frequency of metaphorical expressions of <i>kai</i> ‘head’	56
Table 4.7	Frequency of of metonymical expressions of <i>kai</i> ‘head’	63
Table 4.8	Idealized cognitive models	68

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1	First person
2	Second person
3	Third person
ADJ	Adjective
ASP	Aspect
COP	Copula
F	Feminine
GEN	Genitive
IPFV	Imperfective
M	Masculine
NEG	Negation
PFV	Perfective
PL	Plural
REL	Relative
SG	Singular
ANP	Aminiya Newspaper
DHL	Dictionary of the Hausa Language (Abraham 1962)
FRSC	Federal Road Safety Commission
HED	A Hausa-English Dictionary and English-Hausa Vocabulary (Bagery 1993)
ICM	Idealized Cognitive Models
LHNP	Leadership Hausa Newspaper
Lit.:	Literal Meaning
PDP	People Democratic Party

LIST OF APPENDIXES

Appendix 1	84
Appendix 2	90
Appendix 3	99
Apeendix 4	107

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

From the 1980's, conceptual metaphor and metonymy have attracted much interest from cognitive linguists. Over the decades, seminal works of Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Lakoff (1987, 1993) have remained influential in this area. Also, the prominence of metonymy increased in the late 1990s following work by eminent scholars such as Radden and Kövecses, (1999), Panther and Radden, (1999), Pütz, Niemeier and Dirven, (2001), and Barcelona, (2000), that later became much influential in the field of cognitive linguistics. Conceptual metaphor concerns mapping between source domains through reference to another entity or element in the target domains by means of conceptualization (Barcelona, 2003; Barcelona & Soriano, 2004; Boers, 1999; Croft, 1993; Ibarretxe-Antu ano, 1999; Lakoff, 1987, 1993; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980a, 1980b). Relatedly, metonymy involves single domain mapping of an entity onto another entity, the vehicle gives access to another entity that is the target, in a single domain (Barcelona, 2000, 2002; Croft, 1993; Gibbs Jr & Steen, 1999; Guan, 2009; Panther & Radden, 1999; Radden & Kövecses, 1999).

The present research explores the cognitive mechanisms which function in the creation of metaphorical and metonymical expressions of body part terms in the Hausa language. The study will investigate uses of the body part terms *hannu* 'hand' and *kai* 'head' for the production of conceptualized expressions.

1.2 Background of the Hausa Language

1.2.1 Hausa Language

Hausa has 35 to 40 million speakers and is one of about one hundred and thirty (130) Chadic languages within the Afro-asiatic phylum. Hausa language - ethnic Hausas and settled Fulanis initial language in Hausa-land that encompasses Nigeria's northern states right until Niger's southern province (Newman, 2000; Crysmann, 2012). It has the largest population of speakers in the Chadic languages family (Greenberg, 1963; Newman, 1980). Throughout West Africa's scattered settlements, the Hausa language is spoken as a first language. In Northern Nigeria, Northern Benin, Togo and Ghana, Hausa is used as a second language by millions of non-Hausas as well. Nigeria's national languages are its three dominant languages, namely Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba.

1.2.2 Hausa Language Structure

Hausa is structured using Subject-Verb-Object, (SVO) (Zimmermann, 2006). Another grammatical feature of Hausa language is the language that shows strong gender distinctions (Galadanci, 1976). For example, second and third person pronouns in Hausa show gender distinctions (as shown in table 1.1 below). Moreover, Hausa is a tonal language with both lexical and distinctive grammatical (Crysmann, 2012) and syntactical aspects in its phonological structure of both tone (high, low, falling) and length (long vs. short). The syllable patterns of Hausa are of two types: open and closed syllable.

With reference to the current study, Hausa exploits the uses of body parts in both lexical and grammatical context. Body parts in Hausa are structurally used to express lexical items (Hilpert, 2007; Batic, 2006). For example, the body part 'head' lexically may be extended to refer the top part or the beginning of an object (Hilpert, 2007). Moreover, body parts are not extended only to refer to the lexical meaning, but also to the grammatical meaning, e.g. (head → top part → over) here structurally the

extensions of the body part head to top part which is lexical, as well as the grammatical item which is over. Batic (2006) also claimed that “among all the lexical items making up the Hausa anatomical vocabulary (more or less 70), for 35 of them one may notice the employment of metaphor” (Batic, 2006; p.18). In Hausa, body parts are also used to express grammaticalized items. For examples, the body part ‘hand’ may express the grammatical items of object, activity, time, space, and quality in Hausa (Batic, 2006; p. 21). ‘Head’ may express the grammatical items of object, activity, space, and quality, respectively.

	Singular	Plural
1 st person	Ni	mu
2 nd person: Male Female	kai ke	ku
3 rd Person: Male Female	shi ita	su

Table 1.1: Hausa pronouns per Galadanci (1976, p. 25).

Table 1.1 above shows the pronouns gender specification in the Hausa language.

1.3 Background of the Study

According to a traditional view, metaphor and metonymy are simply figures of speech; however, from a cognitive linguistics point of view both are important cognitive mechanisms. Metaphor and metonymy usually involve conceptualization of an entity either within two discrete domains for metaphor, or within a single domain for metonymy. To generate any type of conceptualization, there must be either a conceptual shift or mapping from one conceptual domain to another domain. During conceptualization, human thought and experiences typically consider the source domain to be more tangible and visibly salient compared to the target domain, which is more intangible and less defined (Kövecses, 2002). In other words, Lakoff (1987) argued that “since bodily experience is constant experience of the real world that mostly involves

successful functioning stringent real-world constraints are placed on conceptual structure this avoid subjectivism” (Lakoff, 1987, p. 268).

As human body parts are crucial in the creation of metaphor and metonymy, Kövecses (2002) claimed that the human body is the best candidate for the source domain, as it is clearly defined and easily understood. He also stated that the body parts especially employed in metaphorical and metonymical conception include various body parts such as head, face, legs, hands, back, heart, bones, shoulders, and others. Therefore, the experiential basis of conceptual metaphor and metonymy is both bodily and cultural. Then the mind of the human being is embodied in such a way that our conceptual systems draw largely upon the peculiarities of the human body and the specifics of our physical and cultural environment (Johnson, 1987; Lakoff, 1987; Lakoff & Johnson, 1987; Yu, 2008; Maalej & Yu, 2011). On this basis, the human body plays a crucial role in meaning and understanding, and our interaction in and with the physical and cultural world defines the contours of what is meaningful to us and determines the ways of our understanding (Gibbs, 1999; Yu, 2008; Maalej & Yu, 2011). By this, we understand that human meaning and understanding are in part metaphorical mappings from the concrete to the abstract. We also understand that our body, with its experiences and functions, is a potentially universal source domain for metaphorical mappings onto more abstract domains.

Body part terms are heavily exploited in most languages. The functions and interpretation may be the same, or perhaps vary in viewing the body and its role in grounding metaphors across languages. They may interpret the same embodied experience differently or attach different values to the same bodily experiences or the same parts of the body (Maalej & Yu, 2011). Moreover, it is possible that in differing languages, different body parts or bodily experiences may be mapped onto the same abstract concepts (Kövecses, 2005; Yu, 2008). Equally, the same body parts or bodily experiences may be selected to map onto and structure different abstract concepts.

Hence, this gives rise to varied conceptual mappings in different languages (Kövecses, 2005; Yu, 2008; Maalej & Yu, 2011).

Thus, body parts are classified into two main groups: internal and external parts. The internal body parts are comprised of the heart, liver, mind, blood, nerves, and so on. While the external body parts include the head (eye, nose, mouth, etc. as attach to head), hand, and legs and so on. Investigations by Sharifian, (2011); Sharifi, (2012); Yu, (2004, 2011); Nissen, (2011); and Zahedi, (2012), among others, have been conducted to investigate how human body parts have been conceptualized to generate metaphoric and metonymic expressions. In addition, there are two volumes of books that addressed the grounding of metaphors and metonymies in mind and body through our worldly bodily experiences. Sharifian et al. (2008) wrote a report based on empirical research which deals with the conceptualization of heart and other internal body organs across languages and cultures. Also, Maalej & Yu (2011) compiled empirical investigations of embodiment via body parts across the geographical locations of the world languages and cultures studied.

1.3.1 Hand Embodiment

As one of the defining characteristics of human beings, the ‘hands’ are one of the crucial body parts which deal with the external world. We act through and hold things with our hands. Our bodily experiences with our hands are a common experiential base for many shared theoretical metonymies and metaphors structuring abstract concepts in all languages (Yu, 2008).

1.3.2 Head Embodiment

‘Head’ as the sensory selector is associated with the ability to make choices based on what is recorded. We think and process cognitively; we fantasize, dream, and imagine with our head, which includes our brain, skull, and perceptive organs such as the eyes,

ears, and nose. We decipher and decode all internal and external stimuli through this body part (Halprin, 2002).

In view of the above, this research is focused on finding out the cognitive mechanisms that are operating in the conceptualization of metaphorical and metonymical expressions of *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’ in the Hausa language.

1.4 Statement of Problem

There have been claims made by previous investigations that “since the conventionalization of metaphoric and metonymic mappings is normally understood to be culturally bound, it is tempting to cognitive linguists to dismiss the problem as one of looking into the mapping system of each language” (Velasco, 2000; p. 52). On the other hand, an interrelated issue is the problem of why metonymy does not always work in the same way across different languages (Velasco, 2000; p. 52). Therefore, the present study will examine the mapping system of Hausa language, by investigating the conceptual processes of metaphoric and metonymic expressions of *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’.

1.5 Objectives of Study

The objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To identify the metaphorical and metonymical conceptualizations of *hannu* ‘hand’ in the Hausa language.
2. To identify the metaphorical and metonymical conceptualizations of *kai* ‘head’ in the Hausa language.
3. To examine how ICMs function in the creation of metaphoric and metonymical expressions of *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’ in the Hausa language.

1.6 Research Questions

The research is aimed to solve the following questions:

1. What are the metaphorical and metonymical conceptualizations of *hannu* ‘hand’ in the Hausa language?
2. What are the metaphorical and metonymical conceptualizations of *kai* ‘head’ in the Hausa language?
3. How do the ICMs operate for the creation of metaphorical and metonymical expressions of *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’ in the Hausa language?

1.7 Significance of Study

The significance of this study lies in the development of a comprehensive study of metaphor and metonymy related to two body part terms in the Hausa language. Previous investigations have suggested that the Afro-Asiatic phylum languages of Africa lack deep investigation into their metaphor and metonymy related to body parts compared to their European and Indo-European language counterparts. In the Hausa language, some attempts have been made to investigate the metaphorical conceptualizations related to body parts. However, these attempts have been limited. Batic (2006) claimed that “concerning the Hausa language, only a few attempts have been made to investigate the body paradigm and its metaphorical renderings” (McIntyre, 2002; Pawlak, 2005; cited in Batic, 2006. P. 17).

However, there are some additional studies which were conducted on metaphor and metonymy in the Hausa language unrelated to body parts. Investigations such as Jaggar and Buba (2009) on eating and drinking conceptualizations in the Hausa language and Pawlak (2005) on spatial orientation conceptualizations are among the popular studies. The current study will therefore contribute to the existing body of literature of Hausa studies in the domain of cognitive linguistics.

1.8 Scope and Limitations of the Study

The study is limited only to human body parts, specifically *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’ in Hausa. Body parts consist of differentiated segments such as the internal (heart, blood and nerves) and external (legs, eyes, mouth, nose and eyes) body parts, distinctions between which are important for the study of metaphor and metonymy.

1.9 Operational Definition of Terms

Metaphor: Conceptual metaphor refers to the understanding of one conceptual domain (source), interns of another (target). It also viewed as a form of conceptual projection involving mappings holding between distinct domains. The purpose of such a set of mappings is to provide structure from one conceptual domain, the source domain, by projecting the structure onto the target domain. This may allows inferences which hold in the source to be applied to the target. For instance, the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY serve to structure the target domain LOVE in terms of the of the source domain JOURNEY which allows us to think and talk about love in terms of journeys. A metaphor of this kind is made up of a number of conventional mappings stored in long-term memory. Hence, the travellars from the domain of JOURNEY are conventionally mapped onto that of lovers in the domain of LOVE, the notion of vehicle is mapped onto that of the love relationship and so on.

Metonymy: Conceptual metonymy refers to the conceptual operation in which one entity, the vehicle, can be employed in order to identify another entity, the target, with which it is associated. Consider the following utterance, in which one waitress is addressing another in a restaurant and describes a customer in the following way: *Be careful, the ham sanwinch has wandering hands*. This use of the expression *ham sandwich* represents an instance of metonymy: tow entities are associated so that one entity (the item the customer ordered) stands for the other (the customer). Therefore we can understand metonymy as the conceptual relation ‘X stands for Y’, and metonymy involes a mapping within a single doamin.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides relevant literature review pertaining to previous investigations. Part one of this chapter describes the non-cognitive approach to the study of metaphor and metonymy. Part two presents the cognitive approach to the study of metaphor and metonymy, respectively. Part three of this chapter highlights past studies which have been conducted on body part terms in the Hausa language. In this part, the review will highlight types of studies conducted on body parts in the Hausa language, based on a cognitive linguistic approach and what contribution the present study will provide to the field of cognitive linguistics. Part four of this chapter will present relevant literature pertaining to body part terms across different languages. This section will bring to light about how body part terms are utilized to produce metaphorical expressions across languages. Part five will also provide a review of previous studies related to body part terms, especially *hand* and *head*, across languages.

2.2 Non-cognitive Approach to the Study of Metaphor and Metonymy

Non-cognitive approaches to the study of metaphor and metonymy are traditional; these include all the classical studies dated before the 1980's. This type of approach views metaphor and metonymy as a figurative language used to decorate language in literary usage. Bearing this in mind, the current study examines how previous studies viewed these two notions (metaphor and metonymy) as simply figures of speech.

2.2.1 Non-cognitive Approach of Metaphor

According to this traditional conception, metaphor is an extraordinary use of language and its purpose is to decorate the language. Charbati (2008) asserted that “traditional account of metaphor was concerned with semantic side, that is, the meaning of metaphor, its nature, and its challenges to the semantic theory” (Charbati, 2008, p.1). He further explained that they only viewed metaphor as simply a literary mechanism that is use to beautify language, showcasing the extraordinary use of language rather than ordinary usage. They also assumed that there was no cognitive value in producing metaphor and that it is typically not used as a means to realize the way humans think (Charbati, 2008).

Aristotle viewed the metaphor as a means of giving an entity a name that belongs to something else. Burke (1952) asserted that the metaphor is a device of seeing something in terms of something else. Metaphor also means an understanding and experiencing one thing in terms of another (Searle, 1969). A detailed definition of metaphor as given by Hawkes (1972) clearly demonstrates how the traditional approach sees metaphor as only a figurative language. He sees metaphor as a linguistics process whereby aspect of one object is transferred to another object; therefore the second object is understood in terms of the first object. This form of transference is called figure of speech; this refers to turning language away from its literal meaning towards figurative language (Hawkes, 1972, cited in Goban 2005).

Black (1962) demonstrated some approaches to the study of metaphor. According to him a metaphor is equivalent to a substitution, that is, whenever a metaphorical expression is used in place of some corresponding literal words a substitution has taken place. We can understand this when a metaphorical expression is used to communicate a meaning which might have been uttered literally. For instance, when a writer substitutes A for B, it is the reader’s job to overturn the substitution, by

using the literal meaning of A as a clue to the intended literal meaning of B (Black 1962). He then classifies this type of metaphorical expressions as a means of substitution, such that any approach to the study of metaphor in these terms is called a substitution approach.

Another approach to the study of metaphor is the use of the metaphor as a comparison. Black (1962) asserted that metaphor consists the presentation of similarities between two objects. He further explained that this method tend to provides more elaboration about the objects compared. For example, the phrase “Richard is a lion” in the comparison view it might be elaborated as “Richard is like a lion” also Richard can be contrasted with a wider variety of features of the lion. It should be noted that in the substitution approach “Richard is a lion” is only limited to mean roughly “Richard is brave”. This might be contrasted to the comparison approach in which the metaphor may be paraphrased to a wider range of features.

The last approach as discussed by Black (1962) is the interaction approach to the study of metaphor; he described this view with reference to “associated commonplaces” in which the writer who uses a metaphor plays upon the hoard of general knowledge apparently shared by the reader and himself. However, Black’s based his view on the seven claims, of which the most important are as follows:

- (a) A metaphorical statement has two distinct subjects, to be identified as the “primary” and the “secondary” one.
- (b) The secondary subject is to be regarded as a system rather than an individual thing.
- (c) The metaphorical utterance works by “projecting upon” the primary subject a set of “associated implications” comprised in the implicative complex, that are predictable of the secondary subject (Black ,1989).

2.2.2 Non-cognitive Approach of Metonymy

Metonymy has also been considered a type of figurative language used to decorate language by the traditional approach. Preminger and Brogan (1993) asserted that traditional approaches to the study of metonymy defined metonymy “as a figure in which one word is substituted for another on the basis of some material, causal, or conceptual relation” (Preminger and Brogan, 1993, cited in Papafragou 1996, p. 169). Papafragou further explained that metonymy confines a variety of phenomena which persist to be productive and extensive in a variety of language. On the other hand, the traditional approach views metonymy as a figure of speech, or a departure from the normal linguistic norms, serving ornamental or literary purposes and demanding suitable training for successful use and comprehension.

Papafragou also pointed out that within the pragmatic literature, metonymy is a case of deferred reference in which a speaker uses a description of A and succeeds in referring to B. Therefore metonymic uses are considered a subcategory of a local word used in which “a speaker believes are generally perceived as traditional against a system of beliefs that is available only to a sub-section of the community” (Nunberg, 1978, p.186, cited in Papafragou 1996, p. 171). In addition, Papafragou asserts that Fauconnier (1985) share the same view with Nunberg (1978) and largely adopted his analysis on metonymy. Fauconnier also saw metonymy as a subclass of deferred reference, which is facilitated by the establishment of links between objects for psychological, cultural, or locally pragmatic reasons; these links are confined by pragmatic mappings which Fauconnier terms connectors (Papafragou ,1996).

Conclusively, we understand that the non-cognitive approach views metaphor and metonymy as only figures of speech used to decorate language in literary uses. We also understand that this approach does not view metaphor and metonymy as a part of human cognition, which deals with the human mind and thought. However, a new

approach to the study of metaphor and metonymy emerged in the early 1980s, in which studies of metaphor and metonymy took a new dimension in the school of thought called cognitive linguistics. The next section discusses the contemporary approach to the study of metaphor and metonymy.

2.3 Cognitive Approach to the Study of Metaphor and Metonymy

The cognitive approach to the study of metaphor and metonymy emerge through the cognitive linguistics studies to language, while cognitive linguistics is part of the general school of thought collectively referred to as cognitive science. “Cognitive linguistics is taken here to refer to the approach to the study of language that began to emerge in the 1970s and has been increasingly active since the 1980s” (Croft and Cruse, 2004, p.1). However, there is no significant difference with other cognitive abilities such as perception, reasoning, and memory, and the mental processes responsible for the language understanding and comprehension. Therefore, the cognitive processes that govern the use of language are in principle the same as other cognitive abilities (Croft, 2004; Charbati, 2008). Cognitive linguistics studies “how the brain processes language along with the relation between language and the mind, and how language affects thought and vice versa” (Charbati, 2008, p.57). He further added that one of the major problems studied is how knowledge of a language can be acquired and used. Referencing such cognitive approach studies of language, the present study considers some of the previous studies which discuss metaphor and metonymy as cognitive mechanisms.

2.3.1 Cognitive Approach of Metaphor

The conceptual approach to the study of metaphor has been propounded by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). Their conception focused on the cognitive aspect of metaphor; that is,

they focused on the relationship between metaphor and thought. Thus, metaphor is a mapping across conceptual domains and a metaphor is evoked whenever a pattern of inferences from one conceptual domain is used in another domain. Charbati (2008) asserted that the conceptual approach to the metaphor views the conceptual metaphor as a theme of thought and action and only derivatively for language. “It assumed that the metaphor is pervasive in language, in thought and action and that the metaphors we use are evidence of the metaphorisity of our ordinary conceptual system” (Charbati, 2008, p.1).

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) also explained that one type of reality is not only understood but really experienced in terms of another. Therefore, the metaphor is a key mechanism through which we realize abstract concepts and perform abstract reasoning and our behavior, including the use of language. However, Ortony (1993) made it clear that the central idea to contemporary metaphors theories is that “cognition is the result of mental *construction*. Knowledge of reality, whether occasioned by perception, language, or memory, necessitates going beyond the information given. It arises through the interaction of that information with the context in which it is presented and with the knower's preexisting knowledge” (Ortony, 1993, p. 1).

2.3.1.1 Definition of Metaphor

Since the 1980's, conceptual metaphors have been influential in the field of cognitive linguistics. Previous investigations discussed extensively the notion of conceptual metaphor, giving rise to a number of definitions and meanings pertaining to the conceptual metaphor. After carefully examining the available and relevant literature at hand, the following definitions were extracted from previous investigations:

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) explained the notion of “metaphor as a conceptual trend which is linked with people's thoughts and behaviors”. This is persistent in

language, human thought, action, and conceptual structure in everyday life where our reflex expressions and actions are basically metaphorical in nature (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 4-5). Lakoff (1993) further added that the discrete domain mapping in the conceptual organization, as well as the realization that such a discrete domain mapping is through metaphorical expressions known as the conceptual metaphor.

Barcelona (2000, p.3) described the metaphor as “a cognitive mechanism whereby one experiential domain is partially mapped onto a different experiential domain, so that the second domain is partially understood in terms of the first one”. He further explained that the source domain refers to a mapped domain, whereas target domain refers to a source mapped domain and both must originate from different super-ordinate domains. From another perspective, Barcelona defined mapping as a conceptual source domain onto the target domain as metaphor. Both source and target domains are either taxonomically different unlinked by a pragmatic function, or they have different functional domains (Barcelona, 2002, p. 246). He also held that both source and target domains are different taxonomic domains and are not associated by a pragmatic meaning.

In the definition given by Kövecses (2002, p. 4), a metaphor is the utilization of another conceptual domain to understand any given conceptual domain, where a conceptual metaphor refers to “CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN (A) IS CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN (B)”. A number of examples were categorically provided by Kövecses to further understand the notion of conceptual metaphor. For instance, journey is used when we converse and ponder about life and love, war for arguments, building for theories, food for ideas, plants for social organizations and so on (Kövecses, 2002, p. 4).

From another perspective, metaphor is a sort of cerebral mapping that has an outcome on human being’s thinking and mind (Gibbs, 2006). Yu (2004, p. 664) pointed out that metaphor refers to the conceptual mapping across a variety of experiential domains, and that source domain is a term for understanding the target domain.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980b) claimed that the conveyance of metaphor from a non-literal meaning is understood by building a mapping connecting between two different domains (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980b, p. 5). Radden & Dirven (2007) were of the view that the metaphorical mapping is the outcrop of one set of conceptual entity against another set of entities (Radden & Dirven, 2007, p. 12). Kövecses further explained the metaphorical mapping by asking the following question: What does B (source domain) mean exactly in terms of A (target domain)? Kövecses (2002, p. 6) answered that there is a set of systematic correspondences between the source and the target, in the sense that constituent conceptual elements of B correspond to constituent elements of A. Technically, these conceptual correspondences are often referred to as mappings.

2.3.1.2 Metaphor and Human Body

Referring to the metaphorical mapping that is related to human body parts plays an important role in the creation of metaphors. Kövecses (2002) claimed that although human body is an ideal source domain that is clearly defined, one should not apply all aspects from this domain to metaphorically understand an intangible target domain. He also mentions that various body parts can be specially employed in metaphorical conceptions. For example:

- (a) The *heart* of the problem
- (b) *To shoulder* a responsibility
- (c) The *head* of the department (Kövecses, 2002, p. 16).

With respect to the metaphorical mappings that are related to the human body there are two main domains: the non-body part domain and the body part domain. In addition, Lu (2005) claimed that the human body metaphorization mapping includes two different types:

- (a) The conceptualized mapping from body part domain to the non-body domain.
- (b) Mapping from non-body to the body part domain (Lu, 2005: 470-485).

2.3.2 Cognitive Approach of Metonymy

Metonymy is also a cognitive mechanism that underlies much of our everyday thinking and that the use of metonymy in language is a reflection of its conceptual nature (Panther and Radden, 1999). Moreover, metonymy has always established links between two conceptual entities in the broadest sense within some conceptual framework or models. These models include domains or idealized cognitive models (ICMs), scenes, frames, and scenarios (Panther and Radden, 1999). Lakoff (1987) posited that in metonymy, one domain that is the target is highlighted frequently with a limited discourse principle, because it is this domain that is partly conceptualized by mapping onto it the source domain included in the same common domain. Therefore, we can understand more of metonymy as a domain highlighting, whereas in the case of metaphor is domain mapping (Croft, 1993).

From another view of point, Papafragou (1996) stressed that within cognitive linguistics, it is thought that metonymic conceptualization develops empirical links between objects or entities and flows straight from a broader theoretical principle, according to which concept formation is directed by external experiential and cultural factors, rather than by the innate human capacity for abstraction. Therefore, according to the cognitive approach, all innate cognitive structures is embodied; that is, it is based on bodily experience and recurrent patterns of interaction with the environment.

2.3.2.1 Definition of Metonymy

Unlike conceptual metaphor, conceptual metonymy has received less attention by cognitive linguists over the decades. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, conceptual metonymy became very influential in the field of cognitive linguistics. However, a

number of investigators such as Langacker (1993), Barcelona (2002), Lakoff and Johnson (1980), and Radden and Kövecses, (1999) have put forward the meaning of conceptual metonymy.

Langacker (1993) describe metonymy as a cognitive mechanism where the reference point (vehicle) accesses the desired target (target) conceptual entity (Langacker, 1993, p. 30). In their discussion about conceptual metonymy, Lakoff and Johnson (1980, Ch. 8) posited that metonymy, like metaphor, is part of the everyday way of thinking, is grounded in experience, subject to general and systematic principles, and structures our thoughts and actions. Barcelona (2002) defined the conceptual metonymy as a source to target conceptual domain mapping, where the target domain is mentally activated by the pragmatic function which links between the two domains (Barcelona, 2002, p. 246).

Radden and Kövecses (1999, p. 21) stated that the conceptual process, within the same idealized cognitive model (ICM) by which a conceptual entity (vehicle) provides a mental access to another conceptual entity (target), is known as metonymy. In principle, both conceptual entities related may stand for the other; that is, a metonymy is basically a reversible process. In the same vein, Kövecses further supported the above mentioned definition, as in his book he asserts that a metonymy is defined as a cognitive or perceptive process that allows conceptual entities, targets, or vehicles to be mentally accessible to one another within the same ICM or domain (Kövecses 2002, p. 145).

In another development, Radeen and Kövecses (1999) further explained that conceptual metonymy as a cognitive mechanism which operates within these three functions:

- (a) Metonymy is a conceptual phenomenon;
- (b) Metonymy is a cognitive process; and
- (c) Metonymy operates within an idealized cognitive model (ICM).

They explained these three functions of conceptual metonymy in detail, using various examples that distinguished the perception of metonymy from the traditional view to the conceptual metonymy as cognitive mechanism (Radeen and Kövecses 1999, p. 17-21).

With reference to the above given definition, the conceptual metonymy is a mapping of the conceptual domain, the target, to another the entity, the vehicle, on which both the target and the vehicle are within the same domain and are connected by a pragmatic meaning. As a result of this, the target is emotionally stimulated (Barcelona, 2002; Radden & Kövecses, 1999; Kövecses, 2002). However, metonymy is known to be understood within cognitive perception, when it operates in idealized cognitive models. The mapping of metonymy will only be located or perceived through these idealized cognitive models (ICM). Radeen and Kövecses (1999) further suggested that there are two general conceptual patterns for metonymy-producing mapping relationships:

- (a) WHOLE ICM AND ITS PART(S)
- (b) PARTS OF AN ICM (Radden & Kövecses, 1999, p.31).

2.3.2.2 Metonymy and Human Body

The PART OF A THING FOR THE WHOLE THING metonymic variant has been traditionally named *synecdoche*, enjoying special privileges. Well-known metonymies for physical domain parts include *hand, face, head, or leg* for the whole person (Kövecses 2002, p. 152). For instance, consider PART FOR WHOLE, as in the following example:

- (a) She's just a pretty face. (Kövecses 2002, p. 152).

Here, we can treat this as a special metonymy case, in which the face of a person stands for the whole person and the entities portray the part as a whole in the conceptual organization (Radden & Kövecses, 1999, p. 18-19).

2.4 Past Studies on Body Part Terms in the Hausa language

With reference to the available literature at hand, there are only two investigations on body part terms in the Hausa language, namely: (a) Towards a Hausa metaphorical lexicon: Body part nouns; and (b) Chained metonymies in lexicon and grammar: a cross-linguistic perspective on body part terms. These are the only two empirical works that have been found related to body part terms in the Hausa language. The former highlights the Hausa body part nouns in lexicon and grammar and their metaphorical productivity, while the later highlights the semantic chain metonymic extensions of meaning access through the body parts organs in many languages, which includes Hausa language.

Batic (2006) examined the Hausa metaphorical lexicon related to body part terms. He attempts to define the main processes of metaphorization involving some body part in Hausa. In addition, the study also aims to identify metaphorical productivity of body part nouns and to put forward a hypothesis of a metaphorical lexicon, referring to the relationship between semantic behavior and syntagmatic delimitation. Theoretical framework of the study was traced back to the theory of metaphor by Lakoff (1980) and Johnson (1987). Studies on the African languages on grammaticalization by Claudi and Heine (1985) and Heine, Claudi and Hunnemeyer (1991) were also adapted by the study. In addition to the above two, cognition theories related to African languages Reh (1999) and Becher (2003) were also taken into consideration in the study. The corpus data of the study was collected from selected Hausa dictionaries and Hausa novels. There were 35 both internal and external body part terms of Hausa anatomical vocabulary out of 70 that exhibit the productivity of metaphor as follows:

Internal: (*ciki* ‘stomach’, *hanji* ‘intestines’, *hanta* ‘liver’, *harshe* ‘tongue’, *huhu* ‘lung(s)’, *jijiya* ‘vein’, *jinni* ‘blood’, *kashi* ‘bone’, and *zuciya* ‘heart’).

External: (*baki* ‘mouth’, *baya* ‘back’, *cibiya* ‘navel’, *dantse* ‘arm’, *diddige* ‘heel’, *farce* ‘fingernail’, *fuska* ‘face’, *gaba* ‘front’, *gashi* ‘hair’, *hannu* ‘hand’, *ido* ‘eye’ *kafada* ‘shoulder’, *kai* ‘head’ *kunne* ‘ear’, *kwibi* ‘side between thorax and hips’, *kafa* ‘leg’ *kirji* ‘chest’, *lebe* ‘lip’, *sau* ‘foot’, *tafi* ‘palm of hand’ *wuya* ‘neck’ *gira* ‘eyebrow’, *gwiwa* ‘knee’ *haba* ‘chin’ *hakori* ‘tooth’ and *hanci* ‘nose’).

Moreover, the findings of the study also revealed that the most productive items are:

(*hanci* ‘nose’, *hannu* ‘hand’, *ido* ‘eye’, *kai* ‘head’, *zuciya* ‘heart’, *fuska* ‘face’, *ciki* ‘stomach’ and *baki* ‘mouth’).

He further indicated that body parts are the source of producing metaphorical lexicon. On the other hand, the study adapted the structure of metaphorical renderings related to the semantic chain proposed by Heine, Claudi and Hunnemeyer (1991) to the analysis of Hausa language data. This structure allows the employment of the grammatical items, such as object, activity, space, time, and quality, to the body parts. Overall, the study highlighted the metaphorical productivity of body part nouns in Hausa, and based on the empirical data, a total number of 320 renderings were analyzed. One factor taken into consideration here is that this study only describes the metaphorical productivity of body part terms in the lexicon and grammar of the Hausa language. However, the present research is intended to investigate the mechanisms operating in metaphoric expressions and how the mechanisms function in metonymic expressions in the Hausa language.

In another development, Hilpert (2007) moved further by incorporating body part terms for cross-linguistic study by analyzing the lexicon and grammatical symmetry of chained metonymies in different sample of world languages. He aimed to investigate why sequential metonymic mapping can be experiential in body parts in non-literal uses, classifying mapping which offer the raise in lexical and grammatical connotation. The study was traced back to the work of Reddy (1976) and the more recent works by Nerlich and Clarke (2001); Gecraert (2002); Mendoza and Diez, (2002). In addition, different theories were used in this study, but the most striking

theory among them is Radden and Kövecses (1999), which produced metonymic relationship. Sixteen (16) body part terms were selected for the study, which comprised: *tongue, eye, head, jaw, buttocks, mouth, arm, heart, ear, belly, finger, foot, back, forehead, hand, and face*. Bilingual dictionaries were researched to find synonyms of these English body part terms in 76 languages samples. Moreover, it was decided to ensure that each entry of body part term defined in the foreign language was used to evoke secondary senses or extension of meaning. The results of the investigation showed that the languages studied, exhibited rich non-literal body part uses. This showcased the importance of lexical and grammatical structure of the human body. Hilpert did note, however, that while all the languages extended the meaning of body parts, some of the body parts do not evoke lexical and grammatical meanings. For example, in some languages *foot, hand, and heart* present a quite number of figurative meanings, but do not project sequential extensions of meanings. Moreover, as previously mentioned, the findings of the study covers 76 different languages, which include Hausa language. Among the findings of the empirical data attested in the study, the extension of meanings that were found in the study related to Hausa language are:

- (a) Hausa extend *back* to ‘behind’
- (b) Hausa extend *back* to ‘after’
- (c) Hausa extend *back* to ‘follow’
- (d) Hausa extend *back* to ‘support’
- (e) Hausa extend *belly* to ‘inside’
- (f) Hausa extend *ear* to ‘hearsay’
- (g) Hausa extend *ear* to ‘attention’
- (h) Hausa extend *eye* to ‘attention’
- (i) Hausa extend *head* to ‘beginning’

Conversely, the study highlights the semantic chain extensions of meaning that body parts can donate in the Hausa language and may other languages as mentioned earlier. Overall, the current study will move further to determine which metaphoric and

metonymic mapping systems have been employed to produce the extended version of meaning in the Hausa language. In addition, the present research will also find out what conventionalized expressions these body parts produce and which idealized cognitive models (ICMs) are constructed in the conceptualizations.

2.5 Past Studies on Body Part Terms across Languages

This section will give a review of past studies which are specifically based on body part terms related to metaphor and metonymy. Here, the review will focus on their objectives, theoretical framework, and findings in order to provide the direction and justification for the current research. Furthermore, the review in this section is solely based on different metaphor and metonymy related to body parts other than *hand* and *head*.

2.5.1 European Languages

Nissen (2011) studied the metonymies and metaphors of “*mouth*” in three different languages; Danish, Spanish, and English. The research was obtained in order to testify the claim that metonymies and metaphors are grounded in bodily experiences. The research was pursued through a cross-linguistic analysis of the non-literal meaning of English “*mouth*” compared to its Danish and Spanish equivalent terms, “*mund*” and “*boca*”, respectively. Nissen attempted to exploit the non-literal uses of linguistic expressions containing the body part *mouth* in the three aforementioned languages. As there is no specific way unanimously accepted within the cognitive linguistics realm of sourcing data and analyzing metaphors, data for this research was gathered from various sources, including dictionaries, introspection, corpora, and native informants. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Kövecses (2002) theory and conclusion on conceptual metaphor was the root theory for this research. Thus, analysis of the data was based on

the qualia structure postulated by Pustejovsky (1995). Pustejovsky introduced four qualia roles, but Nissen translated them and reduced them into three (partitional perspective, operative perspective, and telic perspective) through which he established his analysis. The finding of the research, however, indicated that metonymy and metaphor are powerful tools for generating figurative expressions. He further maintained that these expressions, although not entirely predictable, are motivated by bodily experiences, which supported the claim made by Kovecses (2002). He also held that the metaphorization realization and processes are prejudiced by cultural differences.

Marmaridou (2011) explore the uses of *prosopo* 'face' and its extension of meaning in Modern Greek. The research attempted to reveal the metaphorical and metonymic extensions of the prototypical sense of 'prosopo' *face* and its use based on a cultural model. The study however, focuses on the relationship of a *part-whole* image schema, and NON-PHYSICAL IS PHYSICAL conceptual metaphor as proposed by Marmaridou (2009) in Modern Greek. The research also examined the participation of 'prosopo' *face* in collocations. The study therefore adapted and supports the theory of embodiment hypothesis, proposed by Johnson (1992); theory of cultural experience and embodied behavior, proposed by Gibbs (1999); as well as the Sinclair's (1991) views on collocational meaning. Moreover, the findings of the study revealed that conceptual metaphor and cultural models have equal roles in motivating the polysemy of 'prosopo' *face*. Concerning the participation of 'prosopo' *face* in collocations, the findings further revealed its significance and how it embodies aspects of collocational meaning by identifying two types of prosopo-related collocations, one revealing evaluative semantics and the other a semantics institutional prominence. Overall, the study supported that understanding the language is grounded in the nature of one's bodily experience and activity.

2.5.2 Asian Languages

In his studies, Yu (2011) examined the Chinese cultural ways of understanding speech and language with respect to the metonymic chain from speech organ to language. This was investigated based on these speech organ body part terms *she* ‘tongue’, *chi* ‘teeth’, *chun* ‘lips’ and *zui/kou* ‘mouth’ as used metonymically and metaphorically in conventionalized expressions. The data selections of these speech organs include compounds and idioms that refer to more abstract linguistic actions and functions. The study attempted to attest the extended meanings of these speech organ terms along with the metonymic chain, as initially proposed by Radden (2004). The study was specifically narrowed to the three metonymies SPEECH ORGAN FOR SPEAKING, SPEECH ORGAN FOR SPEECH, and SPEECH ORGAN FOR LANGUAGE. Yu found that the first two metonymies (SPEECH ORGAN FOR SPEAKING and SPEECH ORGAN FOR SPEECH) are richly manifested in a large number of conventionalized expressions. Whereas, the metonymy SPEECH ORGAN FOR LANGUAGE is not realized at the level of lexicon, as attested across different languages, but it plays an important role in the Chinese writing system. However, the findings of the study also support the claim for the embodied nature of human cognition and cultural contexts. In addition to this the findings also claimed that these body part terms: *she* ‘tongue’, *chi* ‘teeth’, *chun* ‘lips’ and *zui/kou* ‘mouth’ are useful metaphorically to refer to more abstract linguistic actions and functions.

In another related study, Occhi (2011) studied Japanese conceptualized expressions of *eye*, through the metaphors of EYE AS MIND and EYE AS PERSON. The linguistics data examined in this study consisted of naturally occurring expressions, ranging from the phonetics level (onomatopoeia and mimesis) to larger utterances (discourse). Similarly, these set of data were analyzed based of the concrete and figurative expressions, including emotional expressions of physiological, culturally specific, and culturally tainted embodiment (Maalej 2004). Therefore, the main aim of

the study was to extensively exploit the uses of ‘eye’ related to human experience. Thus, the uses of ‘eye’ and its metaphorical rendering were attested in various sets of data, which revealed notable conceptualization such as:

- (a) The eye as locus of distinctions in the social hierarchy schema;
- (b) The eye as character traits and emotion; and
- (c) The eye as gender norms are also revealed through certain eye related metaphoric expression.

Generally, the findings of the empirical data attested in this study from Japanese have strongly supported the notions of physiological, cultural, and culturally tainted embodiment outlined by Maalej (2004).

Yu (2004) traced the similarities and differences of the body part term *eye*, in Chinese and English languages. The research was purposely conducted, to explore the conceptualizations of *eye* in Chinese, and then compared it with the corresponding conceptualizations of ‘eye’ in English from a cross-linguistics perspectives within the conceptual metaphors cognitive theory and conceptual metonymy propounded by cognitive linguists such as Barcelona (2000a); Dirven and Porgings, (2002); Gibbs and Steen, (1999); Johnson (1987); Lakoff (1987); Lakoff and Johnson, (1980, 1999); and Panther and Radden, (1999). Yu’s research investigated conceptual metonymy PERCEPTUAL ORGAN STANDS FOR PERCEPTION and the conceptual metaphors SEEING IS TOUCHING AND THINKING, KNOWING, OR UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING. The data was extracted from some previous investigations and dictionaries, containing Chinese compounds and idioms of ‘eye’, and English compounds examples as well. His findings revealed that PERCEPTUAL ORGAN STANDS FOR PERCEPTION (conceptual metonymy) and SEEING IS TOUCHING, THINKING, KNOWING, OR UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING, and PAYING ATTENTION IS SEEING (conceptual metaphor) are shared among the two languages. Moreover, the findings also reveal similarities and differences were found in English and Chinese conceptual expressions which are reflected at the level of linguistic

instantiations. It was, however, noted that these linguistic expressions and our natural bodily experiences with eyes may exhibit both similar and different experiential grounding.

2.5.3 Middle East Languages

Sharifi (2012) traced the role of body part terms in producing metaphors in Persian political texts. The aim was to explore the conceptualized metaphors involving the human body members produced by political Persian speakers. Moreover, the study also attempts to classify and explore the frequency of each body part terms that are found in the Persian political text. The corpus data attested in this research was extracted from published Persian newspaper where data from 2008 to 2011 was randomly selected. The accumulated data included 160 instances of metaphors from a selection of newspapers (Mardom Salari, Hamshahri, Khorasan, Ghods, Etemad, and Jomhorie Eslami). However, the body parts that were found as the most productive in Persian political text are: *ghalb* 'heart' *pā* 'foot', *ru* 'face', *garden* 'neck' *dahān* 'mouth', *cheshm* 'eye', *angosht* 'finger', *zabān* 'tongue', *dandān* 'tooth', *del* 'stomach/ heart', *gush* 'ear', *shāne* 'shoulder', *dast* 'hand', *sine* 'breast', and *sar* 'head'. It was also attested to that among these body part terms, the most frequent used one in the Persian newspapers is *head*, followed by *hand*, which coincidentally are the body part terms of the present study. The findings also revealed that body part terms have been actively used and have a vast application by the Persian political speakers.

In the same vein, Sharifian (2011) investigated conceptualizations of *eye* in Persian. His study attempts to explore the uses of this body part term in various expressions that reflects conceptualizations, which includes EYE AS THE LOCUS OF EMOTION (EYE AS THE SITE OF LOVE, EYE AS THE SITE OF ENVY); EYE AS A CHARACTER TRAITS, THINKING IS SEEING, INTUITION AS PERCEPTION and other *eye* conceptualizations.

However, the study employed the cognitive linguistic theory, which have shown how the use of the body as a resource or anchor in conceptualizing various experiences, including thinking and feeling, is grounded in cultural models e.g. Gibbs (1999); Kövecses (1999, 2000); Lakoff & Johnson (1980); Sharifian, Dirven, Yu & Niemeier (2008). His empirical data confirmed that the conceptualization of eye and its related concepts and processes in Persian, providing supporting evidence for the interaction among body, culture and language. In relating her findings to the previous investigations such as Sharifian et al. (2008), she stated that speakers of different languages make use of body part terms as a source of metaphorization and metonymization conceptualities. The findings also revealed that these conceptualizations are largely culturally constrained, and often have their own roots in certain beliefs.

This section has discussed the past relevant literature on body parts across different languages. The human body is composed of both internal parts and external parts, and it is an organizational system with different components playing different physical, physiological, and even social functions (Malaaj & Yu 20011). As highlighted in the review, different body parts were used to evoke different conceptualizations in many languages. This is an indication that body part terms are a universal source domain for the creations of metaphor and metonymy across languages and cultures. It was also an indication that the study on body parts conceptualization is generally investigated, and different findings were disclosed from across languages. We also noticed that the contribution of individual body parts terms and the specific roles each plays in the conceptualizations of various languages and cultures. Generally, investigations on body parts are conducted in different languages to determine their cognitive mechanisms.

2.6 Past Studies on Body Part Terms Hand and Head across the Languages

In this section, the review of related literature will concentrate on previous studies of body part terms *hand* and *head* across languages. Previous studies that cover both or one of them will be taken into account. However, the review will focus more on the objectives and findings of the previous studies, in order to emphasize and justify the direction of the present research. Also, in the discussion of the findings of the present study, reference will be made to the findings of these previous studies.

2.6.1 European Languages

Hyun and Kwon (2007) examined the body parts term *hand* in English, with the aim to study a range of idiomatic expressions of *hand* that have been thrived in the study of metaphor and metonymy. Their study attempted to add some new standpoints of metaphoric and metonymic expression phrases of *hand*, which previous studies have not accounted for or included in their study. The study discussed the available standpoints of hand metaphors and metonymies from a number of previous investigations, such as those of Boers (2000), Cuysken (2001), and Hanks (2004). However, the analyses of the study were divided into two parts, one part dedicated to metaphor and the other to the metonymy. In the first part, the standpoints for THE HAND IS A CONTAINER were ontologically metaphor based. The study further categorized the container general metaphor into different other sub-metaphors, such as HOLDING IN THE HAND IS POSSESSION; HOLDING IN THE HAND IS CONTROL; HOLDING IN THE HAND IS COOPERATION and HOLDING IN THE HAND IS ATTENTION. After accounting all these sub-metaphors of hand is a container, which is classified under ontological metaphor. The study highlighted the need of some additional standpoints of hand metaphors. Because there is a gap, the available standpoints do not cover all the different types of hand metaphors in English. Therefore, in the findings of the study they came up with new suggested

additional standpoints and proved them worthy of the available ones. They suggested the additions of the following metaphors, which they characterized them under structural metaphor and orientational metaphor respectively. For orientational metaphors, they suggested SURRENDERING ONESELF IS UP; BEING EASY IS DOWN and FINDING SOMETHING IS ON SOMETHING. For structural metaphors, they suggested HAND OF A CLOCK, CRAB'S HANDS and LOBSTER'S HAND, and THE HAND OF A GUN.

Conversely, the available standpoints of *hand* metonymies were also discussed and accounted from the previous studies, such as those of Boers (2000) and Cuyskens (2001). The metonymic expressions they reviewed are typically PART FOR WHOLE metonymy which includes: THE HAND STANDS FOR PERSON; THE HAND STANDS FOR PERSONALITY/EMOTION; THE HAND STANDS FOR ACTIVITY; THE HAND STANDS FOR SKILL; THE HAND STANDS FOR CONTROL/INFLUENCE; THE HAND STANDS FOR GIVING and THE HAND STANDS FOR SIDE. After having carefully explained the available standpoints of *hand* metonymic expressions, they highlighted the need for additional standpoints, because the available standpoints do not cover all types of hand metonymic expressions. THE HAND STANDS FOR CLOSE DISTANCE/ROUTE; THE HAND STANDS FOR RELATIVE HAND-PARTS and THE HAND STANDS FOR HELPING were suggested to be added in. With these newly additional standpoints they suggested, they also feel that they will be more helpful in the study of metaphors and metonymies of hand.

Radić-Bojanić and Silaški (2012) investigate the metonymic and metaphoric conceptualizations of “head” a member of the body part term, comparing Serbian and English. The intents of the study was to find out whether Serbian and English manifest any cross-cultural, cross-conceptual or cross linguistics differences, in metonymic and metaphoric extensions of meaning. The study exploits the uses of the Serbian lexeme “glava” and its corresponding English lexeme “head”. However the study specifically deals with three metonymic and metaphoric conceptualizations of the head; (THE HEAD IS AN OBJECT; THE HEAD IS A CONTAINER and THE HEAD STANDS FOR A PERSON). The

research by Lakoff and Johnson (1980); Johnson (1987); and Lakoff (1987) on conceptual metaphor theory as well as Radden and Kövecses, (1999); Radden (2000); and Barcelona (2000) on conceptual metonymy was adopted into this research. The data attested in the study was extracted from several English and Serbian dictionaries for monolingual, idioms, or phrase expression that cater to both languages. The investigative findings shows that bodily experiences tied to the lexeme *head/glava* are interpreted metaphorically and metonymically expressed equally in both languages. As a result of this, the study therefore, supported the claim that the mind and thought of both English and Serbian speakers are indeed embodied. It should be noted, however, that the findings of the research would only be considered as tentative, because of their method of collecting the data solely from dictionaries.

In another development, Velasco (2000) exploited cross linguistic analysis of English and Spanish conceptualization and nature for *hand* metonymies. The study was based on a cross-linguistic analysis and the nature of some *hand* metonymies between the two languages. Metonymies could be investigated through some cognitive analytical tools propounded by cognitive linguist such as Lakoff & Johnson, (1980); Kövecses and Szabo, (1996) and Lakoff (1987). The investigation was narrowed down to the three metonymies (HAND FOR CLAP; HAND FOR HELP and HAND FOR PERSON) and their interactions with metaphors. One striking issue in this study was that the data attested had no related source. It was only mentioned that the corpus used and analyzed in the study was collected from the English and Spanish *hand* concept for lexicalized metonymic extensions. This does not fully explain the source of the data. In revealing the findings of the research, Velasco indicated that metonymy conventionalization involves a two tiered process; firstly, the existence of conceptual mapping and secondly, language mapping specific realizations. Velasco further added that the first level is a compulsory step in order for the second level to exist and not the other way round. In relation to the interaction of metonymy with metaphor, Velasco indicated that

sometimes the metonymy's existence requires a metaphor as a prerequisite. According to Ruiz de Mendoza's (1999) metaphor and metonymy interaction assumptions acted as the backbone for this study.

Vainik (2011) investigated the nature and dynamic of internal and external body parts in Estonian figurative description of emotion. The study attempted to exploit the range of body part terms used in Estonian figurative description. It was also aimed at detecting any system in the patterns of using body part terms in the conceptualization of metaphor and metonymy of emotion. The study also specifically aimed to determine what kind of conceptualization can be found in emotional instances. Using Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) classical cognitive metaphor theory and Kövecses and Radden's (1999) conceptual metaphor theory, the study exploits the uses of emotion expressions in the Estonian language. Wierzbicka (1999) emotional universals theory, where he hypothesizes the ways in which bodily phenomena can be linguistically manifested was applied in the study. Three out of eleven of Weirzbicka's proposed universals were used in the study. The three include: (a) via observable bodily symptoms, (b) with reference to bodily sensations, and (c) via figurative bodily images. These three emotional universals were set in order to figure out the kind of emotional expressions related to body part terms that can be exploited in the Estonian figurative language of emotions. The study found that both internal (heart, blood and nerves) and external (head, eyes, mouth, nose and hand) body parts are exploited in Estonian figurative descriptions. But, external body parts such as *head* and its sub parts (eyes, mouth, nose), and hand are more heavily exploited than internal organs (heart, blood and nerves) for the purpose of emotional expressions. In addition, the study found a tendency for metaphoric mappings to prevail when the emotional experience is localized in the internal body parts, while metonymy prevails when it is localized in the external body parts. Moreover, with regards to the three emotional universals proposed by Weirzbicka (1999), the findings revealed that these three tendencies clearly occurred in the attested data.

2.6.2 Middle East Languages

Aksan (2011) examined the conceptualized expressions of *head* and *foot* in a number of metonymies and metaphors in Turkish. He focuses on the schematic organization UP-DOWN of the two body parts *bas* ‘head’ and *ayak* ‘foot’, located at the opposite ends of the body. The study then attempted to highlight how the Turkish utilizes the body part terms metaphorically in the conceptualization of culture-specific experiences. However, based on a verticality scale related to up and down image schema, the study noted that feet is the source domain of metaphorization at the first stage. In the second stage, the role of *head* in conceptualizing socio-cultural aspect of Turkish experiences was also investigated. In the last stage, an instance where *head* and *feet* combine in a number of metonymies and metaphors was also illustrated. The corpus of the research was collected from institutionalized dictionaries and the METU (Middle East Technical University) Turkish corpus. The findings of the attested data reveal that the *head* profiles the cultural metonymies HEAD FOR ORDER, HEAD FOR RULER and HEAD FOR TALENT while *foot* produces the conceptual metaphors LESS IS DOWN, LOW STATUS IS DOWN and BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL or FORCE IS DOWN. The findings also discussed cases in which terms for *head* and *feet* are combined in a number of metonymies and metaphors. The study further added that the stereotyping of those who are at the top and those who are at the bottom becomes more evident when *head* and *feet* expressions co-occur in individual proverbs.

This section revealed different conceptualizations of body parts across languages. The review highlighted that the body parts are extensively used to evoke metaphor and metonymy across languages. The review also noticed that different sets of conceptualizations were found in many languages, which has revealed differences in mapping systems and conventionalized expressions in some languages. It was also

revealed that these two body parts are frequently used in many languages to employ conceptual metaphor and metonymy.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

Chapter three presents the methodology of the dissertation. In the following sub-sections, the theoretical framework and research design for the current research will be highlighted, followed by the source of data collection and data collection procedure. The procedure for data analysis will also be highlighted.

3.2 Theoretical Framework

The present study will adopt the theory proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Lakoff (1987), Radden and Kövecses, (1999) and Radden and Dirven (2007). These theories cover the areas identified for the purpose of the present research, including metaphor, metonymy, and idealized cognitive models (ICMs). In the following sub-sections details of these theories will be highlighted.

3.2.1 Conceptual Metaphor Theory

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) explained the notion of metaphor as “a conceptual trend which is linked with people’s thoughts and behaviors”. This notion is persistent in language, human thought, action, and conceptual structure in everyday life where our reflex expressions and actions are basically metaphorical in nature (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 4-5). They went on to state that the conceptual domain from which we draw metaphorical expressions to understand another conceptual domain is known as the source domain. Therefore, the domain understood in this way is the target domain; details will be presented section 3.2.4 below.

3.2.2 Conceptual Metonymy Theory

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) posited that metonymy, like metaphor, has become part of our everyday way of thinking, as it is grounded in experience and subject to general and systematic principles and helps in structuring our thoughts and actions. Radden and Dirven (2007) further stated that a conceptual shift within the same frame or domain indicates metonymy. They further explained that metonymy may be described as a conceptual shift, through which one may determine the conceptual impact. For instance, *The Crown* never rejects a bill approved by Parliament (Radden and Dirven, 2007, p. 14). One may mentally trace a path from a conceptually salient entity such as ‘crown’ to another conceptual entity, ‘monarch’. The notion of *salient* or *salience* is understood here in the sense of clearly standing out conceptually. Technically, we will refer to the salient entity in this conceptual shift. Details of this will be given in section 3.2.4 below.

3.2.3 Idealized Cognitive Models (ICMs)

As claimed by Lakoff (1987) that the organization of knowledge is by means of structures called idealized cognitive models (ICM), and that category structures and prototype effects are by-products of that organization (p. 68). The notion of idealized cognitive models (ICMs) may have impact on metonymic and metaphorical transfer (Radden and Kövecses, 1999, p. 20). ICMs exist in all that is conceptualized, including the conceptualization of thing and events, word forms and their meanings, and things and events in the real world encyclopedic knowledge (Radden and Kövecses, 1999, p. 20).

Moreover, per Croft and Cruse (2004), “An important insight of Fillmore and Lakoff in their early work on frames/domains is that the knowledge represented in the frame is itself a conceptualization of experience that often does not match the reality” (p. 28). For example, consider the concept of ‘bachelor’. A simple conceptual analysis

of this concept leads to a reference to an adult unmarried male. However, in certain situations, one may react whether the person involved is a bachelor or not. Therefore, the frame for bachelor represents an idealized version of the real world that simply does not include all possible real-world situations. Lakoff (1987) referred to this concept as the Idealized Cognitive Model (ICM). However, Lakoff (1987) further stressed that an ICM is complex structured whole or gestalt, using four kinds of structuring principles; propositional structure, image-schematic structure, metaphoric mappings and metonymic mappings. Therefore, each ICM as used structures a mental space (Lakoff 1987, p. 68). However, to fully understand a word, one must use his full knowledge of how one expects the world to be; this refers to one's encyclopedic knowledge. Encyclopedic knowledge is interconnected in the mind, and a word's meaning refers to a perspective of the world as seen through the concept profiled by the word.

3.2.4 Conceptual Shifts

Radden and Dirven (2007) discussed the notions of conceptual metonymy and metaphor. They explained these notions in describing the extension of categories by means of metaphor and metonymy within particular conceptual frames and domains. The theory holds that human capacity to evoke frames and domains allows one to extend his inventory of conceptual and linguistic categories substantially (Radden & Dirven, 2007, p. 12). They further added that as human capacity is constantly confronted with innovations and changes in the world, one needs to categorize these changes conceptually as expressed in linguistic categories. They then stated that one way of dealing with these new experiences is to create new, especially compound words –an action commonplace for most people (Radden & Dirven, 2007, p. 12). Moreover, they added that the neat and competent way of dealing with new experiences and innovations is to make use of existing linguistic categories and extend their meanings,

i.e. the conceptual categories associated with them. Thereby, there are various means of extending the senses of linguistic category. By which they are going to concentrate on the two most powerful conceptual shifts that lead to meaning extension: metaphor and metonymy (Radden & Dirven, 2007, p. 12).

Extensions of the sense of a word use cognition and are not a mere language issues. Hence, before a word is extended to another category, there are some parameters to be included, such as the following: conceptual shift, mapping and evocation of either metonymy or metaphor. Radden & Dirven (2007) fully explained this as follows:

Conceptual shift refers to the shift of meaning of word senses into another category. For example, consider conceptual shifts of the word *brain*. According to a dictionary definition, the brain is ‘the organ inside your head that controls how you think, feel, and move’. In the following examples, *brain* is obviously used in other senses:

- (a) The company is hiring new *brains*.
- (b) The microprocessor is the *brain* of a computer

(Radden & Dirven, 2007, p. 12).

The illustration of these two examples given by Radden and Dirven coined the cognitive mechanisms of mapping process, metaphor, and metonymy. Their illustrations of the two examples are as follows: They indicated that most people immediately understand *brains* in (a) to mean ‘intelligent persons’ and *brain* in (b) to mean ‘microchip of a computer’. We thus need to account for the shift in meaning from ‘organ inside your head’ to ‘intelligent person’ on the one hand, and to ‘microchip’ on the other hand. The cognitive process that relates literal meanings to extended meanings is referred to as mapping. Mapping is the projection of one set of conceptual entities onto another set of conceptual entities. The conceptual shift in (a) involves a mapping between ‘brain’ and ‘intelligent person’. Since a brain is a body part of a person, both categories belong to the same frame. When using the word *brain*, we give prominence to this particular body part of a person. Moreover, an individual’s intelligence lies in the

brain; we are obviously not talking about the brain as an organ but its prominent property of intelligence. Thus, both the body part 'brain' and the property 'intelligence' are mapped onto 'person' so that we arrive at the interpretation of 'intelligent person' for *brain*. This kind of conceptual shift within the same frame or domain is an instance of metonymy.

They continued to explain that the conceptual shift in sentence (b), *The microprocessor is the brain of a computer*, is of a different kind. We are no longer talking about people but computers. People and their brains belong to the conceptual domain 'human being', which comprises human aspects such as consciousness, rationality, emotions, etc. Microchips belong to the conceptual domain 'electronics', which comprises computer technology and other digital equipment such as mobile phones and DVDs. The 'human being' domain structure is linked or mapped on to the 'electronics' structure, whereas the 'brain' from domain of human being is mapped to 'microchip' as a part of a computer. Thus, the way a microprocessor functions in a computer is understood in terms of the way a brain functions in a human being. This kind of conceptual shift across domains is an instance of metaphor. It should be noted that in cognitive linguistics, source and target domain makes up the two conceptual domains linked in a metaphorical mapping. In the *brains* metaphor, source domain refers to a 'human being', whereas the target domain is 'electronics'. With respect to the two different conceptual shifts, we understood that a metonymic shift operates within the same frame or domain, and a metaphorical shift, operates across two different domains. Metonymy is therefore often said to involve contiguity, while metaphor is said to involve similarity (Radden & Dirven, 2007, p. 13).

In pointing out the notion of metonymy clearer and its different types, Radden and Dirven (2007) indicated that, conceptual shift within the same frame or domain is an instance of metonymy. They further explained metonymy is a conceptual shift, and we can now see what its conceptual impact is. For instance:

(a) *The Crown* never rejects a bill approved by Parliament.

One mentally traces a path from a conceptually salient conceptual entity, such as ‘crown’, to another conceptual entity, ‘monarch’. The notion of *salient* or *salience* is understood here in the sense of ‘conspicuously standing out conceptually’. Technically, we will refer to the salient entity in this conceptual shift as a reference point. Metonymy thus involves speaking about a salient reference point, which allows us to access another conceptual entity, the target (Radden & Dirven, 2007, p. 14). However, they classified metonymy in two as follows:

- (a) PART FOR WHOLE METONYMY: in which they described as accessing the whole via a salient part. For example: *The crown* never rejects a bill approved by parliament. Here a whole *monarch* was access via a salient part *crown*.
- (b) WHOLE FOR PART METONYMY: in which a whole serves as a reference point for accessing one of its part, as in the following examples: *Our school* won the cup. Here, *our school* refers to a team of our school.

Both the PART FOR WHOLE metonymy and WHOLE FOR PART metonymy are conceptual in nature because they have a very general application, i.e. many more instances of these metonymies can be found in language, and even outside language. They indicate however that there many other types of conceptual metonymies, some of which are listed below:

Conceptual metonymy	Metonymic expression
(a) POSSESSION FOR OWNER	<i>The Porsche</i> left without paying.
(b) INSTITUTION FOR PERSON	She phoned <i>the hospital</i> .
(c) CONTAINER FOR CONTENTS	<i>The kettle</i> is boiling.
(d) ORGAN OF PERCEPTION FOR PERCEPTION	Our warning fell on deaf <i>ears</i> . (Radden & Dirven, 2007, p. 14).

In all these cases, the metonymic expression highlights a facet of a frame that, for some reason or another, serves as the salient reference point. In (a), a thing possessed, namely the car, serves as the reference point for accessing its owner, the

driver, whom we do not know. In (b), we need a doctor but do not know who will pick up the phone: the receptionist, a nurse or a doctor. In (c), the kettle is visible while the water boiling in it is not. Similarly, in (d), a person's ear is tangible but the person's hearing ability is not (Radden & Dirven, 2007, p. 14).

However, when defining conceptual metaphor, Radden and Dirven (2007) described metaphor by thus providing a means of understanding abstract domains such as emotions by relating them to better-known domains and experiences in the physical world (Radden & Dirven, 2007, p. 16). They further explained that metaphor can be conceptually manifested in language, for example:

Conceptual metaphor	Metaphorical expression
(a) TIME IS MONEY	I've <i>invested</i> a lot of time in her.
(b) LOVE IS MADNESS	I am <i>crazy</i> about her.
(c) BELIEFS ARE POSSESSIONS	He <i>clings</i> to his beliefs.
(d) UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING	I don't <i>see</i> your point.

(Radden & Dirven, 2007, p. 16).

3.3 Research Design

The present study follows a qualitative research design. The research attempts to explore the cognitive mechanism of Hausa language related to the conceptualizations of body part terms. Schmitt (2005) claimed that the best way to present an empirical study of metaphor and metonymy is the use of a qualitative method to analyze the data. However, there is no specific method unanimously accepted in cognitive linguistics for the analysis of metaphor and metonymy (Nissen, 2011). On this basis, the present research will explain in details the methodology of collecting and analyzing the data. The following sub-sections shed more light for the methodology of this research.

3.4 Source of the Data Collection

The sources of the data for the present study include dictionaries and newspapers. However, previous studies on metaphor and metonymy used dictionaries to collect the

data in order to investigate metaphorical and metonymical renderings, studies such as those by Hilpert (2006) and Radić-Bojanić & Silaški (2012) used dictionaries as the only source of the data collection. Some studies combined two or more methods of collecting the data, including dictionaries and other sources, studies such as Nissen (2011); Batic (2006); Aksan (2011); Yu (2004) among others used this method. On the other hand, newspapers also served as a source of collecting natural data for conducting empirical research studies such as Sharifi (2012) used newspapers as the only source of data collection. Therefore, the present research collects data from the sources discussed below.

3.4.1 Dictionaries

The present study used two popular Hausa dictionaries as the first source to collect the data. These two dictionaries were used as they were also used by previous studies on body parts in the Hausa language, such as Hilpert (2007) and Batic (2006). The dictionaries include:

- (a) Dictionary of the Hausa language (Abraham, 1962).
- (b) A Hausa-English Dictionary and English-Hausa Vocabulary (Bargery, 1993).

Dictionaries have been selected here in order to identify the literal and non-literal meaning of the two body part terms. Also, some examples were collected according to the meaning given by the dictionaries. These examples will provide background knowledge on how the newspaper data will be searched and collected.

3.4.2 Leadership Hausa Newspaper

Leadership Hausa is a Hausa version of the Nigerian Leadership English newspaper. Data has been collected from the online archive of *Leadership Hausa* newspaper, which can be accessed and retrieved at any time from their website

(<http://hausa.leadership.ng/>). The online version is updated daily. The printed version of the *Leadership* Hausa newspaper is circulated nationwide each Friday in Nigeria.

3.4.3 Aminiya Newspaper

Aminiya Newspaper is a Hausa version newspaper of the Nigerian Media Trust Publishing company. The data will be collected from the online archive of *Aminiya* newspaper, which can be accessed and retrieved at any time from their website (<http://aminiya.com.ng/>). The online version is updated daily, while the printed version of *Aminiya* newspaper is circulated nationwide each Friday in Nigeria.

These two newspapers were selected base on the following reason; firstly they are the most circulated newspapers in Hausa land and they are printed in standard Hausa form of writing. Secondly the data collected form these newspapers appeared to be natural data compared to the data collected from dictionaries. Therefore, these two sources of the data will convey strong findings to the current research.

3.5 Data Collection Procedure

The method of collecting the data from the dictionaries is that the terms *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’ were searched in the two dictionaries’ entries. The literal dictionary meanings of these two body parts were identified. Similarly, any other meaning rather than the literal one were also collected, compound words were included. An online search was conducted randomly using the search engine provided by the above two newspaper’s website and no specific criteria were given. However, the data comprised all sections of the newspaper, including the news, political, international, sports, and health and community sections, among others. Moreover, search was limited to the period between January 2013 and April 2014. The search was limited to this period to obtain the most current data at the time of data collection. Also, the expected

metaphorical and metonymical tokens needed for the purpose of the present research were also collected during this period.

3.6 Data Analysis Procedure

The procedure for the data analysis of the present study is simple and effective. All possible non-literal meaning of the body part terms *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’ collected from the dictionaries are categorized according to the conceptual shift found in the extended meaning. This conceptual shift, which involves two discrete domains, will be marked as metaphorical meaning; the conceptual shift, which involves a single domain, will be marked as metonymical meaning. Therefore, the four main categorizations have been made as follows:

- (a) Metaphorical meaning of hand;
- (b) Metonymical meaning of hand;
- (c) Metaphorical meaning of head; and
- (d) Metonymical meaning of head.

In presenting the examples of each expression, a Hausa sentence will be given first followed by a word-for-word gloss. This in turn will be followed by the literal meaning. Finally, a proper or equivalent translation will be given in English language.

Therefore, each example will consist of four lines as in the following:

Al’amari-n-su na **hannu**-na
affair-GEN-3PL IPFV hand-1SG
(Lit.: Their affairs are in my **hand**)
‘I am in charge (control) of their affairs’.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

Chapter four presents the analysis and discussion of the collected data. The sections of this chapter will be categorized as follows: Section 4.2 will present the analysis of the metaphorical expressions of *hannu* ‘hand’, while section 4.3 will present the analysis of metonymical expressions of *hannu* ‘hand’. Analysis of metaphorical expressions of *kai* ‘head’ will be presented in section 4.4, followed by section 4.5 of its metonymical expressions. Section 4.6 will present the idealized cognitive models found in the creation of all the metaphorical and metonymical expressions of *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’, respectively. Lastly, in presenting the analysis only sample of the data were presented and the whole sample of the data is in the appendix.

The data for the analysis was comprised of a total of 245 metaphorical and metonymical expressions. For *hannu* ‘hand’, there are 48 expressions of *hand* metaphors and 67 expressions of *hand* metonymies. For *kai* ‘head’, there are 69 expressions of *head* metaphors and 61 expressions of *head* metonymies. A breakdown of this frequency can be seen in the following tables:

Literal meaning	Type	Figurative meaning	Token	Subtotal	Total
<i>Hannu</i> ‘hand’	1	Metaphors of <i>hannu</i> ‘hand’	48	115	245
		Metonymies of <i>hannu</i> ‘hand’	67		
<i>Kai</i> ‘head’	1	Metaphors of <i>kai</i> ‘head’	69	130	
		Metonymies of <i>kai</i> ‘head’	61		

Table 4.1: Summary of the compiled data

	Metaphors of <i>hannu</i> ‘hand’	Token	Metonymies of <i>hannu</i> ‘hand’	Token
I	HAND IS CONTROL	12	HAND STANDS FOR ACTIVITY	16
II	HAND IS POSSESSION	21	HAND STANDS FOR PERSON	10
III	HAND IS COOPERATION	10	HAND STANDS FOR SKILL	4
IV	HAND IS ATTENTION	5	HAND STANDS FOR CONTROL	11
V			HAND STANDS FOR PERSONALITY	10
VI			HAND STANDS FOR SIDE	8
VII			HAND STANDS FOR GIVING	8
	Subtotal	48		67
	Total			115

Table 4.2: Frequency of *hannu* ‘hand’ metaphors and metonyms

	Metaphors of <i>kai</i> ‘head’	Token	Metonymies of <i>kai</i> ‘head’	Token
I	HEAD AS CONTAINER OF INTELLIGENCE	4	HEAD STANDS FOR PERSON	36
II	HEAD AS A TOP OF THING	11	HEAD STANDS FOR INTELLIGENCE	5
III	HEAD AS A TIP OF THING	6	HEAD STANDS FOR INDEPENDENCE	8
IV	HEAD AS BEGINNING OF THING	9	HEAD STANDS FOR COOPERATION	7
V	HEAD AS A BUNDLE	6	HEAD STANDS FOR LENGTH	1
VI	HEAD AS A MOVING OBJECT	22	HEAD STANDS FOR AGREEMENT	4
VII	HEAD AS A SIZE OF AN OBJECT	3		
VIII	HEAD AS INDEPENDENCE OF AN OBJECT	3		
IX	HEAD AS SUFFICE OF AN OBJECT	5		
	Subtotal	69		61
	Total	130		

Table 4.3: Frequency of *kai* ‘head’ metaphors and metonyms

4.2 Metaphorical Expressions of *hannu* ‘Hand’

For the metaphorical conceptualizations of *hannu* ‘hand’ there is total number of 48 metaphors. The following table gives the conceptualizations and frequency of *hannu* ‘hand’ metaphors:

	Metaphors of <i>hannu</i> ‘hand’	Token
I	HAND IS CONTROL	12
II	HAND IS POSSESSION	21
III	HAND IS COOPERATION	10
IV	HAND IS ATTENTION	5
	Total	48

Table 4.4: Frequency of metaphorical expressions of *hannu* ‘hand’

The discussion analyzes these metaphorical expressions as follows:

4.2.1 HAND IS A CONTROL (See Table 4.4, I)

When one holds an entity in one’s hand, one may do anything with it. This mental experience is understood as something being under control (Hyun and Kwon, 2007, p. 201). This implies the presence of the conceptual metaphor HOLDING IN THE HAND IS CONTROL. Consider the following examples:

- (1) Al'amari-n-su na **hannu-na**
 affair-GEN-3PL IPFV hand-1SG
 (Lit.: Their affairs are in my **hand**)
 'I am in charge (control) of their affairs' (DHL, p.371: 10-11)
- (2) Kasaitacciya-r masaurata-r a tafi **hannu-n-sa**
 huge-GEN kingdom-GEN in palm.of hand-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: The huge kingdom is in the palm of his **hand**)
 'The big kingdom is under his control' (LHNP, 29/03/2013)
- (3) Na rantse da wanda rayuwa-ta ke **hannu-n-sa**
 1SG swear with whom life-3FSG REL hand-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: I swear with whom my life is in his **hand**)
 'I swear with whom my life is in his hand (control)' (ANP, 20 March 2014)

As shown in (1) above, the affairs of other people being deemed as in one's hand is conceptualized as controlling affairs. In (2), taking the ruling of the kingdom in the palm of one's hand is metaphorically understood as controlling the kingdom. In (3), the life in God's hands is understood as controlling the life of a person by God.

4.2.2 HAND IS A POSSESSION (See Table 4.4, II)

Possessing an entity refers to a situation in which we hold something in the hand. This may have given rise to conceptual expressions that employs the act of HOLDING SOMETHING IN THE HAND IS A POSSESSION (Kövecses and Szabo, 1996, p. 343). Examples of this instantiation of HAND IS A POSSESSION are in the following instantiations:

- (4) An kama ni ne da bindiga a **hannu-na**
 be.PFV arrest 1SG COP with gun in hand-1SG
 (Lit.: I was arrested with gun in my **hand**)
 'I was arrested with a gun in my possession' (ANP, 03 April 2014)
- (5) Ya-a kwashe sa'o'i 15 a **hannu-n-ta**
 3MSG-PFV spend hours 15 in hand.of-3FSG
 (Lit.: He spends 15 hours in her **hand**)
 'He spends 15 hours in her possession' (LHNP, 29/01/2014)

- (6) Yana a hannu-n ‘yan-sanda
 3MSG-IPFV in hand-GEN police
 (Lit.: He is in the **hand** of police)
 ‘He is under the police custody (possession)’ (LHNP, 29/03/2013)

As depicted in (4), holding a gun in the *hannu* ‘hand’ is conceptualized as possessing the gun. In (5), spending 15 hours in hand is understood as spending the same time under one’s possession, and in (6) hand of police was metaphorically understood as police custody, that is, under police ‘possession’.

4.2.3 HAND IS COOPERATION (See Table 4.4, III)

The action of holding hands implies that two or more people involved have a positive relationship and that they are cooperating (Hyun and Kwonm 2007 p. 202). This projects the metaphorical expressions of HOLDING IN THE HAND IS COOPERATION.

Consider the following examples:

- (7) Don haka mu-ka haɗa hannu domin muradu-n jama’a-r-mu
 for that POSS-1PL join hand for desire-GEN people-GEN-1PL
 (Lit.: For that we join **hand** for the desire of our people)
 ‘For that we cooperate for the development of our people’
 (LHNP, 08/02/2013)

- (8) Sun kama hannu-n juna
 3PL-PFV hold hand-GEN each other
 (Lit.: They held **hand** of each other)
 ‘They helped each other’ (DHL, p.372: 4-5)

- (9) Ta haɗa hannu da shi wajen horas da matasa
 3FSG join-IPFV hand with 3MSG in training the youth
 (Lit.: It joins **hand** with him in training the youth)
 ‘It cooperates with him in training the youth’ (ANP, 21 February 2014)

As shown in (7-9), holding hands of two or more people is metaphorically understood as a positive relationship, which is the result of cooperation of two people.

4.2.4 HAND IS ATTENTION (See Table 4.4, IV)

Attention here is conceptualized as holding an entity in the hand and paying attention to it. When we have something in our hand, we are usually interested in what we hold (Hyun and Kwon, 2007, p. 202). This invokes the conceptual metaphor HOLDING SOMETHING IN THE HAND IS ATTENTION. Instances of this conceptual metaphor may be seen in the following:

- (10) A kullum ta-kan rika ba ta-a shawara da yi mata
in everyday 3FSG-ASP continue give 3FSG-PFV advice and do 3FSG
hannu-n-ka mai sanda
hand-GEN-2MSG hold stick
(Lit.: In everyday she use to give her advice and doing **hand** of stick to her)
'In everyday she use to gave her advice and drawing her attention'
(ANP, 12 September 2013)
- (11) An-yi mini **hannu-n-ka** mai kafada
be-PFV 1SG hand-GEN-2MSG ADJ shoulder
(Lit.: They did me **hand** of shoulder)
'They drew my attention' (DHL, p.372: 24-25)
- (12) Mu rika yi musu **hannu-n-ka** mai sanda
1PL continue do 3PL hand-GEN-2MSG hold stick
(Lit.: We continue doing **hand** of stick to them)
'We continue to draw their attention' (ANP, 25 January 2013)

As shown in (10-12), holding an entity in the hand is conceptualized as drawing the attention of someone in three different situation.

4.3 Metonymical Expressions of *hannu* 'Hand'

For the metonymical conceptualizations of *hannu* 'hand' there total number of 67 metonymies. The following table gives the conceptualizations and frequency of *hannu* 'hand' metonymies:

	Metonymies of <i>hannu</i> ‘hand’	Token
I	HAND STANDS FOR ACTIVITY	16
II	HAND STANDS FOR PERSON	10
III	HAND STANDS FOR SKILL	4
IV	HAND STANDS FOR CONTROL	11
V	HAND STANDS FOR PERSONALITY	10
VI	HAND STANDS FOR SIDE	8
VII	HAND STANDS FOR GIVING	8
	Total	67

Table 4.5: Frequency of metonymical expressions of *hannu* ‘hand’

4.3.1 HAND STANDS FOR ACTIVITY (See Table 4.5, I)

In daily life, many human actions are performed by using hands. Actions performed by hands can represent a specific action conducted by a part of the body or the whole body. This actions performed by hands automatically qualifies HAND to give an access or to stand for the activities of the whole person. However, this metonymy is a special case of more general metonymy THE INSTRUMENT USED IN AN ACTIVITY STANDS FOR THE ACTIVITY (Kövecses and Szabo, 1996). Hence, the hand may be viewed as an instrument. Consider the following examples:

- (13) Shugaba Jonathan ya-a rattaɓa **hannu** a kasafi-n
 President Jonathan 3MSG-PFV sign hand in budget-GEN
 kuɗi-n 2013
 money-GEN 2013
 (Lit.: President Jonathan has signed **hand** in budget money of 2013)
 ‘President Jonathan has signed 2013 budget’ (LHNP, 27/02/2013)
- (14) Ya-a gaggauta sanya **hannu** a kasafi-n kuɗi-n ƙasa-r
 3MSG-IPFV hasten put hand in budget-GEN money-GEN nation-GEN
 (Lit.: He hastens to put hand in the budget of the nation money)
 ‘He has to be fast to sign the nation’s budget’ (LHNP, 02/15/2013)
- (15) Sannan ya sanya **hannu** a biya ka
 therefore 3MSG-IPFV put hand at pay 2MSG
 (Lit.: Therefore he put hand at pay you)
 ‘Therefore he signs to pay you’ (ANP, 28 March 2014)

As shown in (13-15), *hannu* stands for the actions of signing, in that one uses hands to sign one’s name. In these examples, *hannu* ‘hand’ stands for its function,

which is writing, and this it also shows the metonymic relationship of an ENTITY STANDS FOR ITS FUNCTION. Therefore, it subsequently further stands for the activity performed by the person.

4.3.2 HAND STANDS FOR PERSON (See Table 4.5, II)

The HAND STAND FOR THE WHOLE PERSON is a well-known metonymy in English (Kövecses and Szabo, 1996, p. 341) and can be found not only in English but in other languages (Hyun and Kwon, 2007, p. 207). It is an instantiation of the more general metonymy the PART OF THE BODY STANDS FOR THE WHOLE BODY. It should be noted that this type of metonymy has been based on the metonymy THE HAND STAND FOR THE ACTIVITY, that is, the typical person is an ACTIVE person, and since we have the HAND STAND FOR THE ACTIVITY, it is natural that we also have THE HAND STANDS FOR THE PERSON (Kövecses and Szabo, 1996, 341). Consider the following examples:

- (16) **Hannu** da yawa magani-n kazama-r miya
 hand with many cure-GEN dirty-GEN soup
 (Lit.: Many **hands** are medicine of dirty soup)
 ‘Many hands (people) make light work’ (DHL, p.372: 16-18)
- (17) **Hannu-n-ka** ba ya ruɓewa ka yanke ka yas
 hand-GEN-2MSG NEG 3MSG rot 2MSG cut 2MSG throw
 (Lit.: Your **hand** will not be rot then you cut it and you threw it away)
 ‘One cannot but pardon the faults of one’s dependents (person)’
 (LHNP, 29/03/2013)
- (18) Agaji-n ba ya isa **hannu-n-su**
 aid-GEN NEG 3MSG reach hand-GEN-3PL
 (Lit.: The aid it does not to reach their **hand**)
 ‘The aid does not reach them’ (LHNP, 22/03/2013)

As shown in (16), *hannu* ‘hand’ stands for person, whereas in (17) *hannunka* ‘your hand’ means one person and *hannunsu* ‘their hands’ in (18) means many people. In all these expressions, hand stands for the whole person, clearly explaining the relationship of PART FOR WHOLE metonymy.

4.3.3 HAND STANDS FOR SKILL (See Table 4.5, III)

The activity performs by hand also incorporates the skill of a person performing an actions. The basis of this metonymy is the idea that activities that require the use of the human hand also require skills and sophistication or style (Kövecses and Szabo, 1996, p. 341). It also involves the knowledge that practicing an activity maintains the required skill, whereas not practicing it does not. Therefore, on this basis THE HAND STANDS FOR THE SKILL OF A PERSON is brought about. Consider the following examples:

- (19) **Hannu** gare shi wajen aiki
hand has 3MSG rather work
(Lit.: He has **hand** at work)
'He is skillful at his job/work' (HED, p. 448: 16-19)
- (20) **Hannu** gare shi
hand has 3MSG
(Lit.: He has **hand**)
'He is skillful' (DHL, p.371: 37)
- (21) Tsoho-n **hannu** ne
old-GEN hand COP
(Lit.: An old **hand**)
'Old hand at work' (DHL, p.372: 55-56)

As shown in (19-20), *hannu* 'hand' means skill which further stands for the skill of a person. In (21), also *hannu* 'hand' means old hand at work, which clearly indicates the skill of a person after taking long time performing some actions with his hand. However, this type of metonymy was not found in the online Hausa newspapers during the search period; the examples here are all taken from dictionaries.

4.3.4 HAND STANDS FOR CONTROL (See Table 4.5, IV)

The ability of the hand to facilitate the actions of controlling an instrument employs this type of metonymic conceptualization. However, it should be noted that a more general metonymy that motivates this metonymy may be THE INSTRUMENT STANDS FOR

CONTROL (Kövecses and Szabo, 1996, p. 343). The following instances indicate THE HAND STAND FOR CONTROL metonymy:

- (22) Ba shi da **hannu** bisa ka-n-mu
 NEG 3MSG with hand over head-GEN-1PL
 (Lit.: He has no **hand** over us)
 ‘He has no control over us’ (DHL, p.371: 13-14)
- (23) Ya-a rasu a **hannu-n-sa**
 3MSG-PFV died in hand.of-3MSG
 (Lit.: He dies in his **hand**)
 ‘He died under his control’ (LHNP, 28/022013)
- (24) Allah ya-a danka jagoranc-in kasa-r nan a **hannu-n-sa**
 God 3MSG-PFV entrust leadership-GEN nation-GEN this in hand-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: God entrusted the leadership of this nation in his hand)
 ‘God entrusted him the control to lead the nation’ (LHNP, 28/01/2014)

As shown in (22), failure to maintain *hannu* ‘hand’ over other people stands for not controlling people, while in (23), dying in someone’s hands means dying in someone’s control. Whereas, in (24) entrusting the leadership of a nations in one’s hand means giving him control to lead the nations. In these expressions hand clearly means or stands for control.

4.3.5 HAND STANDS FOR PERSONALITY (See Table 4.5, V)

Metonymically, hand may stand for the personality of the person, as we constantly demonstrate and make some special actions with our hand (Hyun and Kwon, 2007, p. 208). The following examples indicate how HAND STANDS FOR PERSONALITY in the Hausa language.

- (25) Sarki Abdullahi ya-a karbe shi **hannu** bibiyu
 King Abdullahi 3MSG-PFV receive 3MSG hand in two
 (Lit.: King Abdullah received him **hand** in two’s)
 ‘King Abdullah received him with warm welcome’ (LHNP, 28/02/2014)
- (26) Ta ga **hannu-n-ta**
 3FSL see.PFV hand-GEN-3FSG
 (Lit.: she saw her **hand**)
 ‘Girl began to menstruate for fist time’ (DHL, p.371: 43-44)

- (27) Ba ma yin **hannu** da shi
 NEG 1PL do hand with 3MSG
 (Lit.: We are not doing **hand** with him)
 ‘He is too senior for us to shake hands with’ (DHL, p.372: 26-28)

As shown in (25), *hannu bibiyu* ‘hand in two’s (i.e. hands)’ means with open hand, where hand stands for the personality of the king to receive his guest with open hand or with warm welcome. In (26), *hannunta* ‘her hand’ means her menstruation which clearly indicates her personality to begin the menstruation. While in (27), the refusal to shake hand with someone clearly shows his personality in Hausa culture, that is, he was regarded as a very important person who one does not shake hands with.

4.3.6 HAND STANDS FOR SIDE (See Table 4.5, VI)

Hands are frequently used to point at objects. This implies the presence of conceptual metonymy HAND STANDS FOR SIDE. For instance, we can see that the hands are positioned in each side of our body and are thus used to stand for the side (Hyun and Kwon, 2007, p. 210). Instantiations of HAND STANDS FOR THE SIDE are as in the following:

- (28) Ka kidaya daki na biyar daga **hannu-n** dama
 2MSG count room number five from hand-GEN right
 (Lit.: You count room number five from **hand** of right)
 ‘You count room number five from right side’ (ANP, 20 March 2014)
- (29) Sai ka matsa ‘Sign In’ daga can sama a **hannu-n** dama
 then 2MSG press ‘Sign In’ from there up in hand-GEN right
 (Lit.: Then you press ‘Sign In’ from there up in **hand** of right)
 ‘Then you press ‘Sign In’ up there from the right side’ (ANP, 18 July 2013)
- (30) Daga **hannu-n** hagu kuwa
 from hand-GEN left thus
 (Lit.: Thus from **hand** of left)
 ‘Thus from the left side’ (LHNP, 31/01/2014)

As shown in (28-29), *hannun dama* ‘right hand’ means right side, which subsequently stands for the right side of the body, since the right hand is located at the

right side of the human body. Also, *hannun hagu* ‘left hand’ in (30), means ‘left side’, as the left hand is located at the left side of the human body and it can also stand for the left side.

4.3.7 HAND STANDS FOR GIVING (See Table 4.5, VII)

Part of the action of hand is giving something to others, which is one of the most important roles of the hand (Hyun and Kwon, 2007). For instance, we give and receive objects with our hand. This employs the metonymy HAND TO STANDS FOR GIVING. Expressions of HAND STAND FOR GIVING in Hausa can be seen as in the following instances:

(31) Haka ya-a zo **hannu-n-sa** goma
 thus 3MSL-PFV come hand-GEN-3MSL ten
 (Lit.: Thus he came with ten **hands**)
 ‘Thus he came without bringing any gift’ (DHL, p.372: 28-31)

(32) Ta koma gida **hannu** rabbana
 3FSG return-PFV home hand lord
 (Lit.: She returned home **hand** lord)
 ‘She returned home empty handed’ (ANP, 21 September 2012)

(33) Haka kuma ga **hannu-n** baiwa
 also and for hand-GEN genius
 (Lit.: And also for **hand** of genius)
 ‘And also for given (gift)’ (ANP, 21 June 2013)

As shown in (31), *hannunsa goma* ‘his hands are ten (i.e. fingers) actually means without bringing anything to give, which further stands for not holding something to give (that is empty handed). In (32) *hannu rabbana* means ‘empty hand’, which indicates that someone does not have anything to give to others in Hausa culture. *hannun baiwa* ‘hand of genius’ in (33) means ‘hand of giving’, the hand that is always use to give something to others. In all these expressions, the conceptual metonymy is HAND STANDS FOR GIVING.

4.4 Metaphorical Expressions of *Kai* ‘Head’

For the metaphorical conceptualizations of *kai* ‘head’ there are total numbers of 69 metaphors. The following table gives the conceptualizations and frequency of *kai* ‘head’ metaphors:

	Metaphors of <i>kai</i> ‘head’	Token
I	HEAD AS CONTAINER OF INTELLIGENCE	4
II	HEAD AS A TOP OF THING	11
III	HEAD AS A TIP OF THING	6
IV	HEAD AS BEGINNING OF THING	9
V	HEAD AS A BUNDLE	6
VI	HEAD AS A MOVING OBJECT	22
VII	HEAD AS A SIZE OF AN OBJECT	3
VIII	HEAD AS INDEPENDENCE OF AN OBJECT	3
IX	HEAD AS SUFFICE OF AN OBJECT	5
	Total	69

Table 4.6: Frequency of metaphorical expressions of *kai* ‘head’

4.4.1 HEAD AS A CONTAINER OF INTELLIGENCE (See Table 4.6, I)

The head is conceptualized as a bounded space with its inside and outside, where content is stored (Radić-Bojanić and Silaški 2012, p. 35). The foundation of this metaphor is the more interest in the content of a container than in the plain container. Therefore, the head is generally conceptualized to refer to the head’s presumed content such as the brain, the mind, human ratio, or intelligence (Niemeier, 2008, p. 363). The following expressions indicate the HEAD IS A CONTAINER in the Hausa language.

- (34) Ya-a na da **kai**
 3MSG-IPFV has with head
 (Lit.: He has **head**)
 ‘He is sharp (keen intelligence)’ (DHL, p.450: 4-5)
- (35) Yaro-n nan ba shi da **kai**
 boy-GEN this NEG 3MSG have head
 (Lit.: This boy does not have **head**)
 ‘This boy is not intelligent/ is not much sense’ (HED, p.528: 16-18)
- (36) Ba shi da **kai** ba shi da gindi
 NEG 3MSG have head NEG 3MSG and bottom
 (Lit.: He does not have **head** and bottom)
 ‘He has no sense’ (HED, p.528: 18-19)

As shown in (34), the fullness of the *kai* ‘head’ indicates that a person is an intelligent person, while the emptiness of head as in (35) means the person is not intelligent in Hausa culture. Also, sometimes in Hausa the emptiness of head as shown in (36), means the person does not have much sense and intelligence.

4.4.2 HEAD AS A TOP OF THING (See Table 4.6, II)

This type of metaphorical expressions conceptualizes head as a top of an object or inanimate thing. The more general metaphor that may employ this conceptualization is OBJECT ARE HUMAN BEING, where the objects also have head at the top of their body.

Consider the following examples:

- (37) Na dora alkalami-na ne a **ka-n** takarda
 1SG put pen-1SG COP on head-GEN paper
 (Lit.: I put my pen on the **head** of a paper)
 ‘I put my pen on the top of a paper’ (ANP, 19 December 2013)
- (38) Na ce ran-ka ya dade ta na nan **ka-n** dutse-n
 1SG say soul-3MSG 3MSG stay long 3FSG IPFV there head-GEN rock-GEN
 (Lit.: I say his soul stay long; she is there **head** of rock)
 ‘I said your Highness she is there on top of the rock’ (ANP, 04 January 2013)
- (39) **Ka-n** soro
 head-GEN roof
 (Lit.: **Head** of roof)
 ‘Roof of flat- topped building’ (DHL, p.451: 1-2)

As shown in (37), *kan takarda* ‘head of paper’ is conceptualized as the top of a paper. Also in (38), *kan dutse* ‘head of rock’ actually means top of the rock, while in (39), head has been conceptualized as top of the building.

4.4.3 HEAD AS A TIP OF THING (See Table 4.6, III)

This type of metaphor is a sub-case of the metaphorical expressions of HEAD IS A TOP OF THING. There are some of the objects that their pointed end is not the same as top but

slightly differ with a tip-pointed end. In the Hausa language, pointed objects have also been conceptualized as having a head. Thus, the following instantiations highlights the metaphorical shift of HEAD IS A TIP OF THING:

- (40) **Ka-n** allura
 head-GEN needle
 (Lit.: **Head** of needle)
 ‘Point of needle’ (DHL, p.451: 6)
- (41) Su ce kai ne mai tada **ka-n** adda
 3PL say.IPFV 2MSG COP ADJ fix head-GEN cutlass
 (Lit.: They will say you that are fixing the **head** of cutlass)
 ‘They will say you are pin pointing the tip of a cutlass’ (ANP, 07 March 2014)
- (42) Wanda duk ya samu aiki ko na tada **ka-n** adda ne
 which all 3MSG find job even that fix head-GEN cutlass COP
 (Lit.: Which all you find a job even that of fixing the **head** of cutlass)
 ‘Who ever find a job even that of fixing the tip of cutlasses’
 (ANP, 04 October 2013)

As shown in (40), *kan allura* ‘head of needle’ is conceptualized to actually mean the tip of a needle. Whereas in (41-42), *kan adda* ‘head of cutlass’ clearly means the tip of a cutlass. It should be noted that this type of metaphorical expressions has proven to be less common in the Hausa language, because it is only for those objects that have a tip-pointed end or are considered to have such end. In the data collected for this study, *kan* also occurs with *dutse* ‘rock’ and *itace* ‘wood’.

4.4.4 HEAD AS BEGINNING OF THING (See Table 4.6, IV)

Head is conceptualized as the beginning of an object or thing, because the head is the beginning of the human body from the top to down. This metaphorical expression rests on the spatial relations behavior of the human body, as vertically the head is the beginning of human body from top –down. Consider the following instances:

- (43) **Ka-n** littafi
 head-GEN book
 (Lit.: **Head** of book)
 ‘The beginning of a book’ (HED, p.528: 27-28)

(44) Har lokaci-n da suka iso **ka-n** rafi-n tururuwa
 until time-GEN that 3PL come head.of stream-GEN Ant
 (Lit.: Until the time they came to the **head** of Ant stream)
 ‘Until they came to the beginning of Ant stream’ (ANP, 05 December 2013)

(45) Yaya zan gane abin da ban san **ka-n-sa** ba!
 how will-1SG understand what with NEG know head-GEN-3MSG NEG
 (Lit.: How I will understand what I did not know his **head**)
 ‘How I will understand what I don’t know its beginning’ (ANP, 03 April 2014)

As shown in (43), *kan littafi* ‘head of a book’ is conceptualized as the beginning of a book. In (44), *kan rafi* ‘head of stream’ is metaphorically understood as the beginning of the stream, while the expression of head in (45), clearly means the beginning of a matter with an unknown source.

4.4.5 HEAD AS A BUNDLE (See Table 4.6, V)

This metaphorical expression conceptualizes head as a bundle of an object. In the Hausa language, the head is viewed as a container that can hold goods. The conceptualization, however, rests on the bounded space of the head, where head is conceptualized as a container with a mere boundary that can hold something inside and outside (Radić-Bojanić and Silaški. 2012). Consider the following examples:

(46) **Ka-n** itace
 head-GEN firewood
 (Lit.: **Head** of firewood)
 ‘A load of firewood’ (DHL, p.452: 8-9)

(47) Itace yana nan **kai-kai**
 firewood 3MSG-IPFV there head-head
 (Lit.: Firewood is there **head-head**)
 ‘Firewood is there in bundles’ (DHL, p.452: 10-11)

(48) Ruwa **kai** uku
 water head three
 (Lit.: Water three **head**)
 ‘Three head-loads of water’ (DHL, p.452: 9-10)

As shown in (46), *kan itace* ‘head of firewood’ is conceptualized as a bundle of firewood. In (47), *kai kai* ‘head-head’ actually means the bundles of fire wood. This is

the process of reduplication in the Hausa language to indicate plurality. Whereas in (48) head was conceptualized as a load of water carrying by the head. All these metaphorical expressions are a result of Hausa custom of taking goods on/by head.

4.4.6 HEAD AS A MOVING OBJECT (See Table 4.6, VI)

It is possible for the head to move up and down, thus metaphorically employing various types of physical experience with this body part (Radić-Bojanić and Silaški, 2012, p. 33). Also, head movement is limited to up and down but can also include sideways, zigzag, or even backwards movement. Thus the HEAD may reach the limits which, in fact, are the limits of rational behavior. In the Hausa language, this conceptualization evokes different types of metaphorical expressions, as in the following instantiations:

- (49) FC Barcelona dai ta **kai** wasa-n karshe
 fc Barcelona COP 3MSG head game-GEN end
 (Lit.: FC Barcelona **head** to the last game)
 ‘FC Barcelona reached the final game’ (ANP, 10 April 2014)
- (50) Ya-a **kai** gari-n-su
 3MSG-PFV head town-GEN-3PL
 (Lit.: He **head** his town)
 ‘He reached his native town’ (DHL, p.452: 8-9)
- (51) Ya-a **kai** ga Kano
 3MSG-PFV head to Kano
 (Lit.: He **head** to Kano)
 ‘He reached to Kano’ (DHL, p.452: 5-6)

As shown in (49-51), *kai* ‘head’ is conceptualized to directly refer to reach or arriving to a particular place, which means movement from one point to reach another point. Also, evidence from the compiled Hausa data has confirmed the conceptualization of head as moving object cause to reach to reach something. Here head is no longer a noun but becomes verb in these conceptualization.

4.4.7 HEAD AS SIZE OF AN OBJECT (See Table 4.6, VII)

The head is conceptualized as the size of an object, because the head is at the top of human body and thus implies the size of the body. Hence, the conceptualization has been motivated by metonymy HEAD STAND FOR THE LENGTH OF THE PERSON. In the following examples, the head is conceptualized as the equal size of an entity.

- (52) Ba wanda ya-a **kai** shi girma
NEG which/one 3MSG-PFV head 2MSG size
(Lit.: No one which he is **head** size)
'It has not its equal in size' (DHL, p.453: 46-47)
- (53) Ba wanda ya-a **kai** shi mulki
NEG which 3MSG-PFV head 2MSG power
(Lit.: No one which he is **head** power)
'He has not his equal in power' (DHL, p.453: 47-48)
- (54) Bai **kai** Kano arziki ba waje-n gyada
NEG head Kano wealth NEG place-GEN ground-nuts
(Lit.: It is no **head** Kano wealth in ground-nuts)
'It is no match for Kano in ground-nuts' (DHL, p.453: 48-50)

As shown in (52), *kai* 'head' is conceptualized to refer to the size of an object, while in (53), head is conceptualized to refer to the size of a power of somebody. In (54), head is understood such that no city matches the city of Kano in terms of producing ground-nuts. Thus, in all these expressions head is conceptualized as a size of various objects.

4.4.8 HEAD AS INDEPENDENCE OF AN OBJECT (See Table 4.6, VIII)

The head has the ability to move side by side and up and down, independently without the movement of the rest of the body. On this basis, the function of the head as an independent part to the rest of the body is conceptualized as the independence of an object. The metaphor was motivated by the metonymy head stands for the independence of a person. Consider the following expressions:

- (55) Jirage ma-su sarrafa **ka-n-su** na Amurka a Nijar da
 Planes POSS-3PL control head-GEN POSS America in Niger and
 Barkina Faso
 Burkina Faso
 (Lit.: American planes that control their **head** are in Niger and Burkina Faso)
 ‘American planes operating without pilot are in Niger and Burkina Faso’
 (LHNP, 08/02/2013)
- (56) Kungiyoyi ma-su zaman **ka-n-su**
 Association POSS-3PL sitting head-GEN-3PL
 (Lit.: Associations that are sitting of their **head**)
 ‘Non-governmental organization’
 (LHNP, 0504//2013)
- (57) Kamfanoni ma-su zaman **ka-n-su**
 Companies POSS-3PL sitting head-GEN-3PL
 (Lit.: Companies that are sitting of their **head**)
 ‘Private/independent organization’
 (LHNP, 05/04/2013)

As shown in (55), *kansu* ‘their head’ is conceptualized as the independence of the planes. While in (56-57), *zaman kansu* ‘sitting their head’ actually means independent organizations. In these expressions, the movements of the head independent of the rest of the body are mapped onto the objects that are conceptualized to be ‘independent’ in various ways. This conceptual link evokes metaphorical expressions of the HEAD IS AN INDEPENDENT OF AN OBJECT.

4.4.9 HEAD AS SUFFICE OF AN OBJECT (See Table 4.6, IX)

The head is looked at as the endpoint of the human body from foot to the head (down-top), similar to other objects. The conceptualization rests on the verticality of the human body, as the head is viewed as the ending point of the human body from the foot to the head (down-up). In the following instances, head was conceptualized as a sufficed of an object:

- (58) Ba zai **kai** ba
 NEG will head NEG
 (Lit.: It will not **head**)
 ‘It will not suffice’
 (DHL, p.453: 21-22)

- (59) Igiya-n nan ba za ta **kai** ba
 rope-GEN this NEG will 3FSG head NEG
 (Lit.: This rope will not **head**)
 ‘This rope will not suffice’ (HED, p.528: 18-19)
- (60) Tsawo-n soro ya-a **kai**
 tall-GEN building 3MSG-PFV head
 (Lit.: The tall of building is **head**)
 ‘The wall of the house is finished and only await roof’ (DHL, p.453: 23-24)

As shown in (58), *kai* ‘head’ is conceptualized as the shortage of an object, because it is not sufficient. Whereas in (59), head indicates that the rope will not suffice the length. Also in (60), head was conceptualized to actually mean the wall length of the building.

4.5 Metonymical Expressions of *Kai* ‘Head’

For the metonymical conceptualizations of *kai* ‘head’ there total number of 61 metonymies. The following table gives the conceptualizations and frequency of *kai* ‘head’ metonymies:

	Metonymies of <i>kai</i> ‘head’	Token
I	HEAD STANDS FOR PERSON	36
II	HEAD STANDS FOR INTELLIGENCE	5
III	HEAD STANDS FOR INDEPENDENCE	8
IV	HEAD STANDS FOR COOPERATION	7
V	HEAD STANDS FOR LENGTH	1
VI	HEAD STANDS FOR AGREEMENT	4
	Total	61

Table 4.7: Frequency of metonymical expressions of *kai* ‘head’

4.5.1 HEAD STANDS FOR PERSON (See Table 4.7, I)

The action performs by the head make the body part to be frequently used to stand for the whole person. Thus, realizing the BODY PART FOR PERSON metonymy, this is in turn activated by the general metonymy PART FOR WHOLE metonymy. This type of metonymy demonstrates the unique characteristic of the HEAD TO STANDS FOR THE WHOLE BODY (Radić-Bojanić and Silaški, 2012, p. 36). However, in the Hausa language

there are several metonymic conceptualizations of the HEAD STAND FOR PERSON. The following examples illustrate this type of metonymy:

- (61) Sannan kuma ya-a harbe **ka-n-sa**
 therefore and 3MSG-PFV shoot head-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: Therefore he shot his **head**)
 ‘Therefore he shot himself’ (ANP, 03 April 2014)
- (62) Ta **kai-na** nake yi
 by head-1SG 1SG do
 (Lit.: I do by my **head**)
 ‘I am relaying on myself alone’ (DHL, p.451: 20-21)
- (63) Don haka na ba **kai-na** shawara-r in bi tasi
 For that 1SG give head-1SG advice-GEN to follow taxi
 (Lit.: For that I give my **head** advice to follow taxi)
 ‘For that I give myself advice to follow a taxi’ (ANP, 03 April 2014)

As shown in (61), the act of shooting *kai* ‘head’ stands for the shooting the whole body of a person. While in (62-63), *kaina* ‘my head’ is clearly understood as referring to the whole person. Here it should be noted that in the Hausa language head may stand for both gender (male and female). Also, in Hausa *kai* ‘head’ can stand for the independent masculine pronoun.

4.5.2 HEAD STANDS FOR INTELLIGENCE (See Table 4.7, II)

Head is conceptualized as a container which contains the brains, the five senses (vision, hearing, smell, taste, touch) and is the locus of reasoning (Niemeier, 2008, p. 360). Hence, the head is used in this conceptualization to refer to the intelligence of a person. On the basis of this the HEAD metonymically may stand for the intelligence of a person. This metonymy is illustrated with the following examples:

- (64) Yaron nan ba shi da **kai**
 boy this NEG 3MSG have head
 (Lit.: This boy does not have **head**)
 ‘This boy is not much intelligent’ (HED, p.528: 16-18)

(65) Masu fari-n **kai**
 3PL white-GEN head
 (Lit.: Those of white **head**)
 ‘Educated persons’ (DHL, p.450: 1-2)

(66) Masu baƙi-n **kai**
 3PL black-GEN head
 (Lit.: Those of black **head**)
 ‘Ignorant persons’ (DHL, p.450: 2-3)

As shown in (64), the emptiness of *kai* ‘head’ stands for the lack of intelligence of a person. In (65), *farin kai* ‘white head’ stands for the intelligent of a person, which indicates that a person is gifted. And in (66), *bakin kai* ‘black head’ stands for the lack of intelligence of someone.

4.5.3 HEAD STANDS FOR INDEPENDENCE (See Table 4.7, III)

One of the unique features of the head is its existence a separate entity, apart from the rest of the body. This function of the head metonymically stands for the independence of the whole person. Consider the following examples:

(67) Ya-a yi gaba-n **ka-n-sa**
 3MSG-PFV does front-GEN head-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: He fronted his **head**)
 ‘He followed his own counsel’ (DHL, p.451: 31-32)

(68) Ya-a sami gaba-n **ka-n-sa**
 3MSG-PFV finds front-GEN head-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: He find front of his **head**)
 ‘He started his own house hold’ (DHL, p.451: 32-33)

(69) Wata budurwa mai zama-n **ka-n-ta**
 A lady ADJ sit-GEN head.of-3FSG
 (Lit.: A lady sitting **head** of herself)
 ‘A Prostitute lady’ (LHNP, 14/03/2014)

As shown in (67-68), *kansa* ‘his head’ stands for the independence of the person who is having his own counsel. While *kanta* ‘her head’ in (69) stands for the independence of a woman. Moreover, the expressions in (69) may metonymically be understood in two ways whereby both meanings stand for the independence of a

woman. In the first it can be understood as independence of a prostitute lady, while in the second way, it may be interpreted as a married woman who becomes independent in her household (housewife).

4.5.4 HEAD STANDS FOR COOPERATION (See Table 4.7, IV)

The head has been presumed to be the locus of reasoning and thinking as well as the container of the brain in general (Niermeir, 2008, p. 360). Therefore, head may stand for the cooperation of a person with both his consent and support. Its metonymy may be explained through the following examples:

- (70) Su-kan hada **kai** don yi wa juna taimako-n gaggawa
 3PL-ASP join head for do COP each help-GEN emergency
 (Lit.: They use to join **head** for doing each other emergency help)
 ‘They use to cooperate with each other to do emergency help’
 (ANP, 20 March 2014)
- (71) Mu a Jihar Filato mun saba hada **kai** a yi abu tare
 1PL in State Plateau 1PL usual join head in do thing together
 (Lit.: We in Plateau State we usually join **head** in doing things together)
 ‘We in Plateau State we always cooperate to do thing together’
 (ANP, 20 February 2014)
- (72) Nijeriya za-ta samu hadi-n **ka-n** a'lummar-ta da cigaba
 Nigeria will-3FSG found join-GEN head-GEN society.of-3FSG and progress
 (Lit.: Nigeria will find join **head** of its society and progress)
 ‘Nigeria will get the cooperation of its society and to progress’
 (LHNP, 02/04/2014)

As shown in (70-71), the act of *hada kai* ‘join head’ actually means given cooperation which further stands for the cooperation in the Hausa language. In (72), *hadin kan al’umma* ‘join head of society’ is metonymically understood as the cooperation of the society. Therefore, in all these expressions head stands for the cooperation.

4.5.5 HEAD STANDS FOR LENGTH (See Table 4.7, V)

This type of metonymical expressions conceptualized head to refer to the length/size of the whole person. Having the head at the top of the human body implies the length of the whole body. Thus, realizing body part for length of the body metonymy, this is in turn activated by the general metonymy PART FOR WHOLE. As shown in (73) below, *kansu* ‘their head’ stands for two persons of the same size.

- (73) **Ka**-n-su dāya ne
head-GEN-3MPL one COP
(Lit.: Their **head** is one)
‘They are at the same size/age’ (DHL, p.450: 18-19)

4.5.6 HEAD STANDS FOR AGREEMENT (See Table 4.7, VI)

The head has been presumed to be the locus of reasoning and thinking, as well as the content of the brain in general (Niermeir, 2008, p. 360). Therefore, the head stands for the agreement of a person in terms of reasoning and understanding. Consider the following illustrations:

- (74) Abokan gaba sun bada **kai**
friend.of enemy 3PL-PFV give head
(Lit.: They (friend of enemy) gave **head**)
‘The enemy agreed to stop fighting’ (DHL, p.450: 35-36)
- (75) **Ka**-n-su ya gamu
head-GEN-3MPL do joint
(Lit.: Their **heads** do joint)
‘They are unanimous’ (DHL, p.450: 26-27)
- (76) Da mu da su duk **kan**-mu ya zo dāya
and 1PL and 3PL all head-1PL PFV come one
(Lit.: We and they all our **heads** come into one)
‘They and we are unanimous’ (DHL, p.450: 27-29)

As shown in (74), the act of giving *kai* ‘head’ to the enemy stands for the agreement of the people over delicate matters (such as fighting). Also in (75-76), head

actually means the agreement of people over certain issues, which subsequently stands for the agreement of those people.

4.6 Idealized Cognitive Models

The idealized cognitive models (ICMs) that are operating for the creations of the above metaphorical and metonymical conceptualizations of *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’ are highlighted in the following table:

Idealized Cognitive Models	
1	Containment ICM
2	Human being ICM and Non-human ICM
3	Part for whole ICM

Table 4.8: Types of Idealized Cognitive Model

Each of these ICMs is discussed in the following subsection. At this juncture, the research will demonstrate the type of experiences which cause the emergence of these ICMs, per the above data analysis.

4.6.1 Containment ICM

Radden and Kövecses, (1999) posited that “the image-schematic situation of containment is so basic and well-entrenched that it deserves to be treated as an ICM of its own among locational relations” (p. 41). Therefore, as a basic rule, we are more interested in the contents of a container than the mere container, such that we commonly find conceptualizations which target the contents via the container. However, human bodily experience’s most persistent features include encounters with containment ICM. A container ICM encompasses three major compositions, namely interior, exterior, and boundary. These organizational structures make it experientially basic in human experience and understanding. The basic human bodily experience is that human bodies are also containers. For instance, the body contains organs, bloods and other fluids (Kovecses, 2006, p. 209). In light of this bodily experience, all of the

major parts of the human body may be seen as containers with boundaries; the contents they carry may be poured, spilled, and emptied, and so on. With respect to the conceptualizations of the following metaphors HAND IS CONTROL (Section 4.2.1), HAND IS POSSESSION (Section 4.2.2), HAND IS COOPERATION (Section 4.2.3), HAND IS ATTENTION (Section 4.2.4), HEAD AS A CONTAINER OF INTELLIGENCE (Section 4.4.1), and HEAD AS A BUNDLE (Section 4.4.5), the present study has provided the type of bodily experience which causes the emergence of the containment ICM in these conceptualizations.

In HAND IS CONTROL conceptual metaphor, *hand* is metaphorically understood as a three-dimensional (interior, exterior and boundary) entity that may hold things inside. This projected that the *hand* is conceptualized as a bounded space with its inside and outside, where a content is stored and controlled. Hence, many *hannu* ‘hand’ expressions in the Hausa language are frequently used to refer to the *hands* presumed content as being under control by the *hand*. For example, when an entity is hold in one’s *hand*, one may do anything with it. This experience is understood as something being under control, thus implying the presence of metaphorical expressions of HOLDING IN THE HAND IS CONTROL. The same basic bodily experiences of containment ICM are shared in HAND IS POSSESSION, HAND IS ATTENTION, and HAND IS COOPERATION conceptual metaphors, respectively.

With respect to HEAD AS A CONTAINER OF INTELLIGENCE, and HEAD AS A BUNDLE conceptual metaphors, several expressions are frequently used to refer to the *heads* presumed content in the Hausa language, that is brain, human ratio and intelligence (see Section 4.4.1), as well as the ability of head to also hold goods with its exteriors boundary (see Section 4.4.5). Therefore, the *head* is metaphorically understood as a container which, much like other container, may be filled with certain content. According to Niermeir (2008), there are certain *head* expressions which are either focused on its fullness versus emptiness or on the dynamic process of filling or

emptying it (p. 363). For example, in the Hausa language the fullness of *kai* ‘head’ is metaphorically understood as a sharp and richness of intelligence, whereas, the emptiness of a *kai* ‘head’ is understood as the lack of intelligence, as well as the lack of sense, respectively.

4.6.2 Human Being ICM and Non-Human Being ICM

Croft and Cruse (2004) claimed that a human being ICM may presuppose several different ICMs or domains. They further stated that “a human being must be defined relative to the domains of physical objects, living things and volitional agents and several other domains, e.g. emotion” (p. 25). This corresponds with the view of Langacker, who claimed that some domains involve more than one dimension (Langacker, 1987, cited in Croft and Cruse, 2004, p. 25). Therefore human beings are living things with mental abilities, such as volition, intention, cognition and emotion. Whereas, non-human is a physical object that possess material existence and is spatial entity. The human being ICM consists of the human body that encompasses various structures internal and external. For the external structure of the human body, it includes various degrees of spatial orientations or relations of the whole human being body. For example, the spatial relation of the head and foot represents the spatial orientation of up-down. Therefore, we understood that human being ICM structure and it is spatial representation may be extended to non-human that is physical objects. The basic human bodily experiences and encyclopedic knowledge of the real world would allow one to understand physical objects in terms of human beings.

In HEAD AS AN OBJECT conceptual metaphor, physical objects (non-human) is metaphorically understood as possessing various functions of the human *head* in the Hausa language. For example in HEAD IS TOP OF THING conceptual metaphor (see Section 4.4.2), the physical structure of the human being *head* as top of the body is

conceptualized to refer to the top structure of a physical object such as paper. In this conceptualization, paper does not have *head* in physical terms but does have in its structure a top which is similar to the top of the body. As discussed in the data analysis (see Section 4.4.2, 4.4.3,), several functions and spatial representations of the human being's ICM have been conceptualized to refer to the various functions and representations of the physical objects, which are non-human ICMs.

4.6.3 Part-whole ICM

This type of ICM leads to metonymies, in which one accesses a whole ICM via one of its parts that is A PART FOR THE WHOLE (Radden and Kövecses, 1999). Moreover, this configuration relates to conceptual entities that function as part with respect to a whole ICM. Basic human knowledge of the real world allows one to understand the function of a part of the body in relation to the whole body. In the Hausa language, various functions of *hannu* 'hand' and *kai* 'head' are metonymically understood as a whole function of the body. Therefore, both the body parts *hand* and *head* and the various functions that they stand for are mapped on to human body. This type of conceptual shift within the same ICM is an instance of PART FOR WHOLE metonymy. Moreover, many metonymic conceptualizations of these body parts are as a result of cultural functions. As shown in the data analysis, various functions of *hannu* 'hand' stand for activity, person, skill, control, personality, side and giving (see Sections 4.3.1 to 4.3.7) in the Hausa language was a result of various cultural motivations. The same processes were also applied to the metonymic conceptualizations of *kai* 'head'.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Introduction

Chapter five presents the general conclusions of the dissertation. The first part of this chapter (Section 5.2) summarizes the findings of the dissertation by answering the research questions (see Sections 1.5 and 1.6), these research question are:

4. What are the metaphorical and metonymical conceptualizations of *hannu* 'hand' in the Hausa language?
5. What are the metaphorical and metonymical conceptualizations of *kai* 'head' in the Hausa language?
6. How are the ICMs operate for the creation of metaphorical and metonymical expressions of *hannu* 'hand' and *kai* 'head' in the Hausa language?

This part will also include the general concluding remarks for the whole thesis. In the second part (Section 5.3), recommendations for the future research will be presented.

5.2 Findings

In this study I have undertaken an analysis of two Hausa body part terms *hannu* 'hand' and *kai* 'head' in order to investigate their metaphorical and metonymical conceptualization. On the basis of the analysis, the present study found that generally speaking, hand and head are heavily exploited in Hausa language. This is as a result of the general role and function of these two body parts play in describing various conceptual experiences. Therefore, they are very instrumental in figurative language especially metaphor and metonymy. Bearing this in mind the findings of this study can be summarized as follows:

5.2.1 What are the metaphorical and metonymical conceptualizations of *hannu* ‘hand’ in the Hausa language?

Analysis of the investigation found that metaphorically *hannu* ‘hand’ is conceptualized as HAND IS CONTROL, HAND IS POSSESSION, HAND IS ATTENTION and HAND IS COOPERATION. Metonymically, *hannu* ‘hand’ is conceptualized as HAND STANDS FOR ACTIVITY, HAND STANDS FOR PERSON, HAND STANDS FOR SKILL, HAND STANDS FOR CONTROL, HAND STANDS FOR PERSONALITY, HAND STANDS FOR SIDE and HAND STANDS FOR GIVEN.

On the basis of these conceptualizations the presents study found that the speakers of the Hausa language use the body part term *hannu* ‘hand’ to evoke figurative conceptualizations. As data analysis has revealed, some of the conceptualizations of *hannu* ‘hand’ was as a result of its general function in the human body. In Hausa various functions of the body part *hannu* ‘hand’ give rise to different conceptual expressions. We believed that hand is one of the defining characteristics of human beings; we also know that with our hand we can act and hold things. Therefore, such bodily experiences with our hands became the basis of so many metaphors and metonymies structuring abstract concept in Hausa. For instance, consider the abstract concept of control which we mentally trace through the function of our bodily experiences of hand. When one hold an entity in one’s hand, one may do anything with it, this mental experience is understood as being under control. Thus implying the presence of metaphorical expression of HOLDING IN THE HAND IS CONTROL (see sections 4.2.1). Here we understand that as a result of the function of hand to hold and manipulate something, it is metaphorically regarded as control, thereby, hand denotes control.

As the analysis also revealed it is not only the functions of body parts that are providing the basis to be use as a figurative language, but, other situations and

experiences also play other significant role. Therefore, the study found that some of the conceptualizations in the analysis were as a result of some specific cultural beliefs that have root in the language traditions. As it was well known in the study of body parts conceptualizations that culture plays a significant role in producing figurative language across languages, Hausa language was not an exception as well. It also exploits the use of cultural beliefs in some of the conceptualization. For instance, it is normal for two persons to shake hands when they meet as a form of greeting. But in Hausa culture there are some situations in which such forms of greeting is not proper and the refusal to shake hand with a person is an indication that the person has a special personality or belongs to the elite group in the society. Therefore, culturally in Hausa it is not everyone you meet that you can shake hand with. As a result of such beliefs and culture of the Hausas, some metonymical expressions were found using hand to stands for the personality of a person.

Another cultural belief of the Hausas which become the basis of some of the conceptualizations is the culture of presenting gifts whenever they pay a courtesy visit to someone. It is well known that we usually use our hands as the container to carry such gifts; this motivated the Hausas to used hand conceptually to stands for giving (see section 4.4.1 for more details).

Moreover, the action performed by hand also plays a role in producing so many conceptualized expressions in Hausa. We know in our daily life, many human actions are performed by using our hands. Therefore, such actions performed by hands can conceptually represent specific actions that have been conducted. This basis becomes the root of so many conceptualizations in the analysis of this study. For example, consider the metonymical expressions of HAND STANDS FOR ACTIVITY in Hausa. In this metonymy hand, conceptually and metonymically, stands for various activities as a result of the role hand plays in performing the actions (see sections 4.3.1 for more details).

Therefore, the present study found that the concept *hannu* ‘hand’ plays a significant role in the Hausa language and culture, describing various activities, functions and the human experience both metonymically and metaphorically (see the conceptualizations of *hannu* ‘hand’ in section 4.1).

5.2.2 What are the metaphorical and metonymical conceptualizations of *kai* ‘head’ in the Hausa language?

The analysis further found that the metaphorical expressions of *kai* ‘head’ as HEAD IS A CONTAINER OF INTELLIGENCE, HEAD AS A TOP OF THING, HEAD AS A TIP OF THING, HEAD AS BEGINNING OF THING, HEAD AS MOVING OBJECT, HEAD AS INDEPENDENCE OF AN OBJECT and HEAD AS SUFFICE OF AN OBJECT. Metonymical expressions of *kai* ‘head’ identified include HEAD STANDS FOR PERSON, HEAD STANDS FOR INTELLIGENCE, HEAD STANDS FOR INDEPENDENCE, HEAD STANDS FOR COOPERATION, HEAD STANDS FOR LENGTH and HEAD STANDS FOR AGREEMENT.

With respect to these conceptualizations the present study found that the speakers of the Hausa language make use of the body part term *kai* ‘head’ as a source of figurative conceptualizations. The study found that speakers of Hausa language focus on the function of the head to predominantly conceptualize *kai* ‘head’ as an agent capable of acting independently of their possessor’s volition. This particular function of the head brought so many conceptualized expressions in Hausa. Consider the special function of the head to move up and down and side by side, independently without the movement of the rest of the body. With reference to this particular function of the head the Hausas conceptually used head to metaphorically mean independence (see section 4.4.8 for more details).

The data has also revealed that *kai* ‘head’ plays a significant role in the Hausa language and culture, describing mental operations. As revealed from the data, the *head*

is a center of rational control and the locus of reasoning in the Hausa language culture. As it was apparent within cognitive linguistics and the study of embodiment via body part that head is a sensory selector that is associated with the ability to make choices based on what is recorded. Therefore, we can think, fantasize, dream, imagine and process cognitively with our heads, which contain our brain, skull and perceptive organs. On the basis of these special and unique characteristics of the head, culturally it becomes an important source of so many conceptualized expressions in Hausa. For instance, in Hausa whenever they address any one that he/she does not have head, they metaphorically mean that he/she does not have much sense (see sections 4.4.1 for more details). This cultural belief was based on the responsibility of the head as a container of the brain, which is responsible for our sense and intelligence.

Moreover, the Hausas also use their cognition and thought to metaphorically and culturally understand HEAD AS A BUNDLE. In Hausa head is viewed as a container responsible for carrying goods. As we know that head has a bounded space like a container that can hold something inside and outside. Based on this the Hausas use to metaphorically understand measured goods that can be carried by head as a bundle (see section 4.4.5, for more details). Thus, the present study found that various expressions have been conceptualized evoking both the metaphorical and metonymical meaning of *kai* 'head' (see the conceptualizations of *kai* 'head' in sections 4.4 and 4.5).

5.2.3 How are the ICMs operate for the creation of metaphorical and metonymical expressions of *hannu* 'hand' and *kai* 'head' in the Hausa language?

Analysis also revealed that the containment ICM, human being ICM, non-human ICM, and part-whole ICM are ICMs that are involved in the creation of the metaphorical and metonymical expressions of *hannu* 'hand' and *kai* 'head' in the Hausa language.

The last finding of the present study demonstrates how speakers of the Hausa language make use of real-world encyclopedic knowledge to extend and understand figurative word meaning. The basic encyclopedic knowledge of a human being allows him to interconnect his mind and the meaning of a word with real-world experiences. Thus, different sets of ICM have been found in the Hausa language conceptualizations of *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’, interconnecting the mind of the Hausa speaker and the word meaning with their perspective of the real world, as determined by the word itself. Therefore, each ICM (containment ICM, human being ICM, non-human ICM, and part-whole ICM) used in the metaphoric and metonymic conceptualization of *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’ has a specific structured mental space.

Conclusively, the study focused on finding both metaphorical and metonymical expressions of body part terms *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’ respectively. The study further investigated the cognitive idealized models (ICMs) that operated in the conceptualizations. Among the striking finding of the study is that both body part terms hand and head are heavily exploited in producing metaphors and metonymies in Hausa language. Therefore, the study found that the speakers of the Hausa language make use of these two body part terms as sources of figurative conceptualizations of; mental operations, experiences, and rational control. However, these conceptualizations are largely describing various function and activities as well as culturally constructed and often have roots in certain beliefs and traditions. Finally Yu (2011) opined that, the body is at the center of the radial network of human language and cognition. Thus, the body is however surrounded by the dynamic forces of culture. In each cultural context, therefore, the body radiates with a different pattern of routes and nodes.

5.3 Future Research

The present study is concerned only with two body part terms: *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’. These two body parts were selected to conduct the present research based on

their frequent occurrence in selected online newspapers and dictionaries in Hausa language. Therefore, other major body parts such as foot, nose, stomach, ear, finger, etc, are not considered. Future research may be conducted with reference to these major body parts using the same method of this study.

However, regarding the selection and collection of the data, the present study only considers the metaphorical and metonymical expressions. Therefore, future research will be conducted considering other sources of collecting data and compare them with the method of the present study.

Also, the current study has considered only the cases of metaphorical and metonymical expressions of *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’ in the Hausa language. Future research should carry out a contrastive analysis of body part terms *hannu* ‘hand’ and *kai* ‘head’ in Hausa and other languages, especially other African languages.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, R. C. (1962). *Dictionary of the Hausa language*: London: University of London Press.
- Aksan, A. (2011). The apocalypse happens when the feet take the position of the head: Figurative uses of head and feet in Turkish. In Z. Maalej & N. Yu (Eds.), *Embodiment via body parts* (pp. 241-255). Amsterdam: John Benjamin's publishing Company.
- Barcelona, A. (2000). On the plausibility of claiming a metonymic motivation for conceptual metaphor. In A. Barcelona (Ed.), *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads: A cognitive perspective*, (pp. 31-58). Berlin and New York: Mouton Gruyter.
- Barcelona, A. (Ed) (2000b). *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads: A cognitive perspective*. Berlin and New York: Mouton Gruyter.
- Barcelona, A. (2002). Clarifying and applying the notions of metaphor and metonymy within cognitive linguistics: An update. In R. Dirven & R. Porings (Eds.), *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast* (pp. 207-277). Berlin and New York: Mouton Gruyter.
- Barcelona, A., & Soriano, C. (2004). Metaphorical conceptualization in English and Spanish. *European Journal of English Studies*, 8(3), (295-307).
- Bargery, G. P., & Westermann, D. (1951). *A Hausa-English Dictionary and English-Hausa Vocabulary*: Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Batic, G. C. (2006). Towards A Hausa Metaphorical Lexicon: Body Part Nouns. *Aion* (66/1-4) (17-45).
- Berendt, E. A., & Tanita, K. (2011). The 'heart 'of things: a conceptual metaphoric analysis of heart and related body parts in Thai, Japanese and English. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 20(1), (65-78).
- Black, M. (1962). *Models and metaphors: Studies in language and philosophy*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Boers, F. (1999). When a bodily source domain becomes prominent: the joy of counting metaphors in the socio-economic domain. *Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science series 4*, (47-56).
- Burke, K. (1969). *A Rhetoric of Motives*. 1950. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Charbati, Y. (2008). *Towards a cognitive theory of metaphor*. Unpublished Phd Thesis. Faculty of Language and Linguistics, University of Malaya.
- Croft, W. (1993). The role of domains in the interpretation of metaphors and metonymies. *Cognitive linguistics*, 4(4), (335-370).

- Croft, W., & Cruse, D. A. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics*: Cambridge University Press.
- Crysmann, B. (2012). *Resumption and Island-hood in Hausa*. Paper presented at the Formal Grammar.
- Crysmann, B. (2011). *A unified account of Hausa genitive constructions*. Paper presented at the Formal Grammar.
- Galadanci, M. K. M. (1976). *An introduction to Hausa grammar*: Longman Nigeria.
- Gibbs, R. W., & Steen, G. J. (Eds.). (1999). *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics: Selected Papers from the 5th International Cognitive Linguistics Conference, Amsterdam, 1997* (Vol. 175): Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Gibbs, R. W. (1999). Speaking and thinking with metonymy. *Metonymy in language and thought*, 61-76.
- Gibbs, R. W. (1999). Taking metaphor out of our heads and putting it into the cultural world. *Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science series 4*, 145-166.
- Gibbs, R. W. (2006). *Embodiment and cognitive science*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goban, G. N. (2005). Metaphors of business discourse. Unpublished master dissertation. University of Malaya.
- Goossens, L. (1990). Metaphonymy: the interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. *Cognitive Linguistics (includes Cognitive Linguistic Bibliography)*, 1(3), 323-342.
- Greenberg, J. H. (1963). *The languages of Africa* (Vol. 25): Indiana University.
- Halprin, D. (2002). *The expressive body in life, art, and therapy: Working with movement, metaphor and meaning*: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Hampe, B., & Grady, J. E. (2005). *From perception to meaning: Image schemas in cognitive linguistics* (Vol. 29): Walter de Gruyter.
- Hawkes, T. (1972). *Metaphor: the critical idiom*.
- Hilpert, M. (2007). Chained metonymies in lexicon and grammar. In G. Radden, K.M. Kopcke, S. Berg & P. Siemund (Eds.), *Aspects of meaning construction*, (pp. 77-98). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Hyun, J. A., & Yeon, J. K. (2007). A study on metaphor and metonymy of hand. *언어과학*, 14(2), (195-215).
- Jaggar, P. J., & Buba, M. (2009). Metaphorical extensions of 'eat' overcome and 'drink' undergo in Hausa. In J. Newman (Ed), *The Linguistics of Eating and Drinking*, 84, 229-151.

- Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*: University of Chicago Press.
- Johnson, M. (2005). The philosophical significance of image schemas. *From perception to meaning: Image schemas in cognitive linguistics*, 15-33.
- Kovecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*: Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2003). *Metaphor and emotion: Language, culture, and body in human feeling*: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z., & Szabó, P. (1996). Idioms: A view from cognitive semantics. *Applied linguistics*, 17(3), 326-355.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago, Chicago University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought*, 2, 202-251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Conceptual metaphor in everyday language. *The journal of Philosophy*, 77(8), 453-486.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*, Chicago, Chicago University Press.
- Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: theoretical prerequisites. Volume 1* (Vol. 1): Stanford university press.
- Maalej, Z. A., & Yu, N. (2011). (Eds.). *Embodiment via body parts: Studies from various languages and cultures* (Vol. 31): John Benjamins Publishing.
- Maalej, Z. (2011). Figurative dimensions of ʒayn in Tunisian Arabic. In Z. Maalej & N. Yu (Eds.), *Embodiment via body parts* (pp. 213-240). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Marmaridou, S. (2011). The relevance of embodiment to lexical and collocational meaning: The case of prosopo 'face' in Modern Greek. In Z. Maalej & N. Yu (Eds.), *Embodiment via body parts* (pp. 23-40). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Newman, J. (Ed.). (2009). *The linguistics of eating and drinking* (Vol. 84). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Newman, P., Newman, R. M., Yahaya, I. Y., Dresel, L., Bayero, K. J. a., & Nijeriya, M. C. N. H. (1992). *Modern Hausa-English Dictionary*: University Press PLC.
- Newman, P. (1980). *The two R's in Hausa*: School of Oriental and African Studies.

- Newman, P. (2000). *The Hausa Language. An Encyclopedic Reference Grammar. New Haven.*
- Newman, R. M. (1990). *An English-Hausa dictionary: Yale University Press New Haven.*
- Niemeier, S. (2008). To be in control: kind-hearted and cool-headed. The head-heart dichotomy in English. In F.Sharifian, R. Dirven, N. Yu, & S. Niemeir (Eds), *Culture, Body, and Language: Conceptualizations of Internal Body Organs across cultures and Languages* (pp. 349-372). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nissen, U. K. (2011). Contrasting body parts: Metaphors and metonymies of mouth in Danish, English and Spanish. In Z. Maalej & N. Yu (Eds.), *Embodiment via body parts* (pp. 71-92). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Occhi, D.J. (2011). A cultural-linguistic look at Japanese eye expression. In Z. Maalej & N. Yu (Eds.), *Embodiment via body parts* (pp. 171-193). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Oakley, T. (2007). Image schemas. *The Oxford handbook of cognitive linguistics*, 214-235.
- Ortony, A. (Ed). (1993). *Metaphor and thought*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Panther, K.-U., & Radden, G. (Eds.). (1999). *Metonymy in language and thought*: Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Papafragou, A. (1996). On metonymy. *Lingua*, 99(4), 169-195.
- Pütz, M., Niemeier, S., & Dirven, R. (2001). *Applied Cognitive Linguistics: Theory and Language Acquisition. I* (Vol. 1): Walter de Gruyter.
- Radden, G., & Dirven, R. (2007). *Cognitive English Grammar* (Vol. 2): John Benjamins Publishing.
- Radden, G., & Kövecses, Z. (1999). Towards a theory of metonymy. In K.-U. Panther & G. Radden (Eds.), *Metonymy in language and thought*, 4, (pp. 17-60).
- Radić-Bojanić, B., & Silaški, N. (2012). Metaphoric and metonymic conceptualizations of the head: A dictionary-based contrastive analysis of English and Serbian. *Facta universitatis-series: Linguistics and Literature*, 10(1), (29-39). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Schmitt, R. (2005). Systematic metaphor analysis as a method of qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 10(2), 358-394.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language* (Vol. 626): Cambridge University press.
- Siahaan, P. (2011). Head and eye in German and Indonesian figurative uses. In Z. Maalej & N. Yu (Eds.), *Embodiment via body parts* (pp. 93-115). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Sharifah, H. (2003). Metaphors in stock market news discourse. Unpublished master dissertation. University of Malaya.
- Sharifi, S. (2012). Role of Body Members in Constructing Metaphors in Persian Political Texts. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 3 (171-178).
- Sharifian, F., Dirven, R., Yu, N., & Niemeier, S. (Eds.). (2008). *Culture, body, and language: Conceptualizations of internal body organs across cultures and languages* (Vol. 7): Walter de Gruyter.
- Sharifian, F. (2011). Conceptualizations of cheshm 'eye' in Persian. In Z. Maalej & N. Yu (Eds.), *Embodiment via body parts* (pp. 197-212). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Steen, G. (2004). Introduction: Metaphor across languages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(7), 1(183-1188).
- Ungerer, F., & Schmid, H. (2006). *An introduction to cognitive linguistics*: Pearson Education.
- Velasco, O. I. D. (2000). A cross-linguistic analysis of the nature of some hand metonymies in English and Spanish. *Atlantis*, 22(2), (51-67).
- Velasco, O. I. D. (2001). Metaphor, metonymy, and image-schemas: an analysis of conceptual interaction patterns. *Journal of English studies*, 3(2), (47-63).
- Yu, N. (2004). The eyes for sight and mind. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(4), 663-686.
- Yu, N. (2008). The Chinese heart as the central faculty of cognition. In F. Sharifian, R. Dirven, N. Yu, and S. Niesmeir (Eds.), *Culture, body and language: conceptualization of internal body organs across languages and culture*, (pp. 131-168). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yu, N. (2008). Metaphor from body and culture. In R.W. Gibbs (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought*, (pp. 247-261). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yu, N. (2009). *The Chinese heart in a cognitive perspective: Culture, body, and language* (Vol. 12): Walter de Gruyter.
- Yu, N. (2011). Speech organs and linguistic activity in Chinese. In Z. Maalej & N. Yu (Eds.), *Embodiment via body parts* (pp. 117-148). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Vainik, E. (20011). Daynamic body parts in Estonian figurative description of emotion. In Z. Maalej & N. Yu (Eds.), *Embodiment via body parts* (pp. 41-70). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Zahedi, K. (2012). Body parts in language: A cognitive semiosis of human mind. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 32, (334-338).
- Zimmermann, M. (2006). Focus realization in west Chadic. Ms, Humboldt University, Berlin.

APPENDIX 1

Metaphorical Expressions of *Hannu* ‘Hand’

HAND IS A CONTROL (see Table 4.2, I; Section 4.2.1)

- (1) Al’amari-n-su na **hannu-na**
 Affair-GEN-3PL IPFV hand-1SG
 (Lit.: Their affairs are in my **hand**)
 ‘I am in charge (control) of their affairs’ (DHL, p.371: 10-11)
- (2) Ba shi da **hannu** a ka-n-mu
 NEG 3MSG against hand in over-GEN-1PL
 (Lit.: He has no **hand** over us)
 ‘He has no power (authority) over us’ (DHL, p.371: 14-15)
- (3) Dabba-r ta-a karfi **hannu-n-sa**
 Animal-GEN 3FSG-PFV receive hand-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: Animal received his **hand**)
 ‘Animal thrived in his care (control)’ (DHL, p.372: 39-40)
- (4) Yana ja-n zare-n jam’iyyar a tafi-n **hannu-n-sa**
 3MSG-IPFV drag-GEN thread-GEN political party in palm-GEN hand-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: He is dragging the thread of the political party in the palm of his **hand**)
 ‘The political party is under his control’ (LHNP, 28/01/2013)
- (5) Kasaitacciya-r masaurata-r a tafi-n **hannu-n-sa**
 huge-GEN kingdom-GEN in palm.of hand-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: The huge kingdom is in the palm of his **hand**)
 ‘The big kingdom is under his control’ (LHNP, 29/03/2013)
- (6) Jam’iyya-r tasu na da **hannu** kan yunkuri-n
 political party-GEN 3PL IPFV with hand over attempt-GEN
 (Lit.: Their political party has **hand** over the attempt)
 ‘Their political party has control over the attempt’
- (7) Na rantse da wanda rayuwa-ta ke **hannu-n-sa**
 1SG swear with whom life-3FSG REL hand-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: I swear with whom my life is in his **hand**)
 ‘I swear with whom my life is in his hand (control)’ (ANP, 20 March 2014)
- (8) Ba **hannu-n** gwamnati-n
 NEG hand-GEN government-GEN
 (Lit.: No **hand** of the government)
 ‘The government is not involved’ (LHNP, 08/02/2013)

- (9) Ya-a ƙaryata **hannu-n** gwamnati cikin harka-n zabe-n
 3MSG-PFV lie hand-GEN government inside affairs-GEN election-GEN
 (Lit.: He lie **hand** of government inside the affairs of election)
 ‘He denied the government’s involvement in conducting the election’
 (LHNP, 08/02/2013)
- (10) Su zare **hannu-n** ‘yan siyasa
 3PL remove-IPFV hand-GEN politicians
 (Lit.: They have to remove **hand** of politicians)
 ‘They have to remove the control of politicians’ (LHNP, 22/03/2013)
- (11) Su-na da **hannu** cikin kashe malamin
 3PL-IPFV with hand inside kill teacher-GEN
 (Lit.: They have **hand** inside killing the teacher)
 ‘They are involved in killing the teacher’ (LHNP, 03/03/2014)
- (12) Ta-na da **hannu** dumu-dumu
 3FSG-IPFV with hand red handed
 (Lit.: She has hand red handed)
 ‘She has hand in the case’ (LHNP, 15/03/2013)
- HAND IS POSSESSION** (see Table 4.2, II; Section 4.2.2)
- (1) Ya-a sha **hannu**
 3MSG-PFV drink hand
 (Lit.: He drunk **hand**)
 ‘It has been in the possession of a number of people’ (HED, p.448: 20-22)
- (2) Ba shi ko da **hannu** ciki-n-sa
 NEG 3MSG though with hand inside-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: He has no **hand** in it)
 ‘He has no share in it’ (DHL, p.371: 15-16)
- (3) Haka ya-a zo **hannu-n-sa** goma
 thus 3MSL-PFV come hand-GEN-3MSL ten
 (Lit.: He came with ten **hands**)
 ‘He came without bringing any gift’ (DHL, p.372: 28-31)
- (4) Ya-a amshi mulki a **hannu-n-sa**
 3MSG-PFV take power in hand-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: He took power in his **hand**)
 ‘He took the leadership in his possessions’ (LHNP, 09/02/2013)
- (5) Ya fita daga **hannu-n** Jonathan
 3MSG-IPFV out from hand-GEN Jonathan
 (Lit.: To get out from the **hand** of Jonathan)
 ‘To get out from the possession of Jonathan’ (LHNP, 29/04/2013)

- (6) Ya-a kwashe sa'o'i 15 a hannu-n-ta
 3MSG-PFV spend hours 15 in hand.of-3FSG
 (Lit.: He spends 15 hours in her **hand**)
 'He spends 15 hours in her possession' (LHNP, 29/01/2014)
- (7) Ballantana har ta karfi mulki a hannu-n-ta
 neither till 3FSG received leadership in hand-GEN-3FSG
 (Lit.: Neither till it receive the leadership in her **hand**)
 'Neither till it received the leadership from her possessions' (LHNP, 01/03/2013)
- (8) Idan kika saya ya-a dan kwana biyu a hannu-n-ki
 if 3FSG buy 3MSG-PFV just day two in hand-GEN-3FSG
 (Lit.: If she bought it for just two days in your **hand**)
 'If you bought and it stayed for at least two days in your possession'
 (LHNP, 24/02/2014)
- (9) An kama ni ne da bindiga a hannu-na
 be.PFV arrest 1SG COP with gun in hand-1SG
 (Lit.: I was arrested with gun in my **hand**)
 'I was arrested with a gun in my possession' (ANP, 03 April 2014)
- (10) Kaya-n da ke hannu-n-sa don yi-n musanya
 Good-GEN at REL hand-GEN-3MSG for do-GEN exchange
 (Lit.: Goods at his **hand** for exchange)
 'Goods at his possession for exchange' (ANP, 20 March 2014)
- (11) Kuma duk wata takarda ta kadara-r-sa tana hannu-n-ta
 and all a paper 3MSG assets-GEN-3MSG 3FSG hand-GEN-3FSG
 (Lit.: And all the papers of his assets in her **hand**)
 'And all the documents of his properties are in her possession'
 (ANP, 20 March 2014)
- (12) Su-n koma hannu-n-mu
 3PL-GEN return.PFV hand-GEN-1PL
 (Lit.: They return to our **hand**)
 'They returned to our possession' (LHNP, 28/01/2014)
- (13) Ba ya-a iya zuwa hannu-n ainihi-n wafanda abi-n ya
 NEG 3MSG-IPFV can reach hand-GEN actual- GEN those what-GEN 3MSG
 shafa
 affected
 (Lit.: It does not reach the **hand** of those that actually affected)
 'It does not reach the possession of those that are actually affected'
 (LHNP, 22/03/2013)
- (14) Karfa-r kudi daga hannu-n 'yan kasuwa-r
 receive-GEN.IPFV money from hand-GEN trader-GEN
 (Lit.: Receiving money from **hand** of the traders)
 'Receiving money from the possession of the traders' (ANP, 28 March 2014)

- (15) Bayan ya-a share kwana goma a **hannu-n** 'yan bindiga-r
after 3MSG-PFV sweep days ten in hand-GEN terrorist-GEN
(Lit.: After he sweep ten days in the **hand** of terrorist)
'After he spends ten days in the possession of terrorist' (ANP, 20 March 2014)
- (16) Amma ba tabarma a **hannu-n-su**
but NEG mat in hand-GEN-3PL
(Lit.: But no mat in their **hand**)
'But no mat in their possession' (ANP, 27 March 2014)
- (17) Ya-a shiga **hannu-n** 'yan sanda
3MSG-PFV enter hand-GEN police
(Lit.: He entered **hand** of police)
'He was in the police custody (possession)' (ANP, 03 April 2014)
- (18) Yana a **hannu-n** 'yan-sanda
3MSG-IPFV in hand-GEN police
(Lit.: He is in the hand of police)
'He is under the police custody (possession)' (LHNP, 29/03/2013)
- (19) Ya-a fada **hannu-n** 'yan sanda a lokaci-n
3MSG-PFV fall hand-GEN police at time-GEN
(Lit.: He fall **hand** of police at the time)
'He falls into the hands of police at the time' (ANP, 20 March 2014)
- (20) Da mijin-ta Mfon James duk sun shiga **hannu**
with husband.of-3FSG Mfon James all 3PL enter hand
(Lit.: With her husband Mfon James all they enter **hand**)
'With her husband's Mfon James all they are arrested' (ANP, 20 March 2014)
- (21) Don kada na-a fada **hannu-n** hukuma
for NEG 1SG-IPFV fall hand-GEN government
(Lit.: For not falling hand of government)
'Not to fall into the hands of government' (LHNP, 19/02/2014)

HAND IS COOPERATION (see Table 4.2, III; Section 4.2.3)

- (1) Sun kama **hannu-n** juna
3PL-PFV hold hand-GEN each other
(Lit.: They held **hand** of each other)
'They helped each other' (DHL, p.372: 4-5)
- (2) Ya-a kama **hannu-n-ta**
3MSG-PFV hold hand-GEN -3FSG
(Lit.: he held her **hand**)
'He (bridegroom) consummated marriage with virgin wife' (DHL, P.371: 49-51)

- (3) Sun haɗa **hannu** kan yunkuri-n yi wa ƙungiya-r rijista
 3PL join hand over attempt-GEN do COP association-GEN register
 (Lit.: They join **hand** over an attempt of doing the register of the association)
 ‘They join hand for registering the association’ (LHNP, 15/03/2013)
- (4) Don haka mu-ka haɗa **hannu** domin muradu-n jama’a-r-mu
 for that POSS-1PL join hand for desire-GEN people-GEN-1PL
 (Lit.: For that we join **hand** for the desire of our people)
 ‘For that we cooperate for the development of our people’ (LHNP, 08/02/2013)
- (5) Ministoci-n Makamashi-n ƙasashe-n Turai da su haɗa **hannu-n-su**
 Ministers-GEN energy-GEN contries-GEN Europe to 3PL join hand-GEN-3PL
 wuri guda
 place one
 (Lit.: Ministers of energies of European countries to join their **hands** one place)
 ‘Ministers of energy of European countries to come together in one position’
 (ANP, 27 March 2014)
- (6) Hukuma-r za ta haɗa **hannu** ne da jirage-n ruwa 42
 government-GEN will 3FSG join hand COP with ship-GEN 42
 (Lit.: Government will join **hand** with 42 ships)
 ‘The government will cooperate with 42 vessels’ (ANP, 13 March 2014)
- (7) Ta haɗa **hannu** da shi wajen horas da matasa
 3FSG join-IPFV hand with 3MSG in training the youth
 (Lit.: It joins **hand** with him in training the youth)
 ‘It cooperates with him in training the youth’ (ANP, 21 February 2014)
- (8) Su zo a haɗa **hannu** tare a yi aiki don cigaba-n
 3PL come to join hand together to do work for development-GEN
 ƙungiya-r
 association-GEN
 (Lit.: They come to join **hand** together to do the work for the development of
 association)
 ‘They come to cooperate together to do the work for the development of the
 association’ (ANP, 22 November 2013)
- (9) Majalisar dinki-n Duniya za ta haɗa **hannu** da gwamnati-n
 legislative-GEN sewing-GEN world will 3FSG join **hand** with government-GEN
 Filifins
 Philippine
 (Lit.: Legislative of sewing world will join hand with government of Philippine)
 ‘The United Nations will cooperate with Philippine government’
 (ANP, 14 November 2013)

- (10) Ta hada **hannu** da shi wajen horas da matasa
 3FMSG join-PFV **hand** with 3MSG in training the youth
 (Lit.: It joins hand with him in training the youth)
 ‘It cooperates with him in training the youth’ (ANP, 21 February 2014)

HAND IS ATTENTION (see Table 4.2, IV; Section 4.2.4)

- (1) An-yi mini **hannu-n-ka** mai kafada
 be-PFV 1SG hand-GEN-2MSG ADJ shoulder
 (Lit.: They did me **hand** of shoulder)
 ‘They drew my attention’ (DHL, p.372: 24-25)
- (2) **Hannu-n-ka** mai sanda
 Hand-GEN-2MSG ADJ stick
 (Lit.: Your **hand** holding stuff)
 ‘Be careful (come into your attention)’ (DHL, p.372: 15-17)
- (3) A kullum ta-kan rika ba ta-a shawara da yi mata **hannu-n-ka**
 in everyday 3FSG-ASP continue give 3FSG-PFV advice and do 3FSG hand-GEN-
 2MSG
 mai sanda
 hold stick
 (Lit.: In everyday she use to give her advice and doing **hand** of stick to her)
 ‘In everyday she use to gave her advice and drawing her attention’
 (ANP, 12 September 2013)
- (4) Mu rika yi musu **hannu-n-ka** mai sanda
 1PL continue do 3PL hand-GEN-2MSG hold stick
 (Lit.: We continue doing **hand** of stick to them)
 ‘We continue to draw their attention’ (ANP, 25 January 2013)
- (5) Sai kuma ta yi **hannun-ka** mai sanda ga mai shata dokokin
 also and 3FSG do hand-GEN-3MSG with stick to ADJ draw law
 (Lit.: And also she do him **hand** with stick to the law maker)
 ‘Also she warned the lawmaker’ (LHNP, 28/03/2014)

APPENDIX 2

Metonymical Expression of *Hannu* ‘Hand’

HAND STANDS FOR ACTIVITY (see Table 4.2, I; Section 4.3.1)

- (1) Ya-a aika da jawabi-n-sa ta **hannu-n** Audu
3MSG-PFV send with speech-GEN-3MSG via hand-GEN Audu
(Lit.: He sends his speech via **hand** of Audu)
‘He sent his speech via Audu’ (DHL, p.372: 28-30)
- (2) An kashe **hannu**
be-PVF kill hand
(Lit.: **Hand** was killed)
‘Hand-marks made in building have been obliterated’ (DHL, p.371: 41-43)
- (3) Hannu baka **hannu** kwarya
hand mouth hand calabash
(Lit.: Hand in mouth **hand** in calabash)
‘Greedy eating or ceaselessly working’ (DHL, p.372: 61-62)
- (4) Sun gudu ba kama **hannu-n** yaro
3PL run-PFV NEG hold hand-GEN boy
(Lit.: They ran without holding boys **hand**)
‘Everyone fled’ (DHL, p.372: 1-2)
- (5) Mu-na aiki ba kama **hannu-n** yaro
1PL-IPFV work NEG hold hand-GEN boy
(Lit.: we are working without holding **hand** of boy)
‘We are working very hard’ (DHL, p.372: 3-4)
- (6) Shugaba Jonathan ya-a rattaɓa **hannu** a kasafi-n kudi-n 2013
President Jonathan 3MSG-PFV sign hand in budget-GEN money-GEN 2013
(Lit.: President Jonathan has signed **hand** in budget money of 2013)
‘President Jonathan has signed 2013 budget’ (LHNP, 27/02/2013)
- (7) Ya-a gaggauta sanya **hannu** a kasafi-n kudi-n kasa-r
3MSG-IPFV hasten put hand in budget-GEN money-GEN nation-GEN
(Lit.: He hastens to put **hand** in the budget of the nation money)
‘He has to be fast to sign the nation’s budget’ (LHNP, 02/15/2013)
- (8) Sannan ya sanya **hannu** a biya ka
therefore 3MSG-IPFV put hand at pay 2MSG
(Lit.: Therefore he put **hand** at pay you)
‘Therefore he signs to pay you’ (ANP, 28 March 2014)

- (9) Wata sanarwa-r da runduna-r soja-n Najeriya ta-a fitar dauke
in a statement-GEN by troop-GEN army-GEN Nigeria 3FSG-IPFV release take
da sa **hannu-n** kakaki-n-ta
with put hand-GEN Spokesman-GEN-3FSG
(Lit.: In a statement by the troop of Nigerian army release with the **hand** of its
spokesman)
‘A statement released by the Nigerian army with the signature of its spokesman’
(ANP, 27 March 2014)
- (10) Na samu sako ta **hannu-n** jami’ar tallace-tallace-n mujalla-r
1SG get message through hand-GEN public-GEN advertisers-GEN journal-
classic
GEN classic
(Lit.: I get the message through the **hand** of public advertiser’s officer of classic
Journal)
‘I received the message through the public advertiser’s officer of classic journal’
(LHNP, 19/02/2014)
- (11) Hukuma-r FRSC ta **hannu-n** kakaki-n-ta Mista
commission-GEN FRSC through hand-GEN spokesman-GEN-3FSG Mr
Jonah Agu
Jonah Agu
(Lit.: Commission of FRSC, through the **hand** of her spokesman Mr Jonah Agu)
‘FRSC commission through its spokesman Mr Jonah Agu’
(ANP, 03 April 2014)
- (12) Da akwai sana’a-r **hannu** da na-ke yi
And there craft-GEN hand with 1SG-REL do
(Lit.: And there is **hand** craft that I am doing)
‘And there is professional hand craft that I am doing’ (LHNP, 24/03/2013)
- (13) Za ta agaza wa ma-su sana’a-r **hannu**
will 3FSG help to POSS-3PL craft-GEN hand
(Lit.: It will help to those craft of **hand**)
‘It will help those who are doing handcraft’ (ANP, 20 March 2014)
- (14) Na’urori da sauran abin da **hannu** ke iya sarrafawa
devices and other thing that hannu REL can manage
(Lit.: Devices and other things that **hand** can be manage)
‘Devices and other things that can be manually controlled’
(ANP, 20 March 2014)
- (15) Haka nan su-ke zaman **hannu** baka hannu kwarya
so that 3PL-REL sit.of hand mouth hand calabash
(Lit.: So that they are sitting for **hand** mouth hand calabash)

- ‘So that they are sitting for ceaselessly working’ (ANP, 27 March 2014)
- (16) Ba irin ma-su **hannu** baka hannu kwarya ba
 NEG like POSS-3PL hand mouth **hand** calabash NEG
 (Lit.: Not like those hand mouth **hand** calabash)
 ‘Not like those who are greedy’ (ANP, 01 February 2013)

HAND STANDS FOR PERSON (see Table 4.2, II; Section 4.3.2)

- (1) **Hannu** da yawa maganin kazamar miya
 hand with many cure,of dirty.of soup
 (Lit.: Many **hands** are medicine of dirty soup)
 ‘Many hands (peoples) make light work’ (DHL, p.372: 16-18)
- (2) Ya-a sha **hannu**
 3MSG-PFV drink hand
 (Lit.: It drunk **hand**)
 ‘It has been in the possession of a number of people’ (HED, p.448: 20-22)
- (3) **Hannu** gare shi
 hand with 3MSG
 (Lit.: He has **hand**)
 ‘He has many relatives’ (HED, p.448: 16-19)
- (4) **Hannu**-n-ka ba ya rubewa ka yanke ka yas
 hand-GEN-2MSG NEG 3MSG rot 2MSG cut 2MSG throw
 (Lit.: Your **hand** will not be rot then you cut it and you threw it away)
 ‘One cannot but pardon the faults of one’s dependents (person)’
 (LHNP, 29/03/2013)
- (5) Agaji-n ba ya isa **hannu**-n-su
 aid-GEN NEG 3MSG reach hand-GEN-3PL
 (Lit.: The aid it does not to reach their **hand**)
 ‘The aid does not reach them’ (LHNP, 22/03/2013)
- (6) Wani na **hannu**-n dama-n Gwamna-n Jihar Kebbi
 a for hand-GEN right-GEN Governor-GEN State Kebbi
 (Lit.: A right **hand** of Kebbi State Governor)
 ‘A right hand man of Kebbi State Governor’ (ANP, 28 March 2014)
- (7) Gogagge-n dan siyasa ne kuma na **hannu**-n daman janar Buhari
 experience-GEN politician COP and 1MSG hand-GEN right-GEN general Buhari
 (Lit.: Experience politicians and the right **hand** man of general Buhari)
 ‘Experience politicians and Buhari’s right hand man’ (LHNP, 22/02/2013)

- (8) Domin an ce **hannu** da yawa magani-n kazama-r miya
 because be-PFV say hand with many cure-GEN dirty-GEN soup
 (Lit.: Because it was say many **hands** is a cure of dirty soup)
 ‘It was said that many people do a light work’ (ANP, 09 August 2013)
- (9) **Hannu** da yawa sun lalace
 hand with many 3PL damage
 (Lit.: Many **hands** they are damage)
 ‘Many people are corrupt’ (ANP, 21 June 2013)
- (10) Kuma ita kullum abin da ta-ke so shi ne **hannu** da yawa
 and 3FSG everyday what that 3FSG-REL like 3MSG COP hand with many
 (Lit.: And everyday what she likes is many **hands**)
 ‘And everyday what she wants is many people’ (ANP, 16 August 2012)

HAND STANDS FOR SKILL (see Table 4.2, III; Section 4.3.3)

- (1) **Hannu** gare shi
 hand has 3MSG
 (Lit.: He has **hand**)
 ‘He is skillful’ (DHL, p.371: 37)
- (2) **Hannu** gare shi wajen aiki
 hand has 3MSG rather work
 (Lit.: He has **hand** at work)
 ‘He is capable at his job/work’ (HED, p. 448: 16-19)
- (3) Tsoho-n **hannu** ne
 old-GEN hand COP
 (Lit.: An old **hand**)
 ‘Old hand at work’ (DHL, p.372: 55-56)
- (4) Tsoha-n **hannu** ne
 old-GEN hand COP
 (Lit.: An old **hand**)
 ‘An experienced person’ (DHL, p. 448: 51-52)

HAND STANDS FOR CONTROL (see Table 4.2, IV; Section 4.3.4)

- (1) Ba shi da **hannu** bisa ka-n-mu
 NEG 3MSG with hand over head-GEN-1PL
 (Lit.: He has no **hand** over us)
 ‘He has no control over us’ (DHL, p.371: 13-14)

- (2) Ya-a sa mini **hannu**
 3MSG-PFV put 1SG hand
 (Lit.: He has put me **hand**)
 ‘He interferes in my matters’ (HED, p 448: 51)
- (3) **Hannu**-n-sa ya-a rene ni
 hand-GEN-3MSG 3MSG-PFV raise 1SG
 (Lit.: His **hand** raises me)
 ‘I rise in his care’ (LHNP, 03/02/2014)
- (4) Ya-a rasu a **hannu**-n-sa
 3MSG-PFV died in hand.of-3MSG
 (Lit.: He dies in his **hand**)
 ‘He died under his control’ (LHNP, 28/022013)
- (5) Allah ya-a danka jagoranc-in kasa-r nan a **hannu**-n-sa
 God 3MSG-PFV entrust leadership-GEN nation-GEN this in hand-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: God entrusted the leadership of this nation in his **hand**)
 ‘God entrusted him the control to lead the nation’ (LHNP, 28/01/2014)
- (6) Iko-n sarrafa dukkani-n dakaru-n kasa-r nan ke **hannu**-n-sa
 power-GEN control all-GEN forces-GEN nation-GEN this REL hand-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: he has the power to control all the forces of this country in his **hand**)
 ‘He has the power to control all the forces of this country in his hands’
 (ANP, 03 April 2014)
- (7) Tsoma hannun yan siyasa da mayar da bikin da ake yi
 dip hand.of politicians and return.of with celebration that REL do
 (Lit.: **Hand**-dipped of politicians and back of celebration that does)
 ‘Interference of politicians and revenge they did’ (LHNP, 22/03/2013)
- (8) Ana ji-n cewa akwai **hannu**-n wasu kashashe-n Yammaci-n Turai
 it feel-GEN that there.IPFV hand-GEN some county-GEN Western-GEN Europe
 (Lit.: It feels that there is **hand** of some Western Europe countries)
 ‘It feels that there is influence of some Western Europe countries’
 (ANP, 03 April 2014)
- (9) Sakamako-n **hannu** da su-ke da shi a kisa-n wani dan sanda
 as result-GEN hand for 3PL-REL with 3MSG in killing-GEN a police man
 (Lit.: As result of their **hand** with it in killing of a police man)
 ‘As a result of their influence in killing a police man’ (ANP, 27 March 2014)

- (10) An samu mutum 528 da **hannu** a laifi-n kisan wani ɗan sanda
 be.PFV found people 528 with hand in guilty-GEN kill-GEN a police man
 (Lit.: 528 people was found with **hand** in killing of a police man)
 ‘258 people were found guilty (involve) in killing of a police officer’
 (ANP, 27 March 2014)
- (11) Akwai sakaci-n-su ko kuma **hannu**-n-su cikin rikici-n
 there is careless-GEN-3PL or and hand.of-3PL inside crisi-GEN
 (Lit.: There is careless of them and or their **hand** in the crisis)
 ‘There is carelessness of them and or their influence in the crises’
 (ANP, 27 March 2014)

HAND STANDS FOR PERSONALITY (see Table 4.2, V; Section 4.3.5)

- (1) Ta ga **hannu**-n-ta
 3FSL see.PFV hand-GEN-3FSG
 (Lit.: she saw her **hand**)
 ‘Girl began to menstruate for fist time’ (DHL, p.371: 43-44)
- (2) Ka ga irin **hannu**-n-sa
 2MSG see.IPFV like-GEN hand-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: You see his **hand**)
 ‘That is just his line’ (DHL, p.371: 45-47)
- (3) **Hannu** ya-a san na giji
 hand 1MSG-PFV know of heir
 (Lit.: **Hand** knew that of heir)
 ‘He is generous but only to his family’ (DHL, p.372: 13-14)
- (4) Ba ma yin **hannu** da shi
 NEG 1PL do hand with 3MSG
 (Lit.: We are not doing **hand** with him)
 ‘He is too senior for us to shake hands with’ (DHL, p.372: 26-28)
- (5) Mai **hannu** da shuni
 ADJ hand with dye
 (Lit.: **Hand** with dye)
 ‘Prosperous person’ (DHL, p.372: 45)
- (6) Sarki Abdullahi ya-a karbe shi **hannu** bibiyu
 King Abdullahi 3MSG-PFV receive 3MSG hand in two
 (Lit.: King Abdullah received him **hand** in two’s)
 ‘King Abdullah received him with warm welcome’ (LHNP, 28/02/2014)

- (7) Abi-n kunya ne ga ma-su **hannu** da shuni na arewa
 thing-GEN shame COP against POSS-3PL hand with dye of north
 (Lit.: It is a shame against those **hands** with dye of the north)
 ‘It is unfortunate for the wealthiest people of the north’ (LHNP, 29/01/2014)
- (8) Ma-su **hannu** da shuni su ba da tallafi-n-su
 POSS-3PL hand with dye 3PL give CONJ support-GEN-3PL
 (Lit.: Those **hands** with dye to give support)
 ‘Wealthiest people to give their support’ (ANP, 28 March 2014)
- (9) Hukumomi ko ma-su **hannu** da shuni
 governments or POSS-3PL hand with dye
 (Lit.: Governments or those **hands** with dye)
 ‘Governments or wealthiest people’ (ANP, 28 March 2014)
- (10) Inda ya-a yi kira ga ma-su **hannu** da shuni da fungiyoyi
 where 3MSG-PFV do call to POSS-3PL hand with dye and associations
 (Lit.: Where he calls to those **hands** with dye and associations)
 ‘Where he appeals to the wealthiest peoples and associations’
 (ANP, 27 March 2014)

HAND STANDS FOR SIDE (see Table 4.2, VI; Section 4.3.6)

- (1) **Hannu-n-ka** mai sanda
 hand-GEN-2MSG ADJ stick
 (Lit.: Your **hand** with stick)
 ‘Blind man goes in the direction/side of the hand holding the stuff’
 (DHL, p.372: 15-17)
- (2) Ka kidaya daki na biyar daga **hannu-n** dama
 2MSG count room number five from hand-GEN right
 (Lit.: You count room number five from **hand** of right)
 ‘You count room number five from right side’ (ANP, 20 March 2014)
- (3) Na duba **hannu-n** dama sai na ga lambar tiki na 16
 1SG look hand-GEN right then 1SG see-PFV number ticket of 16
 (Lit.: I look **hand** of right then I saw ticket number 16)
 ‘I look to the right side then I saw the ticket number 16’ (ANP, 20 March 2014)
- (4) Sai ka matsa ‘Sign In’ daga can sama a **hannu-n** dama
 then 2MSG press ‘Sign In’ from there up in hand-GEN right
 (Lit.: Then you press ‘Sign In’ from there up in **hand** of right)
 ‘Then you press ‘Sign In’ up there from the right side’ (ANP, 18 July 2013)

(5) Sai ka matsa alama-r ‘Add a Gadget’ da ke sama daga **hannu-n** dama
 then 2MSG press sign-GEN ‘Add a Gadget’ which REL up from hand-GEN right
 (Lit.: Then you press sign ‘Add a Gadget’ which is up from hand of right)
 ‘Then you press the sign ‘Add a Gadget’ which is up at the right side’
 (ANP, 18 July 2013)

(6) Daga **hannu-n** hagu can kasa za ka ga inda aka rubuta ‘Add Your Own’
 from hand-GEN left there down will 2MSG see where was write ‘Add Your Own’
 (Lit.: From the **hand** of right down there you will see where ‘Add Your Own’ was
 written)
 ‘Down there from the left side you will see where ‘Add Your Own’ was written’
 (ANP, 18 July 2013)

(7) Ya-a kidime ya kidaya na huɗu daga **hannu-n** hagu
 3MSG-PFV confuse 3MSG count number four from hand-GEN left
 (Lit.: He was confuse to count number four from **hand** of left)
 ‘He was blindly count number four from the left side’ (ANP, 20 March 2014)

(8) Daga **hannu-n** hagu kuwa
 from hand-GEN left thus
 (Lit.: Thus from **hand** of left)
 ‘Thus from the left side’ (LHNP, 31/01/2014)

HAND STANDS FOR GIVING (see Table 4.2, VII; Section 4.3.7)

(1) **Hannu** da **hannu** ciniki-n makaho
 hand with hand transaction-GEN blind
 (Lit.: Hand in **hand** transaction of blind man)
 ‘Cash preferable in credit = I will not sell you on credit’ (DHL, p.372: 10-12)

(2) Haka ya-a zo **hannu-n-sa** goma
 thus 3MSL-PFV come hand-GEN-3MSL ten
 (Lit.: Thus he came with ten **hands**)
 ‘Thus he came without bringing any gift’ (DHL, p.372: 28-31)

(3) Ya-a shiga adashi **hannu** biyu
 3MSG-PFV enter pool hand two
 (Lit.: He entered pool two **hands**)
 ‘He gave two shares in the pool’ (DHL, p.372: 7-9)

(4) **Hannu-n-sa** wofi
 hand.of-3MSG empty
 (Lit.: His **hand** empty)
 ‘He is empty handed’ (HED, p.448: 15)

- (5) Za ta koma gida **hannu** rabbana ne?
 will 3FSG return home hand lord COP
 (Lit.: Will she return home **hand** lord?)
 ‘Will she return home empty handed?’ (ANP, 25 January 2013)
- (6) Ta koma gida **hannu** rabbana
 3FSG return-PFV home hand lord
 (Lit.: She returned home **hand** lord)
 ‘She returned home empty handed’ (ANP, 21 September 2012)
- (7) Yan majalisa-r dokokin jiha-r Nasarawa sun mayar da **hannu-n** baiwa
 lawmaker-GEN laws state-GEN Nasarawa 3PL return the hand-GEN genius
 (Lit.: The lawmakers of Nasarawa state returns the **hand** of genius)
 ‘The Nasarawa state legislature return the gift’ (ANP, 26 July 2013)
- (8) Haka kuma ga **hannu-n** baiwa
 also and for hand-GEN genius
 (Lit.: And also for **hand** of genius)
 ‘And also for given (gift)’ (ANP, 21 June 2013)

APPENDIX 3
Metaphorical Expressions of *Kai* ‘Head’

HEAD AS CONTAINER OF INTELLIGENCE (see Table 4.3, I; Section 4.4.1)

- (1) Ya-a na da **kai**
3MSG-IPFV has with head
(Lit.: He has **head**)
‘He is sharp = keen intelligence’ (DHL, p.450: 4-5)
- (2) Yaro-n nan ba shi da **kai**
boy-GEN this NEG 3MSG have head
(Lit.: This boy does not have **head**)
‘This boy is not intelligent/ is not much sense’ (HED, p.528: 16-18)
- (3) Ba shi da **kai**
NEG 2MSG with head
(Lit.: He has no **head**)
‘He is dull’ (DHL, p.450: 5-6)
- (4) Ba shi da **kai** ba shi da gindi
NEG 3MSG have head NEG 3MSG and bottom
(Lit.: He does not have **head** and bottom)
‘He has no sense’ (HED, p.528: 18-19)

HEAD AS TOP OF THING (see Table 4.3, II; Section 4.4.2)

- (1) **Ka-n** takarda
head-GEN paper
(Lit.: **Head** of paper)
‘The top of paper’ (DHL, p.451: 49-50)
- (2) **Ka-n** takarda
head-GEN paper
(Lit.: **Head** of paper)
‘The top of a piece of paper’ (HED, p.528: 13-14)
- (3) **Ka-n** dutse
head-GEN rock
(Lit.: **Head** of rock)
‘The top of the rock’ (HED, p.528: 14)
- (4) **Ka-n** dutse
head.of rock
(Lit.: **Head** of rock)

- ‘Summit of rock’ (DHL, p.451: 50)
- (5) **Ka-n** daki
 head-GEN room
 (Lit.: **Head** of room)
 ‘Roof of round house’ (DHL, p.451: 52-1)
- (6) **Ka-n** soro
 head-GEN roof
 (Lit.: **Head** of roof)
 ‘Roof of flat-topped building’ (DHL, p.451: 1-2)
- (7) Na dora alkalami-na ne a **ka-n** takarda
 1SG put pen-1SG COP on head-GEN paper
 (Lit.: I put my pen on the **head** of a paper)
 ‘I put my pen on the top of a paper’ (ANP, 19 December 2013)
- (8) Yarinya-r tana **ka-n** dutse-n da ke kusa da mu
 girl-GEN 3FSG-IPFV head-GEN rock-GEN with REL close with 3PL
 (Lit.: The girl is on the **head** of the rock that is near us)
 ‘The girl is on the top of the rock that is near us’ (ANP, 28 November 2013)
- (9) Wasu su-ka ce a **ka-n** dutse
 Some 3PL-ASP says on head-GEN rock
 (Lit.: Some they say on **head** of rock)
 ‘Some they said on top of the rock’ (ANP, 11 October 2013)
- (10) Na ce ran-ka ya dade ta na nan **ka-n** dutse-n
 1SG say soul-3MSG 3MSG stay long 3FSG IPFV there head-GEN rock-GEN
 (Lit.: I say his soul stay long; she is there **head** of rock)
 ‘I said your Highness she is there on top of the rock’ (ANP, 04 January 2013)
- (11) Ba sai ta sauko daga **ka.n** itace ba
 NEG but 3FSG down from head-GEN wood NEG
 (Lit.: but she does not get down from the **head** of the wood)
 ‘But she does not need to get down from the top of the wood’
 (ANP, 11 October 2013)

HEAD AS TIP OF THING (see Table 4.3, III; Section 4.4.3)

- (1) **Ka-n** allura
 head-GEN needle
 (Lit.: **Head** of needle)
 ‘Point of needle’ (DHL, p.451: 6)
- (2) **Ka-n** allura
 head-GEN needle
 (Lit.: **Head** of needle)
 ‘The point of a needle’ (HED, p.528: 32-33)

- (3) **Ka-n** bulala
 head-GEN whip
 (Lit.: **Head** of whip)
 ‘The flexible end of a whip’ (HED, p.528: 33-34)
- (4) **Ka-n** bulala
 head.of whip
 (Lit.: **Head** of whip)
 ‘Whip tip’ (DHL, p.451: 7)
- (5) Su ce kai ne mai tada **ka-n** adda
 3PL say.IPFV 2MSG COP ADJ fix head-GEN cutlass
 (Lit.: They will say you that are fixing the **head** of cutlass)
 ‘They will say you are pin pointing the tip of a cutlass’ (ANP, 07 March 2014)
- (6) Wanda duk ya samu aiki ko na tada **ka-n** adda ne
 which all 3MSG find job even that fix head-GEN cutlass COP
 (Lit.: Which all you find a job even that of fixing the **head** of cutlass)
 ‘Who ever find a job even that of fixing the tip of cutlass’ (ANP, 04 October 2013)

HEAD AS BEGINNING OF THING (see Table 4.3, IV; Section 4.4.4)

- (1) **Ka-n** littafi
 head-GEN book
 (Lit.: **Head** of book)
 ‘The beginning of a book’ (HED, p.528: 27-28)
- (2) **Ka-n** littafi
 head.of book
 (Lit.: **Head** of book)
 ‘Beginning of a book’ (DHL, pp.451: 51)
- (3) Ban ji **ka-n** magana-r ba
 NEG.of-1 hear head-GEN matter-GEN NEG
 (Lit.: I do not hear **head** of the matter)
 ‘I do not understand the beginning/origin of the matter’ (HED, p.528: 24-26)
- (4) **Ka-n** izufi
 head-GEN paragraph
 (Lit.: **Head** of paragraph)
 ‘The beginning of the paragraph’ (HED, p.528: 26-27)
- (5) **Ka-n** rafi
 head-GEN stream
 (Lit.: **Head** of stream)
 ‘Source of stream’ (DHL, p.450: 6-7)

- (6) **Ka-n** rafi
 head.of stream
 (Lit.: **Head** of a stream)
 ‘The source of a stream’ (HED, p.528: 23-24)
- (7) Yaya zan gane abin da ban san **ka-n-sa** ba!
 how will-1SG understand what with NEG know head-GEN-3MSG NEG
 (Lit.: How I will understand what I did not know his head)
 ‘How I will understand what I don’t know its beginning’ (ANP, 03 April 2014)
- (8) Gwamnatin Najeriya ba ta san **ka-n-ta** ba
 Government.the Nigeria NEG 3FSG know head-GEN-3FSG NEG
 (Lit.: The government of Nigeria did not knew her head)
 ‘The government of Nigeria does not know her beginning’ (ANP, 07 August 2013)
- (9) Har lokaci-n da suka iso **ka-n** rafi-n tururuwa
 until time-GEN that 3PL come head.of stream-GEN Ant
 (Lit.: Until the time they came to the head of Ant stream)
 ‘Until they came to the beginning of Ant stream’ (ANP, 05 December 2013)

HEAD AS A BUNDLE (see Table 4.3, V; Section 4.4.5)

- (1) **Ka-n** itace
 head-GEN firewood
 (Lit.: **Head** of firewood)
 ‘A load of firewood’ (DHL, p.452: 8-9)
- (2) **Ka-n** itace
 head.of wood
 (Lit.: **Head** of firewood)
 ‘Bundle of wood’ (DHL, 528: 39)
- (3) Itace yana nan **kai-kai**
 firewood 3MSG-IPFV there head-head
 (Lit.: Firewood is there **head-head**)
 ‘There is wood here in bundles’ (HED, p.258: 40-41)
- (4) Itace yana nan **kai-kai**
 firewood 3MSG-IPFV there head-head
 (Lit.: Firewood is there **head-head**)
 ‘Firewood is there in bundles’ (DHL, p.452: 10-11)
- (5) **Ka-n** kara
 head-GEN corn-stalks
 (Lit.: **Head** of corn-stalks)
 ‘Bundle of corn-stalks’ (DHL, p.452: 12-13)

- (6) Ruwa **kai** uku
 water head three
 (Lit.: Water three **head**)
 ‘Three head-loads of water’ (DHL, p.452: 9-10)

HEAD AS A MOVING OBJECT (see Table 4.3, VI; Section 4.4.6)

- (1) Ya-a **kai** Kano
 3MSG-PFV head Kano
 (Lit.: He **head** Kano)
 ‘He reached Kano’ (DHL, p.452: 5-6)
- (2) Ya-a **kai** ga Kano
 3MSG-PFV head to Kano
 (Lit.: He **head** to Kano)
 ‘He reached to Kano’ (DHL, p.452: 5-6)
- (3) Ya-a **kai** gari-n-su
 3MSG-PFV head town-GEN-3PL
 (Lit.: He **head** his town)
 ‘He reached his native town’ (DHL, p.452: 8-9)
- (4) Ya-a **kai** gari-n-su
 3MSG-PFV head town-GEN-3PL
 (Lit.: He **head** his town)
 ‘He reached his native town’ (HED, p.528: 13-14)
- (5) FC Barcelona dai ta **kai** wasa-n karshe
 fc Barcelona COP 3FSG head game-GEN end
 (Lit.: FC Barcelona **head** to the last game)
 ‘FC Barcelona reached to the final game’ (ANP, 10 April 2014)
- (6) Sai da ta **kai** ga matasa na nuna fushin-su
 until that 3FSG head to youth IPFV show anger.of-3PL
 (Lit.: Until it **head** that the youth to shows their anger)
 ‘Until it reaches that the youth shows their anger’ (ANP, 04 April 2014)
- (7) Ya-a **kai** baki zai sha
 3MSG-IPFV head mouth will drink
 (Lit.: He **head** mouth to drink)
 ‘He put his mouth to the vessel to drink’ (DHL, p.453: 1-3)
- (8) Allah **kai** mu gobe
 God head 1PL tomorrow
 (Lit.: God **head** us tomorrow)
 ‘May god cause us to see tomorrow’ (DHL, p.453: 5-7)

- (9) Abin zai **kai** ga barna
 thing will head to thrash
 (Lit.: Thing will **head** to thrash)
 ‘It will lead (ended) to trouble’ (DHL, p.453: 27-28)
- (10) Al’amari-n ya-a **kai** ga yaki
 affair-GEN 3MSG-PFV head to war
 (Lit.: Affair **head** to war)
 ‘The affair ended/lead to war’ (DHL, p.453: 28-29)
- (11) Abin ya-a **kai** ga dole a daure su
 thing 3MSG-PFV head to must at tied 3PL
 (Lit.: Thing it **head** to must tied them)
 ‘It becomes indispensable to imprison them’ (DHL, p.453: 30-31)
- (12) Ya-a **kai** ta Kano
 3MSG-PFV head 3MSG Kano
 (Lit.: He **head** her Kano)
 ‘He took her to Kano’ (DHL, p.453: 13-14)
- (13) Mun **kai** su kasa
 1PL head 3PL down
 (Lit.: We **head** them down)
 ‘We felled/took them down’ (DHL, p.453: 18-19)
- (14) Ya-a **kai** ka-n-sa can
 3MSG-PFV head head-GEN-3MSG there
 (Lit.: He **head** his head there)
 ‘He went there’ (DHL, p.453: 20-21)
- (15) Ya-a **kai** kara wuri-n-sa
 3MSG-PFV head complain place-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: He **head** the complain to him)
 ‘He took his complaint to him’ (DHL, p.453: 27-28)
- (16) **Kai** wannan wuri-n-sa
 head this place-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: **Head** this to him)
 ‘Take this to him’ (HED, p.528: 23-24)
- (17) Ya-a **kai** kara wuri-n alkali
 3MSG-PFV head complain place-GEN judge
 (Lit.: He **head** his complain to judge)
 ‘He took his complain to the judge’ (HED, p.528: 24-26)
- (18) Yaro ya-a **kai** kara
 boy 3MSG-PFV head complain
 (Lit.: Boy **head** his complain)
 ‘The boy weeps bitterly’ (HED, p.528: 26-27)

- (19) Na **kai** kuka na waje-n-sa
 1MSG-PFV head cry 1MSG place-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: I **head** my cry to him)
 ‘I took my trouble to him’ (DHL, p.453: 29-30)
- (20) Hare-haren da aka **kai** ciki-n wata-n Janairu-n bana
 attacks that was head in-GEN month-GEN January-GEN year
 (Lit.: Attacks that was **head** in January this year)
 ‘Attacks that were taken in January this year’ (ANP, 06 February 2014)
- (21) Daga nan aka **kai** daki-n ajiye gawa na asibiti
 from here was head room-GEN store corpse POSS hospital
 (Lit.: From there was **head** to the room of storing corpse of the hospital)
 ‘From there was taken to hospital mortuary’ (ANP, 06 February 2014)
- (22) Kuma ku zo mu taimaka a **kai** Man United Abatuwa
 And 3PL come 1pl help in head Man United abattoir
 (Lit.: And you come and help us in **heading** Man United to abattoir)
 ‘And you come and help us in taking Man United to abattoir’
 (ANP, 07 March 2013)

HEAD AS A SIZE OF AN OBJECT (see Table 4.3, VII; Section 4.4.7)

- (1) Ba wanda ya-a **kai** shi girma
 NEG which/one 3MSG-PFV head 2MSG size
 (Lit.: No one which he is **head** size)
 ‘It has not its equal in size’ (DHL, p.453: 46-47)
- (2) Ba wanda ya-a **kai** shi mulki
 NEG which 3MSG-PFV head 2MSG power
 (Lit.: No one which he is **head** power)
 ‘He has not his equal in power’ (DHL, p.453: 47-48)
- (3) Bai kai Kano arziki ba waje-n gyada
 NEG head Kano wealth NEG place-GEN ground-nuts
 (Lit.: it is no **head** Kano wealth in ground-nuts)
 ‘It is no match for Kano in ground-nuts’ (DHL, p.453: 48-50)

HEAD AS INDEPENDENCE OF AN OBJECT (see Table 4.3, VIII; Section 4.4.8)

- (1) Jirage ma-su sarrafa **ka**-n-su na Amurka a Nijar da Burkina Faso
 Planes POSS-3PL control head-GEN POSS America in Niger and Burkina Faso
 (Lit.: American planes that control their **head** are in Niger and Burkina Faso)
 ‘American planes operating without pilot are in Niger and Burkina Faso’
 (LHNP, 08/02/2013)

(2) Kungiyoyi ma-su zama-n **ka-n-su**
 Association POSS-3PL sit-GEN head-GEN-3PL
 (Lit.: Associations that are sitting of their **head**)
 ‘Non-governmental organization’ (LHNP, 0504//2013)

(3) Kamfanoni ma-su zama-n **ka-n-su**
 Companies POSS-3PL sit-GEN head-GEN-3PL
 (Lit.: Companies that are sitting of their **head**)
 ‘Private/independent organization’ (LHNP, 05/04/2013)

HEAD AS SUFFICED OF AN OBJECT (see Table 4.3, IX; Section 4.4.9)

(1) Ba zai **kai** ba
 NEG will head NEG
 (Lit.: Will not **head**)
 ‘It will not suffice’ (DHL, p.453: 21-22)

(2) Igiya-n nan ba za ta **kai** ba
 rope-GEN this NEG will 3FSG head NEG
 (Lit.: This rope will not **head**)
 ‘This rope will not suffice’ (HED, p.528: 18-19)

(3) Doki-n-sa ba zai **kai** wannan fage ba
 horse-GEN-3MSG NEG will head this field NEG
 (Lit.: His horse will not **head** this field)
 ‘His horse will not last out this course’ (HED, p.528: 20-22)

(4) Hatsi ya-a **kai** gar-gara
 corn 3MG-PFV head gar-gara
 (Lit.: The corn is **head** to mature)
 ‘The corn is quit ripe’ (DHL, p.453: 24-25)

(5) Tsawo-n soro ya-a **kai**
 tall-GEN building 3MSG-PFV head
 (Lit.: The tall of building is **head**)
 ‘The wall of the house is finished and only await roof’ (DHL, p.453: 23-24)

APPENDIX 4

Metonymical Expressions of *Kai* ‘Head’

HEAD STANDS FOR PERSON (see Table 4.3, I; Section 4.5.1)

- (1) Ni da **kai**-na
1SG with head-1MSG
(Lit.: I with my **head**)
‘I myself’ (DHL, p.451: 17)
- (2) Yi ta **ka**-n-ka
do on head-GEN-1MSG
(Lit.: Do on your **head**)
‘Be on your guard’ (DHL, p.451: 19-20)
- (3) Ta **kai**-na nake yi
by head-1SG 1SG do
(Lit.: I do by my **head**)
‘I am relaying on myself alone’ (DHL, p.451: 20-21)
- (4) Ku yi ta **ka**-n-ku
3PL do by head-GEN-3PL
(Lit.: They do by their **heads**)
‘Mind your own business’ (DHL, p.451: 25-26)
- (5) Su tafi da **ka**-n-su
3PL go with head-GEN-3PL
(Lit.: They go with their **head**)
‘Let them go by themselves’ (DHL, p.451: 18-19)
- (6) Ya-a kamata ku nemi na **ka**-n-ku
3MSG need 3PL find POSS head-GEN-3PL
(Lit.: You need to find your own **head**)
‘You should earn your own living’ (DHL, p.451: 26-27)
- (7) Ayyuka-n sadauka-r da **kai** da su-ka fara
work-GEN dedication-GEN of head that 3PL-REL start
(Lit.: Works of **head** dedication that they start)
‘Works of self dedication that they start’ (ANP, 04 April 2014)
- (8) Wane mataki ya kamata in dauka a **ka**-n-sa ko a **ka**-n-ta?
which decision 3MSG deserve to take on head-GEN-3MSG or on head-GEN-3fsg
(Lit.: Which decision he deserved to take on his **head** and on her head)
‘Which decision he deserves to take on him or her?’ (ANP, 03 April 2014)

- (9) Don haka na ba **kai**-na shawara-r in bi tasi
 For that 1SG give head-1SG advice-GEN to follow taxi
 (Lit.: For that I give my **head** advice to follow taxi)
 ‘For that I give myself advice to follow a taxi’ (ANP, 03 April 2014)
- (10) Sannan kuma ya-a harbe **ka**-n-sa
 therefore and 3MSG-PFV shoot head-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: Therefore he shot his **head**)
 ‘Therefore he shot himself’ (ANP, 03 April 2014)
- (11) Haka kuma tsoro-n hukunci-n da zai hau **ka**-n-sa
 also and fear-GEN judgment-GEN which will ascend head-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: And also fear of judgment which will ascend on his **head**)
 ‘And also the fear of punishment which will be imposed on him’
 (ANP, 13 April 2013)
- (12) Nauye-nauye-n jama’a da suka hau **ka**-n-sa
 burdens-GEN people that 3PL ascend head-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: Burdens of peoples that is ascended on his **head**)
 ‘Burdens of the society that is ascended on him’ (ANP, 18 February 2013)
- (13) Matashi-n ya-a kashe **ka**-n-sa ne ta hanya-r rataye
 youth-GEN 3MSG-PFV kill head-GEN-3MSG COP through way-GEN hanging
 (Lit.: Youth kills his **head** through way of hanging)
 ‘The youth kills himself by hanging’ (LHNP, 02/13/2014)
- (14) A kofari-n-sa na wanke **ka**-n-sa da **ka**-n-sa
 in attempt-GEN-3MSG IPFV clean head-GEN-3MSG with head-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: In trying to clean his **head** with his **head**)
 ‘In his effort to depend himself by himself’ (LHNP, 28/03/2014)
- (15) Wani da ya-a kira **ka**-n-sa
 Someone with 3MSG-PFV call head-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: Someone who calls his **head**)
 ‘Someone who calls himself’ (LHNP, 02/02/2013)
- (16) Ya-a bayyana **ka**-n-sa ne ga manema labarai
 3MSG-PFV present head-GEN-3MSG COP to journalists
 (Lit.: He present his **head** to the journalists)
 ‘He presents himself to the journalists’ (LHNP, 02/02/2013)
- (17) Duk abin da ya-a fadi a **ka**-n-sa gaskiya ne
 everything that 3MSG-PFV say over head-GEN-3MSG true COP
 (Lit.: Everything that he said over his **head** is true)

- ‘Everything he said against him is true’ (LHNP, 2304//2013)
- (18) Da farko dai za mu so ki gabata-r mana da **ka-n-ki**
 at first cop will 1PL like 2FSG introduce-GEN 1PL with head-GEN-2FSG
 (Lit.: At first we will like you to introduce us with **head** of you)
 ‘Firstly we would like to introduce yourself to us’ (LHNP, 19/02/2013)
- (19) Yanzu idan ki-ka dɔauki **ka-n-ki** a matsayin ‘yar kallo
 now if 2FSG-REL take head-GEN-2FSG in position-GEN viewer
 (Lit.: Now if you take your **head** in the position of viewer)
 ‘Now if you assume yourself as a viewer’ (LHNP, 15/03/2013)
- (20) Wane hali ki-ka tsinci **ka-n-ki** kafin kammalawa?
 which circumstance 2FSG-REL found head-GEN-2FSG before finish
 (Lit.: Which circumstance you found your **head** before you finish?)
 ‘Which circumstance you found yourself before you finished?’
 (LHNP, 21/02/2014)
- (21) Domin lafiya-r iyalin-ki da ma **ka-n-ki**
 because health-GEN family.of-2FSG and POSS head-GEN-2FSG
 (Lit.: Because of the health of your family and your **head**)
 ‘Because of the health of your family and yourself’ (LHNP, 11/03/2013)
- (22) Ta-a jefa **ka-n-ta** cikin wani mummuna-n hali
 3FSG-PFV throws head-GEN-3FSG into a bad-GEN situation
 (Lit.: She threw her **head** into a bad situation)
 ‘She found herself into a bad situation’ (LHNP, 14/03/2014)
- (23) Ya-a zama wajibi ta kare **ka-n-ta** a wannan lokaci
 3MSG become obligatory to defend head-GEN-3FSG at this time
 (Lit.: It become obligatory to defend her **head** at this time)
 ‘It becomes obligatory to defend herself at this time’ (LHNP, 14/02/2014)
- (24) Mun nesanta **ka-n-mu** daga bayani-n-ka
 1PL distance head-GEN-1PL from statement-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: We distance our **head** from statement of you)
 ‘We distance ourselves from your statement’ (LHNP, 28/03/2014)
- (25) Tabbas za mu tsinci **ka-n-mu** cikin walwala
 certainly will 1PL find head-GEN-1PL in happiness
 (Lit.: Certainly we will find our **head** in happiness)
 ‘Certainly we will find ourselves in happiness’ (LHNP, 30/01/2014)

- (26) Adadi-n su kashe **ka-n-su** da **ka-n-su** na karuwa
number-GEN 3PL kill head-GEN-3PL with head-GE -3PL IPFV increasing
(Lit.: Numbers of those kill their head with their **head** is increasing in Nigeria)
‘Percentage of those who are committing suicide is increasing in Nigeria’
(LHNP, 20/02/2014)
- (27) **Kai** ne
Head COP
‘It is you’ (DHL, p.454: 36-37)
- (28) Da ni da **kai**
With 1MSG and head
(Lit.: With I and **head**)
‘Both you and I’ (DHL, p.454: 37-38)
- (29) Ya-a nema-r mini **kai**
3MSG-PFV find-GEN 1MSG head
(Lit.: He found me **head**)
‘He sought you for me’ (DHL, p.454: 39-40)
- (30) Ya-a gajiyar da kai
2MSG tire-GEN with head
(Lit.: It tired **head**)
‘It tired you’ (DHL, p.454: 40-41)
- (31) **Kai**
head
(Lit.: **Head**)
‘You there’ (DHL, p.449: 44-45)
- (32) **Kai** mai tafiya
head ADJ walk-IPFV
(Lit.: **Head** passing by)
‘Hi you passer-by’ (DHL, p.449: 45-46)
- (33) **Kai** ka zo
head REL come
(Lit.: **Head** come)
‘It is you who are to come’ (HED, p.527: 57-58)
- (34) **Kai** ne na ba ka
Head COP 1SG-PFV give 2MSG
(Lit.: **Head** one I gave you)
‘You are the one to whom I gave it’ (HED, p.528: 1-2)
- (35) Ya tafi tare da **kai**
3MSG go with and head
(Lit.: He goes with **head**)
‘He goes with you’ (HED, p.528: 8-9)

- (36) **Kai** ka yi
 head will do
 (Lit.: **Head** will do)
 ‘You will do it’ (HED, p.450: 6-7)

HEAD STANDS FOR INTELLIGENCE (see Table 4.3, II; Section 4.5.2)

- (1) Ya-a na da **kai**
 3MSG-IPFV has with head
 (Lit.: He has **head**)
 (keen intelligence)’ (DHL, p.450: 4-5)

- (2) Yaron nan ba shi da **kai**
 boy this NEG 3MSG have head
 (Lit.: This boy does not have **head**)
 ‘This boy is not much intelligent (is not much sense)’ (HED, p.528: 16-18)

- (3) Ba shi da **kai**
 NEG 2MSG with head
 (Lit.: He has no **head**)
 ‘He is dull’ (DHL, p.450: 5-6)

- (4) Masu fari-n **kai**
 3PL white-GEN head
 (Lit.: Those of white **head**)
 ‘Educated persons’ (DHL, p.450: 1-2)

- (5) Masu baki-n **kai**
 3PL black-GEN head
 (Lit.: Those of black **head**)
 ‘Ignorant persons’ (DHL, p.450: 2-3)

HEAD STANDS FOR INDEPENDENCE (see Table 4.3, III; Section 4.5.3)

- (1) Gaba-n **kai**
 front-GEN head
 (Lit.: Front of **head**)
 ‘Becoming independent’ (DHL, p.451: 30)

- (2) Ya-a yi gaba-n **ka-n-sa**
 3MSG-PFV does front-GEN head-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: He fronted his **head**)
 ‘He followed his own counsel’ (DHL, p.451: 31-32)

- (3) Ya-a sami gaba-n **ka-n-sa**
 3MSG-PFV finds front-GEN head-GEN-3MSG
 (Lit.: He find front of his **head**)
 ‘He is started his own house hold’ (DHL, p.451: 32-33)
- (4) Ya-a yi ta **ka-n-sa**
 3MSG-PFV does by head.of-1MSG
 (Lit.: He did by his **head**)
 ‘He took to his heels’ (DHL, p.451: 37)
- (5) Ta sami gaba-n **ka-n-ta**
 3FSG find front-GEN head-GEN-1FSG
 (Lit.: She find front of her **head**)
 ‘She is living on her own’ (she is now married) (DHL, p.451: 33-34)
- (6) Wani Lauya mai zama-n kan-sa Barista Emmanuel Ofoegbu
 a lawyer that sit-GEN head.of-3MSG Barrister Emmanuel Ofoegbu
 (Lit.: A lawyer sitting of his **head** Barrister Emmanuel Ofoegbo)
 ‘A private/independent lawyer Barrister Emmanuel Ofoegbo’
 (ANP, 03 April 2014)
- (7) Wata budurwa mai zama-n **ka-n-ta**
 a lady ADJ sit-GEN head.of-3FSG
 (Lit.: A lady sitting **head** of herself)
 ‘A Prostitute lady’ (LHNP, 14/03/2014)
- (8) Mu tafi mu kwato **ka-n-mu** daga bauta
 1PL go we fight head-GEN-1PL from slavery
 (Lit.: We go we fight our **head** from slavery)
 ‘We go to fight ourselves from slavery’ (LHNP, 22/02/2013)

HEAD STANDS FOR AGREEMENT (see Table 4.3, IV; Section 4.5.6)

- (1) **Ka-n-su** ya gamu
 head-GEN-3MPL do joint
 (Lit.: Their **heads** joint)
 ‘They are unanimous’ (DHL, p.450: 26-27)
- (2) Da mu da su duk **ka-n-mu** ya zo daya
 and 1PL and 3PL all head-GEN-1PL PFV come one
 (Lit.: We and they all our **heads** come into one)
 ‘They and we are unanimous’ (DHL, p.450: 27-29)

(3) **Ka-n-su** dāya ne da yin sa
 head-GEN-3PL one COP in doing 3MSG
 (Lit.: Their **heads** are one in doing it)
 They are unanimous that it should be done (DHL, p.450: 29-31)

(4) Abokan gaba sun bada **kai**
 friend.of enemy 3PL-PFV give head
 (Lit.: They (friend of enemy) give **head**)
 ‘The enemy surrendered’ (DHL, p.450: 35-36)

HEAD STANDS FOR COOPERATION (see Table 4.3, V; Section 4.5.4)

(1) Ya zo mu haɗa **kai** mu ceto al’ummar Jiha-r Katsina
 3MSG come 1PL join head 1PL rescue people-GEN State-GEN Katsina
 (Lit.: He come we join **head** and we rescue people of Katsina State)
 ‘He comes for us to unite together to rescue the people of Katsina State’
 (ANP, 04 April 2014)

(2) Su-kan haɗa **kai** don yi wa juna taimako-n gaggawa
 3PL-ASP join head for do COP each help-GEN emergency
 (Lit.: They use to join **head** for doing each other emergency help)
 ‘They use to cooperate with each other to do emergency help’
 (ANP, 20 March 2014)

(3) Mu a Jihar Filato mun saba haɗa **kai** a yi abu tare
 1PL in State Plateau 1PL usual join head in do thing together
 (Lit.: We in Plateau State we usually join **head** in doing things together)
 ‘We in Plateau State we always cooperate to do thing together’
 (ANP, 20 February 2014)

(4) Ta haka sai su haɗa **kai** su nemi magani-n matsala-r tare
 through this then 3PL join head 3PL find solution-GEN problem-GEN together
 (Lit.: Through this then they join **head** together to find the solution)
 ‘Through this they cooperate together to find the solution’ (ANP, 20 February 2014)

(5) Idan taro-n kasa na son haɗa **ka-n** ‘yan Nijeriya
 If conference-GEN nation IPFV like join head-GEN Nigerians
 (Lit.: If conference of the nation is like to join **head** of Nigerians)
 ‘If the national conference likes to unite the Nigerians’ (LHNP, 02/04/2014)

(6) Jim kaɗan da kammala taro-n gangami-n PDP na haɗi-n
 a moment after finish conference-GEN movement-GEN PDP for join-GEN
kai tsakani-n ‘yayan-ta
 head between-GEN member-GEN-3MSG

(Lit.: A moment after finishing the conference of the movement of PDP for the joining **head** between its members)

‘A moment after finishing the conference of the movement of PDP for the cooperation of its members’ (LHNP, 14/03/2014)

(7) Nijeriya za-ta samu haɗi-n **ka**-n a'lummar-ta da cigaba
Nigeria will-3FSG found join-GEN head-GEN society.of-3FSG and progress

(Lit.: Nigeria will find join **head** of its society and progress)

‘Nigeria will find unity of its society and progress’ (LHNP, 02/04/2014)

HEAD STANDS FOR LENGTH (see Table 4.3, VI; Section 4.5.5)

(a) **Ka**-n-su ɗaya ne
head-GEN-3MPL one COP

(Lit.: Their **head** is one)

‘They are at the same size/age’

(DHL, p.450: 18-19)