Fast and *robust* as intensifying words—metaphors of intensification in English

Sayaka Ogasawara

1. Introduction

In the English language, the same intensifying lexical item has been applied to many types of vocabularies. The use of *robust* is just one of many contemporary examples. *Robust* has been a buzzword, and now it is used in a wide range of contexts where something is ascertained as in '*robust* debate', '*robust* response', 'being not scientifically *robust*', '*robust* drought plans', 'food sales remained *robust*', and '*robust* design'. In the history of English, similar application of intensifying meaning is seen in the use of *fast* as an adverb in Middle English (ME). ME *fast* was used as an intensive adverb, adding some strength to the meanings of its modified entity. The meaning of *fast* varied largely according to context as in 'love *fast* (dearly)', 'sing *fast* (loudly)', 'drink *fast* (a lot')', and 'run *fast* (rapidly)'. If these applications of intensifying meanings show the way people perceive similarity between the different categories, how conceptually close are those categories, and what kind of metaphors are working?

INTENSITY is one of the popular concepts as a target concept among the studies of metaphors related to human emotion (e.g. Geeraerts & Grondelaers, 1995, Kövecses, 2000). Conceptual metaphors such as INTENSITY IS HEAT, INTENSITY IS QUANTITY or INTENSITY IS SPEED have been much discussed in a number of earlier publications (Kövecses, 2005, 2014, 2000). However, when it comes to intensification or intensifiers themselves, the focus of the study has been more on the process of grammaticalization and delexicalization of rather grammaticalized intensifiers (Sinclair,1992, Partington, 1993, Lorenz, 2002) than on the intensifying words in wider categories and their semantic change in light of metaphor. The level of the 'intensifier' is usually restricted to the adjectival modifier, such as *very* or *really*. To date, intensifying adverbs and lexical items which have intensifying meanings have rarely been the subject of semantic change.

The purpose of this paper is to explore the diachronic process of how INTENSITY is applied to different conceptual categories and find the metaphorical links between them by comparing the semantic history of *fast* and *robust.* My recent works (e.g. Ogasawara, 2013) have focused on the semantic development of *fast* and how intensification sprung off from new meanings. Both *fast* and

robust have quite similar semantic functions as those of intensifiers, though the two words differ at several levels—intensifying use of *fast* is mainly as an adverb while *robust* is an adjective, and the intensifying use of *fast* is defined as 'an intensive' in the *Middle English Dictionary* (MED), whereas *robust* today is not defined as an intensifier.[1] In this current paper, however, I will compare *fast* (mainly ME use) and *robust* both as having an intensifying function. I believe that by comparing these two lexical items, we can find that there is a tendency in the process of semantic change or development that involves similar metaphors and metonymies. The main argument will be on the concept INTENSITY, and how it comes to be applied to wider categories, so the difference in grammatical function might not be a major problem. By tracing their semantic developments, I would like to suggest that they share five different conceptual categories they apply strengthening meanings to—PHYSICAL THINGS (PEOPLE, ANIMALS, PLANTS), EMOTION or THOUGHT, PHYSICAL ACTIVITY, SOUND or VOICE, and COLOUR, and that these concepts are close and there might be some sets of metaphors and metonymies working when people use intensifying expressions. In the following sections, after introducing the semantic history of *fast* and *robust*, I will discuss how these different concepts might be associated in a metaphor and metonymy and will conclude that there are several sets of metaphors that particularly arise when people scale things around them.

2. Semantic change of *fast* and *robust*

There are some salient similarities in the semantic change of *fast* and *robust*. Compared with *fast*, *robust* begins to be recorded much later around the end of the 15th century according to the *Oxford English Dictionary Online* (hereafter OED Online), and *robust* is used mainly as an adjective, while the intensifying use of *fast* was used as an adverb. However, they show similar semantic developments in that they both originally expressed the notion of firmness or toughness, and in the course of their semantic change, the notion of strength was gradually used in more metaphorical manner, and they began to be used as intensifying words, though they were not necessarily labelled as intensifiers. Here in this section, I will trace the semantic change of *fast* and *robust* respectively,

---

[1] In the OED Online, ME *fast* is not explained as an intensive adverb, whereas MED regards a range of intensive usages 'as an intensive'. The terminology relating to intensification is quite tricky and difficult to differentiate to modal adverbs, hence the definition of intensifier varies to a large extent among different scholars (Bolinger 1972; Quirk et al. 1985; Allerton 1987). The categorization of intensifier is beyond the scope of this article, as my main concern in the present paper is the conceptual link between the different categories to which people apply the same intensifying word.

mainly using data from OED Online.[2] In the following section, I will focus on their similarities, highlighting the metaphors that might be working when the categories of intensified items expand.

2.1 Semantic change of *fast* as an adverb and adjective

The most dominant meaning of *fast* today is 'rapidly'. This meaning pertaining to rapidity occurred through the intensifying use of *fast* in Middle English. In short, the semantic change of *fast* is from 'firmly, immovably' to 'rapidly, swiftly' by way of the intensifying meaning 'vigorously, eagerly' (Ogasawara, 2013).

The earliest meaning of *fas*t documented in the OED Online is 'firmly, fixedly' (c.900)[3] or 'tightly, securely' (c.888). OE *fæst* mainly expressed being immovable or firmly adhered. In Middle English, it began to be used more figuratively, and the meaning of immovableness had gradually been applied to the mental domain to express fixity of attention or effort or vigour in action, in the meanings such as 'earnestly, steadily, diligently, zealously' (?c.1200) and 'stoutly, strongly, vigorously' (1297). ME *fast* was also used to express spatial proximity, meaning 'close to', in the collocations such as '*fast* beside' or '*fast* by' (1275). The sense of spatial proximity was also used in temporal meaning such as 'immediately' or 'at once' in the collocation 'as *fast* as' (a.1300). The most prevalent meaning today, 'rapidly' also gradually developed in the ME period through its intensifying use mainly with verbs of motion or travel. In the OED Online, the earliest documented use as an intensifying meaning is cited from Layamon's *Brut* c1275 (<?a1200). While the OED Online does not use the label 'as an intensive' for the intensifying uses of *fast* in ME, *MED* regards the intensifying usage as 'an intensive, with various verbs' under *fast(e* (adv.), definition 9. The collocation 'sleep *fast*' (sleep 'soundly'), which is still in use as an archaic expression, is listed as one of the intensifying usages in the sense 9 in *MED.* Though *MED* displays separately the sense 'rapidly' under definition 10, as I argued elsewhere, it can be said that all the newly developed meanings in ME emerged from their intensifying uses. The meanings of ME *fast* are quite ambiguous and often cannot be defined straightforwardly (e.g. Sylvester, 2010: 213), but at the same time, it seems that the ME *fast* was a quite useful and versatile word as it sometimes appears twice in a row in *The Canterbury Tales*. Meanings such as 'rapidly, swiftly' were only contextual during the ME period, but later as the intensifying use became

---

[2] All the data on the semantic history are from OED Online if not otherwise attributed.
[3] The date in the brackets suggests the earliest date of the usage or meaning attested in the OED Online.

obsolete at around the beginning of the Early Modern English period, meanings relating to speed (rapidly) entrenched as its lexical meaning.[4] In the 16th century, *fast* no longer had an intensifying meaning. For example, in the works of Shakespeare, the collocation such as 'play *fast*' only meant 'play rapidly', and it no longer meant 'play devoutly'.

The adjective *fast* has shown almost the same semantic development as the adverb. The earliest meaning recorded in the OED Online is largely categorised as being physically and mentally 'firm' (888). The other umbrella sense is 'rapid' (a.1400), which is apparently transferred from adverbial usage as the OED Online suggests. During the course of its semantic development, the adjective *fast* developed some meanings that are not found in its adverbial meanings, such as 'close-fisted, mean, niggardly' (c.1275, now obsolete), a meaning describing a style of writing 'compact, terse' (1568, now obsolete) or one referring to the colour, 'permanent' (1658).

2.2 Etymology and semantic development of *robust*

BBC *news magazine* (online) nominated the word *robust* as being one of the top twenty of the most overused words of 2013.[5] The article reports that *robust* has become the buzzword of politicians, citing an illustrative usage by Business Secretary Vince Cable who stated he would "take *robust* action on bank bonuses" in 2010. Though Vanessa Barford asked "Is *robust* robust enough to stick around in 2014?", it is still a word people often use and hear, perhaps most frequently in the news media. The initial stage of semantic change might start with a state that is 'not always recognized as such by a non-specialist audience' and 'likely to be identified as "misuse" or "overuse"' such as in the case of *wicked* or *awesome* (Durkin 2012: 4). *Robust* does not experience a dramatic semantic change nor has it been criticized as 'misused', but it has certainly become buzzword and is being overused recently. When a word is overused, it comes to be used in a wider range of contexts. *Robust* apparently has undergone this process of expanding contexts where it is used, and the meaning attached to it has gradually expanded. A quick look at the recent articles from BBC Online can show

---

[4] In *The Canterbury Tales*, for instance, there are 75 instances of adverbial use of *fast*, and the most frequent meaning of this word is as an intensive (31 instances) with a wide variety of verbs such as 'drink *fast* (deeply)', 'rain *fast* (hard)' and 'cense *fast* (earnestly)'. The second most frequent meaning is 'rapidly', though this meaning completely depends on the verbs it modifies such as *run*, *walk* and *haste* (18 instances). There are also instances of its application to spatial/temporal proximity, 10 and 6 instances respectively, and its original meaning 'firmly' is used 10 times.
[5] See https://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-23362207

that there are much wider uses in many kinds of contexts ranging from a context referring to animate beings such as humans- 'a quite *robust* person', animals- 'a very *robust* horse' and plants- 'a *robust* plant' to inanimate entities such as colour- 'a *robust* colour', taste- 'bake *robust* and perfectly flavoured biscuits' and voice - 'she had a very *robust* voice'. Amongst these, the most frequent uses of *robust* today might be in a political, economic or scientific context as in 'a meeting with the DUP had been open and *robust*, but respectful', 'the UK economy saw *robust* performance', and 'there was still a lack of *robust* scientific evidence', respectively. Whereas the adjective itself does not add any specific meaning to its modified entity, *robust* adds some 'strength' to the degree which is accompanied by the modified noun. *Robust* is not an intensifier, but it is indeed a versatile word, just to add some sense of assuredness. The meaning of it is largely contextual, depending on the nouns it modifies.

Robust is not of English origin. OED Online explains *robust* has multiple origins, partly a borrowing from French and partly from Latin. Middle French *robuste* originally denotes a person to be 'strong, healthy' (early 14th century), and this meaning comes to be applied to a thought or emotion being 'firm, unshakeable' (1481), and a plant being 'hardy, vigorous' (1604). Its etymon classical Latin *robustus* denotes the attributes of oak to be 'physically strong, powerful, firm solid, and capable of resisting change, durable'. Though *robust* has been in use since the end of the 15th century, there is no citation from Shakespeare or Milton in this form. At that time, there were several other forms for this word (*robustious*, *robustuous* and *robustous*) and *robustious* was in more common use than *robust*. Each form had slightly different shades of meaning other than its core meaning 'strong', and went on different semantic development. While *robustious* went on a negative semantic shift to the meanings such as 'violent' or 'boisterous', *robust* has developed positive meanings that developed from its original sense 'strong'.[6]

---

[6] For example, both Shakespeare and Milton used the form *robustious.* Shakespeare used this word only in the meaning such as 'violent' or 'boisterous'. Milton used this word both in the senses of 'strong', which is almost the same as the sense 1 of *robust* in the OED Online, and 'violent' or 'boisterous'. There were two more adjectival forms *robustuous and robustous* listed in the OED Online, and they both are used with the same meaning as *robustious*. In the section of etymology, there is an accompanied comment from the *New English Dictionary* (1909) which says that *robustious* was in common use during the 17th century, and in the 18th it became rare followed by a comment by Johnson "now only used in low language, and in a sense of contempt". Perhaps *robustious* had experienced a unique semantic shift, from 'strong' to slightly negative application of meaning 'violent' or 'boisterous', and became obsolete somewhere in the 18th century. If we could pin down the closest meaning among the senses of *robust*, it would be sense 2 'coarse', 'rough', 'rude' that is attested from 1511 and accompanied by the comment 'now rare'. From these comments in the dictionary, and the

The earliest meaning of *robust* documented in the OED Online refers to a person or animal's attributes, or to the body or its constitution, disposition, and is defined as 'strong, hardy; strongly and solidly built, sturdy; healthy' (1490). In the same umbrella sense, the meaning applied to a tree or other plant appears slightly later, attested from 1627. The senses such as 'coarse, rough, rude' are first documented in the dictionary in 1511, but now this sense is rare as the OED Online notes. More general senses of 'relating, requiring or promoting physical strength or hardiness', defined as 'energetic' or 'vigorous' are attested from 1652, and this meaning of general strength has expanded to be applied to sound or voice, in meanings such as 'strong, powerful' or 'loud' (1656). The initial meaning of *robust* was related to the strength of animate beings such as people, animals and plants, but once it gained a more general sense expressing physical strength, it further gained its meaning to express strength of a material object denoting 'sturdily constructed, solid, not easily damaged or broken, resilient' (1670). It was a bit later when the meaning of 'resilient' was first applied to economics (1886). The meaning of material strength has further been applied to immaterial things, such as a thought or emotion, in the senses of 'strong' or 'resilient'. Then *robust* came to express the intensity of colour, in the collocation such as 'robust tone of the flesh-colour' '(1826), and slightly later in 1873, the first attested usage that denotes richness or intensity of food's or drink's taste, appeared. Finally, *robust* has come to be used for statistics or tests (1955), or computer programs (1979), in senses such as 'reliable'

3. Metaphors of scale and intensification

3.1 STRENGTH OF EMOTION/THOUGHT IS PHYSICAL STRENGTH/STRENGTH OF MOVEMENT

Both *fast* and *robust* originally have the senses of physical fixity or strength, and later the notion of strength was applied to express fixity of attention or mental strength. It seems that there has been a metaphorical link between the concepts PHYSICAL STRENGTH and EMOTIONAL STRENGTH. However, there might have been slightly different pathways in their semantic developments with different mapping processes.

In the case of adverb *fast*, there is a good gap between the original meaning 'firmly, fixedly' (900) and the immaterial sense 'fixity of attention' (1291), while as an adjective, there is a sense

---

meaning displayed on the OED Online, we can assume that *robust* has undergone positive semantic change, where *robustious* went on a negative semantic shift.

'unchangeable' (describing person or his attribute, feeling) first recorded in c.900, and the gap between the PHYSICAL STRENGTH and EMOTIONAL STRENGTH is rather small. It still appears to be likely that the source concept PHYSICAL STRENGTH (firmly, fixedly) was mapped onto the EMOTIONAL STRENGTH. Once its strengthening meaning was used figuratively such as 'ardently' or 'diligently', EMOTIONAL STRENGTH triggered STRENGTH OF MOVEMENT (INTENSITY OF MOVEMENT). This is the outcome of the metaphor worked between the meaning of *fast* and the meaning accompanied by the verbs of motion or travel. The following instances from *The Canterbury Tales* are very illustrative to see how *fast* was used in the 14th century.

(1) *He kiste hire sweete and taketh his sawtrie,*

'He kissed her sweetly and takes his psaltery,'

And pleyeth faste, and maketh melodie.

'And plays fast, and makes melody.'

(*The Canterbury Tales* Mil. 3305–6)

(2) *And after that men daunce and drynken faste,*

'And after that men dance and drink deeply,'

(*The Canterbury Tales* Mch. 1769)

(3) *And spede yow faste, for I wole abyde*

'And hurry yourself, for I will wait'

Til that ye slepe faste by my syde."

'Until you sleep fast by my side."'

(*The Canterbury Tales* Mch.1927–8)

In citation (1), *fast* is used in the collocation 'play fast', which might suggest that it actually used to add some strength to the mental attitude of the player. Another popular usage at that time was where *fast* was used with a wide variety of verbs of motion. When *fast* was used with the verb *drink,* as in citation (2), it could mean 'a large volume' or 'a lot'. It is intriguing to see how useful *fast* was as is shown in (3) where it appears twice in a row and with different meanings. The first collocation 'spede

fast' (speed fast) is apparently the one which would drive its meaning to 'rapidly'. However, at this point, there is no clear evidence to confirm whether the new meaning 'rapidly' was entrenched as its lexical meaning. The other collocation 'slepe fast' appears to have been very popular in that period. In ME, these figurative usages were very popular. At that time, several metaphors based on EMOTIONAL STRENGTH IS PHYSICAL STRENGTH (STRENGTH OF MOVEMENT) might have worked between the notion of INTENSITY and the notions accompanied by the modified constituencies of the sentence. Towards the end of the 15th century when the new meaning 'rapidly' had gradually become entrenched as its lexical meaning, intensifying use became much less popular (Ogasawara 2013).

In contrast, *robust* manifests slightly different mapping processes to *fast* as the first mapping process seems to have been from PHYSICAL STRENGTH onto STRENGTH OF MOVEMENT/ACTIVITY (INTENSITY OF MOVEMENT/ACTIVITY). The original meaning of *robust* only described physical strength of human or animal (1490), and the notion of physical strength is gradually mapped onto something 'relating, requiring or promoting physical strength or hardiness'. More general meanings such as 'energetic', 'vigorous' in the collocations with the words like *exercise* or *activity* began to be recorded from 1652. STRENGTH OF MOVEMENT/ACTIVITY seems to have transferred to the conceptual field of EMOTION/THOUGHT. Later in 1766, the sense describing emotion or thought as being 'powerful, firm, unyielding', 'resilient' is firstly attested in OED online:

(4)   To prevent the robust title of occupancy from again taking place, the doctrine of
        escheats is adopted. (William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the laws of England*,
        1766)

In citation (4), *robust* is used with the noun *title*, thus categorized as 'immaterial sense', meaning 'firm' or 'unyielding'. The first quotation of the use with the words such as *thought*, *thinker*, *contempt*, which is more apparently linked with emotion or thought, is attested from 1807:

(5)   Such words as..were best calculated to impress his robust thoughts. (*Cobbett's weekly
        political register*, 1807)

Fast and *robust* had developed their meaning through slightly different pathways, but it seems likely that both originally have meanings which express PHYSICAL STRENGTH and later this concept was mapped onto EMOTION/THOUGHT. There might have been two possible mapping processes for the target concept STRENGTH OF EMOTION/THOUGHT; first is from PHYSICAL STRENGTH onto STRENGTH OF EMOTION/THOUGHT, as in the case of *fast*, and the second is from STRENGTH OF MOVEMENT/ACTIVITY onto STRENGTH OF EMOTION/THOUGHT as we have seen in the case of *robust*.

3.2 COLOUR IS SOUND

Metaphorical transfer of the vocabularies denoting sound to the domain of colour has been already well attested by a study using the *Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary* (*HTOED*). Hamilton (2016) offers a landscape of the conventional metaphorical mapping processes of colour terminology, revealing the way people think in terms of colour. According to the study, colour terminology is a 'bidirectional domain' (Hamilton 2016 :1), and the majority of the vocabulary shows the COLOUR IS SOUND metaphor, whereas the remainder shows as SOUND IS COLOUR metaphor. Quite similar cases can be seen in the semantic development of *fast* and *robust*, however, there seem to be some internal steps involved in the metaphor COLOUR IS SOUND. Both *fast* and *robust* transfer their intensifying meanings to the sound and colour domains. However, as we have traced their semantic history in the earlier sections, in the case of *fast*, meaning transfer to the colour domain only happened in the adjective, and transfer to the sound domain happened only in its adverbial use in ME. On the other hand, *robust* shows a somewhat more general process of the meaning application to both sound and colour domains. Moreover, judging from the fact that many other meanings have appeared before *robust* transferred its strengthening meaning to the colour domain, it cannot be safely said that there is a strong or direct metaphoric connection between SOUND and COLOUR in the case of *robust*. It seems more likely that it shows more intricate mapping processes which eventually lead to the metaphor COLOUR IS SOUND.

3.2.1 STRENGTH OF MOVEMENT/PHYSICAL STRENGTH FOR STRENGTH OF VOICE/SOUND

In the case of *fast*, there seems to be a metonymic association between STRENGTH OF MOVEMENT and STRENGTH OF VOICE/SOUND. As we have seen in the previous sections, meaning of *fast* was largely contextual in ME. In the following citations, *fast* occurs with particular verbs which has a scale of

sound (soft—loud), and it functions to indicate upper level of the scale, 'loud'. These are very illustrative examples of how *fast* functions when it modifies the verbs that have scale of sound, and how it comes to be construed as 'loud' based on the CAUSE FOR RESULT metonymy:

(6) *And with that word, the arwes in the caps*
'And with that word, the arrows in the quiver'
Of the goddesse clateren faste and rynge,
'Of the goddess clatter fast and ring,'
And forth she wente and made a vanysshynge;
'And forth she went and vanished;'
(*The Canterbury Tales,* Kn. 2358-60)

(7) *The rynges on the temple dore that honge,*
'The rings that hung on the temple door,'
And eek the dores, clatereden ful faste,
'And also the doors, clattered very fast'
(*The Canterbury Tales,* Kn. 2422-3)

(8) *Haldez heʒe ouer his hede, halowez faste,*
'holds high over his head, hallows fast.'
(*Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, 1908)

The citations (6) and (7) are from the Knight's Tale where *fast* is used with the verb *clateren* (clatter). As the verb *clateren* means 'resound loudly', *fast* here merely intensifies its meaning with the verb *ring,* which also means 'make sound'. The collocation of 'hallow fast' is used in citation (8), which can be construed as 'hallow loudly'. All the verbs entail some meanings of sound making caused by the action. *Fast* is used as an intensifier and plays a roll of indicating the upper level of the scale of the verbs. By just adding some strength to the meaning of verbs, it comes to express the outcome of the state accompanied by louder sound. The metonymy STRENGTH OF MOVEMENT FOR STRENGTH OF VOICE/SOUND can be assumed to be based on a causation metonymy ACTION FOR RESULT.

In the case of *robust***,** the application of the strengthening meaning to SOUND/VOICE is attested from 1656. *Robust* is an adjective so if the word modifies nouns denoting sound or voice, *robust* should then naturally be construed as the voice being 'strong, loud'. However, there is slight evidence in the OED Online that we can assume this usage (loud voice) might have been triggered by the meanings such as 'energetic', those which are associated with the physical strength or strong body. In the second of the earliest citations in the OED online, the context in which it is used is closely linked to the strength of the body, 'strong Limbs'.

(9)   It will have something manly in it,..as strong Limbs, a swarthy Complexion, a robust Voice. (in *T. Creech tr. Lucretius Of Nature of Things* (new ed.) II. iv. 413, 1715)

The application to SOUND might have been a part of consequences of *robust* developing more general senses such as 'energetic, vigorous' (1652). This sense then comes to be combined with sound through the metonymic association CAUSE FOR RESULT, more specifically STRENGTH OF THE BODY FOR LOUD VOICE.

3.2.2 PHYSICAL STRENGTH FOR HEALTHY COLOUR

Another application to the colour domain is based on the metonymic/metaphoric association between someone being healthy and their skin sun-burnt healthily, or the colour of things which can be considered as being healthy. Colour has several aspects when it is talked about, but in the case of *robust*, as the earliest citations (10 and 11) below show, the meaning of strength refers to a certain set of hues that can be associated with something healthy (green, sun-burnt skin colour).

(10)   But for the sun-burnt, well-baked, robust tone of the flesh-colour, commend me to the leg and girded thigh of the robber. (W. Hazlitt *Notes Journey through France & Italy* xxiii. 357 , 1826)

(11)   The wheat plant looks exceedingly well, being already fully a foot in height, of a robust healthy green colour, and thickly stooled. (*Newcastle Courant* 21 May ii. 2/4, 1847)

What these instances suggest is that in the case of *robust*, the meaning 'healthy' which is one of the earliest attestations of the meaning of *robust* has gradually been applied to body parts by way of the metonymy; PHYSICAL STRENGTH FOR HEALTHY (STRONG) COLOUR.

3.2.3 STRENGTH OF COLOUR IS FIRM ADHESION

In the case of *fast*, its application to the conceptual field of COLOUR is only seen in the adjectival use, meaning 'not quickly fade out or wash out', 'permanent' in the collocations such as *fast-colour* (1658), *colorfast* (1851), *fast-dyed* (1888) and *wash-fast* (1963).[7] The meaning 'firm' or 'immovable' is the earliest meaning from the OE period, and this meaning was later applied to colour to refer to the physical strength of it firmly fixing to cloth, and not being easily washed away as in (12) and (13).

(12) Fast and firm colours, as Umber, Oke. (W. Sanderson *Graphice* 80, 1658)

(13) Its texture is strong and neat; its colours are fast. (F. D. Bennett *Narr. Whaling Voy.* II. 92, 1840)

Hamilton (2016) offers some evidences for the metaphor COLOUR IS MOVEMENT. If we see something in common between these two concepts COLOUR and MOVEMENT, I would rather contend that it would be the scale of potency (strength) that both of these concepts have in common. This might appear to be partly confirmed by the fact that most of the vocabularies Hamilton (2016) takes up (*vibrant*, *quick*, *violent*, *vigorously*) mean 'lively' or 'strong' movement, and the terms expressing 'slow' are not usually applied to describe the colour.

If we consider the two metaphors: STRENGTH OF COLOUR IS FIRM ADHESION and COLOUR IS MOVEMENT together, there appears to be an umbrella metaphor; COLOUR IS PHYSICAL POTENCY under which these two metaphors work. People might have been seeing the colour as if it had a physical strength, and might use the same scale weak-strong to describe the quality of colours.

---

[7] If we look at *HTOED*, there are two other vocabularies, *standing* and *fixed*, which also have transferred from the domain of physical firmness or strength to the colour domain to refer to the colour which does not fade quickly.

3.3 ECONOMICS/TESTS/COMPUTER PROGRAM IS A PERSON

There is another metaphor that has developed relatively recently in the case of *robust*, which is the personification metaphor ECONOMICS/TESTS/COMPUTER PROGRAM IS A PERSON. Kövecses (2000: 39) explains the personification as a means of ontological metaphor. Some examples of which are as follows:

> We can conceive of personification as a form of ontological metaphor. In personification, human qualities are given to nonhuman entities. Personification is common in literature, but it also abounds in everyday discourse, as the samples below show:
>
>> His theory explained to me the behavior of chickens raised in factories.
>> Life has cheated me.
>> Inflation is eating up with him.
>> Cancer finally caught up with him.
>> The computer went dead on me.
>
> Kövecses (2000: 39)

The metaphorical transition by the personification metaphor is seen in the case of *robust. Robust* has applied its strengthening meaning to many different vocabularies which in the modern world should be proved to be 'strong' enough for us to rely on—they are economics, computers, tests, and computer systems or programs. The original meaning of *robust* which describes a person as being 'strong' has been applied to other familiar things in the modern world.

This section has discussed how the different notions that are intensified by the same lexical items are metonymically or metaphorically associated with each other. There are certain sets of notions over time, and these are PHYSICAL THINGS (PEOPLE, ANIMALS, PLANTS), EMOTION or THOUGHT, PHYSICAL ACTIVITY, SOUND or VOICE, and COLOUR. To conclude, I will discuss the concept of INTENSITY and the metaphors concerning it.

4 Discussion and conclusion—Orientational metaphors and scale

4.1 INTENSITY IS UP

The initial question was why does there seems to be certain sets of concepts that are intensified by the same lexical item? This section will consider this question in terms of the function that intensifying words have in common.

Lakoff & Johnson (1980: 14) argue that orientational metaphors, such as MORE IS UP, "give a concept a spatial orientation". Having a plentiful amount, having good health and feeling good have all been discussed to be oriented upwards based on our physical or social experiences. (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 14-9). Relating to the concepts UP and MORE, several other metaphors might be at work, namely the metaphors MORE (IN QUANTITY) IS UP, and INTENSITY IS QUANTITY (Kövecses, 2000). Barcelona (2009: 369) also suggests 'quantitative meaning is metaphorically mapped onto an intensity meaning'. When people use an intensifying expression, scaling something, INTENSITY plays a quite similar role to the concept UP. With these in mind, these two concepts can be assumed to be working together as a higher metaphor INTENSITY IS UP.

There is another metaphor that might relate to the concept UP, specifically highlighting its positive evaluative meaning. Intensifying expression is generally explained as having no specific lexical meaning, however there seem to be largely two things people are doing by using them. The first one is to scale the quality up, the second one is to give some assuredness or certainty to the remarks to show the affirmative attitude of the speakers towards the things they mention, which eventually leads to the metaphor GOOD IS UP. In other words, when language users scale something indicating upwards on a scale, they also give some evaluative meaning to the utterance. As we have seen in the previous sections, the concept INTENSITY plays a roll of indicating upwards on a scale, mapping the concept UP and several different concepts which are metaphorically linked to the concept UP (MORE, HEALTHY, GOOD) to the different target concepts. The concepts which have commonly appeared in the present study, PHYSICAL THINGS (PEOPLE, ANIMALS, PLANTS), EMOTION or THOUGHT, PHYSICAL ACTIVITY, SOUND or VOICE, and COLOUR, can be considered to be target concepts which the notion INTENSITY is mapped onto.

4.2 Conclusion

This paper has attempted to find conceptual proximity between the different notions that are intensified by the same lexical items. Both *fast* and *robust* had/have very close semantic functions to that of intensifiers, and both show quite similar semantic development—initially having the

strengthening meaning associated with physical things, like physical state (firmly) or attributes of animals or plants (strong). Also starting from PHYSICAL, the strengthening meaning has later been applied to more immaterial things, such as EMOTION or THOUGHT, PHYSICAL ACTIVITY, and finally to the attributes of SOUND and COLOUR. My tentative conclusion to this case study regarding *fast* and *robust* is that there are metaphors related to people's ability of scaling things around them. Certain sets of concepts, PHYSICAL THINGS (PEOPLE, ANIMALS, PLANTS), EMOTION or THOUGHT, PHYSICAL ACTIVITY, SOUND or VOICE and COLOUR, appear repeatedly in different words, in different periods of time. What this might suggest is that these concepts can be more fundamental to people's cognition when they scale, hence they can be more easily tied up with the notion UP and the other closely related concepts to UP, which are MORE, HEALTHY, and GOOD.

References

Allerton, D. 1987. 'English intensifiers and their idiosyncrasies.' In R. Steele, & T. Threadgold (eds.), *Language Topics: Essays in Honour of Michael Halliday*, vol. 2. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 15–31.

Barcelona, A. 2009. 'Motivation of construction meaning and form: the roles of metonymy and inference. In K. U. Panther, L. L. Thornburg & A. Barcelona (eds.), *Metonymy and Metaphor in Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 363–401.

Bolinger, D. 1972. *Degree Words.* The Hague: Mouton.

Chaucer, G. *The Canterbury Tales. The Riverside Chaucer.* 3rd ed, edited by L.D. Benson. Oxford University Press, 1998.

Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse. 2006. Online at http://quod.lib.umich.edu/c/cme (Accessed April 1, 2018).

Durkin, P. 2012. 'Variation in the lexicon: the 'Cinderella' of sociolinguistics?: why does variation in word forms and word meanings present such challenges for empirical research?' *English Today* 28(4), pp. 3–9.

Geeraerts, D. & Grondelaers, S. 1995. 'Looking back at anger: cultural traditions and metaphorical patterns.' In J. R. Taylor & R. E. MacLaury (eds.), *Language and the Cognitive Construal of*

the World (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 82), Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 153–79.

Hamilton, R. 2016. 'The Metaphorical Qualities of Cool, Clear, and Clashing Colours.' In W. Anderson*,* E. Bramwell, and C. Hough (eds.), *Mapping English Metaphor through Time*. Oxford University Press, pp. 97–114.

Kay, C., Roberts, J., Samuels, M., & Wotherspoon I. (eds.). 2009. *The Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Z. 2000. *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture and the Body in Human Feeling.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—. 2005. *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—. 2014. 'Context-induced variation in metaphor'. *Argumentum* 10, pp. 392–402.

Kurath, H. et al. (eds.) *Middle English Dictionary*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1952-2001.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. 2003 (1980). *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Lorenz, G. 2002. *Really worthwhile or not really significant?* A corpus-based approach to the delexicalization and grammaticalization of intensifiers in Modern English. In I. Wischer & G. Diewald (eds.), *New Reflections on Grammaticalization* (Typological Studies in Language 49), Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp. 143–61.

Ogasawara, S. 2013. 'Delexicalization and lexicalization of intensive adverbs: semantic change from intensity to speed.' *Studies in Pragmatics* 15, pp. 24–41.

Oxford English Dictionary (*OED*) *Online* 2000. Online at http://www.oed.com (Accessed April 1, 2018.)

Partington, A. 1993. 'Corpus evidence of language change: the case of intensifiers.' In M. Baker, G. Francis & E. Tognini-Bonelli (eds.),   *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 177–92.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Sinclair, J. 1992. 'Trust the text: the implications are daunting.' In M. Davies & L. Ravelli (eds.), *Advances in Systemic Linguistics*. London: Pinter, pp. 5–19.

Sylvester, L. 2010. 'The roles of reader construal and lexicographic authority in the interpretation of Middle English texts.' In M. E. Winters, H. Tissari & K. Allan (eds.), *Historical Cognitive Linguistics*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 197–219.

Tolkien, J. R. R. & Gordon, E. V. (eds.). 1967. *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, 2nd ed. rev. by N. Davis. Oxford: Clarendon.