

## **Semantic Triggers of Various Meanings of *Bread***

**Ali Abdolahinejad**

**PhD student of Linguistics, Ferdowsi university of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran**

**Dr. Ali Izanloo<sup>1</sup>**

**Assistant professor of Linguistics, Ferdowsi university of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran**

**Dr. Azam Estaji**

**Associate professor of Linguistics, Ferdowsi university of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran**

*Received: 21 June 2017*

*Accepted: 13 December 2017*

### **Extended abstract**

#### **1- Introduction**

When a word resembles the meaning of another word, both words are in the same ideal cognitive domain and follow a certain conceptual cognitive pattern. Such associations suggest important relations between these concepts that can be because of so many reasons like cultural priorities. Making a new association and eventually a new concept out of a new word, depends on the importance and the state of the association. Linguists' emphasis on the existence of focal and prominent meaningful entity for every single one of the concepts has been the fountain of many investigations for determining various meanings of a concept and its focal meaning in the form of semantic network.

#### **2- Theoretical Framework**

Some similar researches involve: (Achresh & Jahromi, 2015), (Afrashi et al., 2012), (Afrashi et al., 2015), (Afshari & Samet, 2014), (Ghavam Esperghem, 2015), (Golshaieb et al., 2014), (Graf, 2011), (Hesabi, 2016), (Ibañez-Moreno, 2005), (Mousavi et al., 2015), (Nasib & Izanloo, 2016), (Rasekh Mahand & Ranjbar Zarabi, 2013), (Rezaee & Rafiee, 2016), (Seargeant, 2009), (Sorahi, 2012), (Zahedi & Mohammadi Ziyarat, 2011). The common point that can be found among these researches and similar ones is that they try to determine different meanings of a word and draw its semantic network. The point that has usually been ignored is the grounds or inspirations that these meanings originated from. In the current research, based on the assumption that meanings are inspired by concrete or abstract features (social, psychological, cultural, etc.), the motivations of the meanings of bread in Farsi are going to be investigated.

#### **3- Methodology**

For collecting different meanings of *bread*, 18 Persian dictionaries and a corpus containing more than 2,600,000 words were covered. Meanings were elicited by

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding Author : aliizanloo@ferdowsi.um.ac.ir

referring to dictionaries' explanation for that special entry, then the prominent feature of *bread* that played the most salient role in making the meaning, was gained. For instance, the idiom "naan-e sefid-e falak" that could literally be translated as "white bread of sky" means (is recorded in the dictionaries as) "moon". When it is asked what feature of *bread* has inspired this meaning, it leads to "appearance": Similarity between a white round bread and the moon. Therefore, the shape and appearance of *bread* has been the ground and motivation for this idiom.

#### 4- Results

In this research, the role of experience in creating various secondary meanings is studied. According to Fillmore (1982), meaningful elements in a language are created based on recurring experiences. Concepts are frames containing a collection of experiences that in contact with new phenomenon, one of their aspects can be triggered. On the other hand, for using the idiom "yek loghmeh naan"/"a bite of bread" meaning "a little amount of food or money", the concept of *amount* has been triggered, or in another idiom "nan-daani"/"bread's place" meaning "stomach", the place of bread has been triggered. Therefore, it can be said that tracing the semantic triggers of concepts leads to valuable information about different aspects of life and culture of societies.

#### 5- Conclusion

According to Lakoff and Johnson (2003), our conceptual system is the result of our interaction with our culture and physical environment. It is interesting that in some idioms the meaning of *bread* refers to high value and in some to low value. The low value of *bread* can be traced through history in periods that Farsi speakers were suffering from drought and famine and vice versa, the high value of *bread* can be traced in periods that this foodstuff has been abundant. This research showed that meanings are not arbitrary and there are not any meanings out of the circle of features and interaction concerning them. It approved results of Buccino, Colagè, Gobbi & Bonaccorso, (2016) that by neuro-physiological investigation and analyzing the linguistic meaning reached to the conclusion that neurological structure of brain of human is responsible for perceiving sensual, dynamic and emotional meaning of words that proves embodied meaning in linguistics. The most important role of embodiment is generating commonalities from experiences of various people in a language society. These experiences build the infrastructure of common linguistic meanings.

**Key Words:** Polysemy, Meaning trigger, Semantic network, Bread.

#### References (In Persian)

1. Achrash, Kh. & Jahromi, M. K. (2015). Rasm-e shabakeh-ye ma'nae-ye vazheh-ye "fetneh" va motaradefat-e an dar ghor'an [Drawing the semantics net for "sedition" and its synonyms in Quran]. *Quarnic Studies Quarterly*, 24, 29-52.
2. Afkhami, A., & Asghari, S. Z. (2012). Chegoonegi-ye eshteghagh-e mafahim-e gheir-e makani az mafhoom-e makani-ye harf-e ezafe-ye *dar*, dar howzeh-ye

- ma'na shenasi-ye shenakhti va bar اساس-e nazariyeh-ye LCCM [Status of derivation of non-spatial concepts from spatial concept of preposition of "dar" from perspective view of cognitive semantics and based on the LCCM theory]. *Zabanshenakht*, 7, 27-48.
3. Afrashi, A., Asi, S. M., & Joulaei, K. (2015). Este'areh-haye mafhoomi dar zaban-e Farsi; tahlil-e shenakhti va peykareh-madar [Conceptual metaphors in Persian: A cognitive perspective and a corpus driven Analysis]. *Zabanshenakht*, 2, 39-62.
  4. Afrashi, A., Hesami, T., & Salas, B. (2012). Barresi-ye tatbighi-ye este'areh-haye mafhoomi-ye jahati dar zaban-haye espaniyae va Farsi [A comparative survey of orientational conceptual metaphors in Spanish and Persian]. *Language Related Research*, 12, 1-24.
  5. Afshari, A., & Saamet, S. S. (2014). Chand ma'nae-ye nezammand ba rooykard-e shenakhti tahlil-e chand-ma'nae-ye fe'l-e hessi-ye shenidan dar zaban-e Farsi [Cognitive systematic polysemy of the verb "Shenidan"/ "Hearing" in Farsi]. *Adab Pazhuhi*, 30, 29-59.
  6. Amini, A. (1990). *Farhang-e Avam* [Dictionary of common proverbs] (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Isfahan: Isfahan University.
  7. Anvari, H. (2002). *Farhang-e bozorg-e Sokhan* [Big dictionary of Sokhan]. Tehran: Sokhan Publications.
  8. Bijankhan, M. (2017). *Bijankhan corpus*. Retrieved from [http:// dbrg.ut.ac.ir/ Bijankhan](http://dbrg.ut.ac.ir/Bijankhan)
  9. Daaee-yol-Eslam. M. (1939). *Farhang-e Nezam* [Nezam dictionary]. HaysarAbaad: Machine Press.
  10. Dekhoda, A. (1982). *Amsal-o hekam* [Proverbs and anecdotes] (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Tehran: Tyrazheh Press.
  11. Dekhoda, A. (1982). *Loghat-nameh-ye Dekhoda* [Dekhoda dictionary] (1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> eds.). Tehran: University of Tehran Press.
  12. Dekhoda, A. (2018). *Loghat-nameh-ye Dekhoda* [Dekhoda dictionary]. Retrieved from <https://www.vajehyab.com>
  13. Delaramifar, M., Yousefian, P., Allahbakhsh, M., & Ahangar, A. (2017). Ravabet-e Ma'nae-ye fe'l-e "gereftan" dar zaban-e Farsi: rooykard-e Ma'nee-shenasee-ye ghaleb-bonyad-e Fillmore [Semantics relations of Persian verb "gereftan": Fillmore's frame semantic]. *Language Research*, 8(1), 79-98.
  14. Gharib, M. (1988). *Vazheh-name-ye Novin* [New Dictionary] (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Tehran: Bonyad Press.
  15. Ghavam, A., & Espargham, S. (2015). Barresi-ye este'areh-ha-ye "eshgh" va "ma'shoogh" dar do-beyti-ha-ye amiyaneh-ye mantagheh-ye khorasan bar bonyad-e nazari-ye este'areh-ye shenakhti [Cognitive analysis of "love" and "beloved" in local couplets of Khorasan]. *Kohan-name-ye Parsi*, 6(3), 1-26.

16. Golshaie, R., Golfam, A., Asi, S. M., & Aghagolzadeh, F. (2014). Arzyabi-ye peykare-bonyad-e mafroozat-e nazariye-ye este'areh-ye mafhoomi: Barresi-ye moredi-ye este'areh-ye "bahs be masabeh-ye jang" dar zaban-e Farsi [A Corpus-based evaluation of conceptual metaphor theory's assumptions: The case of "argument is war" metaphor in Persian]. *Language Related Research*, 17, 223-248.
17. Hesabi, A. (2016). Fe'l-e "khordan" az didgah-e zaban-shenasi-ye shenakhti [The verb "khordan" from the perspective of cognitive linguistics]. *Language and Linguistics*, 11(22), 1-26.
18. Jamaal Zaadeh, M. (1962). *Farhang-e Amiyaneh* [Dictionary of colloquial expressions]. Tehran: Farhang-e Iran-Zamin.
19. Jamshidi Pour, Y. (1968). *Farnhang-e amsal-e Farsi: shamel-e amsal, zarb-ol-masal-ha, hekam, khorafat va folklor-ha-ye rayej va mansookh*. [Dictionary of Persian proverbs: Common proverbs, anecdotes, and folklore]. Tehran: Ketabforoushi Foroughi.
20. Khodayar, A. (1985). *Andarz-ha va mesal-ha-ye mostalah dar zaban-e Farsi* [Common proverbs in the language of Farsi] (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). Tehran: Entesharate Khorshid.
21. Khodayar, A. (1991). *Amsal-o hekam dar zaban-e Farsi* [Proverbs and anecdotes in the language of Farsi] (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Tehran: Khorshid Publications.
22. Majd, M. (2008). *Ghahti-ye bozorg* [Great famine and genocide in Persia, 1917-1919] (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). Tehran: Political Studies and Research Institute.
23. Moazeni, A. M., & Khanjari, Sh. (2014). Tahlile barkhi az este'areh-ha-ye mafhoomi-ye Farsi ba estefadeh az olgoo-ye shabakeh-ee-ye edgham [Analysis of conceptual metaphors in Persian using the Lattice model and integrate]. *Persian Literature*, 13, 1-16.
24. Moeen, M. (1981). *Farhang-e Farsi* [Farsi dictionary] (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Tehran: Soroush (Seda va Sima Press).
25. Mokhtari, Sh., & Rezaee, H. (2013). Barresi-ye shabakeh-ye ma'na-ee-ye harf-e ezafeh-ye "ba" dar zaban-e Farsi [Cognitive analysis of semantic network of preposition of "ba" in Farsi]. *Linguistics and Khorasan Dialects*, 9, 73-94.
26. Moshiri, M. (2009). *Farhang-e zaban-e Farsi* [Farsi language dictionary] (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Tehran: Soroush (Seda va Sima Press).
27. Mousavi, S. H., Amoozadeh, M., & Rezai, V. (1394). Barresi-ye vazheh-ye "didan" bar asas-e ma'na-shenasi-ye ghalebi [Analysis of the word "didan"/"seeing" based on frame semantics]. *Language Related Research*, 6(7), 219-236.
28. Nasib, F., & Izanloo, A. (2016). Barresi-ye ma'na-shenakhti-ye fe'l-e "khordan" bar asas-e ma'na-ye payeh-ye pazira [A semantic study of "khordan"/"eating" based on the basic meaning of "accepting"]. *Zabanpazhuhi*, 20, 125-142.
29. Padeshah, M. (1984). *Farhang-e Anandaraj* [Anandaraj dictionary]. Tehran: Entesharat-e Ketabkhane-ye Khayyam.
30. Rasekh Mahand, M., & Ranjbar Zarrabi, N. (2013). Barresi-ye shabakeh-ye ma'nae-ye horouf-e ezafeh-ye "dar" va "sar" [The semantic networks of two prepositions: dar and sar]. *Comparative Linguistic Research*, 5, 95-112.

31. Rezaee, H., & Rafiee, A. (2016). Barresi-ye shabakeh-ye ma'naee-ye pasvand-e makan-saz-e "-gah" ba rooykardi shenakhti [A study of the semantic network of "-gah" suffix of location in Persian: A cognitive perspective]. *Zabanpazhuhi*, 18, 107-123.
32. Sadri Afshar, Gh. H. (1990). *Farhang-e zaban-e Farsi-e emrouz* [Today's Farsi language dictionary] (1<sup>st</sup> ed). Tehran: Nashre Kalameh.
33. Sadri Afshar, Gh. H., & Hakami, N. (2004). *Farhang-e moaser-e Farsi* [Contemporary Farsi dictionary]. Tehran: Farhang-e Moaser.
34. Shakour Zadeh Boluri, A. (1993). *Dah-hezar masal-e Farsi va bist-o panj hezar mo'adel-e anha* [Ten thousand Persian proverbs and their twenty five thousand counterparts] (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). Mashhad: Astane Ghods Press.
35. Sorahi, M. A. (2012). Rooykardi radeh-shenakhti be este'areh-ha-ye marboot be rang dar zaban-e farsi [Cognitive study of color metaphors in Persian]. *Zabanpazhuhi*, 11, 97-118.
36. Taleshi, M. (2018, April 3). We throw away food of 15 million hungry people. Retrieved from <http://www.ion.ir/News/114753.html?catid=7&title=دور-می-ریزیم-غذای-15-میلیون-گرسنه-را>
37. Zaferanchi, M., & Amoozegar, H. (1991). *Farhang-e Farsi be Farsi-ye Danesh* [Farsi to Farsi dictionary of Danesh] (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). Tehran: Saffar Press.
38. Zahedi, K., & Mohammadi Ziyarati, A. (2011). Shabakeh-ye ma'naee-ye harf-e ezafeh-ye Farsi-ye "az" dar chaharchoob-e ma'nee shenasi-ye shenakhti. [Semantic network of a modern Persian preposition: "Az" in a cognitive semantic framework]. *Advances in Cognitive Science*, 49, 67-80.

#### References (In English)

1. Buccino, G., Colagè, I., Gobbi, N., & Bonaccorso, G. (2016). Grounding meaning in experience: A broad perspective on embodied language. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 69, 69-78.
2. Deignan, A., & Potter, L. (2004). A corpus study of metaphors and metonyms in English and Italian. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36, 1231-1252.
3. Evans, V. (2014). A unified account of polysemy within LCCM theory. *Lingua*, 127, 100-123.
4. Falkum, I. L. (2015a). The how and why of polysemy: A pragmatic account. *Lingua*, 157, 83-99.
5. Falkum, I. L. (2015b). Polysemy: Current perspectives and approaches. *Lingua*, 157, 1-16.
6. Fauconnier, G. (1985). *Mental spaces*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
7. Fillmore, C. J. (1982). Frame semantics. In The Linguistics Society of Korea (Ed.) *Linguistics in the morning calm*. Seoul, South Korea: Hanshin Publishing Co.
8. Graf, E. (2011). Adolescents' use of spatial time metaphors: A matter of cognition or socio-communicative practice? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 723-734.
9. Ibañez-Moreno, A. (2005). An analysis of the cognitive dimension of proverbs in English and Spanish: The conceptual power of language reflecting popular believes. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*, 2(1), 42-54.

10. Kovecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
11. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, Ltd.
12. Rabagliati, H., Marcus, G. F., & Pytkkanen, L. (2011). Rules, radical pragmatics and restrictions on regular polysemy. *Journal of Semantic*, 28(4), 485– 512.
13. Rosch, E., & Mervis, C. (1975). Family resemblance: Studies in the internal structure of categories. *Cognitive Psychology*, 7, 573–605.
14. Seargeant, Ph. (2009). Metaphors of possession in the conceptualism of language. *Language and Communication*, 29, 383-393.