Sticking one's nose in the data: Evaluation in phraseological sequences with *nose*

Magnus Levin and Hans Lindquist
Växjö University

1   Introduction

1.1. Background

With the realization that introspection and the use of dictionaries constitute a precarious foundation for studies of metaphor and metonymy, corpora have in recent years been used increasingly in the endeavour to explore the authentic use of figurative language (see, e.g. Deignan 2005; Stefanowitsch and Gries 2006). Similarly, investigations of phraseology (e.g. Moon 1998) have come to rely heavily on modern large-scale corpora, while analyses of evaluative lexis in the tradition of John Sinclair (e.g. Sinclair passim; Hunston and Thompson 1999; Stubbs 2001) have a theoretical commitment to the corpus as an indispensable tool. The present paper brings together these theoretical strands.

It is commonplace in cognitive linguistics that human cognition is embodied (cf. Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Langacker 1987, 1991; Kövecses and Szabó 1996; Gibbs and Wilson 2002; Gibbs et al. 2004). Therefore it is no surprise that many phraseological sequences are built up around words related to the body, and in this corpus-based case study we have chosen to focus on the evaluative functions of metonymic and metaphorical sequences containing the noun *nose*. In comparison with other body parts, such as the hand and the mouth, the nose is fairly restricted in its use. Whereas in some cultures, like Maori and Inuit, the nose has an additional social importance as it is used for greeting, in western societies the nose seems to have predominantly negative or humorous connotations (cf. Gogol's *The Nose*). One can only speculate about the reasons for this: perhaps it is the predominance of bad smells, or the association with snoring and the excretion of mucus. Some sequences containing *nose* also imply that the agent is behaving like an animal. As an example of the latter type of connotations, consider (1) to (3) with the metonymic sequence *stick one's nose somewhere*. This sequence is most frequently negative, as in (1), sometimes slightly ironic, as in (2), and occasionally positive, as in (3) (see further section 4.1.1).

(1)   The Steinbrenner we remember was always *sticking his nose* in where it's not wanted. (*NYT* 1996)

(2)   As soon as it's nice enough to *stick your nose* outside, this place is packed (…) (*Ind* 2000)

(3)   *Stick your nose* in it. Grind it out. You can't be turning the other cheek all the time. (*NYT* 1990)

In contrast to most studies of evaluative language we will consider both instances where speakers express their opinions about other people's activities and cases where the disapproval is on the part of the agent in the clause without the speakers conveying their opinions of this.

1.2   Aims
The aim of this paper is to

- describe, analyze and discuss the conventionalized evaluative functions of phraseological sequences containing the noun *nose*,
- describe, analyze and discuss the metonymic and metaphorical uses of phraseological sequences with *nose*, and
- draw conclusions regarding the function of evaluative phraseological sequences containing body nouns and the way they are likely to be learned and stored.

2   Previous work

2.1   Evaluation and semantic prosody
Evaluative language has received a great deal of attention in recent years in a number of different frameworks. One of the more influential approaches concerns semantic prosody[1] (e.g. Sinclair 1991, 2004; Louw 1993; Partington 1998, 2004; Hunston and Thompson 1999), which usually studies the spread of connotational meaning beyond single words. An example of such semantic prosody is the phrasal verb *set in* (Sinclair 1991), which usually indicates that something undesirable starts (e.g. *dry rot* or *disillusionment*). Because of this, semantic prosodists claim that *set in* has come to be associated with unpleasant events, and that therefore it has acquired unfavourable prosody. Semantic prosody, as it is usually defined, pertains to such cases of indirect evaluative meanings which are not necessarily available to introspection (Louw 1993: 173), although these

meanings are part of the communicative competence of native speakers (Partington 2004: 132).

The concept of semantic prosody is not unproblematic, however, and criticism has been levelled against it, notably by Whitsitt (2005), who strongly criticizes the idea of 'empty' words acquiring connotations exclusively from their collocates. Because of the inherent problems of the concept of semantic prosody, and our interest in both the attitude of speakers and of agents, we opt for a very broad definition of evaluation in this paper and will consider all kinds of evaluative language connected to specific phraseological sequences. By doing this we will be able to present a fuller picture of the evaluative meaning of those sequences. We also avoid some problems, for instance having to determine which meanings are explicit in the target words themselves, and which connotations have been 'rubbed off' on these words from their most typical collocates, a task whose feasibility Whitsitt (2005) casts considerable doubt on.

Our wide definition of evaluation allows us to deal with several different kinds of evaluation. The different types involve sequences where the evaluation is on the part of the agent (e.g. *wrinkle one's nose* expresses the wrinkler's disapproval without indicating the speaker's opinion towards this action), while others indicate both the attitude of the speaker and the agent of the action. For instance, *look down one's nose* suggests that the agent disapproves of something, while at the same time conveying the opinion of the speaker, who, uttering this, shows his or her dislike of the agent's behaviour (see section 4.1.5). There are also some sequences which only express the attitude of the speaker. For instance, *pay through the nose* ("to pay an exorbitant price, be charged excessively. Also *fig.* [sic]", according to the *OED* (s.v. *nose* n 25)) is a phrase which explicitly expresses the speaker's disapproval of the action referred to. This phrase has a clearly negative meaning, as evidenced by the 16 tokens in the 100-million-word British National Corpus and the 58 tokens in our newspaper material,[2] and illustrated in (4):

(4)   But all-seaters don't mean all-safe so why should clubs risk bankruptcy and fans *pay through the nose* for an ill-conceived scheme? (K52)

Moon (1998: 267–269) discusses some of the motivations for using fixed expressions in language, and argues that the establishment of solidarity between speaker/writer and listener/reader is one of the major reasons. By using dysphemistic phrases like *kick the bucket* or *pay through the nose* a writer may appeal to values shared with the readers. The use of such evaluative phraseological

sequences can therefore be connected to Brown and Levinson's (1987) concept of face-work.

In many phrases the negative meaning is more implicit than in *pay through the nose*, and there are also differences in the literalness between various sequences. For example, the mainly metonymic sequence *poke/stick one's nose somewhere* often, though not always, expresses the negative attitude of the speaker, as illustrated in (1) to (3) above. That this sequence is connected to negative evaluation is recognized in dictionary definitions, such as the *OED*'s "to intrude or interfere, esp. without good reason, in (something, esp. someone else's concern)" (s.v. *nose* n 13 b). Studies on the type of evaluative language usually referred to as semantic prosody (e.g. Partington 2004: 153) have found that dictionaries often fail to identify cases where 'indirect' negative connotations are acquired from the context, but *poke/stick one's nose into something* appears to be an exception which is classified as negative by dictionaries in spite of the fact that it is sometimes neutral, or even positive.

2.2 Phraseology

Research on the evaluative functions of language has clear connections with work on phraseology (Pawley and Syder 1983; Moon 1998; Wray 2002; Stubbs forthcoming). Just as there are a number of terms in the area of evaluative lexis, there is a host of different terms describing phraseological units and as yet there is no consensus (cf. Wray 2002: 8–10 for a list and discussion). The choice of term obviously depends on the theoretical inclination of the researcher and the purpose of the research. We have opted for a modification of Wray's term 'formulaic sequence', i.e. 'phraseological sequence', since, while we like the open-endedness implied by the word *sequence*, we wanted to avoid the associations of 'formulaic' to fixed formulae. The choice of the word *phraseological* also shows the links to the established field of phraseology.

Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992: 12–13) argue that phrases that are stored holistically (such as *if I were X* [*you/king* etc.]) are connected with specific pragmatic meanings whereas superficially similar phrases produced by the regular rules of grammar (e.g. *if I were the one that she really wanted to talk to*) are not associated with such meanings. However, some phraseological sequences that express evaluation on the part of the agent, rather than on the part of the speaker, are generally more literal, as *wrinkle one's nose* in (5) (see further section 4.1.4).

(5)   Denise Winston *wrinkles her nose* at such stories. 'People shouldn't be so flaky. Romance has to be planned,' she says. (*Ind* 1995)

2.3 Metaphor and metonymy

The sequences in this investigation are based on both metaphor and metonymy.[3] Metaphor is usually defined as using a word for something resembling its referent (e.g. *the mouth of a river*), while metonymy is defined as a figure of speech where one word or phrase is substituted for another with which it is closely associated (e.g. *wrinkle one's nose* 'show disapproval'). In cognitive semantics, this difference is typically described as metaphor involving a mapping across two conceptual domains, while metonymy involves only one domain (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Kövecses and Szabó 1996). It should nevertheless be stressed that many of the non-literal instances of phraseological sequences are not exclusively metaphorical or metonymic (see Goossens 1990 for discussions of instances where metaphor and metonymy interact).

Within cognitive linguistics there has been a considerable focus on both metaphor and metonymy (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 35–40; Kövecses and Szabó 1996; Panther and Radden 1999). Metonymic links with body nouns often seem to express emotions and evaluations in English. There are a number of phrases that are based on the metonymic principle THE PHYSIOLOGICAL AND EXPRESSIVE RESPONSES OF AN EMOTION STAND FOR THE EMOTION (Kövecses 2000: 133): *get cold feet* (fear), *my mouth dropped open* (surprise) and *foaming at the mouth* (anger) (cf. Lindquist and Levin forthcoming). Kövecses and Szabó (1996: 336–337) suggest that connotative aspects of idioms can be inferred from our background knowledge of the domains involved. For instance, the idiom *smoke coming out of your ears*, which is based on the ANGER IS FIRE metaphor, implies that the anger is potentially dangerous but in principle under control. Shared cultural information about different domains therefore facilitates the interpretation of connotations of various non-literal phrases (Kövecses and Szabó 1996: 338).

Evaluation, phraseology and metaphor/metonymy are the central themes in our results section 4. Section 4.1 presents the findings for the phraseological sequences that express different kinds of negative evaluation and 4.2 deals with the rare cases of positive evaluation. We first turn to a discussion of the method and material used.

3 Method and material

The method we use has been called 'from lexis to n-grams' by Stubbs (forthcoming) and is further described in some detail in Lindquist and Levin (forthcoming). We used William Fletcher's (2003/2004) database *Phrases in English* which includes all n-grams (identical strings of words) with a length between

two and eight words which occur three times or more in the British National Corpus. The searches were made in a number of consecutive passes, so that n-grams of different lengths and with the key word in different positions were detected. In this way all cases of 8-grams including *nose(s)* were retrieved, as illustrated for 5-grams in Figure 1 (where N stands for *nose(s)*, and + for any other word), and then the same procedure was carried out for 7-grams down to 2-grams.

N + + + +	**nose** on the back of
+ N + + +	her **nose** in the air
+ + N + +	wrinkled her **nose** at him
+ + + N +	in through your **nose** and
+ + + + N	the side of his **nose**

Figure 1: The extraction of 5-grams

The output consisted of lists, quite short for 8-grams and very long for 3- and 2-grams, which were then scanned manually for instances of phrases with linguistic integrity. The present study deals with a selection of some of the n-grams extracted, and the focus is on sequences that are either exclusively non-literal (e.g. *pay through the nose*) or can be either literal or non-literal (e.g. *wrinkle one's nose*). Phrases are often found in their original literal senses as well as in their metonymic and metaphorical senses. Nevertheless, Moon (1998: 180) points out that when there is a non-literal interpretation of a phraseological sequence, the literal interpretation tends to be disfavoured. The n-grams investigated here are grouped into semantically related categories. For instance, *rub someone's nose in something* and *lead someone by the nose* both have implications of an agent treating a patient like an animal. Literal-only n-grams, such as *in through your/the nose* (12 tokens), do not generally have any specific positive or negative connotations and have therefore not been considered.

In order to boost the number of tokens and also to access material from a different regional origin, we complemented PIE with *The Independent* (1990, 1995, 2000) and *The New York Times* (1990, 1994–1997, 2000) on CD-ROM (in all 400+ million words). These CD-ROMs were searched for the sequences found in the BNC, and they were also scanned manually to find sequences not retrieved by PIE (such as *tweak someone's nose* in section 4.2.1). Comparisons with the newspaper material also made it possible to discern some differences between genres and registers. Partington (1998: 107–108) suggests that one of the distinguishing features of genres is the types of metaphors that are found in

them. He argues (2004: 153) that the 'quality and strength' of the patterns of semantic prosody vary between genres, which means that results from searches made in the total corpus cannot be generalized to the language as a whole without qualifications. This is the case with some of the evaluative sequences in this study, since a number of them occur frequently in newspapers, while others are more common in for instance fiction, and there are also different probabilities of the sequences being used in their literal non-evaluative meanings in different genres.

As mentioned in the introduction, studies of metonymy and metaphor in general rely heavily on introspection and invented examples (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Kövecses 2000; for a recent exception, see Deignan 2005), while studies of evaluation in language make use of corpus facilities (Sinclair passim; Partington 1998, 2004; Stubbs 2001, forthcoming). This study bridges some of the gap between these approaches in that a corpus methodology typical of studies of evaluative language is combined with a cognitive approach. Our study is to some extent corpus-driven (Tognini-Bonelli 2001) since our starting point is the results generated by the computer searches rather than our own intuitions about the use of phraseological sequences with body nouns. In this manner we largely avoid Whitsitt's (2005: 293–296) criticism that studies of evaluative language in fact start out from the researchers' intuitions rather than from corpus data. It should nevertheless be mentioned that obviously intuition as well as principled argumentation must come into the research process in the classification and analysis of the material.

4   Results

Previous research has indicated that negative evaluative lexis is more frequent than positive (Louw 1993: 171; Channell 1999: 55; Partington 2004: 133). According to Partington (2004: 133), this may be a reflection of humans having a greater need to communicate 'bad things' in life. The present study provides support for this hypothesis in that *nose* is mainly connected with negative evaluations, as will be seen below. Nevertheless, had we chosen to investigate another body part, the results might have turned out very differently.

Many of the phraseological sequences containing *nose* have their origin in conventionalized gestures and facial expressions. For instance, Deignan and Potter (2004: 1248) note that for phrases such as *turn one's nose up at something* the figurative meaning stands for the emotion conveyed through the gesture. The metonymic link between bad smell and the nose is also exemplified in the phrase *hold one's nose*, which describes another conventionalized gesture. This

phraseological sequence can convey both literal and non-literal meanings, as illustrated in (6) and (7) below. In its non-literal metonymic sense the sequence expresses the 'nose-holder's' evaluation of something perceived as repellent or unattractive. In the 18 tokens in the BNC it only occurs in its literal sense, while there were six literal and five non-literal tokens in *The Independent* (*Ind*), and 27 literal and 48 non-literal tokens in *The New York Times* (*NYT*). The non-literal sense therefore seems to be very rare in BrE but slightly more common in AmE, especially in texts about politics where it often occurs in relation to the act of voting, as in (7), where it seems to indicate voting for the least-disliked candidate:

(6) The smell of urine is so potent that many children *hold their noses* as they cross. (*NYT* 2000)

(7) 'The White House calculation is that when people go into the polling booth and, facing the Republican Neanderthal and Ross Perot, that they will vote for Bill Clinton even if they have to *hold their nose*,' Mr. Shuman said. (*NYT* 1994)

Examples of *hold one's nose* may thus be more or less metonymic. (7) probably does not involve any literal holding of the nose, although this is apparently the case in other instances (*when the bill passed* (…) *he signed it while literally holding his nose* (*NYT* 2000)).

Section 4.1 contains discussions of selected phraseological sequences which have negative evaluations, and the much shorter section 4.2 deals with positive evaluations. Negative evaluations connected to the following sequences will be discussed: *poke/stick one's nose somewhere* (4.1.1), *under one's nose* (4.1.2), *rub someone's nose in something* and *lead someone by the nose* (4.1.3), *wrinkle one's nose* (4.1.4), *look down one's nose*, *nose in the air* and *turn one's nose up at something* (4.1.5).

4.1 Negative evaluation

4.1.1 Poke/stick one's nose somewhere

By saying that someone is *poking their nose somewhere*, a speaker usually associates this behaviour with negative connotations. The same often applies to *stick one's nose somewhere*, but this sequence less frequently expresses negative evaluations than *poke one's nose*. *Stick one's nose* occurs fairly regularly in neutral, or sometimes even positive, contexts, as was indicated in (1) to (3). By focusing on the nose in sequences like *poke/stick one's nose somewhere*, the negative

connotations are possibly connected to the implications of the agent behaving like an animal (a parallel with animal behaviour for this idiom is also proposed by Gibbs and Wilson 2002: 527). Since negative connotations are only found in some of the instances, the implications of behaving like an animal when poking/ sticking one's nose somewhere may be restricted to some uses of the phrase. These two related sequences which have different likelihoods of expressing unfavourable connotations can be compared to Partington's (2004: 136–144) examples of various degrees of negative connotations in a semantic field of verbs: *set in* (very negative), *happen* (often negative), *occur* (mainly neutral), *take place* and *come about* (the latter of which does not appear to have any specific tendency at all).

The negative connotations of *poking/sticking one's nose somewhere* are often emphasised by the specification of 'locations' such as *into matters that do not concern you*, as in (8) below, *where it didn't belong* and *into other people's business*. Nevertheless (9), which contains no reference to what the nose is being poked into, is readily interpreted as expressing a negative attitude:

(8)   I understand that you have been very busy in Edinburgh asking many questions, *poking your nose* into matters that do not concern you. (BMN)

(9)   God, why doesn't he just shut up, stop *poking his nose* in? (HJC)

In those instances where *poke/stick one's nose* has more neutral connotations, as in (10) below (see also (2) above), the sequence indicates minimal extent (brief visits to the abbeys and walled towns), similar to *stick/put one's head in/round the door*.

(10)   Again, although we *poked our noses* in at the odd obligatory abbey and walled town, our one great memory is of something encountered by chance. (*Ind* 1990)

Interestingly, there were five tokens in *NYT* where *stick one's nose* appears to have positive connotations. Four of these occurred in articles about sports, as exemplified in (11). In such cases, *stick one's nose in* would seem to mean 'get involved' or, to use another body-based idiom, 'not be afraid to get one's hands dirty'.

(11)   He's been a team-oriented guy, terrific on face-offs, *sticks his nose in* when we need him to. (*NYT* 1996)

Poke/stick one's nose is thus not exclusively negative but may take on different evaluations depending on the cotext. As pointed out by Partington (2004: 136–144) this is commonplace for evaluative phrases. This phenomenon is also illustrated by the next phraseological sequence under study, *under one's nose*.

4.1.2 Under one's nose

Under one's nose refers metonymically either to someone's field of vision or to someone's sphere of influence. The nose is thus connected to the eyes via their proximity in the face, and, more indirectly, someone's field of vision is linked metonymically to 'influence' or 'control'. This sequence occurs in texts with two separate evaluative functions. The most common one is when a speaker or writer expresses a negative attitude towards the lack of attention, activity or interest in those who have something *snatched from (right) under their noses* (9 tokens in the BNC) or fail to notice some activity *going on under their noses* (8 tokens), as illustrated in (12) and (13).[4] Negative evaluations are also directed towards the patient in the sequence *lead someone by the nose* in section 4.1.3. *Under one's nose* is similar *to poke/stick one's nose somewhere* in that it expresses evaluation on the part of the speaker in many instances although there are also some uses which do not express any particular evaluation.

(12) His scheme to transform B&C with a string of bold acquisitions began almost immediately. The biggest and brashest was the purchase in 1986 of Exco, his old company, which he *snatched from under the nose* of Morgan Grenfell, the merchant bank. (*Ind* 1990)

(13) A policeman in the crowd seemed equally uninterested in the illegal trade in tiger parts that was *going on under his nose*. (*NYT* 1995)

When someone is said to *thrust* or *wave* (10 tokens each in the BNC) *something under someone else's nose*, however, the choice of words usually indicates a negative attitude towards the agent performing the action rather than the patient who is intruded upon, as illustrated in (14) and (15):

(14) But Mr. Lazio turns out to be one of those politicians with no thermostat. Having started hot, he just got louder and louder. By the end, he had charged over to Mrs. Clinton's lectern and *thrust* a no-soft-money pledge *under her nose*, demanding: Sign it! Right now! (*NYT* 2000)

(15) If he was really concerned about not hurting your feelings, he'd have just discreetly kept his stupid 'date' out of your way instead of *waving* her *under your nose* like he'd won on the Instants. (*Ind* 1995)

Examples (14) and (15) contain multiple specifications of the unfavourable connotations (*no thermostat*; *stupid*, etc.). Furthermore, (14) and (15) illustrate the cline of literalness of such evaluative sequences. (14) is the slightly more literal example where some object may actually be physically positioned under Mrs. Clinton's nose, while in (15), on the other hand, the date is not physically under anybody's nose, but in somebody's field of vision.

Under one's nose thus does not in itself have either positive or negative connotations, since the wider context needs to be taken into account. Although *snatch/go on under someone's nose* and *thrust/wave under someone's nose* are based on the same metonymic links, the evaluations expressed are different in that the former involves unfavourable opinions towards the patient of the action, while the latter involves unfavourable opinions towards the agent. A similar difference between evaluations of agents and patients is discussed in the next section.

4.1.3 Rub someone's nose in something *and* lead someone by the nose
Rub someone's nose in something ('to draw a person's attention to an embarrassing or painful fact, esp. in an emphatic way' (*OED* s.v. *nose* n 22)) and *lead someone by the nose* ('to cause to obey submissively' (*OED* s.v. *lead* v 4 c)) are two infrequent sequences which are similar in that they both suggest metaphorically that someone treats another person like an animal. *Rub someone's nose in something* usually occurs with an evaluative non-literal sense (5 tokens in the BNC, 61 tokens in the newspapers), as in (16), but some rare literal instances can also be found.

> (16) The man may feel that, if she's harking back to the whys and wherefores, his wife is *rubbing his nose* in the past. (G2V)

In our material *lead someone by the nose* occurs in a non-evaluative literal sense in reference to animals, and, more frequently, in an evaluative non-literal sense. The evaluative non-literal sense is exemplified in (17) and (18):

> (17) We should take it easy and not be *led by the nose* by the Commission or by the Council of Foreign Ministers. (HHW)

> (18) It is usually the ignorant who are most easily *led by the nose*. (*NYT* 1996)

There is an important difference between *rub someone's nose* and *lead someone by the nose* in that a speaker by using the non-literal instances of *rub someone's nose* expresses dislike only towards the agent of the action, whereas *lead some-*

one by the nose (11 non-literal instances and one literal instance referring to an animal in the BNC; 18 non-literal instances in the newspapers) mainly conveys the speaker's criticism of the patients who allow themselves to be treated in this way. The patients are described variously as being *stupid*, *mad* or, as in (18), *ignorant*.

The examples *rub someone's nose in something* and *lead someone by the nose* have illustrated that the same phrases occur both with essentially non-evaluative literal meanings and with (negatively loaded) non-literal meanings. This has also been found for other phrases in previous studies. For instance, Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (1993: 175) shows that *paved with* as a lexicalized collocation has negative connotations in its metaphorical sense, while being neutral in its literal sense. In this section and in the previous one we have seen that speakers use phrases which have similar metaphorical bases but different conventionalized evaluations. These negative attitudes are either towards the agent (*rub someone's nose*) or towards the patient (*lead someone by the nose*).

The next phraseological sequence under study, *wrinkle one's nose*, is different from the previous ones in that it expresses the attitude of the agent and not of the speaker.

4.1.4 Wrinkle one's nose

Wrinkle one's nose refers to a conventionalized facial expression which metonymically expresses dislike. As with most sequences in the present study, *wrinkle one's nose* generally occurs in its less literal meanings. It is only used in reference to actual smell (or taste) in a minority of cases, while the less literal meaning, implying the subject's disapproval of something not connected to smell is more common (64% in the BNC (53 out of 83 tokens); 78% in the newspapers (53 out of 68 tokens)). (19) is an example of someone smelling something and then wrinkling his nose, while (20) to (22) are instances of other manifestations of disapproval:

(19) He sniffed the breeches and *wrinkled his nose*. (HTM)

(20) Asked if he would be satisfied with a tie match, Anand *wrinkled his nose* and said, 'Not really.' (*NYT* 1995)

(21) Asked if she gambles, Mrs. Luckman *wrinkled her nose* in disapproval. "No, and we don't encourage others to gamble," she said. (*NYT* 1990)

(22) Sir Alec and Merula, his painter wife of almost six decades, have an exemplary marriage. Sure, they have their equally exemplary little

arguments about whether 'a rack of tiny lamb cutlets … should take 20 or 40 minutes in the oven,' their footling differences as he relishes a CD of 'Manon Lescaut' while 'M *wrinkles her nose* slightly at Puccini.' (*NYT* 1997)

12 instances in the newspaper corpora specify what the subjects wrinkle their noses *at*, as in (22) and (5) above. *Wrinkle one's nose* is only very rarely used independently without further specification of the opinion of the person wrinkling their nose. This is sometimes done by explicitly mentioning the emotion involved (e.g. *in disapproval* in (21)), or with a quotation (e.g. *People shouldn't be so flaky* in (5)) where the subject voices her disagreement. Examples like these can be argued to have a discourse cohesive function where a semantic feature – in this case disapproval – is specified a number of times. In (21), for instance, there is multiple specification of this property (*wrinkled her nose*, *in disapproval*, *No*, *we don't encourage*).[5] As indicated in these examples, *wrinkle one's nose* is generally neutral in its connotations towards the 'wrinkler'.

Moon (1998: 168) claims that *wrinkle one's nose* is not fixed lexically since other verbs than *wrinkle* are used in collocations with *nose* in the same meaning, in phrases like *curl up one's nose* and *crinkle one's nose*.[6] In this, she argues, it differs from other phrases like *grit one's teeth*, *hold one's breath*, *lick one's lips*, *shake hands* and *twiddle one's thumbs* which are 'relatively fixed' (1998: 184). Further research into such phrases can reveal to what degree they are variable and to what extent the non-literal senses of these phrases are supported by contexts.

The fact that the less literal instances of *wrinkle one's nose* only rarely occur without contextual clues emphasizing and specifying the disapproval suggests that the meaning of disapproval is not fully entrenched. The instances we found illustrate a scale of literalness from the involuntary wrinkling of one's nose when smelling or tasting something unpleasant in (19), to the general expression of disapproval in (5) and (20) to (22), where it is uncertain whether the subjects in fact wrinkle their noses in (5) and (22). Moon (1998: 184) comments on such body-based phrases that they are often ambiguous between literal and what she calls metaphorical uses. Discussing *wrinkling/curling up/crinkling one's nose*, she writes that "[t]here is no real metaphor involved, just symbolism" (1998: 169). We regard phrases like these, which refer to a bodily action that can be interpreted as an outward sign of an emotion, as being metonymic in character.

The next section discusses three phraseological sequences which refer to agents expressing their disapproval of something while speakers by using these sequences convey their dislike of the agents' behaviour.

4.1.5 Look down one's nose, nose in the air *and* turn one's nose up at somethin*g*
There are some phraseological sequences with *nose* which usually express contempt, scorn and self-importance, and this section deals with the following three: *look down one's nose*, *nose in the air* and *turn one's nose up at something*. These sequences are different from those discussed above in that they can express the disapproving attitude of both the agents and of the speakers, who often, though not always, express their own disapproval of the perceived arrogance of the agents. For instance, if a person looks down her nose at something, she expresses dislike of something. Furthermore, the speaker or writer describing this situation using the phrase *look down one's nose* expresses disapproval of the agent's behaviour.

In the BNC there were 16 *look* (etc.) *down one's nose*, all of which expressed negative evaluation on the part of both the speaker and the agent. Some instances are more literal in that they involve the actual physical action of someone looking down their nose, as in (23) from *NYT*, while others, such as (24), are more metonymic in that they do not involve any actual looking down a nose:

(23) I remarked to this gentleman that it must be wonderful to work in Tiffany's, surrounded every day by these items of beauty and wealth. He *looked down his nose* with hauteur and answered, 'One does get tired of all the glitter.' (*NYT* 1996)

(24) 'One of the things I liked about Pete was that he didn't *look down his nose* at other kinds of music,' she said of another former member of the Weavers. (*NYT* 1996)

Nose in the air occurred 18 times in the BNC, 14 of which had the evaluative metonymic sense (four non-evaluative instances were more literal or referred to dogs). The newspapers gave very similar results with 12 metonymic, evaluative instances, and six more literal, non-evaluative tokens. The typically negative connotations are exemplified in (25):

(25) (…) I see the stupid bitch prancing around Stowmarket with her silly *nose in the air*! She's a very conceited woman (…) (KBF)

Note that the negative evaluation is specified repeatedly in (25) with a number of negatively loaded words: *stupid*, *bitch*, *prancing*, *silly*, *conceited* and that the choice of *bitch*, *prancing* and *nose in the air* creates an image of a (stupid) animal.

Turn one's nose up at something is rare in the BNC, occurring only 12 times. It is also fairly rare in the newspapers where there were 73 tokens, at least 34 of which had negative connotations directed towards the people turning up their noses, as exemplified in (26) to (28). *Turn one's nose up at something* is therefore less strongly associated with negative evaluation than the other phrases in this section. In (26) to (28) the negative evaluation is related to the fact that the shops, Ibiza and the Wimbledon tennis tournament are indicated as being desirable things which the agents consider unworthy.

(26) The shops here are very good, but Dana is inclined to *turn her nose up at* anything outside London or Paris, so I imagine an hour could see her back at the flat. (H8J)

(27) However, while the self-appointed cognoscenti are busy *turning their noses up*, Ibiza is still a thriving party playground, with licensing laws to match. (*Ind* 1995)

(28) At least, however, he turns up to give it a go, which is more than can be said of his French final victim, Andre Agassi, who has *turned his nose up at* Wimbledon since getting a first-round spanking from Henri Leconte in 1987. (*Ind* 1990)

However, some instances may express a neutral or even positive attitude towards the act of turning up one's nose. This is seen in (29), where both the phrase *truly borderline inedible* and the references to the taste of cardboard indicate a strong dislike for the food in question, so that the turning up of noses was well motivated. It should be noted that (29) is more literal than the above examples in that it involves a disapproval of food rather than a disapproval of any more abstract entity.

(29) With the exception of a respectable kosher hot dog, the entire menu is truly borderline inedible. The 9- and 13-year-old food tasters I took with me *turned their noses up at* the hamburger and chicken-breast sandwich -- probably because they intuited the former would taste like ground cardboard and the latter, to save waste, unground cardboard. (*NYT* 2000)

The three sequences discussed in this section all tend to express the agent's disapproval of something, but there are differences regarding the attitude of the speakers uttering these sequences. While *look down one's nose* and *nose in the air* always appear to express a negative speaker attitude towards the agent, *turn*

one's nose up at something may be negative, neutral or even positive. These sequences are therefore different from, for instance, *wrinkle one's nose*, which only expresses the agent's attitude, and *poke/stick one's nose*, which only expresses the speaker's attitude.

4.1.6 Conclusions about negative evaluations

Sections 4.1.1 to 4.1.5 have illustrated phraseological sequences with *nose* that express negative evaluation. Some of them only express the attitude of the agent, some instead express the speaker's attitude towards the agent (or occasionally the patient), while some convey both the attitude of the agent and that of the speaker towards the agent. The phrases clearly demonstrate that there is a cline between more literal and less literal instances. Less literal instances are more likely to be connected to evaluations than literal instances, although this is not a clear-cut distinction. There is also a cline in evaluations, in that some phraseological sequences are more negative than others. It should be stressed that these negative evaluations are often supported by multiple specifications of unfavourable aspects in the immediate cotext.

At least three reasons can be proposed for the connection between phraseological sequences containing *nose* and negative evaluation. Firstly, the nose is metonymically connected to unpleasant smell, and therefore to innate facial expressions as in *wrinkle one's nose* and to conventionalized gestures as in *hold one's nose*. Secondly, some metaphorical phrases indicate that the agent is inconsiderate in treating a patient like an animal (*rub someone's nose*), or that a patient is ill-advised in letting him-/herself be treated like an animal (*lead by the nose*) (see further Stubbs 2001: 210f. for a discussion of the expression of cultural stereotypes in language). Thirdly, a speaker can refer metonymically to the nose to represent someone's interference into someone else's affairs in phrases like *under one's nose* and *poke/stick one's nose*, where there are possibly indications of animal behaviour as well. The physical salience of the nose, rather than the eyes for instance, is also likely to be a factor. There thus seem to be several culturally-based as well as anatomical reasons why the metaphoric and metonymic phraseological sequences with *nose* are often connected to negative evaluations. The next section concerns some of the rare instances which are mainly connected with positive evaluations.

4.2   Positive evaluation

As indicated in section 4.1, there are quite a few sequences with body part nouns expressing negative evaluations. Sequences expressing positive evaluations seem to be less frequent. Two such positive instances based on *mouth*, *mouth-*

watering and *make one's mouth water* are discussed by Lindquist and Levin (forthcoming). Positive evaluations in connection with *nose* are rare, but there are at least three examples that express positive evaluation on the part of the speaker: *to give someone a bloody nose* (or *to get a bloody nose*), *tweak someone's nose* and *have a nose for something*.

4.2.1 Bloody nose *and* tweak someone's nose

The sequences *to give someone a bloody nose* ('to inflict a resounding defeat on a person' (*OED* s.v. *nose* n 24)) and *tweak someone's nose* ('to pull (a person) by the nose (or a person's nose) as a mark of contempt or insult' (*OED s.v. tweak* v 1)) can be used in either non-evaluative literal senses or evaluative metaphorical senses. In the large majority of evaluative cases in our material both unambiguously connote a positive attitude towards people showing defiance against mighty opponents.[7] There is a clear preference for powerful people or organizations to be the recipients of metaphorical bloody noses in the sequence *get/give someone a bloody nose*. The examples from the BNC include patients such as *John Major*, *the government* and, as in (30), *IBM*, while *The Independent* contains instances where *Tony Blair*, *Labour* and the *government* get a *bloody nose*. Example (31) shows the positive evaluation of the first person subject wanting to give a powerful company a bloody nose.[8] In these phraseological sequences the exposed position of the nose is habitually linked metaphorically to an opportunity for powerless parties to inflict damage on the powerful.[9]

(30)　The users have given IBM *a bloody nose* and IBM, in learning the lesson, is making changes both to marketing pitch and technology. (CPX)

(31)　We'd like to give SWW [South West Water] a *bloody nose*. This is England, not the Third World. We should be able to take for granted decent drinking water. (*Ind* 1995)

A slim majority (17 of 30) of all examples of *bloody nose* were metaphorical in the BNC, which suggests that there still is a strong literal meaning connected to this sequence. Non-literal instances mostly, but not always, occur in the sequences *give X a bloody nose* and *X got a bloody nose*,[10] and the literal examples sometimes occur in similar phrases as the non-literal ones.

Tweak someone's nose is even rarer than *bloody nose*, but its propensity for evaluative metaphorical usage is slightly greater with 15 non-literal and five literal instances of *tweak someone's nose* in the newspapers (no instances in the BNC). A literal example of *tweak someone's nose* is given in (32) below where an adult tweaks the nose of a child. This indicates a different perspective from

the less literal instances, since the metaphorical instances without exception concern weaker parties defending themselves against more powerful ones (*the big and rich bully*, *Saddam Hussein* or *the establishment*), as in (33):

> (32) When her mother first saw her in Mr. Dais's arms, she *tweaked the little girl's nose* and said, 'Hey, brat, you better hush up.' (*NYT* 1994)

> (33) While *tweaking Uncle Sam's nose* might be gratifying, several observed, American "rent" for the bases and other expenditures bring in about $1 billion a year. (*NYT* 1990)

With these two phrases there is a clear difference between the evaluatively neutral literal instances and the evaluative metaphorical instances. In spite of the fact that the bloodying or tweaking of someone's nose must be seen as negative acts from a humane point of view, our corpus examples show that the phraseological sequences referring to metaphorical instances of these acts are in fact positively loaded and are most frequently used to express a positive evaluation of the perpetrator.

4.2.2 Have a nose for something

A further exception to the tendency for *nose* to be connected with negative connotations is the phrase *have a nose for something*. In this case the nose appears to represent instinct in contrast with analytical intelligence (Deignan and Potter 2004: 1247). The sense of smell is here metaphorically compared to intuition, which generally has positive connotations, while the nose, as seen in the discussion of negative connotations, is otherwise often metonymically connected to unpleasant smells.

Have a nose for something is almost always positive (all 17 tokens in the BNC), and it seems to be particularly frequently used in the subject areas of business and journalism, which is also the case in the newspaper corpora (see the examples below). *Have a nose for* has parallels in the similarly positive phrases *have an eye/ear for*, as illustrated in (35). It should be noted that *a nose for* is metaphoric in origin, while *an eye for* and *an ear for* are more metonymic.

> (34) He to me was an example of one of the few untrained journalists who make a real success of TV news. But he possessed a *nose for a story* and by his own endeavours acquired expertise. (EVN)

> (35) Mr. Olsen, a former senior editor for Time and the author of 18 previous books, has all the gifts of a seasoned reporter and an entrancing

> raconteur – *an eye for quirky detail, an ear for memorable quotes* and *a nose for a good story.* (*NYT* 1994)

4.2.3 Conclusions about positive evaluations

Although the nose seems to be habitually associated with negative connotations, there are a few phraseological sequences that convey positive attitudes. It is noteworthy that all the three sequences expressing positive speaker attitude discussed here are based on metaphors while most instances expressing negative speaker attitude are based on metonymies. The metaphors in *bloody nose* and *tweak someone's nose* are based on the exposed position of the nose while in *have a nose for something* there is a metaphorical link between the nose and instinct.

5   Summary and conclusions

This exploratory paper has investigated the evaluative patterns connected to a particular body noun, *nose*, by looking at the phraseological sequences in which it frequently occurs. The choice of a body noun was motivated by the claim developed within cognitive linguistics that human cognition is embodied, which we believe is an important factor in explaining the prevalence of body-related phraseology based on metonymic and metaphorical processes.

A number of specific conclusions can be drawn from this study. First, as has been indicated by previous studies, negative evaluation is in general more common than positive, and we found that this is the case for sequences with *nose* as well. To some extent this may be related to the physiological function of different body parts, so that *nose* for instance may be related to bad (rather than good) smells and the excretion of mucus. It is likely that these connotations are partially universal and partially culture-dependent (cf. Maori and Inuit greeting ceremonies involving the nose).

Second, phraseological sequences with *nose* can express evaluation either from the speaker's (*poke/stick one's nose somewhere*) or the agent's (*hold one's nose*) point of view, or both (*turn one's nose up at something*). Only two of the phraseological sequences (*give someone a bloody nose* and *tweak someone's nose*) express a positive evaluation of the agent, and one (*have a nose for something*) expresses a positive evaluation of a quality in a person. The latter is based on the physiological function of the nose, while the first two are based on the exposed position of the nose in a person's face.

Third, it was noted that those sequences which express negative attitudes on the part of the agent (e.g. *hold one's nose*, *wrinkle one's nose*, *nose in the air*) are

all based on metonymies, while the sequences in this study which express positive evaluations on the part of the speaker are all based on metaphors.

Fourth, literal meanings have developed through both metonymic and metaphorical processes into more or less conventionalized and entrenched non-literal phraseological sequences. Literal meanings exist side by side with non-literal ones, but in the majority of cases the non-literal meaning is more frequent (cf. *rub someone's nose in something*, *give someone a bloody nose*), as suggested by Moon (1998: 180). Literal and non-literal meanings can also exist simultaneously, when a text reports that a conventionalized gesture or facial expression is carried out physically at the same time as the non-literal meaning is conveyed (*wrinkle one's nose*). Such a blending of the literal and the non-literal can give rise to a cline from literal to non-literal. There is also a cline of evaluation in that some phraseological sequences are exclusively negative (*pay through the nose*), while others may be negative, positive or neutral (*stick one's nose somewhere*).

Fifth, the fact that the same sequences sometimes occur both in literal/non-evaluative and non-literal/evaluative senses suggests that such sequences are stored (at least) twice in the mental lexicon. Such multiple storage of some sequences was proposed by Pawley and Syder (1983: 192), and the idea has later been developed by for instance Wray (2002: 261–281). This double storage might explain why specific negative (or positive) connotations are only connected to the metonymic and metaphorical extensions and not to the literal meanings. Wray (2002: 262–264) exemplifies multiple representations in the lexicon with the sequence *take it slowly!*, which, when stored holistically, would mean 'perform your action with care', while the compositional meaning of the same sequence of words could mean 'grasp the object at low speed'. This way of reasoning could easily be transferred to the sequences dealt with in this paper, e.g. *to get a bloody nose*.

Sixth, the learning of the connotations of sequences like these must be facilitated by several factors. To begin with, Channell (1999: 55) argues that frequency plays a role in the learning of evaluations (as in most types of learning). Although many of the sequences considered in this paper occur quite infrequently in text, there are several circumstances supporting the acquisition of the evaluative patterns: (1) similar either positive or negative patterns are found with many different phrases containing the same body word; (2) the immediate context as a rule provides clues to the interpretation of the phrase, an aspect which seems to be connected to the discourse cohesive functions of these sequences; and (3) some of the phrases are based on conventionalized gestures and facial expressions, which may be culturally transmitted or even innate (*wrinkle one's nose*).

Our final conclusion is that evaluation is an important feature in the development and use of phraseological sequences based on body nouns and that the evaluative meanings to a certain extent are the result of metonymic and metaphorical extensions of literal meanings related to the physiological function of the body parts. In further studies it would be interesting to see to what extent nouns denoting other body parts are associated with conventionalized evaluation, and whether such evaluations can be shown to be physiologically or culturally motivated, or both.

Notes

1. There is variable terminology in the field, and, as is often the case, different definitions of the term in question. Other terms used for similar types of evaluative lexis include 'evaluative polarity' (Channell 1999) and 'discourse prosody' (Stubbs 2001).

2. The newspaper material consists of various years of *The Independent* and *The New York Times* on CD-ROM. See section 2 for a discussion of the material used. Since the *New York Times* material is around three times larger than the *Independent* material and only 12 of the 58 tokens occurred in the AmE corpus, this suggests that *pay through the nose* is more common in BrE.

3. There is some variation regarding the term 'metonymy'. Some linguists prefer 'metonyms' to refer to words used metonymically (e.g. Deignan and Potter 2004), while most seem to opt for 'metonymies' (e.g. Hilpert 2006). We follow the majority and will in the following refer to metaphors and metonymies.

4. The most frequent verbs co-occurring with the 320 instances of *under one's nose* in the newspaper corpora were *steal* (18), *snatch* (16), *wave* (15), *go on* (11) and *thrust* (7).

5. These findings should be compared to Lindquist and Levin's (forthcoming) findings regarding other body-related sequences conveying emotions, such as *mouth go dry* which expresses the subject's experience of fear, and *foaming at the mouth* which may refer to the subject's expression of anger. The former sequence generally co-occurs with other bodily expressions of fear (e.g. *felt her legs tremble*), while in the latter this is not the case. Lindquist and Levin therefore argue that *foaming at the mouth* can be taken to be a highly conventionalized sequence conveying anger.

6. It is noteworthy that both these alternatives are very rare in our corpora. There are no instances at all in the BNC, while *crinkle one's nose* occurred

eight times in the newspapers (three of which refer to smell or taste), and there was only one (non-literal) instance of *curl up one's nose*.

7. It should be stressed that the *OED's* definitions cited here do not indicate any positive connotations but instead speak about contempt and insult.

8. The material only contained one clear instance of comparatively powerless people receiving a bloody nose: *But the shares have proved the most volatile of all sectors this year. And small investors with heavy exposure to utility issues will need no reminding of the bloody nose they received as a result.* (*Ind* 1995)

9. This phrase may therefore be compared to the more ambiguous adjective *hard-nosed*, which may either express a negative attitude ('obstinate, stubborn,' according to the *OED* (s.v. *hard* (adj.), 23 a)), as in *the F.D.A. is a* [sic] *such a hard-nosed Gestapo organization*, or it may be more neutral or even positive ('not affected by emotions, and determined to get what you want', according to *Longman dictionary of contemporary English*), as in *we admire Bobby for his hard-nosed realism*.

10. There were 57 non-literal instances in *Ind*, as compared to only three in *NYT* in spite of the fact that the American newspaper material is approximately three times larger than the BrE material. Our material therefore provides a strong indication that metaphorical bloody noses are more common in BrE than in AmE.

References

Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Channell, Joanna. 1999. Corpus-based analysis of evaluative lexis. In S. Hunston and G. Thompson (eds.), 38–55.

Deignan, Alice. 2005. *Metaphor and corpus linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Deignan, Alice and Liz Potter. 2004. A corpus study of metaphors and metonyms in English and Italian. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36: 1231–1252.

Fletcher, William. 2003/4. PIE: Phrases in English. http://pie.usna.edu.

Gibbs, Raymond W. and Nicole L. Wilson. 2002. Bodily action and metaphorical meaning. *Style* 36: 524–540.

Gibbs, Raymond W., Paula Lenz Costa Lima and Edson Francozo. 2004. Metaphor is grounded in embodied experience. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36: 1189–1210.

Goossens, Louis. 1990. Metaphtonomy: The interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1: 323–340.

Hilpert, Martin. 2006. Keeping an eye on the data: Metonymies and their patterns. In A. Stefanowitsch and S. Th. Gries (eds.), 123–151.

Hunston, Susan and Geoff Thompson (eds). 1999. *Evaluation in text. Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Zoltán. 2000. *Metaphor and emotion: Language, culture and the body in human feeling*. Port Chester: Cambridge University Press.

Kövecses, Zoltán and Péter Szabó. 1996. Idioms: A view from cognitive semantics. *Applied Linguistics* 17 (3): 326–355.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of cognitive grammar. Vol. 1: Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1991. *Concept, image, and symbol. The cognitive basis of grammar*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Barbara. 1996. Cross-linguistic and language-specific aspects of semantic prosody. *Language Sciences* 18 (1–2): 153–178.

Lindquist, Hans and Magnus Levin. Forthcoming. Foot and mouth: The phrasal patterns of two frequent nouns. To appear in S. Granger and F. Meunier (eds.). *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Longman dictionary of contemporary English. 1995. 3rd ed. Harlow: Longman.

Louw, Bill. 1993. Irony in the text or insincerity in the writer? The diagnostic potential of semantic prosodies. In M. Baker, G. Franci and E. Tognini-Bonelli (eds.). *Text and technology: In honour of John Sinclair*, 157–176. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Moon, Rosamund. 1998. *Fixed expressions and idioms in English: A corpus-based approach*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Nattinger, James R. and Jeanette S. DeCarrico. 1992. *Lexical phrases and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

The Oxford English dictionary. http://www.oed.com.

Panther, Klaus-Uwe and Günter Radden. 1999. *Metonymy in language and thought*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Partington, Alan. 1998. *Patterns and meanings. Using corpora for English language research and teaching*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Partington, Alan. 2004. "Utterly content in each other's company". Semantic prosody and semantic preference. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 9 (1): 131–156.

Pawley, Andrew and Frances Hodgetts Syder. 1983. Two puzzles for linguistic theory. In J. C. Richards and R. W. Schmidt (eds.). *Language and communication*, 191–226. London: Longman.

Sinclair, John. 1991. *Corpus concordance collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, John. 2004. *Trust the text: Language, corpus and discourse*. London: Routledge.

Stefanowitsch, Anatol and Stefan Th. Gries (eds.). 2006. *Corpus-based approaches to metaphor and metonymy*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Stubbs, Michael. 2001. *Words and phrases. Corpus studies of lexical semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Stubbs, Michael. Forthcoming. Quantitative data on multi-word sequences in English: The case of the word *world*. To appear in M. Hoey, M. Mahlberg, M. Stubbs and W. Teubert (eds.). *Text, discourse and corpora*. London: Continuum.

Tognini-Bonelli, Elena. 2001. *Corpus linguistics at work*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Whitsitt, Sam. 2005. A critique of the concept of semantic prosody. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 10 (3): 283–305.

Wray, Alison. 2002. *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.