



Cultural Models of the Body Parts HAND and HAIR in Hungarian Archaic Prayers

Judit BARANYINÉ KÓCZY

University of Pannonia (Veszprém, Hungary)
Institute for Hungarian and Applied Linguistics
baranyikoczy@gmail.com
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6685-7133>

Abstract. Body part names are productive sources of metaphoric and metonymic expressions, which constitute coherent constructions in the languages. These cognitive cultural models are subconsciously known to all cultural community members (D'Andrade 1992). In the paper, I explore how culture influences the conceptualizations of body parts. The theoretical framework is Cultural Linguistics (Sharifian 2017), which investigates cultural conceptualizations in language. The data and analysis presented here consider the uses of 'hand' and 'hair' metaphors and metonymies in Hungarian archaic prayers, which represent a specific subculture mingling elements of the Christian religion with other (pagan or shamanistic) belief systems. The corpus of the study is Erdélyi's collection of 321 archaic prayers (2013 [1976]), from which all representations of 'hand' and 'hair' are selected and conceptually analysed. The results show that 1) the figurative functions of the two body parts partly correspond to metaphors which are also found in secular Hungarian (e.g. HAND FOR HELP, HAND FOR CARE, HAND FOR ACTION); however, in the archaic prayers, they often take form in specific meanings (HAND FOR HELP TO GET INTO HEAVEN, HAND FOR PROVIDENCE, HAND FOR CONTROL); 2) their figurative uses strongly rely on cultural schemas which are attached to people and events. It is concluded that the body parts under consideration have fundamentally different cultural models in prayers than in secular usage.

Keywords: cultural conceptualizations, cultural linguistics, hair, hand, Hungarian, metaphor, schema

1. Introduction

Language testifies that the human body is one of the richest sources of experience utilized in conceptualization. The overarching theory that established this observation was the embodiment hypothesis (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Johnson 1987), proposing two important claims: a) abstract concepts are conceptualized

in terms of concrete concepts, which are perceived in our everyday physical experiences, and b) human beings understand the complex aspects of their experiences through their bodies (including its possibilities and constraints). It is a universal tenet that the very first experiences humans have about their environment is their own body; at the same time, the human body is not a culture-free object (Gibbs 2005). Linguistic, especially lexicographic studies show that due to the rich experience of body parts, they often serve as source domains to be applied to various aspects of human life, including abstract domains (Kövecses 2000, Sharifian et al. 2008). Body parts are extended to both external concepts (this division follows Kraska-Szlenk 2014) like OBJECTS or SPACE (*foot of the hill, back, heading, mouth of the cave*) and internal, or person-bound concepts like REASONING, EMOTIONS (which are often metonymical, e.g. *happy/sad eyes, hair rising, get under one's skin, raise an eyebrow*), CULTURAL VALUES (comprising of MORALITY, HONOUR, HOSPITALITY; about EYE and VISION, cf. Baranyiné Kóczy 2023), BEHAVIOUR, CHARACTER TRAITS, OR SOCIAL INTERACTIONS.

While the figurative use of body parts has raised considerable interest for cognitive and cultural linguists in recent years (e.g. Yu 2001, Sharifian et al. 2008, Maalej and Yu 2011, Baş and Kraska-Szlenk 2021, Baranyiné Kóczy and Sipőcz 2023), their intra-cultural specifics in terms of religious context or traditional folk-cultural context received considerably less attention. Even more peculiar is when the two are combined such as in the case of Hungarian archaic prayers (Erdélyi 2013 [1976]) reflecting the spiritual belief system of traditional folk communities, mingling elements of the Christian religion with other pagan or shamanistic belief systems.

This study aims to pinpoint the cultural conceptualizations of body parts in Hungarian archaic prayers (belonging to the Hungarian folk subculture) by examining Hungarian *kéz* 'hand' and *haj* 'hair' occurrences in the corpus of Erdélyi's collection of archaic prayers (2013 [1976]) and compares their figurative usages with secular usages of 'hand' and 'hair'.

2. Theoretical background

2.1. Cultural conceptualizations and cultural models of the body

The present research employs the theoretical framework of Cultural Linguistics, a multidisciplinary approach that investigates the dynamic interface between language, culture, and conceptualization (Sharifian 2017). This framework combines a cognitive semantic approach with other culture-related disciplines, which draw on elements of culture that anchor language data into the cognition of a cultural community. Cultural Linguistics asserts that cognition and conceptualization do

not only operate at the level of individuals, but they also engage with the cultural (collective) level of cognition. In this context, culture is defined as a specific worldview (beliefs, ideas, and values) that characterizes a group of people who live together in a particular social, historical, and physical environment and interpret their experiences in a more or less homogenous way (Sharifian 2017: 26). Its fundamental notion *cultural conceptualizations* is used as an umbrella term for a broad and diverse category involving various manifestations of cultural cognition in the forms of cultural schemas, categories, and metaphors (Sharifian 2011, 2017). Cultural conceptualizations can be found at different language levels and in extralinguistic phenomena, including rituals, emotions, nonverbal behaviour, and other instances where verbal and nonverbal representations coexist harmoniously.

Cultural metaphors are conceptual constructions based on cross-domain mappings embedded in cultural schemas related to folk medicine, worldview, or a spiritual belief system (Sharifian 2017: 4; cf. Kövecses 2015, Yu 2017). Cultural schemas, or “those pools of knowledge that contain a significant portion of meanings encoded in human languages” (Sharifian 2017: 52), are another branch of cultural conceptualizations. They include beliefs, norms, and expectations of behaviour, and they are apparent in the forms of various types of schemas, e.g. event schemas (like that of CHRISTMAS), emotion schemas (such as PRIDE, ANGER, and SHAME), or role schemas (e.g. gender roles). Cultural models are “presupposed, taken-for-granted models” that are shared among a group of individuals (Quinn and Holland 1987: 4), and they are thought of as the basic components of knowledge, organizing systems of concepts based on folk theories (religion, philosophy, or other belief systems) (e.g. Kövecses 2000, Yu 2001, Sharifian et al. 2008). Speaking of the human body, Yu asserts that: “cultural models set up specific perspectives from which certain aspects of bodily experience or certain parts of the body are viewed as especially salient and meaningful in the understanding of those abstract concepts” (Yu 2004: 683). The term “cultural model” is essential to the study of culture in cognitive anthropology (Quinn and Holland 1987, Shore 1996, Strauss and Quinn 1997), highlighting the unifying aspect of this conceptual knowledge shared by many individuals collectively (Ungerer and Schmid 2006). Sharifian stated in a previous article that “cultural models may encompass a network of schemas, categories, and metaphors” (2008: 339), though he later replaced this statement with “cultural conceptualizations” as a cover term for “cultural schema”, “cultural category”, and “cultural metaphor” (Sharifian 2017). “Cultural model” and “cultural schema” are concepts that are comparable in many ways; however, many researchers use the term “cultural schema” for specific types of conceptual content (like role schema), while they prefer the term “cultural model” when referring to the systematic nature and complexity of cultural-conceptual creations made up of different kinds of cultural conceptualizations. This direction is likewise taken by the current study.

2.2. Cultural models, folk culture, and sacrality

The three thematic pillars of the present study manifest in three interacting themes: the nexus of body and folk culture, the nexus of sacrality and folk culture, and the nexus of body and sacrality. In the Hungarian context, the first two have already been studied, but the third one, concerning the “cultural models of the BODY in traditional Hungarian folk communities”¹ is yet to be explored. Perhaps the only available literature in a cultural-cognitive framework is Lajos (2021), who explored the intra-cultural variation of the conceptualization of EYE based on interviews with senior villagers of Csíkszentdomokos (collected by Balázs 2009) on traditional views of sexual life in villages. She found that the EYE is primarily extended to MORALITY and CONTROL, which shows that the monitoring and enforcing moral standards and confrontation with their violation were central to the community. She also unveiled a culture-specific version of the UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING metaphor: (IMMORAL) KNOWLEDGE IS EYE/VISION because the expression ‘one’s eyes opened up’ was used by the interviewees partly linked to the disapproval of sex education in schools and partly to the condemnation of new norms of behaviour that go hand in hand with social development, which was viewed as a threat to values of the traditional world (Lajos 2021: 226).

The second pillar, sacrality and Hungarian folk culture, has been investigated by Szelid (2021), who observed the traditional folk model of LOVE in peasant communities and found that it is morality-based due to the conceptualization of LIFE as having the transcendental and the terrestrial spheres inseparably united, where the continuity of life was a central element. It followed from this that at the heart of the traditional folk model of love was the need to ensure the continuity of life, which was understood on two levels: in the procreation and in the attainment of eternal life as the reward of a virtuous life. Love and marital love were, therefore, inextricably linked to HOLINESS.

The third theme, the nexus of body and sacrality, has not been addressed in Hungarian. Although SPIRITUALITY, a highly cultural concept, is described with far less frequency in the embodiment literature (Pattillo 2023), there are some remarkable results concerning other cultures. Some studies explored the locus of SPIRIT/SOUL and found it in the HEART in various languages (for a summary, cf. Baranyiné Kóczy and Sipőcz 2023: 32–33), including Old English (Geeraerts and Gevaert 2008), Turkic languages like Kazakh (Abdramanova 2023), Serbian (Prodanović Stankić 2023), but also in the BELLY in Kuuk Thayorre (Gaby 2008). Furthermore, the HEART was identified as the SEAT OF SPIRITUALITY in Christianity (Pattillo 2023) and in Islam (as opposed to secular usages in Tunisian Arabic and Persian; cf. Maalej 2008, Sharifian 2008). Using a corpus of Christian music, Pattillo (2023) highlights substantial

1 Tánczos (2015) provides a list of metaphorical body-related expressions collected in Csíkszentmihály (Mihăileni, Romania).

differences between the modern American English Christian model of the HEART and its secular usages (cf. Niemeier's (2000) categories for HEART metaphors), showing that the basic distinction is that in Christianity, the HEART is God-oriented, symbolizing both the humanity and sacrificial love of Jesus Christ (commonly referred to as the *Sacred Heart*). In contrast, in secular usage, the HEART is either self- or love-oriented, being symbolic of romantic love. Furthermore, instead of EMOTIONS dominating in *heart* metaphors, within Christian music, CHARACTER dominates, where emotions associated with the heart are primarily positive. She draws on the example of 'burning heart', which has a negative meaning in secular English, but in the Christian model, it stands for experiencing God's presence in humans' lives.

Following the discussion of the interconnectedness of body, sacrality, and culture, the goal of this paper is to pinpoint the cultural conceptualizations of the body in Hungarian archaic prayers (belonging to the Hungarian folk subculture) by focusing on two body parts, HAND, and HAIR, and to find out how they correspond to secular Hungarian. The aim is to identify further how culture plays a role in embodied cognition and answer the following research questions:

- a. How are HAND and HAIR conceptualized in the archaic prayers?
- b. What differences exist in HAND and HAIR conceptualizations in religious and secular usages?
- c. How do these findings contribute to understanding culture's role in embodiment?

3. Corpus and methodology

The corpus data of the study comprises prayers from Erdélyi's collection (2013 [1976]) *Hegyet hágék, lőtőt lépék. Archaikus népi imádságok* [I climbed a mountain, I stepped into a valley: Archaic folk prayers], which includes 321 texts selected from approx. 6,000 prayers collected between 1968 and 1972. The ethnographer Erdélyi claims that the prayers exhibit a mixture of "magic, religion, myth, archaic beliefs, Christianity, medieval, baroque, east-west; Byzantium, Rome; canonical, apocryphal, deviant, heretical" (2013 [1976]: 13). The texts are divided into three categories according to the belief system they represent:

- 1) mixed consciousness (spells/incantations, protection spells, apotropaic spells);
- 2) Christian consciousness (grouped by the stages of the Passion of Christ);
- 3) texts with links to medieval ecclesiastical literature.

In the prayers, because of the diversity of their archaic and dialectical forms, the lexemes *kéz* 'hand' and *haj* 'hair' were manually selected and conceptually analysed. Due to the limited scope of the study, only the main branches of cultural conceptualizations are presented via a few text examples.

For a brief overview of the secular usages of *HAND* and *HAIR*, I have collected phrases, idioms, and proverbs from two dictionaries (Bárczi and Országh 1959–1962, Szemerkenyi 2009) in order to identify the main trends of figurative usages of *HAND* and *HAIR*. Apart from locating the specific cultural metonymies and metaphors (which are presented in the *A FOR B* form referring to their metonymical grounds, and generally metaphonymic – a transition between metaphor and metonymy-status; cf. Goossens 1990), I also grouped them to name the generic target concepts (domains) of conceptual metaphors and metonymies following Lakoff and Johnson’s Conceptual Metaphor Theory (1980).

4. Data analysis

4.1. Metaphorical and metonymical extensions of *HAND* and *HAIR* in secular Hungarian

Based on the two dictionaries, in secular usage, the *HAND* is commonly extended to an *INSTRUMENT OF ACTIVITY/WORK*, *HELP/CARE*, *POSSESSION*, *CONTROL*, *FIGHT/CONFLICT*, *INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP*, and *EMOTIONS* (Table 1). These metaphors/metonymies are similar to the ones found in various languages: *HAND IS AN INSTRUMENT FOR POSSESSION*, *HELP*, *WORK*, *POWER/CONTROL* (Kraska-Szlenk 2014: 29–30), but some of the cultural metaphors and the expressions themselves are specific to Hungarian, e.g. *kéz alatt elad* ‘selling sth below hands’ utilizes the *HAND FOR SECRET ACT* metonymy, where the visibility of the transfer is mapped onto the overtness of the action, and vice versa.

Table 1. Metaphors and metonymies of *HAND* based on Bárczi and Országh (1959–1962) and Szemerkenyi (2009)

Target domains	Metaphors and metonymies	Hungarian example	English translation
ACTIVITY/WORK (CAUSE FOR EFFECT)	HAND FOR ACTIVITY	<i>ölbe tett kézzel vér tapad a kezéhez</i>	hands on one’s lap = inactive blood on one’s hands
	HAND FOR WORK	<i>ügyes kezű lyukas a keze minden arannyá válik a kezében</i>	dexterous hands having a hole in one’s hand everything turns to gold in one’s hands
	HAND FOR FREEDOM (OF ACTION/DECISION)	<i>meg van kötve a keze szabad kezet kap</i>	one’s hands are tied getting free hands
	HAND FOR SECRET ACT	<i>kéz alatt elad</i>	selling sth below hands
	(CLEAN) HAND FOR MORAL ACT	<i>mossa kezeit</i>	washing one’s hands
HELP/CARE	HAND FOR HELP	<i>a jobb keze valakinek</i>	being one’s right hand
	HAND FOR CARE	<i>leveszi a kezét vkiről/vmiről</i>	taking one’s hands off sb or sth

Target domains	Metaphors and metonymies	Hungarian example	English translation
POSSESSION	HAND FOR POSSESSION	<i>kiengedi a kezéből lecsapja a kezéről</i>	letting sth out of one's hands slapping sth off one's hand
CONTROL	HAND FOR CONTROL	<i>rát teszi a kezét a vagyontra kézben tart valamit kezébe veszi a sorsát</i>	putting one's hands on the asset keeping sth in one's hand taking one's fate in sb's hands
FIGHT/CONFLICT	HAND FOR FIGHT	<i>fel a kezekkel kezet emel rá</i>	hands up (command) raising one's hand to sb = hitting sb
INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP	HAND FOR AGREEMENT, COMRADESHIP, RECONCILIATION, MARRIAGE/UNITY	<i>kéz a kézben kezet rá! békülő kezét nyújt kézfogó</i>	hand in hand = in agreement take my hand! giving a forgiving hand hand-holding = engagement
	HAND FOR GREETING	<i>kezet nyújt neki kezet csókol</i>	gives him a hand kisses her hand
EMOTIONS	HAND FOR SURPRISE, ANGER, GRATITUDE, ANXIETY	<i>összecsapja a két kezét ökölbe szorítja a kezét összeteszi a két kezét tördeli a kezét</i>	claps his two hands together clenches his fists clasps his two hands together wrings his hands
PHYSICAL SPACE	HAND FOR PROXIMITY	<i>keze ügyébe esik</i>	falls into his hands

The conceptualizations of HAIR are connected to FIGHT/CONFLICT, FORCE, EMOTIONS, PERSONALITY TRAITS, TIME, and AMOUNT (Table 2). It should be highlighted that the HAIR FOR PERSONAL TRAITS is the most productive, where the quality of one's hair signifies one's age, gender, or internal characteristics.

Table 2. *Metaphors and metonymies of HAIR based on Bárczi and Országh (1959–1962) and Szemerkenyi (2009)*

Target domains	Metaphors and metonymies	Hungarian example	English translation
FIGHT/CONFLICT	DAMAGING ONE'S HAIR FOR FIGHT/CONFLICT	<i>Haja szála sem görbül meg</i>	Not a strand of one's hair curls
	GRABBING ONE'S HAIR FOR FIGHT/CONFLICT	<i>Hajba kap valakivel</i>	grabbing someone's hair
FORCE	PULLING BY THE HAIR FOR FORCE	<i>hajánál fogva előráncigált</i>	dragged by the hair = artificially made up [argument, objection]
	LOSING HAIR FOR MENTAL EFFORT	<i>nem sok haja hullott ki a tudományokért</i>	he hasn't lost much hair for the sciences = for learning
EMOTIONS	GREY HAIR FOR ANXIETY	<i>Sok ősz hajat szerez a bú-gond</i>	Sorrow brings much grey hair
	TEARING ONE'S HAIR FOR ANNOYANCE	<i>Tépi a haját</i>	tearing one's hair

Target domains	Metaphors and metonymies	Hungarian example	English translation
PERSONAL TRAITS	FRIZZY HAIR FOR DISHONESTY (HAIR FOR BEAUTY)	<i>Fodor a haja, sík a szája</i>	His/her hair is frizzle, and his/her mouth is flat
	LONG HAIR FOR WOMEN (WOMEN FOR POOR LOGIC SKILLS)	<i>Hosszú haj, rövid ész</i>	Long hair, short brain
	HAIR FOR LUCK	<i>Haja nőne, ha kopasz lenne is</i>	His hair would grow even if he were bald
	HAIR FOR AGE	<i>Az ősz haj dudazaj, de a ránc már nem tánc</i>	The grey hair is a bagpipe, but wrinkles are no longer a dance
TIME	GROWTH OF HAIR FOR TIME	<i>Tar gyermeknek még megnő a haja</i>	A bald child will grow hair = there is still time for change
AMOUNT	AMOUNT OF HAIR FOR AMOUNT	<i>Annyi van, mint a hajam szála</i>	There are as many as strands of my hair

4.2. Cultural conceptualizations of HAND in the archaic folk prayers

Most of the figurative usages of HAND represent it as a spiritual bond between God and man, the saints and man, generally, between the terrestrial and celestial world. These archaic prayers concern the issue of man's desire to get into heaven and gain salvation. In this context, HAND is loaded with various figurative meanings depending on the event schema. In some texts, the event schema SALVATION is depicted, where the scenario is the following: a man approaches the Virgin Mary for her to extend her helping hand and lead him (the one who prays or another one) into heaven by holding their hands (1–2). Mary's HAND (and BOSOM also) represents her CARE for humans, which is further specified to THE HAND (OF A SACRED BEING) TO HELP MAN TO GET INTO HEAVEN.

(1) <i>Nyiccs kaput, angyal, Nyújcs kezét, Mária, Hogy mennyek bé boldog mennyszágba.</i>	Open the gate, angel, Stretch out your hand, Mary, That I may enter the happy heaven. ²
(2) <i>Szerelmes Szent Anyám, Boldogságos Szűz Mária, Ha olj kedves néked a bűnös lélek, Ereszd mennyszágba, Örök boldogságba, Fogd szent kezedbe, Tedd szent kebledre, Vidd föl a Paradicsomba.</i>	My beloved Holy Mother, Blessed Virgin Mary, If the sinful soul be so dear to you, Let him go to heaven, To everlasting bliss, Take him in your holy hands, Place him on your holy bosom, Take him up to Paradise.

2 The translations from Hungarian literature are my own throughout the article, J. Baranyiné Kóczy.

However, Mary similarly approaches Jesus.

(3)	<i>Fiam, fiam, fényes fiam, Nyújcsd kezedet, Hadd mennyek Úr színe látni</i>	My son, my son, my shining son, Stretch out your hand, Let me go Before the Lord
-----	--	---

HAND has other roles in the event schema of SALVATION: HAND holds the KEY TO HEAVEN/SALVATION (4) or HELL/DOOM (5). However, the KEY has different meanings in the examples; in (4), it is the assurance of SALVATION “bought” by repeating a certain prayer twice a day, and in this way, the key is given into the hand of man. This conceptualization can be linked to the secular metaphor HAND FOR POSSESSION, where the possessed entity is the abstract concept of ETERNAL LIFE (HAND FOR THE POSSESSION OF SALVATION). However, the KEY stands for JUDGMENT in (5), where St Peter as God’s servant holds the key. This text indirectly represents the HAND FOR JUDGMENT extension because only God’s hand can judge humans.

(4)	<i>Mondom, mondom, bizonyal mondom, Aki ezt az imáccságot este, reggel elmongya, Kezibe adom a mennyország kúcsát,</i>	I tell you, I tell you, I certainly tell you, He who says this prayer in the evening and in the morning, I give into his hand the keys of heaven,
(5)	<i>Aki aptyát, annyát megverte, Én nem verem meg, csak gondoltam, Fogd, Szent Péter, a kezedbe a kujcsokat, Mutasd néki a hosszú, széles, poros utakat, Amerre az ördögök a pokolba járnak.</i>	Those who beat his father or his mother, I didn’t beat them, I just had it in mind, St Peter, take the keys in your hands, Show him the long, wide, dusty roads, Where the devils go to hell.

Similar to (5), THE HAND appears as a means of God’s JUDGMENT, which is specified to the negative meaning of DAMNATION/DOOM in (6): while GOD’S HAND stands for DOOM, taking back his hand means MERCY. The conceptualization of judgment elaborates the HAND FOR CONTROL/POWER metonymy.

(6)	<i>Könyörülvén, Űristen, Ki mondád a népedet Öldöklő angyalnak, Vond vissza kezedet.</i>	Mercifully, O Lord, Who judged your people As slaying angels, Take back your hand.
-----	--	---

Although related to doomsday and the theme of SALVATION, JESUS’S HAND has a different function from JUDGMENT in (7): it serves as a reference point for the RIGHT/LEFT SIDE and PROXIMITY of man to God. Being located on the right-hand side of

Jesus on the Day of Judgement is the equivalent of gaining salvation. In this event schema, the degree of proximity to Jesus is proportional to the degree of spiritual proximity to God. It follows from this that the concepts of SIDE and PROXIMITY are also interconnected with JUDGMENT.

(7)	<i>Engedd, Jézus, Hogy én a te választottid közibe számlálhassak az ítélet napján is, Jobb kéz felől Mária, Krisztus anyja, Boldogságos Szűz Mária!</i>	Let me, Jesus, That I may be counted among your chosen ones on the day of judgment, On the right hand, Mary, Mother of Christ, Blessed Virgin Mary!
-----	---	--

However, Jesus's HAND is often represented as providing CARE or PROVIDENCE for man throughout their lives. In (8), man seeks Jesus's help to look after him, his livestock, and his properties. The HAND is figuratively located above everything under God's care, providing PROTECTION like a shelter. The meaning of HAND can also be connected to CREATION (cf. the parallel of "*az ő keze alatt, / Teremtése alatt*" (everything under his hand, under his creation), where the HAND stands for CREATION (note that here God is substituted by Jesus), indicating that living beings or material properties of human needs under his hand are ensured providence because they are all God's creations.

(8)	<i>A Názáretbeli Jézus tartson meg münköt! A Szentlélekisten ereje oltalmazjon meg münköt! Hazánkot, határinkot, hajlékunkot, lakásunkot Családunkot, állatainkot és mindent ami az ő keze alatt, Teremtése alatt, őrizjön meg minden veszedelemtől.</i>	May Jesus of Nazareth keep us! May the power of God, the Holy Spirit, protect us! Our country, our borders, our dwelling, our home Our family, our animals, and everything under his hand, under his creation, keep us from all harm.
-----	--	---

The metaphor HAND FOR CARE is observed when Jesus entrusts Mary to Apostle John to take care of her after His death. John takes Mary by the hand and leads her away from the spot that causes pain to her. Therefore, spatial distancing represents a decrease in sorrow (9).

(9)	<i>János, kedves tanítványom! Az én édesanyámra legyen gondod! Kezinél fogva messze vezesd el a keresztfától, Ne lássa, hogy mit szenvedek!</i>	John, my dear disciple! Take care of my mother! Take her by the hand and lead her far from the cross, Let her not see how I suffer!
-----	---	---

Another metonymy is connected to the apostles' hands in (10). When Jesus commissions them to proclaim God's kingdom, they are commanded to hold a SWORD and a ROD in their hands on their mission; the first one is used to FIGHT for Christianity, and the second is to EVANGELIZE or teach people. The underlying metonymy is, therefore, HAND FOR ACTION.

(10)	<i>Szent Pál és Szent Péter, Ne szánakozzatok, ne bánakozzatok énrajtam, [...] Hanem fogjatok a jobb kezetekbe kardot, A balba pegyig pálcát, És menjetek a széles világra, hirdessétek: [...]</i>	St Paul and St Peter, Have no pity on me, have no sorrow for me, [...] But take the sword in your right hand, In your left hand, a rod, And go into the wide world and proclaim:
------	--	---

Some cultural conceptualizations of HAND are connected to the event schema of JESUS CHRIST'S PASSION. Jesus is often depicted on the cross in a specific position with his head down, legs outstretched, and hands folded, showing his acceptance of sacrifice and surrender (11). Another variant is hands/arms outstretched, which depicts Jesus's sorrow more intensively (12). In both images, the hand can be linked to various figurative functions, the most obvious being HAND FOR (IN) ACTIVITY and HAND FOR SACRIFICE.

(11)	<i>Kire Krisztus Urunk szent fejét lehajtotta, Szent lábát kinyújtotta, Szent kezét összetette, Szent szemét békunytta, Szent vérént kiontottta, Öt sebét kinyitotta.</i>	Onto whom Christ our Lord bowed his holy head, He stretched out his holy feet, His holy hands were folded, His holy eyes were closed, He shed his holy blood, He opened his five wounds.
(12)	<i>Feje lehajtva, Szíve szomorodva, Két orcája meghervadva, Két keze ki van terjesztve, Öt mélységes sebe elejbe van terjesztve.</i>	His head down, His heart saddened, His two cheeks stiffened, His two hands outstretched, His five deep wounds spread in front.

In Jesus's Passion, the hands of the Jewish leaders who sought to arrest him are represented as a means for having power over him according to the HAND FOR POWER/CONTROL metaphor (13).

(13)	<i>Hirdessed az én keserves kényyaimat, mert én holnap álla délkor pokolzsídók kezikbe adatom magamat.</i>	Proclaim my bitter pains, for tomorrow at noon I will deliver myself into the hands of the Jews of hell.
------	--	---

Overall, the HANDS represented in the archaic prayers belong to both terrestrial and celestial beings, and their current figurative meanings depend on the context, namely, the event schemas (MAN'S SALVATION, JESUS CHRIST'S PASSION). The two most essential target concepts are JUDGMENT and CARE, imbued with specific meanings in archaic prayers, such as DIVINE SALVATION/DOOM and PROVIDENCE.

4.3. Cultural conceptualizations of HAIR in the archaic folk prayers

In the cultural conceptualizations of HAIR, Jesus Christ's hair is depicted as part of his TORTURE and HUMILIATION during his Passion, while Mary's hair represents MOURNING, GLORY, or an OBSTACLE that prevented her from protecting his Son.

The torture of Jesus Christ is represented by some typical schematic elements, including ripping and pulling his hair out, which is both painful and humiliating (14). HAIR is a metonymical reference to his TORTURE (DAMAGING HAIR FOR TORTURE), which is interesting because this detail is highlighted in the whole process of torture.

(14)	<i>Mert megfogták Jézust A kegyetlen zsidók, Kőoszlophoz kötözték, Vasustorokva ustorozták, Szent haját szálanként szaggatták.</i>	For they have taken Jesus The cruel Jews, They tied him to a stone pillar, They scourged him with iron whips, They ripped his holy hair out strand by strand.
------	--	---

Another image is when Jesus is dragged by the hair (15), and his head is raked by an iron rake (16), both of which profile the painfulness of his Passion and which are only present in folk cognition but absent from the Bible. Using the rake instead of the comb indicates human rudeness, symbolizing the contrast between the holiness of Jesus and sinful man.

(15)	<i>Szent hajadnál fogva harmincszor vonattál</i>	You [Jesus] were dragged by your holy hair thirty times
(16)	<i>Szent fejét vasgerebljével gerebljézik</i>	His holy head is raked with an iron rake

The hair is further represented along with the beard; both pulled during his torture.

(17) <i>Jézus a Gecemáni kertbe, Vasvesszőkkel vesszőzik, Szent haját húzgálják, Szent szakállát tipálják</i>	Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane, They wave him with iron rods, They keep pulling his holy hair, They keep plucking at his holy beard
---	---

Mary's hair has an entirely different meaning in the prayers. First of all, it is much more figurative and has no Biblical evidence as a basis. One pivotal conceptualization is HAIR FOR VISUAL OBSTRUCTION, which is represented as a cause or excuse that prevented her from protecting Jesus (18).

(18) <i>Mér sírsz, mér rísz, Boldogságos Szűz Mária? Hogyne sírnék, hogyne rínék, Mikor még a hajamat fésültem Szent Fiamat elvesztettem</i>	Why do you weep, O blessed Virgin Mary? Of course, I weep, of course, I weep, When I was combing my hair I lost my holy Son
--	---

According to the traditional folk belief (Kálmány 1885), when combing her hair, Mary let her hair down, which prevented her from seeing Jesus arrested by the Roman officers. There were several folk beliefs connected to Mary's hair washing on Holy Thursday:

"The Blessed Virgin always wore a bonnet, but only when she was washing her hair on Holy Thursday came the news from Mary Magdalene that Jesus Christ had been arrested; then, she could not even tie her head; in the meantime, her hair got stuck in a branch, so from then on she always wore the bonnet on her head" (Kálmány 1885: 10).

In other contexts, Mary is presented with her hair down, having three distinct meanings. In connection with death, it symbolizes her MOURNING at the death of Jesus (19), following the Hungarian folk customs of mourning, when women who wore their hair put up in a bun let their hair down as a sign of grieving (Dömötör 1990: 86).

(19) <i>Szive szomorodvan vig kedve meg szegven szen füle meg fügesztven haja meg eresztven</i>	Her heart grieving her joyful mood disheartened her holy ears drooping her hair let down
---	---

Again, the following conceptualization is grounded in folk traditions, namely, ritual practices connected to burial positions. In her burial position and dressing, Mary's hair is let down, and her prayer book is in her hands (HAIR DOWN FOR DEATH). However, the hair spread around her body also serves as a robe of glory, which

protects her from Satan's temptation (HAIR FOR PROTECTION). Mary had blond (*sárig* 'yellow') hair in the Hungarian tradition.

(20) <i>Távozz, Sátán, távozz, ne kíséj te engem, Mer' ha én e' menek a fekete föld alá, Kiterjesztem sárig bodor hajamat, Kezembe veszem világszoltár kiskönyvit [...]</i>	Go away, Satan, go away, do not tempt me, For if I descend under the black earth, I'll spread my yellow wavy hair, I'll take my little book of psalms into my hand [...]
--	---

Finally, Mary's GLORY is represented by her blond hair let down in the highly mythical scenes of (21) and (22), where she is pictured while praying or reading the Bible. These texts emphasize the holiness of Virgin Mary, who is depicted as a queen, her hair surrounding her (again) as a robe of glory. Her blond hair and golden belt show her SHINING, metaphorically representing HOLINESS.

(21) <i>Én kilépek én ajtómból, Ott találok egy kápolnát, Kivül fényes, belül irgalmas, Abban van a boldogságos Szüz Mária Arany haját leereszti, arany övét megoldozza</i>	I'm stepping out of my door, There I find a chapel, Bright on the outside, merciful on the inside, There's the blessed Virgin Mary She lets down her golden hair, She loosens her golden belt
(22) <i>Fehér rózsza, Mária Űl a Paradicsomkertbe', Leereszti sárgaszínű bodor haját, Így olvassa a világok oltárját</i>	White Rose, Mary Sitting in the Garden of Paradise, Letting down her yellow wavy hair, She is reading the altar of the worlds

5. Discussion and conclusions

The overview of the cultural conceptualizations of body parts in archaic prayers shows that they have different linkages to metaphors and metonymies in standard Hungarian. Three basic classes can be identified: common ones, similar ones with specific instantiations, and culture-specific ones. An example of common conceptualization is the HAND FOR CARE, specifically in the sense of TAKING ONE'S HAND FOR CARING, as observed in the scene when Jesus entrusts Mary to the Apostle John. Another group is where the folk cultural conceptualizations are grounded in metaphor/metonymy present in secular Hungarian, but a more certain sense is given to them in the prayers. Such an example is the HAND FOR HELP, represented in the context of salvation and restricted to MARY'S HAND AS HELP FOR MAN TO GET INTO

HEAVEN. Another example is the metaphor GRABBING/DAMAGING ONE'S HAIR FOR FIGHT/CONFLICT in secular Hungarian, which is used in a more concrete sense in the folk prayers; namely, the CONFLICT is focused on Jesus's arrest and TORTURE, and his hair is not damaged with the intention of fighting or winning but to inflict pain and humiliation. The third cluster involves figurative usages only present in prayers, such as the cultural conceptualizations connected to the Virgin Mary's hair: HAIR (DOWN) FOR MOURNING/DEATH/GLORY.

Regarding the figurative usages of the HAND, as *Table 3* shows, they are varied, and they belong to various terrestrial and celestial figures. However, they are worth analysing primarily as anchored to particular event schemas. Most can also be linked to secular metaphors/metonymies of HAND. Apart from having a much more restricted and specified meaning, they are also interconnected in many ways; one example is HAND FOR SIDE/PROXIMITY, which also refers to JUDGMENT in the prayers

Table 3. *Figurative extensions of HAND in the archaic prayers, their corresponding extensions, and cultural schemas involved*

HAND belonging to...	CULTURAL CONCEPTUALIZATIONS IN THE ARCHAIC PRAYERS	CORRESPONDING SECULAR EXTENSIONS	EVENT SCHEMAS
Virgin Mary / Jesus	HAND FOR HELP FOR A MAN TO GET INTO HEAVEN	HAND FOR HELP	SALVATION, LAST JUDGMENT
man	HAND FOR THE POSSESSION OF SALVATION	HAND FOR POSSESSION	
God (St Peter)	HAND FOR JUDGMENT HAND FOR DOOM TAKING BACK HIS HAND FOR MERCY	HAND FOR CONTROL/ POWER	
Jesus	HAND FOR SIDE HAND FOR PROXIMITY	HAND FOR JUDGMENT HAND FOR SIDE HAND FOR PROXIMITY	
God/Jesus	HAND FOR CARE/PROVIDENCE HAND FOR CREATION	HAND FOR CARE HAND FOR ACTION	PROVIDENCE
Apostles Apostles	HAND FOR FIGHT (FOR CHRISTIANITY) HAND FOR EVANGELIZING	HAND FOR ACTION	EVANGELIZATION
Jesus	HAND FOR (IN)ACTIVITY HAND FOR SACRIFICE	HAND FOR ACTION ? HAND FOR UNITY	JESUS CHRIST'S PASSION
Jews	HAND FOR POWER/CONTROL (OVER JESUS)		

The cultural conceptualizations of HAIR show a rather different model. Only one of them has a corresponding secular version, which suggests that these conceptualizations, especially the ones related to Virgin Mary, are only grounded in Hungarian folk cognition. Moreover, some of these metonymies have a stronger link with a figure, i.e. the role schema of JESUS or MARY, rather than with an event schema.

Table 4. *Figurative extensions of HAIR in the archaic prayers, their corresponding extensions, and cultural schemas involved*

HAIR belonging to...	CULTURAL CONCEPTUALIZATIONS IN THE ARCHAIC PRAYERS	CORRESPONDING SECULAR EXTENSIONS	ROLE SCHEMA	EVENT SCHEMA
Jesus	DAMAGING HAIR FOR TORTURE	DAMAGING HAIR FOR CONFLICT	JESUS	JESUS CHRIST'S PASSION
Virgin Mary	HAIR FOR (VISUAL) OBSTRUCTION		VIRGIN MARY	JESUS CHRIST'S PASSION
	HAIR (DOWN) FOR MOURNING			
	HAIR (DOWN) FOR DEATH			
	HAIR (DOWN) FOR GLORY			

The present study shows that the comprehensive analyses of the figurative extensions of body parts in secular and folk religious contexts are very different, not only in terms of their results but also in terms of their methodology. Not only can it be said that the cultural conceptualizations in archaic prayers are more specific than their general Hungarian counterparts, but they cannot be investigated as independent linguistic data only in relation to different cultural schemas (event schemas or role schemas). Furthermore, their different manifestations of the same conceptual category (e.g. HAND FOR CARE) are often filled with entirely different semantic content: CARE from God's perspective (i.e. providence) is far from John's taking care of Mary.

Another issue that could not be addressed in the paper is the concept of "figurativeness" in the folk prayers. Mary washing her hair on Holy Thursday or having it let down in her grave may be considered a reality and not a figurative expression for the members of folk communities. However, further analysis is needed to delve deeper into the conceptualizations of body parts in a folk religious context.

References

- Balázs, Lajos. 2009. „Amikor az ember nincs es ezen a világon.” *Paraszti nemi kultúra és nemi erkölcs Csíkszentdomokoson* [“When You Are Not Even in This World.” Peasant Sexual Culture and Sexual Morality in Csíkszentdomokos]. Miercurea Ciuc: Pallas Akadémia Kiadó.
- Baranyiné Kóczy, Judit. 2023. Cultural conceptualizations of sight and cultural values: A contrastive analysis of Hungarian vision verbs. In Judit Baranyiné Kóczy–Rita Brdar-Szabó (eds), *Perception, Culture and Language. Special Issue of Cognitive Linguistic Studies* 10(2): 313–342.

- Bárczi, Géza–László Országh, eds. 1959–1962. *A magyar nyelv értelmező szótára I–VII*. [Dictionary of the Hungarian Language. Vol. I–VII]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Baş, Melike–Iwona Kraska-Szlenk, eds. 2021. *Embodiment in Cross-linguistic Studies: The ‘Eye’*. Leiden: Brill.
- D’Andrade, Roy G. 1992. Schemas and motivation. In Roy G. D’Andrade–Claudia Strauss (eds), *Human Motives and Cultural Models*, 23–44. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dömötör, Tekla, ed. 1990. *Magyar néprajz VII. Népszokás, néphit, népi vallásosság* [Hungarian Ethnography. Vol. VII: Folk costume, folk belief, and folk religion]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Erdélyi, Zsuzsanna. 2013 [1976]. *Hegyet hágék, lőtőt lépék. Archaikus népi imádságok* [I Climbed a Mountain, I Stepped into a Valley: Archaic Folk Prayers]. Budapest: Kalligram Kiadó.
- Geeraerts, Dirk–Caroline Gevaert. 2008. Hearts and (angry) minds in Old English. In Sharifian, Farzad–René Dirven–Ning Yu–Susanne Niemeier (eds), *Culture, Body, and Language: Conceptualizations of Internal Body Organs across Cultures and Languages*, 319–348. Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gibbs, Ray. W. 2005. *Embodiment and Cognitive Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goossens, Louis. 1990. Metaphonymy: The interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1(3): 323–340.
- Kálmány, Lajos. 1885. *Boldogasszony ősvallásunk istenasszonya* [Virgin Mary, the Goddess of Our Ancient Religion]. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2000. *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture and the Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, George–Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago–London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lajos, Katalin. 2021. “Nem tudnak újjal rámutatni:” A test a szexualitásról való beszéd csíkszentdomonkosi frazeológiájában [“No-one can point their fingers at her:” The body in the phraseology of talking about sexuality in Sândominic]. In Katalin Lajos–Judit Pieldner (eds), *Zsuzsa könyve. Tanulmányok Tapodi Zsuzsa születésnapjára*, 217–227. Cluj-Napoca: Erdélyi Múzeum Egyesület.
- Maalej, Zouheir. 2008. The heart and cultural embodiment in Tunisian Arabic. In Farzad Sharifian–René Dirven–Ning Yu–Susanne Niemeier (eds), *Culture, Body, and Language: Conceptualizations of Internal Body Organs across Cultures and Languages*, 395–428. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Maalej, Zouheir–Ning Yu, eds. 2011. *Embodiment via Body Parts: Studies from Various Languages and Cultures*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Niemeier, Susanne. 2000. Straight from the heart: Metonymic and metaphorical explorations. In Antonio Barcelona (ed.), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads. A Cognitive Perspective*, 195–213. Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Pattillo, Kelsie. 2023. The sanctity of English ‘heart’. In Judit Baranyiné Kóczy–Katalin Sipőcz (eds), *Embodiment in Cross-linguistic Studies: The “Heart”*, 267–283. Leiden: Brill.
- Prodanović Stankić, Diana. 2023. “My heart is dancing with joy”: Cultural conceptualizations of the heart in Serbian. In Judit Baranyiné Kóczy–Katalin Sipőcz (eds), *Embodiment in Cross-linguistic Studies: The “Heart”*, 284–300. Leiden: Brill.
- Quinn, Naomi–Dorothy Holland, eds. 1987. *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sharifian, Farzad. 2011. *Cultural Conceptualizations and Language: Theoretical Framework and Applications*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- 2017. *Cultural Linguistics*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Sharifian, Farzad–René Dirven–Ning Yu–Susanne Niemeier, eds. 2008. *Culture, Body, and Language: Conceptualizations of Internal Body Organs across Cultures and Languages*. Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Shore, Bradd. 1996. *Culture in Mind: Cognition, Culture, and the Problem of Meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Strauss, Claudia–Naomi Quinn. 1997. *A Cognitive Theory of Cultural Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Szelid, Veronika. 2021. Szerelem és szentség: A magyar népköltészet és népművészet kognitív nyelvészeti megközelítésben [Love and Sanctity: Hungarian Folk Poetry and Folk Art in a Cognitive Linguistic Approach]. In Laura Iancu (ed.), *A moldvai magyarság kutatása a 21. században. Tanulmányok Domokos Pál Péter tiszteletére* [Research on the Moldavian Hungarians in the 21st century. Studies in Honour of Péter Pál Domokos], 203–234. Budapest: ELKH Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, Néprajztudományi Intézet.
- Szemerényi, Ágnes. 2009. *Szólások és közmondások* [Proverbs and Idioms]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.
- Tánczos, Vilmos. 2015. Az emberi testre és a testiségre vonatkozó metaforikus kifejezések Csíkszentkirály szókincsében [Metaphorical expressions of the human body and carnality in the vocabulary of Sâncrăieni]. *Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Közlemények* (59)2: 118–148.
- Ungerer, Friedrich–Hans-Jorg Schmid. 2006. *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. London–New York: Routledge.
- Yu, Ning. 2001. What does our face mean to us? *Pragmatics and Cognition* 9(1): 1–36.
- 2004. The eyes for sight and mind. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36(4): 663–686.