

Ivana Grbavac ◊ Ivana Zovko-Bošnjak

University of Mostar

THE PRESENCE OF METAPHORICITY MARKER (PMM) IN THE LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE OF MOSTAR

Abstract

Linguistic landscape research is a new scientific field that investigates the intersection of language, communication and space. LL can be defined as visibility and salience of language in public space (Gorter, 2006). LL researchers come from a wide range of language-related disciplines, most notably applied linguistics, multilingualism studies, sociolinguistics, discourse studies, and linguistic anthropology. They believe that linguistic and communicative practice can only be properly understood in the context of its emplacement. Also it is important to be recognized that the physical location and public visibility of different ways of communication have deep social, political implications. The discipline was launched by a now classic paper by Landry & Bourhis (1997), with some notable precursors, such as Spolsky & Cooper (1991). On the other hand, metaphor research is not losing its popularity, not even 38 years after the publication of Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*. Therefore, this paper combines the two – the linguistic and metaphorical approach in the LL research. Using *MP Method* (De Landsheer, 2009) we analyze the frequency of metaphors in the linguistic landscape of a multilingual city in B&H. We propose the hypothesis that in the LL of post-war ecologies the Presence of Metaphoricity Marker (PMM) is highly prominent. The corpus of the study consists of 1010 signs collected in the post-war period in the mentioned city.

Key words: linguistic landscape, sociolinguistics, language, space, metaphors, *MP Method*

Introduction

Linguistic landscaping is a new phenomenon in the sociolinguistic studies of language in the public space. As one of the earliest definitions says “The language of public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on government buildings combines to form the linguistic landscape of a given territory, region, or urban agglomeration” (Landry and Bourhis, 1997, p. 25). Linguistic landscaping has been developing at a high speed ever since the publication of the pioneering paper by Landry and Bourhis (1997). Nowadays, more than twenty years afterwards, it has become a highly recognized discipline of sociolinguistics that has caught the attention of many prominent names in sociolinguistics (Coulmas, 2009; Gorter, 2006; Huebner, 2016; Malinowski, 2015; Shohamy & Waksman, 2009; etc.). Various workshops on linguistic landscaping have been held across the globe; most recent one was held in Bern, Switzerland, in May 2018, and the approaching one is to be held in Bangkok, Thailand in 2019. The community of researchers that became passionately involved in the investigation of language in multicultural and multilingual environments has discovered the heuristic potential of this discipline. Namely, the linguistic landscape is an investigation not only of language and language patterns, but it offers huge potentials and insights into the deep sociolinguistic structures of a speech community. Through LL research we can discover huge amount of data concerning politics, ideologies, religion, linguistic behavior, language policies, tourism, economy, etc.

Linguistic landscape is also an excellent frame for the investigation of linguistic phenomena, such as language mixing, code mixing, idiosyncrasies, etc. but also, on the semantic level of analysis, of metaphors, metonymies etc. For the purpose of this paper we shall limit our research onto the investigation of metaphors in the linguistic landscape of a given territory, the city of Mostar, in a given period of time. The study is synchronic, developed on a set corpus from a previously done research (Grbavac, 2018). The aim of the paper is to check the frequency of metaphors in the linguistic landscape of a multilingual city in B&H using a highly established method for the count of metaphors (De Landtsheer, 2009). We set the hypothesis that in the LL of post-war ecologies the Presence of Metaphoricity Marker (PMM) is highly prominent.

1. Linguistic landscaping and its heuristic potential

As already emphasized linguistic landscaping has a huge potential in discovering sociolinguistic data. That has been the reason for the steep ascend of the discipline since the very beginning of the first phase of the LL research (1997

– 2007, according to Grbavac, 2018). The first phase of the LL research started in 1997 when a paper by the two Canadian authors, Landry and Bourhis, “Linguistic landscape and Ethnolinguistic Vitality” was published. That was a direct impetus for LL research that spread quickly all over the multilingual hotspots worldwide. This phase was characterized by a huge and quick interest of many scientists all over the world who were documenting and analyzing languages on public signs in urban agglomerations. In the first phase of LL research the authors recognized the potential and meaning of linguistic landscape research. The LL research became a separate sociolinguistic discipline. Basic theoretical, methodological and practical issues were determined.

In the second phase of LL research (2008 – onwards) the linguistic investigation of the visibility and salience of language in the public space continues. It acquired a broader aspect, broader theoretical and methodological perspectives. The authors believe that linguistic landscaping is a wider concept than just language documenting. This is a very productive phase that has “expanded the scenery” (Shohamy & Gorter, 2009) of LL. The authors of this phase believe that “Language in spaces and places is calling for the attention of researchers and scholars who attempt to study and interpret its meaning, messages, purposes and contexts” (Shohamy & Gorter, 2009, p. 1). Various questions arise: What is LL really? Does this term refer only to language or also to other things around us, like images, sounds, buildings, thoughts? How are signs and people and languages connected? etc.

We also belong to the group of researchers who believe that deeper messages can be discovered in the LL in various contexts. LL can be an instrument for measuring changes in the society, an indicator of changes, but also it is a whirlpool of information that are present at the synchronic level. It does have documentary value but not only that. LL offers new insights into the meaning and function of language in multilingual, urban environments. Thanks to LL research we can come to various conclusions about speech community and its social and political implications, prevailing cultural beliefs; it mirrors different social but also psychological issues. As a result of this type of research we can reach the data and find out the results about the ethnolinguistic composition of the surveyed area, geographical distribution, power relations, prestige, symbolic value, vitality and literacy (Grbavac, 2013, p. 144).

2. Linguistic landscape and metaphors

“Metaphors are all around us” is the basic premise of the book *Metaphors We Live By* (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). The fact is that metaphors are so pervasive in language. Mark Johnson and George Lakoff claim that metaphor is rife

in language and that much of our conceptual structure is actually metaphorical in nature. That is the thesis of their widely popular book that was so influential that even four decades after its publication we still have metaphor in the center of numerous cognitive linguistic studies. Thirty-nine years after this book about metaphor was published, we still have dissertations being written on the topic of metaphors and their meanings. We took this thesis as the foundation for our hypothesis.

We believe that linguistic landscape, in other words language in the public space, is also full of metaphors and metaphorical meanings. In that way Lakoff and Johnson's statement that metaphors are all around us gets its physical realization: metaphors are around us on buildings, on T-shirts, on huge billboards, on small stickers in a café, ...If we are a careful observer, or, let us use the LL terminology, if we are a careful LL actor, we shall notice an abundance of metaphors in the LL, just like in every other discourse, as already noted and discussed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). Metaphors, just like every other aspect of language, are an integral part of LL and as such they deserve a scholarly attention.

So far metaphors have been researched on different corpora (Cameron & Low, 1999; Charteris Black, 2004, 2005; Low et al., 2010; Musolff, 2004; Musolff & Zinken, 2009). As far as we know, there have not been any studies of the frequency of metaphors in a LL. For the purpose of our research we look at the LL of the given territory as a special type of discourse, as a corpus in which we can analyze metaphors.

Stanojević (2013, p. 19) believes that the human represents the foundation of cognitive linguistics, in other words, human thoughts and *(inter)action in the culture and the world* are the foundations of understanding and description of language in cognitive linguistics. In this sense we believe that a human is the key factor in LL and that the relation between the human, his thoughts, LL and culture are crucial for the understanding of language. This means that this paper is seen as an interplay between cognitive linguistics and linguistic landscaping. Metaphor is seen as one of the aspects of the meaning construction (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Lakoff & Turner, 1989; Kövecses, 2005). In the combination with the linguistic landscape research, metaphor represents a valuable asset for deciphering the depths of human thoughts.

3. Sociolinguistic context of the research

The research was done in the city of Mostar, Bosnia and Herzegovina. Mostar has around 100 000 inhabitants. It is the capital of Herzegovina, and the capital city of the Herzegovina-Neretva Canton. It is the political, educational

and economic center of the southern part of the country, very much influenced by the recent war (1992 – 1995) and its consequences. It is a multilingual, multiethnic and multicultural city. It is a space with live language contacts and language conflicts and therefore we believe it is a very good place for LL studies. We look at the city as a dynamic and interactive space where various influences form the LL. It is characterized by complex asymmetries and imbalance in social and political relations (Grbavac, 2013, p. 503). According to the census from 2013, Mostar had 105 797 inhabitants (48, 41 % Croats, 44,19 % Bosniaks, 4,18 % Serbs, 3,22 % others). It is the fifth-largest city in the country. Mostar is a city with a strict geographical distribution (Grbavac 2018), similar to the situation in Brussels (Tulp 1978, according to Backhaus 2007) or Montreal (Monnier 1989, according to Backhaus 2007), where we also have bilingual sociolinguistic environments.

4. Methodology

4.1. Linguistic landscape methodology

The basis for our research was a corpus of signs collected in a LL research of the city of Mostar at its six locations in a post-war period (Grbavac, 2013). It was a quantitative type of research where the author collected 1010 signs at six survey areas (Orca, Rondo, Avenija, Korzo/Musala, Stari grad, Fejićeva) using the *Diversity or Heterogeneity Sampling Method* (Cook and Campbell 1979, Edelman 2010). It is a method of deliberate sampling for heterogeneity. This means that in this model the LL researcher does not do the random sampling of the signs. He or she takes photographs of diverse landscapes; the aim is not to represent all the linguistic landscapes proportionately. Deliberate sampling for heterogeneity is more practical than random sampling for representativeness, because in this way we can depict the most unusual linguistic landscapes. On the corpus collected in this way the author of the study analyzed linguistic features (e.g. languages used, scripts used), semiotic features (e.g. the size of font in different languages, the order of different languages) and other features (e.g. government vs. private sign). For the purpose of our research we took the 1010 photographs from the six locations and analyzed them. We marked them with a PMM (Presence of Metaphoricity Marker) if they contained a metaphorical expression. Then we counted all the marked signs.

4.2. Metaphor Power Method

Another method that we used for the needs of our research was *Metaphor Power (MP) method*. That is a method often used in cognitive semantics. Its

author De Landtsheer (1994) describes it as a political-semantic metaphor analysis and it refers to quantitative analysis of metaphor content. The final aim of the method is to calculate the metaphor power index by multiplying the scores on three variables, metaphor frequency (MF), metaphor intensity (MI), and metaphor content (MC) (De Landtsheer, 2009, p. 65).

The aim of our paper is to analyze the frequency of metaphors (MF), but we shall explain all three variables in order to get a better overview of the method.

Metaphor Frequency (MF) gives the guidelines about the metaphor power of discourse. Simple counting of the metaphors is not enough for determining the power of a certain discourse. Metaphor frequency should be calculated taking into consideration the total amount of language or speech of the sample. Therefore, we divide the total number of metaphors (f) by the total number of words in the discourse sample (tw). Since f-values then are very small and difficult to understand, we multiply this result by 100. According to the formula below MF can be understood as the number of metaphors per 100 words of discourse, or, when examining spoken language, as the number of metaphors per minute of speech (ts = total speech time in seconds) (De Landtsheer, 2009, p. 65):

$$MF = 100f/tw \text{ or } MF = 60f/ts$$

As it was already mentioned the second variable of the *Metaphor Power Method* is *metaphor intensity* which, of course, represents the intensity of the metaphors usage. Metaphor theory states that innovative, creative, and original metaphors are more intense than dormant or dead metaphors (Tsoukas, 1991). If the literal meaning of the metaphor is still strong, then we call it a strong metaphor. In contrast, if the literal meaning does not come to mind, metaphors are weak (Black, 1962). In the *Metaphor Power Method* we calculate the metaphor intensity value of a sample of metaphorical language.

We give metaphors intensity scores with values ranging from (1) for weak (w) metaphors, (2) for moderate or normal (n), and (3) for creative, strong (s) metaphors. The following formula indicates how 'MI' stands for the sum of the weighted values of metaphor intensity divided by the total number of metaphors (T):

$$MI = (1w + 2n + 3s)/T$$

Levels of metaphor intensity can be calculated as follows:

Weak: e.g. decisions that "follow the wind".

Moderate: e.g. problems "put in the refrigerator".

Strong: e.g. 1991 Iraq War "Desert Storm". (De Landtsheer, 2009, p. 66)

The third variable introduces the *content power of the metaphor* (MC). Different semantic fields, identified by different lexical fields have different metaphor power or in other words different semantic fields or sources from which meaning is derived such as illness, nature, or family can be grouped into content categories that have less or more metaphor power. Content categories are awarded scores on a scale ranging from 1 to 6, based on insights from psycholinguistic and social-psychological theories (De Landtsheer, 2009, p. 66).

The values assigned 1–6 represent lower to higher power, weaker to stronger ratings:

- 1 The first content category consists of metaphors that use images from the semantic field of „everyday-life reality’. The category includes family metaphors and popular sayings, as well as images of objects actions and persons that appear in everyday-life reality. Popular metaphors (**p**) serve the basic function of metaphor of making the abstract tangible and comprehensible to a large audience.
- 2 Nature metaphors (**n**) belong to the second category (score 2) because they suggest conformation and natural order, even though they always contain the possibility of change.
- 3 Political, intellectual and technological metaphors (**po**) are often sophisticated constructs that are well suited for simplifying complex political processes. These metaphors enable politicians to provide a perspective for framing multi-dimensional processes. They do not produce the same amount of emotive power as the higher categories.
- 4 Disaster and violence metaphors (**d**) are much less neutral than the metaphor categories mentioned above. They have in common the expression of despair, depression or aggression.
- 5 Sports, games and drama metaphors (**sp**) that appeal to many people and are manipulative receive the value (5). ‘Winning’ and ‘losing’ can, for example, be very emotional activities.
- 6 The category that is attributed the highest metaphor power (6) is the category of body, disease, medical and death (**m**) metaphors.

Combining the content categories constitutes the metaphor content (MC) variable. Higher MC-values denote stronger emotional appeals. The following formula brings together all the content categories and their values, which results in the metaphor content power score (De Landtsheer, 2009, p. 66-68):

$$MC = (1p + 2n + 3po + 4d + 5sp + 6m)/T$$

Metaphor power can be expressed by calculating the metaphor power index or by multiplying the *metaphor frequency* (MF), *metaphor intensity* (MI) and *metaphor content* (MC) (De Landtsheer, 2009, p. 69):

$$MP = MF \times MI \times MC$$

4.3. MIP method

The third method that was significant for our research was the *MIP method* (Pragglejaz Group, 2007) that was used to recognize whether a text was used metaphorically or not on the signs from our corpus. The main purpose of this method is to give us a tool for researching in a simple way the metaphorical content of the discourse. It enables us to discover through a relatively simple procedure whether a discourse (in our case a linguistic sign) contains metaphorical expressions or not. Identification of metaphors in a concrete discourse is very complex and we could say sometimes problematic. Even scientists with huge experience in metaphor research can be of different opinions what can be considered a metaphor. The prime problem is the fact that the scientists differ in their intuition about what forms the metaphorical expression. A solution of this problem was offered by the Pragglejaz Group, a group of researchers from different academic disciplines who named this method the *Metaphor Identification Procedure* (MIP). Its aim is to establish whether a lexical unit in specific context can be described as metaphorical. Namely, there is a huge number of words that can have metaphorical meaning if we take into consideration the context in which they are used. It is also very important for the LL research because it is the context and physical emplacement of the word (on a sign) that produces special meaning.

The Pragglejaz Group suggests the following metaphor identification procedure that consists of the following four steps:

- 1 Read the whole text to grasp the meaning
- 2 Determine the lexical units in the text (in the discourse, on the sign)
- 3 a) For each lexical unit, establish its meaning in context (contextual meaning). Take into account what comes before and after the lexical unit.
- b) For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. Basic meanings are usually
 - more concrete
 - related to bodily action
 - more precise (as opposed to vague)

- historically older

Basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit.

- c) If the lexical unit has a more basic current-contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given one, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it.

4 If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical (Pragglejaz Group, 2007, p. 3).

The method will be exemplified in the following chapter.

5. Analysis

As already emphasized, the aim of our paper is to analyze the frequency of metaphors in the linguistic landscape of Mostar, a multilingual city in B&H. For this purpose we used the quantitative method of counting the PMM (Presence of Metaphoricity Marker). Every photograph, that in LL research represents one sign, was marked with plus if it contained a Metaphoricity Marker, i.e. if it contained a metaphorical expression. All signs that contained only literal meanings of the words were omitted. We proposed the hypothesis that in the LL of post-war ecologies the Presence of Metaphoricity Marker (PMM) was highly prominent.

Here is a list of some of the examples from the corpus of 1010 signs that have metaphorical expressions in them:



Picture 1: An LL sign (a stand) with a PMM

- Samsonite – full of light
- Hespo – *neopisiva lakoća buđenja* (Hespo is a brand of mattress, it is being advertised as easy waking up.)
- Namex – *ključ za dobru kupovinu* (Namex is a chain of supermarkets, it is being advertised as ‘a key for good shopping’.)
- Carpisa – what colour are you
- Art – creative footwear
- *Kruško lopove odlazi iz svetinje* (‘Kruško, you thief, go away from our sanctity’, reference to the local football club)



Picture 2. An LL sign (a billboard) with a PMM

- *Okle mačke – Mostar grad za pješaka* ('Look at those cats – Mostar, a city for a pedestrian', reference to good looking women)
- *Ožujsko – Uberi osvježenje* (Ožujsko is a brand of beer, 'pick up your refreshment')
- *Vrati kravu (vrati mesnicu)* ('Bring back our cow', reference to the butcher's)
- *Tangerina – tako nova, a već tako iskusna* (Tangerina is a brand of juice, 'So new, so much experienced')

In the process of determining whether some sign contains a metaphorical expression or not we were led by the MIP method (Metaphor Identification Procedure) (Pragglejaz Group. 2007). Here is an example of the procedure:

- Namex – ključ za dobru kupovinu

The first step consists of careful reading of the entire text, which is in our case a phrase on a LL sign. At this level we are supposed to establish a general understanding of the meaning of the text on the sign. At step two, we identify the lexical units in the phrase, with slashes indicating the boundaries between the lexical units.

Namex/ - ključ / za / dobru / kupovinu.

At step three, we consider each lexical unit in turn, starting from the beginning of the phrase. At step four, we report our final decision as to whether the unit is used metaphorically in the context.

Namex

A *Contextual meaning*: In this context, Namex is a proper noun that introduces an apposition. It refers to a unique, easily recognizable supermarket.

B *Basic meaning*: There is not a more basic meaning

C *Contextual meaning versus basic meaning*: Contextual meaning is the same as the basic meaning.

Metaphorically used? No.

ključ

A *Contextual meaning*: In this context *ključ* (a key) means a solution, something that gives good results, it means that you can easily shop

B *Basic meaning*: The basic meaning of the noun *ključ* (key) is metal instrument shaped so that it will turn the bolt of a lock (and so lock or unlock something). It is more concrete and related to bodily action.

C *Contextual meaning versus basic meaning*: The contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning and can be understood by comparison with it. Abstract *ključ* is something that gives you a good, concrete solution.

Metaphorically used? Yes.

za

A *Contextual meaning*: In this context *za* (for) is a preposition that introduces a noun phrase.

B *Basic meaning*: there is not a more basic meaning

C *Contextual meaning versus basic meaning*: contextual meaning is the same as the basic meaning

Metaphorically used? No.

dobru

A *Contextual meaning*: In this context *dobar* (good) is an adjective that means favourable, not expensive, satisfactory, etc.

B *Basic meaning*: the basic, dictionary meaning of this adjective is *of high quality*, as in *a good lecturer, harvest etc.*

C *Contextual meaning versus basic meaning*: contextual meaning is the same as the basic meaning

Metaphorically used? No.

kupovinu

A *Contextual meaning*: In this context *kupovina* (shopping) means the process of buying something in a shop. It is very concrete.

B *Basic meaning*: the basic, dictionary meaning of this noun is *activity of shopping*. It is related to bodily action.

C *Contextual meaning versus basic meaning*: contextual meaning is the same as the basic meaning

Metaphorically used? No.

This example illustrates the way we used the *MIP method* to determine whether a LL sign contained a metaphorical expression or not.

6. Results and discussion

The results that we got in our research were very much surprising. At the beginning of our research we proposed the hypothesis that in the linguistic landscape of post-war ecologies the Presence of Metaphoricity Marker would be highly prominent. Our results have not shown that. We were led by the thoughts of the cognitive linguists who claim that metaphors are present all around us, and that they are very frequent in language. Therefore we assumed that linguistic landscape, as a special type of discourse, will also be full of metaphors, especially in a post-war ecology that might be vulnerable to different sociopolitical and sociolinguistic challenges. We had expected to detect a higher percentage of PMM (Presence of Metaphoricity Marker) in the LL of the investigated area. But the hypothesis was not proved. Table 1 shows the results of our research:

Table 1. Results of the research – general overview

Survey area	No of institutions	No of signs	No of signs with PMM (percentage)	No of words	Metaphor frequency
Orca	15	137	14 (10.22%)	724	1.93
Rondo	16	216	13 (6.02%)	792	1.64
Avenija	22	153	23 (15.03%)	630	3.65
Fejićeva	25	161	9 (5.6%)	855	1.05
Korzo/ Musala	24	137	16 (11.68%)	574	2.79
Stari grad	18	206	7 (3.4%)	867	0.81
Total	120	1010	82 (8.12%)	5309	1.54

The highest percentage of signs with PMM was detected in the survey area Avenija (15.03 %) which is a residential area full of graffiti. This might be the reason why the percentage of signs with PMM was so high. Namely, graffiti are full-size text signs as opposed to, for example, street signs that carry less text and consequently less metaphorical expressions. Metaphor frequency was also the highest in the survey area Avenija (3.65 %). As regards average metaphor frequency index in the LL of Mostar, it is 1.54, which is a low result compared to the average metaphor frequency index in newspaper articles and full-size texts (4.9) (Zovko-Bošnjak, 2018). We believe that this is an important feature of LLs. It is not so metaphorical as we had expected. Out of 1010 signs only 82 (8.12 %) carried PMM.

Table 1 shows a general overview of the results of our research. But a better insight can be obtained from the comparison with the studies of other types of discourse. Therefore we shall compare the results of our research with the results of a similar study of metaphor frequency (MF) in a political discourse taken from the newspaper articles (Grbavac & Zovko-Bošnjak, 2015).

Table 2. Metaphor frequency index in a full-size text discourse from the newspaper Dnevni list

	No. of words	No. of metaphors	MF
Dnevni list - March	4950	174	3.52
Dnevni list - April	5335	170	3.19

Table 2 shows that average MF index in newspaper articles is 3.35, which is a relatively high metaphor frequency index (MF index) (Grbavac & Zovko-Bošnjak, 2015, p. 140). Our results have shown that metaphor frequency index in the LL of the city of Mostar is quite low (1.54), which can be explained through the different nature of the two types of the discourse.

Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to check the Presence of Metaphoricity Marker (PMM) on the LL signs in the city of Mostar. We combined the methodology of LL research and cognitive linguistic approach to the analysis of metaphors in a discourse. Our aim was to detect metaphorical expressions in the short texts displayed on the signs in the LL of a post-war environment. The hypothesis that was set at the beginning of the research was not proved. We could not prove that in the LL of post-war ecologies the Presence of Metaphoricity Marker (PMM) was highly prominent. On the contrary, due to the specific nature of the LLs in the city of Mostar, we came to the conclusion that PMM in the LL of Mostar was very low. Despite the fact that there is a number of scientific papers that prove the fact that metaphors are very much alive in everyday language and that they have a very important role in the conceptualization of the world that surrounds us, metaphors are not abundant in LL. We believe and conclude that the reason for this is the specific informative nature of the LL signs. LL signs do produce meanings through their emplacement; they have special meanings in special contexts, but due to the fact that they are meager in words, they also have low frequency of metaphors (in comparison to full-size texts).

The first part of our research was based on a quantitative analysis of LL signs from our corpus, in which we counted PMM on LL signs. Prior to that we did a semantic analysis of the semantic content of the LL signs, where we used the *MIP method*. Additionally we calculated the *Metaphor Frequency* index. On the basis of our results, we concluded that LL is a very specific type of discourse that has its special features that call for the scientific attention.

Recommendations for future research include comparative analysis of other LLs in other environments. It would be interesting to compare the LLs of different cities synchronically and diachronically. Another challenge for future researchers of the topic could be to calculate the entire *MP index* (*metaphor frequency* MF, *metaphor intensity* MI, and *metaphor content* MC).

References

- Backhaus, P. (2007) *Linguistic landscapes: A Comparative Study of Urban Multilingualism in Tokyo*, Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters.
- Black, M. (1962) *Models and Metaphors; Studies in Language and Philosophy*, Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Cameron, L. & Low, G. (1999) *Researching and Applying Metaphor*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Charteris Black, J. (2004) *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*, London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Charteris Black, J. (2005) *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*, London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Cook, T. D. & Campbell, D. T. (1979) *Quasi-experimentation: Design & analysis issues for field settings*, Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Coulmas, F. (2009) "Linguistic landscaping and the seed of public sphere", in: Shohamy, E. & Gorter, D. (ed.), *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery*, New York, London: Routledge, pp. 13-24.
- De Landtsheer, C. (1994) "The language of prosperity and crisis, a case study in political semantics", *Politics and the Individual*, 4, 2, pp. 63-85.
- De Landtsheer C. (2009) "Collecting Political Meaning from the Count of Metaphor" in Musolff, A. & Zinken, J. (ed.), *Metaphor and Discourse*, Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 59-78
- Edelman, L. (2010) *Linguistic landscapes in the Netherlands: A study of multilingualism in Amsterdam and Friesland*, Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam, PhD thesis
- Gorter, D. (ed.) (2006), *Linguistic Landscape: A New Approach to Multilingualism*, Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Grbavac, I. (2013) "Linguistic landscape in Mostar", *Jezikoslovlje*, 14, 2-3, pp. 501-515.
- Grbavac, I. (2018) *Uvod u istraživanja jezičnoga krajobraza*. Mostar: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Mostaru.
- Grbavac, I. & Zovko-Bošnjak, I. (2015) "Uporaba konceptualnih metafora u političkome diskursu poslijedejtonskoga razdoblja u BiH", *HUM*, Vol. X, No. 14, pp.126-147.
- Huebner, T. (2016) *Linguistic landscape: history, trajectory and pedagogy*, *Journal of Humanities*, Special Issue No.22.

- Kövecses, Z. (2005) *Metaphor in Culture Universality and Variation*, Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago – London, The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Turner, M. (1989) *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*, Chicago – London, The University of Chicago Press.
- Landry, R. & Bourhis, R. Y. (1997) "Linguistic Landscape and Ethnolinguistic Vitality", *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, Vol. 16, 1, pp. 23-49.
- Low, G. et al. (2010) *Researching and Applying Metaphor in the Real World*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Malinowski, D. (2015) "Opening spaces of learning in the linguistic landscape", *Linguistic landscape*, Vol. 1, Issue 1, pp. 95-113.
- Musolff, A. & Zinken, J. (ed.) (2009) *Metaphor and Discourse*, Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Musolff, A. (2004) *Metaphor and Political Discourse*, Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Musolff, A. & Zinken, J. (ed.) (2009) *Metaphor and Discourse*, Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Pragglejaz Group (2007) MIP: "A Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words", in *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22(1), pp. 1-39.
- Shohamy, E. & Gorter, D. (ed.) (2009) *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Shohamy, E. & Waksman, S. (2009) "Linguistic landscape as an ecological arena: Modalities, Meanings, Negotiations, Education", in: Shohamy, E. & Gorter, D. (ed.), *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery*, New York, London: Routledge, pp. 313-331.
- Spolsky, B. & Cooper, R.L. (1991) *The Languages of Jerusalem*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Stanojević, M. M. (2013) *Konceptualna metafora: temeljni pojmovi, teorijski pristupi i metode*, Zagreb, Srednja Europa.
- Tsoukas, H. (1991) "The missing link, a transformational view of metaphors in organizational science", *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 3: pp. 66-85.
- Zovko-Bošnjak, I. (2018) *Varijacije metaforičkoga preslikavanja u političkome diskursu, Analiza političkoga diskursa u Bosni i Hercegovini s kognitivno-lingvističkoga aspekta (doctoral thesis)*, Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Mostaru.

PRISUTNOST METAFORIČKOGA OBILJEŽJA U JEZIČNOM KRAJOBRAZU MOSTARA

Sažetak

Istraživanja jezičnoga krajobraza predstavljaju novo znanstveno područje koje istražuje vezu jezika, komunikacije i prostora. Jezični krajobraz možemo definirati kao vidljivost i istaknutost jezika u javnom prostoru (Gorter 2006). Istraživači jezičnoga krajobraza dolaze iz različitih jezičnih disciplina, najviše iz područja primijenjene lingvistike, istraživanja višejezičnosti, diskursa, iz sociolingvistike i lingvističke antropologije. Oni vjeruju da se jezična i komunikacijska praksa može ispravno razumjeti tek ako ju stavimo u neki kontekst mjesta. Također je važno naglasiti i shvatiti da fizička lokacija i javna vidljivost različitih načina komuniciranja imaju duboke društveno-političke implikacije. Ova je disciplina doživjela svoj uzlet pojavom sada već klasičnog rada Landryja i Bourhisa (1997). Začetnici discipline bili su još primjerice Spolsky i Cooper (1991). S druge strane, istraživanja metafora nisu izgubila na svojoj popularnosti ni 38 godina nakon objavljivanja knjige Lakoffa i Johnsona (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*. Stoga ovaj rad kombinira to dvoje – jezični, metaforički pristup i istraživanja jezičnoga krajobraza. Koristeći metodu MP (*Metaphor Power Method*) (De Landtsheer 2009) analiziramo učestalost metafora u jezičnom krajobrazu jednoga višejezičnog grada u Bosni i Hercegovini. Naša je hipoteza da je u jezičnom krajobrazu poslijeratnih ekologija prisutnost metaforičkoga obilježja vrlo istaknuta. Korpus na kojem je rađeno istraživanje sastoji se od 1010 znakova prikupljenih u poslijeratnom razdoblju u navedenom gradu.

Ključne riječi: jezični krajobraz, sociolingvistika, jezik, prostor, metafore, MP metoda