

Dobiášová, Sarah

[Kövecses, Zoltán. **Extended conceptual metaphor theory**]

Theory and Practice in English Studies. 2021, vol. 10, iss. 2, pp. 37-41

ISSN 1805-0859 (online)

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/145108>

License: [CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 International](#)

Access Date: 16. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

REVIEWS,
CONFERENCE REPORTS

BOOK REVIEW

Zoltán KÖVECSES: *Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2020.

Sarah Dobiášová

ZOLTÁN Kövecses's interest in the pervasiveness of metaphor in everyday language spans decades. His work on this topic is extensive and detailed. It builds directly on the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), proposed by Mark Johnson and George Lakoff in the 1980s, develops their ideas, and provides a deeper understanding of the production processes and use of figurative devices in everyday, non-poetic language. Kövecses' long-standing interest in the topic has produced a number of monographic publications. *Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory*, published by Cambridge UP in 2020, can be regarded as a culmination of efforts of a renowned and focused linguist who explores his point of interest in a thorough and systematic way and is able to present his conclusions efficiently and persuasively to the broader academic public.

The book consists of a preface and eight chapters. It also contains a considerable number of figures in order to make the ideas, expressed throughout the book, more accessible and transparent. The individual chapters are organized in such a way as to address both a knowledgeable researcher and, at least to a certain extent, a novice to the theory. Chapter 1, entitled "A Brief Outline of 'Standard' Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Some Outstanding Issues," is meant as a succinct introduction to the topic, a summary of previous work on the topic, and a personal view of the author on the current state of research in this area. The titles of Chapters 2 to 6 are articulated in the form of questions (e.g., "The Abstract Understood Figuratively, the Concrete Understood Literally, but the Concrete Understood Figuratively?", "Direct or Indirect Emergence?", "Domains, Schemas, Frames, or Spaces?" etc.) which suggests that each of them is dedicated to a different problem of metaphor generation and use in everyday language. Chapters 7 and 8 ("The Shape of the Extended View of CMT" and "By Way of Conclusion: Responses to the Five Questions") present Kövecses' conclusions, supported by a number of very illustrative examples, and summarize, once again, his responses to some of the questions of metaphor research, which he considers fundamental and crucial for further development of the theory. Therefore, the publication forms a unified whole, starting with the old and thoroughly explaining the new.

Chapter 1, “A Brief Outline of ‘Standard’ Conceptual Metaphor Theory” starts with explaining the main tenets of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), as proposed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson in their seminal publication *Metaphors We Live By* (1980). Besides mentioning their initial definition of conceptual metaphor, Kövecses proposes his own, more technical definition of the phenomenon. He also stresses the fact that metaphor is not just a matter of language, but, perhaps more importantly, also a matter of thought. Thus, the so-called conceptual mappings such as LIFE IS A JOURNEY, ANGER IS FIRE and THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS can be regarded as slogans that can guide our thinking about the corresponding concepts.

In Chapter 2, “The Abstract Understood Figuratively, the Concrete Understood Literally, but the Concrete Understood Figuratively?”, Kövecses challenges the concrete-to-abstract orientation of the “Standard” CMT, as proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). In traditional terms, conceptual mapping involves transferring some of the features of a concrete entity (i.e., source domain) to an abstract entity (i.e., target domain) in order to present it in a more accessible and tangible way. In other words, conceptual mapping, whose output is linguistically presented in the form of a metaphorical expression, has been predominantly presented as unidirectional. However, as Kövecses asserts, abstract entities themselves can serve as source domains. For example, SMELL, a very frequent source domain for a number of conceptual mappings, such as SUSPICION IS SMELL and BAD IS SMELLY, appears, at the same time, as a target domain in metaphorical expressions such as *The air was filled with a pervasive smell of chemicals.* and *The cottage has a musty smell.*, which are realizations of the conceptual mappings SMELL IS A SUBSTANCE and SMELL IS AN OBJECT, respectively. As Kövecses points out, SMELL, in this case, plays the role of a target domain. With the help of innumerable examples, Kövecses finally arrives at a radical claim: One of the traditional assumptions of the CMT, namely that we understand abstract as concrete is void as both concrete and abstract entities can, at least to a certain extent, function as source domains and target domains to create different conceptual mappings.

In Chapter 3, “Direct or Indirect Emergence?”, Kövecses discusses one of the most basic claims of the CMT, namely that primary metaphors emerge directly from our most basic embodied experiences. In his view, many of these metaphors do not emerge directly, but through the so-called metonymic stage. For example, Kövecses explores the relationship between metonymy and metaphor, as observed in expressions such as *He is in low spirits.* Despite being analyzed predominantly as metaphorical, the origins of the expression lie in some of the most typical bodily responses to the emotion of sadness: drooping posture, bowed head, and lowered eyesight. This claim

that many figurative expressions, analyzed as metaphorical, have emerged via a metonymical stage, is fully in line with similar claims of other researchers working in this area (e.g., Grady 2005).

As Kövecses asserts in many of his recent publications, conceptual mapping, i.e., the transfer of some of the features of a source domain, concrete or abstract, to a target domain, has a complex internal structure. In Chapter 4, “Domains, Schemas, Frames or Spaces?”, he presents a detailed description of the frame-like structure of the process and seeks to answer the following question: What is (are) the appropriate conceptual structure/unit (or structures/units) involved in conceptual metaphors? There is considerable terminological confusion in the way the individual structures/units are being referred to by different researchers. Kövecses is successful in removing this confusion in that he designs a stage-like structure of metaphor production. He exemplifies the process by tracing the production of the conceptual mapping JOHN BUILDING A CAREER IS JOHN BUILDING A HOUSE, which can be realized linguistically in metaphorical sentences such as *John is slowly building his career in the company*. The mapping of one concept to another starts at the most schematic level of image schemas (COMPLEX ABSTRACT SYSTEMS ARE OBJECTS), proceeds first to the domain level (A COMPLEX ABSTRACT SYSTEM IS A PHYSICAL OBJECT/BUILDING), and later to the frame level (THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SYSTEM IS BUILDING PROCESS), ending at the level of mental spaces (JOHN BUILDING A CAREER IS JOHN BUILDING A HOUSE), which is the least schematic of all of the proposed levels. Kövecses introduces a plethora of additional examples that prove the usefulness of the proposed framework as different parts of the schema might play different roles in the creation of linguistic metaphors in our everyday language.

In Chapter 5, “Conceptual or Contextual,” Kövecses moves away from the structural analysis of the mapping processes to contemplate the wider context of metaphor use. One of his objections to the “Standard” CMT is that it presents conceptual mapping as an exclusively cognitive phenomenon, uninfluenced by the context in which it is produced or employed. However, in Kövecses’ view, context, or, in Sperber and Wilson’s (1995) terms, mutual cognitive environment, influences the production, comprehension, and use of metaphorical expressions. As in the preceding chapter, Kövecses makes efforts to systematize the knowledge of all of these contextual factors. In line with his previous research, he recognizes four types of contextual factors which might influence the production, comprehension, and use of linguistic metaphors: situational, discourse, conceptual-cognitive and bodily. In this way, the notion of context, as taken into account by the proponents of the “Standard” CMT, is

broadened because it has traditionally been only the bodily context that has been considered to directly influence the form and interpretation of linguistic metaphors.

In Chapter 6, “Offline or Online?”, Kövecses explores what is happening in figurative expressions, produced in real-life discourse. He maintains that such online use of non-literal language adds an additional layer of meaning to the offline use of a conceptual metaphor. To be more precise, although many metaphorical expressions rely on many of the widely spread conceptual mappings (e.g., LIFE IS A JOURNEY), the actual, online use of individual linguistic metaphors involves much more. From a pragmatic point of view, a particular linguistic metaphor may be employed to fulfill a specific discourse function or to deliver a specific emotion. In relation to this, Kövecses pays special attention to two related phenomena: metaphor mixing and conceptual integration. According to Kövecses, metaphor mixing is an interesting and under-explored phenomenon of metaphor use in actual discourse. Apparently, a piece of discourse on a particular topic is not just filled with metaphors making use of a single source domain to talk about a selected target domain. Instead, the selected target domain can be referred to by means of several, very often unrelated, source domains, a process that results in the creation of a mixed metaphor, tailored to suit the particular purposes of the target discourse. Throughout this chapter, Kövecses displays continuous support for Grady’s (2005) view that two of the most prominent conceptual theories, the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) and the Conceptual Integration Theory (CIT), deemed incompatible and opposing for a long time, should be regarded as complementary instead.

In the final two chapters, Kövecses consolidates his views on the state of the CMT and summarizes his ideas, expressed throughout the publication. The shape of his new perspective on the way conceptual mappings are established by the speakers of a language is outlined in Chapter 7, entitled “The Shape of the Extended View of CMT.” In contrast to the “Standard” CMT, Kövecses discusses not only the de-contextualized establishment of conceptual mappings but also stresses the necessity to focus on the online use of figurative language, which is heavily influenced by the context. In order to better analyze the pairings of the source and target domains in both conventional and novel conceptual mappings, Kövecses presents a unified framework, comprising four levels of analysis, each level differing from the other in the degree of its schematicity. This analytical apparatus, when used consistently, might help researchers to capture the complex reality of metaphor production, use, and comprehension. In Chapter 8, “By Way of Conclusion: Responses to Five Questions,” Kövecses presents his answers to the questions, outlined in the introductory parts of the publications, and suggests new paths for further research.

Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory is undoubtedly a significant contribution to the ongoing research on conceptual metaphor. Its worth is even greater if we consider the plethora of similarly-oriented publications that have been published over the forty years of the existence of the CMT. Kövecses' monograph presents a unified approach to the analysis of conceptual metaphor and, in contrast to the "Standard" CMT, enlarges the scope of the analysis by taking the wider context of the actual realizations into account. Thus, Kövecses opens a brand-new field of research for researchers working in the same area. For novices to the theory, the book is written in a very accessible and precise language; new ideas are presented with the help of a multitude of examples. The author makes constant reference to the seminal publications of the field, both his own and written by other, equally influential, researchers. As such, the book is by no means meant as an introductory textbook but requires either a knowledgeable reader or someone, who is willing to supplement missing knowledge by referring back to the other publications, mentioned in the text. However, the book is undoubtedly an indispensable assistant for everyone who wants to do research on figurative language using an up-to-date and thought-out approach to the analysis of conceptual metaphor in a wide variety of texts.

Bibliography

- Grady, Joseph E. 2005. "Primary Metaphors as Inputs to Conceptual Integration." *Journal of Pragmatics* 37: 1595–614.
- Johnson, Mark, and Lakoff, George. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: Chicago UP.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2020. *Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sperber, Dan, and Wilson, Deidre. 1986/1995. *Relevance Communication and Cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Sarah Dobiášová, Masaryk University
dobiasova@mail.muni.cz



This work can be used in accordance with the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license terms and conditions (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode>). This does not apply to works or elements (such as images or photographs) that are used in the work under a contractual license or exception or limitation to relevant rights.

