

Revisiting Common Source and Target Domains in Conceptual Metaphors in a Sample of English Fiction: Implications for Literacy Practices and Advanced EFL Pedagogy

Nasim Layegh*, Yaser Hadidi, Mohammad Zohrabi

University of Tabriz, Iran

Corresponding author: Nasim Layegh, E-mail: nasimlayegh@yahoo.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: April 11, 2020

Accepted: July 20, 2020

Published: July 31, 2020

Volume: 8 Issue: 3

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

ABSTRACT

Metaphor research has always been conducted with various purposes in mind, among which the diachronic analysis of metaphor variation in discourse is outstanding. The current work followed a qualitative research mould to analyze the use of conceptual metaphors within the two novels *Persuasion* and *The Fault in Our Stars*, belonging to 19th and 21st centuries, respectively. To this end, a framework of common source and target domains proposed by Zoltán Kövecses was adopted. The analysis was conducted using the Metaphor Identification Procedure, a reliable method for marking metaphorically used words (Pragglejaz Group, 2007). The majority of the identified source and target domains in the two samples were identical, supporting the common domains in the framework, although some novel domains were also identified. With the support found for these common source and target domains and their being expected to repeat prominently in different advanced literary and semi-literary genres, the present analysis resonates with important implications for upper-intermediate and advanced EFL pedagogy, as well as teachers and syllabus designers, when literature-text, as part and parcel of the upper-intermediate EFL context, is introduced to the classroom.

Key words: Metaphor, Fiction, Diachronic Variation, Source Domain, Target Domain, EFL Pedagogy

INTRODUCTION

An inseparable component of human life and language, metaphor is simply defined as “understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003, p. 6). A simple example of metaphor use is seen when William Shakespeare (2011, p. 83) uses the phrase “All the world’s a stage”. Our attempt to understand this sentence engages us in pursuit of conceptual metaphors, in which we face two distinct conceptual domains, including our underlying conceptualizations of what a *WORLD* is and our conceptualizations and ideas of what a *STAGE* of theater is. In this way, we begin to make sense of the *WORLD* in terms of a *STAGE*.

Metaphors have a profound influence on how people think and behave (Thibodeau et al., 2017). In spite of the enormous bulk of research dedicated to the study of various aspects of metaphor, there remains a great deal of insights yet to be gained. An interesting aspect of metaphor to be investigated is studying conceptual domains of metaphor across time periods. Kövecses (2010a) believes that language changes constantly, and there is a possibility that the linguistic and conceptual metaphors change over time. It was with respect to this scarcity of studies on source and target domains of conceptual metaphors across time periods

that the present study was undertaken. Diachronic study of metaphor is an under-researched area (Mischler, 2013) and this particular study was intended to contribute a small brick to the body of knowledge in this field. Kövecses (2010a) outlined the most common source and target domains, a framework that we applied to samples from two established novels *Persuasion* (1818) and *The Fault in Our Stars* (2012), belonging to two disparate time periods, aiming to explore the common source and target domains employed by the authors and running them against Kövecses’s outline. The aim was to see whether the use of source and target domains in metaphorical conceptualization fluctuates over time as the constancy or variation of this might have implications for metaphor use and conceptualization in human language and particularly the language of language learner. To the best of the researchers’ knowledge, no particular study has tried to apply Kövecses’s framework to natural works of art, namely novels which belong to distant time periods.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

What Is Metaphor?

Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) was first introduced in George Lakoff and Mark Johnson’s seminal book *Metaphors*

We Live By (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) and then revised by 2003 in a second edition. Kövecses (2010a, p. 4) defines *metaphor* as “understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain”, where a *conceptual domain* refers to “any coherent organization of experience”. In line with Cameron (2003, p. 11), “a domain is not just a collection of concepts or entities”, but it also consists of “the relations between the entities”. A domain is “a background knowledge structure which includes related words, concepts, and inferences” (Nabeshima, 2017, p. 123). Following this definition, any metaphor includes two conceptual domains. The domain from which linguistic metaphorical expressions borrow to make sense of the other (target domain) is called the *source domain*, while the more abstract harder-to-understand domain (needing to be) understood and communicated in this way is called the *target domain*. For instance, in an explicit metaphor like LOVE IS A JOURNEY, we have *JOURNEY* as the source domain and *LOVE* as the target domain. Therefore, the main function of metaphors is to allow us to use more concrete domains to understand abstract concepts (Jamrozik, McQuire, Cardillo, & Chatterjee, 2016).

The two domains are “quite distinct and distant from each other” (Goatly, 2002, p. 72). What connects these two domains is “a set of systematic correspondences” or *mappings* between them (Kövecses, 2010a, p. 7). Mappings are paths along which meaning is transferred from one domain to another. The distinguishing characteristic of source and target domains is that the source domain is generally concrete and physical while the target domain is mostly abstract (Kövecses, 2010a; Lakoff & Johnson, 2003; Nabeshima, 2017). In the example mentioned, LOVE is a more abstract concept than JOURNEY, and it is LOVE that stands in need of being communicated and conveyed in discourse, to the audience, by recourse to a conceptual metaphor, i.e. to a more tangible source domain. So in this sense, and from a semiotic point of view, a conceptual metaphor is a ‘sign’, a coin with two sides. This accounts for the validity of conceptual metaphor theory from both a Cognitive Linguistics standpoint (which was its main parent discipline), and a semiotic one. The theory has also attracted discourse analytic accounts and support, as well as ones from Pragmatics.

Metaphor and Learning

The role of metaphor as a communication tool which can overcome our cognitive limitations is undeniable in education (Sticht, 1993). Metaphors can potentially convey a lot more than what is on the surface and their power in creating vividness and imagery can well contribute to the memorability of concepts. More often than not, we opt for conceptual metaphors because the abstract elusive target concept, even if lexicalized, cannot convey the full force and communicative discursive impact intended by the speaker in a situation. There is a consensus that the importance and place of all this cognitive engagement, from the upper-intermediate levels and beyond, will obviously need to be imparted to the learners.

Metaphorical thinking leads students to engage in analytical thought processes, which in turn leads to the facilitation

of learning (Sticht, 1993). As claimed by Philip (2006, p. 895), “there is strong evidence to suggest that encouraging students to reflect on the metaphorical origins of figurative expressions makes learning and recall of vocabulary demonstrably more effective”. A study conducted by Pearson et al. (1981) confirmed the facilitative role of metaphor on comprehension and recall of metaphorical texts in comparison with literal texts.

Metaphor Universality and Variation

Based on claims made by cognitive linguists, metaphors are grounded in embodied experience (Kövecses, 2019; Gibbs, 2017). It follows that a great number of metaphors are found in genetically unrelated and remote languages and cultures. However, there is a great degree of metaphor variation across languages, cultures, and even individuals as well. For example, although metaphors like LOVE IS A JOURNEY or LIFE IS A JOURNEY are found consistently in a wide variety of languages and cultures, these nearly universal metaphors are elaborated at a specific level within different languages or cultures (Kövecses, 2000, 2005).

Overview and Purpose

Metaphor analysis of literary texts has presented the field with insightful findings. Metaphors have the power to reveal the subjective views and beliefs of the writers in literary texts. They result in creation of novel and complex textual patterns (Dorst, 2011). As claimed by Weisberg (2012, p. 42), “[I]terary metaphors can transport a reader into exotic, uncharted conceptual realms”. Yamina (2016) examined the use of metaphor and the motive behind using this device in the novel *Hard Times* by Charles Dickens. She concluded that Dickens uses metaphor to portray his characters and the setting in a lively and vivid manner. The motive behind his use of metaphor is to convey his thoughts and opinions to the reader, and increase the comprehension and the memorability of the text. Moreover, Andreev and Fomicheva (2016) investigated metaphorical language in a corpus of contemporary fiction, concluding that analyzing metaphor in a work of fiction “can throw significant light on its subject and theme” (Andreev & Fomicheva, 2016, p. 263).

Diachronic study of metaphor has also attracted the attention of metaphor enthusiast. Gentner and Grudin (1985) investigated the evolution of mental metaphors over a period of 90 years by tracing changes in the kinds of metaphors used for describing mental phenomenon. They concluded that the nature of the mental metaphors changes over time. Boers (1999) conducted a case study of HEALTH domain used to conceptualize the abstract domain of socio-economics, with the aim of examining its variation over time. The procedure involved counting the instances of HEALTH metaphor in the editorials of all the weekly issues of *The Economist* over a period of ten years. The frequency results pointed to the popularity of the HEALTH metaphor in winter times because of its saliency in this season. Musolff (2017) discussed the metaphor NATION IS A BODY. In his attempt to examine the use of Body-State analogy across centuries,

Musolff (2009) noted that conceptualization of a state as the human body does not decline. However, it can get extensions and complexity as a result of context-related necessities.

In addition to these studies, Trim (2011) investigated diachronic universality of language of emotions, especially that of love. Through a corpus-assisted approach, Mischler (2013) conducted a diachronic study on metaphorical conceptualization of ANGER, particularly *blood* and *spleen* metaphors, an interesting result of which was that “the blood and spleen metaphors were prototypical forms of anger” during the studied period (Mischler, 2013, p. 161). Finally, to investigate the history of emotions and related metaphors, Izdebska (2015) examined how ANGER is represented in Old English. In discussing the influence of Latin on Old English, Izdebska (2015) emphasized the predominance of ANGER IS HEAT metaphor.

The literature reveals a scarcity of research regarding the diachronic study of metaphor. In this particular regard, the framework of common source and target domains offered by Kövecses (2010a) has not been applied to any written discourse in an explicit way. The argument here is that, should Kövecses's common source and target domains are seen here to largely overlap in two established representations of English fiction produced two centuries apart, syllabus designers and teachers engaged with upper-intermediate EFL groups of learners and beyond, should move to integrating such awareness into such classes, a cognitive awareness that the Applied Linguistics research on metaphors frequently and amply refers to (Zanotto et al., 2008).

METHOD AND FRAMEWORK

Aside from some simple quantitative reports in terms of frequency counts, this study is a descriptive qualitative text analysis. The samples analyzed, chosen through random purposive selection, are *Persuasion* by Jane Austen (1818) and *The Fault in Our Stars* by John Green (2012). Random purposive sampling both reflects the properties of the text being analyzed and is more rigorous given the constraints on manual analysis, which meant that, in order to achieve the commensurate criterion of practicality, every tenth page of each novel was picked for analysis, which amounted to 40 pages. The results of the analysis were checked against the outline of the most common source and target domains by Kövecses (2010a), which appears in Appendix A.

Data Analysis

The present analysis took place at the *theory level*. The researchers looked for the potentiality of a linguistic expression in triggering a conceptual mapping. Moreover, the analysis followed an inductive or bottom-up approach, in that all of the cases were analyzed on a one-by-one basis.

The analysis was conducted in two phases: linguistic analysis, and conceptual analysis. First, the instance of linguistic metaphors was determined following Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) proposed by the Pragglejaz Group (2007) and later referred to as Metaphor Identification Procedure VU University Amsterdam (MIPVU) (Steen et al., 2010). Decisions

were then made about the existence of comparable conceptual domains which might be linked by a set of cross-domain mappings. The two domains were established in the form of A IS B, following the original and pace-setting conceptual metaphor theory by Lakoff (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980 & 2003).

MIP is “an explicit, reliable, and flexible method” (Pragglejaz Group, 2007, p. 2). Below is an illustration of the steps followed in the identification of metaphorically used words based on stages indicated by Pragglejaz Group (2007, p. 3). To represent the process, a single sentence taken from the sample of *Persuasion* is provided along with its detailed analysis. In order to apply the method, all the steps of the basic procedure of MIP were followed along with a consideration of the guidelines provided by MIPVU.

Step 1: The researchers read the entire novel in order to have a grasp at general idea of the story. The following sentence used for illustrating the steps of analysis is part of the context in which Anne and Admiral Croft, two characters in *Persuasion*, have had a conversation, but Anne is not satisfied with the information she wished to draw from this conversation, and she perceives it to be useless to ask for more details.

Step 2: In the second step, attempt was made to determine the lexical units in the text as follows:

/ Anne / did / not / receive / the / perfect / conviction / which / the / Admiral / meant / to / convey/, but / it / would / have / been / useless / to / press / the / enquiry / farther /. (Austen, 1818, p. 207)

In this sentence, four lexical units have been identified as metaphorically used, namely *receive*, *convey*, *press*, and *farther*. Applying the third step of MIP to these words, the following results are yielded.

Step 3: This step consists of determining the contextual and basic senses of the lexical units:

RECEIVE

- 3.a. **Contextual meaning:** ‘to react to something in a particular way’ (Macmillan sense 3)
- 3.b. **Basic meaning:** ‘to get something that someone gives or sends to you’ (Macmillan sense 1)
- 3.c. **Contrast:** The basic meaning is more concrete and concerns movement and action while the contextual meaning is more abstract and concerns behavior and feelings.

Step 4. Comparison: We can make sense of “understanding” and “reacting” in terms of movement.

CONVEY

- 3.a. **Contextual meaning:** ‘to communicate ideas or feelings indirectly’ (Macmillan sense 1)
- 3.b. **Basic meaning:** ‘to move someone or something from one place to another’ (Macmillan sense 3)
- 3.c. **Contrast:** The basic meaning is more concrete and concerns movement while the contextual meaning is more abstract and concerns communication.

Step 4. Comparison: We can understand communication in terms of movement.

PRESS

- 3.a. **Contextual meaning:** ‘to try in a determined way to make someone do something or tell you something’ (Macmillan sense 1)

3.b. Basic meaning: ‘to push one thing against another’ (Macmillan sense 3)

3.c. Contrast: The basic meaning is more concrete and concerns force while the contextual meaning is more abstract and concerns convincing and persuading someone.

Step 4. Comparison: We can understand making someone do something in terms of physical forces.

FARTHER

3.a. Contextual meaning: ‘more’ (Macmillan sense 3)

3.b. Basic meaning: ‘in or to a place that is more distant’ (Macmillan sense 1)

3.c. Contrast: The basic meaning is more concrete and concerns distance while the contextual meaning is more abstract and concerns amount of something.

Step 4. Comparison: We can understand amount of something in terms of distance.

After identifying metaphorically used lexical units, the second phase of the analysis was to identify the source and target domains of a particular metaphorical lexical unit. This phase was conducted on the basis of the researchers’ intuitions, and this is the tradition that has been followed in all metaphor studies. However, the process was not a fully subjective one since the information obtained from the first phase equipped the researchers well enough to decide upon the domains. This phase is demonstrated below for each lexical unit.

RECEIVE

Target domain: COMMUNICATION

Source domain: MOVEMENT

Conceptual metaphor: COMMUNICATION IS MOVEMENT

A sub-metaphor of this more general metaphor is the conceptual metaphor IDEAS ARE OBJECTS.

CONVEY

Target domain: COMMUNICATION

Source domain: MOVEMENT

Conceptual metaphor: COMMUNICATION IS MOVEMENT

Here, communicating one’s ideas is described in terms of physical movement. A sub-metaphor can be the conceptual metaphor IDEAS ARE OBJECTS.

PRESS

Target domain: COMMUNICATION

Source domain: FORCE

Conceptual metaphor: COMMUNICATION IS FORCE

In this context, the basic meaning of the lexical unit *press* signifies *force*, while it has been used metaphorically to signify asking questions in communication. Thus, communication is understood in terms of physical force.

FARTHER

Target domain: AMOUNT

Source domain: PATH

Conceptual metaphor: AMOUNT IS A PATH

Here, the amount of enquiry is conceptualized in terms of distance, or more concretely, in terms of a path. Therefore, amount is understood in terms of a physical path.

Identifying the conceptual domains of each metaphorical expression was followed by running them against

the common source and target domains in Kövecses’s framework. The purpose was to see if the identified domains overlap those outlined by Kövecses (2010a). If they do, and given the ubiquity of conceptual metaphors in almost all genres to some extent as attested by the literature, then EFL pedagogy at upper-intermediate contexts and beyond, especially in terms of tasks involving reading and writing, would need to integrate some awareness raising of these conceptual domains and their important role in negotiation of meaning into tasks, conscious raising work, and strategy-based moments of teaching (Wong & Nunan, 2011; Christison, 2003).

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS

Source Domains of Persuasion and The Fault in Our Stars

Table 1 maps out the source domains identified in the two samples of English fiction from two disparate time periods, i.e. *Persuasion* and *The Fault in Our Stars*. The source domains not outlined by Kövecses in his common source and target domains are marked in italics.

The outsider domains, those outside Kövecses’s proposal that appeared only once or twice in the samples, are presented in Table 2.

Target Domains in Persuasion and The Fault in Our Stars

The target domains identified in the two samples of English fiction are presented in Table 3, with those lying outside common target domains shown in italics.

Some of these non-common target domains were found to occur only once or twice. This says a lot about why and how Kövecses argues on the basis of all previous CMT research that these “common” source and target domains designate human cognition’s recourse to experiential and bodily bases as source domains to express a commensurately limited but limited cognitive intangible experience. In other words, a (seemingly) limited (but vast) cognitive range of abstract experience (including thoughts, feelings, and opinions) stand in need of lexicalization and semiotic packaging by using analogy to certain experiential and tangible counterparts in bodily experience or sheer embodiment if they are to be communicated and lexicalized and conveyed at all in real-time discourse. This leads to the observation that these common source and target domains that a lot of research in CMT also attest to are basic to both abstract cognition and concrete cognition. The non-common target domains occurring in both novels at only a single frequency of instance are presented in Table 4.

To shed light on the use of metaphor in the samples taken from *Persuasion* and *The Fault in Our Stars*, a number of examples have been provided in Appendix B. These examples include the sentences taken from the samples alongside interpretations to manifest the source and target domains involved in the metaphor (Please see Appendix B).

Table 1. Source domains of conceptual metaphors in the novels *Persuasion* and *The Fault in Our Stars*

Novel	Source domains of conceptual metaphors	f
<i>Persuasion</i>	THE HUMAN BODY	10
	HEALTH AND ILLNESS	15
	ANIMALS	4
	PLANTS	4
	BUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION	8
	MACHINES AND TOOLS	7
	GAMES AND SPORTS	6
	MONEY AND ECONOMIC TRANSACTIONS	13
	COOKING AND FOOD	5
	HEAT AND COLD	11
	LIGHT AND DARKNESS	8
	FORCES	31
	MOVEMENT AND DIRECTION	103
<i>The Fault in Our Stars</i>	CONTAINERS	152
	SUBSTANCES/PROPERTIES OF SUBSTANCES	21
	OBJECTS/PROPERTIES OF OBJECTS	105
	PERSON	39
	PERCEPTION	51
	ACTIONS	12
	PATH	21
	WAR	10
	PLAYS	2
	ORGANIZATIONS	1
	LIFE	1
	THE HUMAN BODY	4
	HEALTH AND ILLNESS	4
<i>The Fault in Our Stars</i>	ANIMALS	8
	PLANTS	4
	BUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION	9
	MACHINES AND TOOLS	4
	GAMES AND SPORTS	4
	MONEY AND ECONOMIC TRANSACTIONS	10
	COOKING AND FOOD	5
	HEAT AND COLD	7
	LIGHT AND DARKNESS	4
	FORCES	11
	MOVEMENT AND DIRECTION	85
	CONTAINERS	57
	SUBSTANCES/PROPERTIES OF SUBSTANCES	7
<i>The Fault in Our Stars</i>	OBJECTS/PROPERTIES OF OBJECTS	60
	PERSON	46

(Contd..)

Table 1. (Continued)

Novel	Source domains of conceptual metaphors	f
	PERCEPTION	10
	ACTIONS	15
	PATH	7
	WAR	12
	MEDICINE/DRUGS	2
	NATURAL RESOURCES	1
	STARS	1

Table 2. Non-common source domains

Novel	Source domain	f
<i>Persuasion</i>	PLAYS	2
	ORGANIZATIONS	1
	LIFE	1
<i>The Fault in Our Stars</i>	MEDICINE/DRUGS	2
	NATURAL RESOURCES	1
	STARS	1

DISCUSSION

The Case of Source Domains

Totally, 24 source domains were identified in the samples of *Persuasion* and *The Fault in Our Stars*. All 13 of the source domains listed by Kövecses appeared in the samples alongside 11 further domains, most of which were identical in both. The ones lying outside of the framework occurred at varying frequencies, some more frequently than others. The frequent ones have been referred to and discussed elaborately in the literature on metaphor; Kövecses (2010a) has named some of these as further source domains. The low-frequency ones (at 1 or 2 instances) can have originated from the authors' personal creativity.

Through comparing the source domains identified in these two novels from two distinct historical eras of English fiction, it was observed that 21 out of 24 source domains were the same in both samples, irrespective of the frequency and supporting the same 'relative' universality of cognitive experience and conceptualization that Kövecses and others talk about. Similarly, this might also suggest that human conceptualization of various concepts in terms of particular source domains has not changed significantly over time. A large number of existing conceptual metaphors are well-known and have been widely used in a speech community (Kövecses, 2010a). Therefore, it is not beyond expectation that a large portion of the domains identified belong to the conventional domains known to be in use in a particular culture over a long period of time.

Studies conducted by scholars such as Kövecses (1995, 2017) have proved that there exist some universal conceptual metaphors found in all languages and cultures. The reason for universality is basic embodied experience usually referred to

Table 3. Target domains of conceptual metaphors in the novels *Persuasion* and *The Fault in Our Stars*

Novel	Target domains of conceptual metaphors	f
<i>Persuasion</i>	EMOTION	59
	DESIRE	6
	MORALITY	54
	THOUGHT (IDEAS)	126
	SOCIETY/NATION	7
	POLITICS	8
	ECONOMY	7
	HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS	23
	COMMUNICATION	17
	TIME	70
	LIFE AND DEATH	4
	RELIGION	9
	EVENTS AND ACTIONS	109
	AMOUNT	28
	PERSON	16
	CHARACTERISTICS	10
	VOICE/SOUND	4
	OBJECTS	4
	THE WORLD	1
	BUILDINGS	1
	FOOD	1
	THE HUMAN BODY	1
<i>The Fault in Our Stars</i>	EMOTION	19
	DESIRE	4
	MORALITY	12
	THOUGHT (IDEAS)	57
	SOCIETY/NATION	6
	POLITICS	5
	ECONOMY	4
	HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS	5
	COMMUNICATION	9
	TIME	38
	LIFE AND DEATH	22
	RELIGION	5
	EVENTS AND ACTIONS	59
	AMOUNT	29
	PERSON	13
	CHARACTERISTICS	9
	VOICE/SOUND	4
	OBJECTS	10
	THE WORLD	1

(Contd..)

Table 3. (Continued)

Novel	Target domains of conceptual metaphors	f
	BUILDINGS	1
	FOOD	1
	THE HUMAN BODY	8
	MEDICINE	1
	ILLNESS	14
	PLANTS	1
	BUSINESS	1

Table 4. Non-common target domains

Novel	Target domain	f
<i>Persuasion</i>	THE WORLD	1
	BUILDINGS	1
	FOOD	1
	THE HUMAN BODY	1
	<i>The Fault in Our Stars</i>	
	THE WORLD	1
<i>The Fault in Our Stars</i>	BUILDINGS	1
	FOOD	1
	MEDICINE	1
	PLANTS	1
	BUSINESS	1

as *embodiment* (Kövecses, 2014). According to Gibbs (2006, p. 3), “human cognition is fundamentally shaped by embodied experience” and this embodied experience shapes the way we think and use language. Embodiment is a universal phenomenon in a sense that our basic human experiences are common to all human beings. For instance, people all over the world and from the very early times of existence experience heat and pressure when they are angry. This is why anger is universally and conventionally conceptualized in terms of heat, yielding the universal metaphor ANGER IS HEAT. Universality can also be defined in terms of time periods. That is, it can refer to the existence of some conceptual metaphors in all time periods.

The important finding that 21 out of 24 of the source domains identified are identical in both samples is in line with the studies that have explored a particular conceptual metaphor within various languages or cultures. One of these studies is the one conducted by Kövecses (1995), which revealed that conceptualizing human beings as a container and emotions as fluid is present in highly distant languages including English, Chinese, Japanese, and Hungarian. By the same token, the fact that two samples from the same genre of literary language, albeit 2 centuries apart, are tapping into almost the same ‘cognitive template’ (Kövecses, 2005) is little wonder from this perspective, but diachronically it is very significant. Diachronic variation has been the subjective of cognitive linguistic studies, but the finding that these two time periods in the same genre evidence diachronic

consistency of cognitive conceptualization speaks of a much more solid and rooted existence of metaphorical thought patterns in a culture and the genres branched off therein. What would complement this current study and this observation is future work using a number of languages and samples of literary work in them spanning a diachronic scale of, say, the same two centuries, to see to what extent the conceptual domains used show up in these samples from the same literary genre in all these languages.

There were also a very limited number of source domains in either sample that did not tally with the sources identified in the other one. They include the domains of PLAYS, ORGANIZATIONS and LIFE in the sample of *Persuasion*, and the domains of MEDICINE/DRUGS, NATURAL RESOURCES and STARS in the sample of *The Fault in Our Stars*. There are two points worth noting about these non-matching source domains. First, these do not appear as common source domains in Kövecses's framework. Second, the frequency of occurrence of these sources was considerably low, with the frequency of one or two in the whole sample. This is suggestive of these source domains being the product and manifestation of the author's creative mind, in the online real-time literary discourse, in an attempt to add some variety, angle and color to the readers' comprehension process.

Variation and creativity can also be induced by context (Kövecses, 2010b, 2014, 2017). The role of the topic of the novel cannot be ignored in triggering creativity. For example, the use of the domain of MEDICINE/DRUGS as a source domain in the sample of *The Fault in Our Stars* is stimulated by the topic of the story, which revolves around an illness. Moreover, the immediate linguistic context is also highly influential in causing novelty (Kövecses, 2010b). The use of the metaphorical expression "Cancer kids are essentially *side effects* of the relentless mutation that made the diversity of life on earth possible." (Green, 2012, p. 22) is clearly motivated by the immediate linguistic context, which includes words like *cancer* as an illness, which belongs to the same category to which side effects of medicine belong.

Looking at these low-frequency and non-matching source domains as opposed to the common source domains listed in the original framework, it can be said that the non-matching domains mostly capture specific concepts. For example, the concept of STARS is not as general as the sources such as RELIGION or ECONOMY. This leads to the suggestion that these specific, non-matching source domains are instances of general source domains like SPACE in the case of STARS. What can be considered another line of future research would be to investigate whether the general source domains derived from specific instances do exist or not.

A further point to be discussed is that a number of the source domains identified, which appeared frequently in both samples, go beyond this framework. These include the domains of CONTAINERS, SUBSTANCES/PROPERTIES OF SUBSTANCES, OBJECTS/PROPERTIES OF OBJECTS, PERSON, PERCEPTION, ACTIONS, PATH, and WAR. In other words, the sources of CONTAINERS, SUBSTANCES/PROPERTIES OF SUBSTANCES, and OBJECTS/

PROPERTIES OF OBJECTS, as argued by Kövecses (2010a), are further sources which have been discussed in the literature on metaphor. For example, Kövecses (1990) offered an extensive discussion of the Container Metaphor. Johnson (1987) and Lakoff (1987) discussed the image schemas of CONTAINER and PATH (as cited in Hampe, 2005). These two sources as well as the source of OBJECTS have also been discussed by Boers (1999). Kövecses (2005) discussed the sources of SUBSTANCES, OBJECTS, PATH and WAR. The source domain of PERCEPTION has been mentioned in Kövecses (2010a) as a domain used for conceptualizing less-active aspects of thought. He has also discussed the conceptual metaphors POLITICS IS WAR, ARGUMENT IS WAR, and SPORT IS WAR, suggesting that the source domain of WAR is an active and common source domain used for conceptualizing a range of target concepts. Knowles and Moon (2006) talked about the source domains of WAR and PERCEPTION in terms of the conceptual metaphors ARGUMENT IS WAR, SPORT IS WAR, and UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING. The source domains of PATH, OBJECTS, and SUBSTANCES have also been noted of by Nabeshima (2017). Finally, Johannessen (2014) who examined the conceptual metaphors of *The Fault in Our Stars* has commented on the frequent use of the conceptual metaphor TREATING ILLNESS IS FIGHTING A WAR in this novel, something we came upon a lot too.

The source domain of ACTIONS is evident in the generic-level conceptual metaphor EVENTS ARE ACTIONS (Kövecses, 2010a). Comprehending external events as actions entails that we view events as produced by an agent. Actions have an agent, and viewing events in terms of actions entails that events have also an agent. This results in the personification of events (Kövecses, 2010a). The source domain of PERSON, which denotes a human being with his/her physical as well as non-physical characteristics, abounds in language. Employing the source domain of PERSON to conceptualize various target concepts results in Personification. This source domain has been discussed in various works such as Kövecses (2000), Lakoff and Johnson (2003), Knowles and Moon (2006) and Kövecses (2010a). In light of this extensive treatment in the literature of these important source domains lying outside Kövecses's common source domains framework, we believe it might be a good idea for Kövecses to consider incorporating more of these into a coherent framework for common source domains.

The Case of Target Domains

Overall, 22 and 26 target domains were identified in the samples of *Persuasion* and *The Fault in Our Stars*, respectively, with 22 target domains identical in both samples. All the target domains included by Kövecses's (2010a) common target domains were identified in the samples. Similar to diachronic consistency in borrowing from source domains over a relatively long time span of literary meaning-making in English, human metaphorical conceptualization of the meanings we 'intend' to convey, i.e. the target conceptual domains, has barely seen significant change over time. This is, of course, a more intuitive insight and a more natural case, in light of

the universality of human experiences and embodiment, as discussed before. It would be an intuitive thing to say that, when it comes to the meanings we ‘mean’ to express and conceptualize, human experience, cognition and affect are more resistant to change, even over time. One would expect to see them change only if something in the environment or context lies beyond our long-standing cultural heritage. But this, at least in literature, would not happen a lot. Again, this makes for a region of insights that can be explored further, i.e. diachronic variation in target concepts in culture, genres and cross-generically.

There were a number of target domains in the sample of *The Fault in Our Stars*, not observed in *Persuasion*. They include such target domains as MEDICINE, ILLNESS, PLANTS, and BUSINESS. Similarly to the case of the source domains above, these non-matching target domains lie outside Kövecses’s framework. Except for the target domains of ILLNESS and THE HUMAN BODY, the rest occurred only once. These outliers could, thus, be the product of the authors’ exercise of creativity.

The target domains of ILLNESS and THE HUMAN BODY popped up frequently in the sample of *The Fault in Our Stars*, though they are not listed in Kövecses’s framework. Metaphorical conceptualization of these domains is closely related to the topic of the novel, which revolves around the cancer-driven life of an individual who is generally conscious of her body. The topic seems to have fed into a creative conceptual space for the author to conceptualize these concepts metaphorically, as the mainstay of the story.

The analysis revealed that THE HUMAN BODY was repeatedly conceptualized in terms of a CONTAINER or a PERSON, based on the metaphors THE HUMAN BODY IS A PERSON and THE HUMAN BODY IS A CONTAINER. The review of the literature reveals that THE HUMAN BODY as a target domain is fairly conventional, commonly serving as a target domain. Along the same lines, the metaphors THE BODY IS A CONTAINER and A BODY IS A PRISON FOR THE SOUL have been discussed by Steen (2007), as was the BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS metaphor by Kövecses (1990).

The domain of ILLNESS was creatively conceptualized in terms of various source domains such as WAR, PERSON, and GAMES AND SPORTS in the sample of *The Fault in Our Stars*. Knowles and Moon (2006) mentioned the conceptual metaphor ILLNESS IS WAR, which was frequently observed in this sample. The concepts of ILLNESS and THE HUMAN BODY are common target domains but those of THE WORLD, BUILDINGS, and FOOD occurred in both samples only once. These low-frequency target domains can likewise be accounted for in terms of the authors’ creativity.

A number of target domains manifesting themselves in both samples with a considerable frequency of occurrence have not been included by Kövecses (2010a). These include the domains of AMOUNT, PERSON, CHARACTERISTICS, VOICE/SOUND, and OBJECTS. Metaphor research has extensively analyzed these target domains. For example, MORE or LESS have been commonly conceptualized in terms of UP and DOWN, respectively (Kövecses, 2010a;

Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). INANIMATE OBJECTS ARE PEOPLE is also a possible metaphor (Kövecses, 2010a). Kövecses (2010a) mentions the metaphors A PERSON IS AN ANIMAL, A PERSON IS A CONTAINER, and A PERSON IS A BUILDING. Various characteristics of objects and human beings, such as stability, indifference, importance, difficulty and the like have also been metaphorically conceptualized in terms of PROPERTIES OF OBJECTS AND SUBSTANCES. According to Kövecses (2010a), there is the HUMAN PROPERTIES ARE THE PROPERTIES OF INANIMATE THINGS metaphor. As suggested by Knowles and Moon (2006), HUMAN VOICE can be treated as an agent who can do things. This amounts to personification of the HUMAN VOICE. Moreover, when the verbs such as scream, howl, whisper, and shriek, which more literally describe human or animal noises, are used to describe the sound made by the wind, machines, or other inanimate things, the result is the metaphorical conceptualization in the form of personification (Knowles & Moon, 2006).

Since the domains of AMOUNT, PERSON, CHARACTERISTICS, VOICE/SOUND, and OBJECTS appeared at considerable frequencies in both samples, and since their status as target domains has been regularly recognized in the literature, a framework along the lines of Kövecses’s common target domains might consider incorporating them into a more coherent outlook. However, this suggestion calls for more refining research.

To reiterate, this study suggested that metaphorical conceptualization, more specifically, the use of particular concepts as source domains or target domains, is not prone to much variation across time. The results obtained can be linked to the concept of embodiment. Since metaphor is a matter of the mind, the brain, and the body, and since these aspects of people are universal, conceptual metaphors are (near-) universal and diachronically constant (Kövecses, 2006). The results are also in line with Sweetser (1990) who pointed out that many of the metaphors we live by today have been with us for thousands of years (as maintained and cited by Kövecses (2006) too).

Follow-up research can address common source and target domains in bigger corpuses and styles of English fiction, and other text types. Further studies can concentrate merely upon the creative and novel uses of metaphor in various texts from a comparative angle. Finally, research might trace variation in metaphorical expressions denoting the same underlying conceptual metaphor over time.

EFL Pedagogy and the Role of Conceptual Metaphors

The present work bears some implications for upper-intermediate and advanced EFL pedagogy, as well as teachers and syllabus designers. This is especially immediate when literature-text, as part and parcel of the upper-intermediate/advanced EFL context, is introduced to the classroom.

As discussed earlier in our own terms, in a conceptual metaphor like LOVE IS A JOURNEY, LOVE is a more abstract concept than JOURNEY, and it is LOVE (the target domain) that stands in need of being communicated and conveyed in discourse, to the audience, by recourse to a

conceptual metaphor, i.e. to a more tangible source domain. We would like to argue that in this sense, and from a semiotic point of view, a conceptual metaphor is a ‘sign’, a coin with two sides, accounting for, we would maintain, the validity of conceptual metaphor theory from both a Cognitive Linguistics standpoint (which was its main parent discipline), as well as a semiotic one. Conceptual metaphors have also been looked at from discourse analytic (Musolff & Zinken, 2009; Moder, 2008; Cameron, 2008) as well as Pragmatic (Tendahl, 2009) angles.

More often than not, we opt for conceptual metaphors because the abstract elusive target concept, even if lexicalized, cannot convey the full force and communicative discursive impact intended by the speaker in a situation. Usually, when some language-related phenomenon rests on all these simultaneous cognitive, Pragmatics, discourse analytic, communicative, Applied Linguistics, and semiotic bearings, a consensus is forged among practitioners and researchers that the importance and place of all this cognitive engagement, from the upper-intermediate levels and beyond, will obviously need to be imparted to learners in EFL contexts. This theme is also treated at length by Picken (2007) where the place of CMs in the literary language taken to the classroom as well as CM awareness-raising and L2 recognition and interpretation of linguistic metaphor are discussed at a useful pace.

The argument accompanying this study is that, with Kövecses’s common source and target domains seen to largely overlap in two established representations of English fiction penned two centuries apart, syllabus designers and teachers engaged with upper-intermediate EFL groups of learners and beyond, should move to integrating such awareness into such classes, a cognitive awareness that the Applied Linguistics research on metaphors frequently and amply refers to (Zanotto et al., 2008; Cameron, 2003).

Given the ubiquity of conceptual metaphors in almost all genres to some extent as attested by the literature, EFL pedagogy at upper-intermediate contexts and beyond, especially in terms of tasks involving reading and writing, would need to integrate some awareness raising of these conceptual domains and their important role in negotiation of meaning into tasks, conscious raising work, and strategy-based moments of teaching (Wong & Nunan, 2011; Christison, 2003). What we strongly agree with is Cameron’s (2003) argument that before approaching metaphor in classroom discourse and integrating it in classroom activity, one needs, to start with, to be trained in and well-informed of researching metaphor interpretation and metaphors in text.

By possibly implicit means, students can be made aware, for both use in writing and speaking and in comprehension, that there could be common source and target domains designating human cognition’s recourse to experiential and bodily bases as source domains to express a commensurately limited but limited cognitive intangible experience. To comprehend demanding advanced text, like the norm in political writing and literature now is, the upper-intermediate and advanced learner we want to be reflective is to be aware that a (seemingly) limited (but vast) cognitive range of abstract

experience (including thoughts, feelings, and opinions) stand in need of lexicalization and semiotic packaging by using analogy to certain experiential and tangible counterparts in bodily experience or sheer embodiment if they are to be communicated and lexicalized and conveyed at all in real-time discourse, that these source and target domains that a lot of research in CMT also attest to (Lakoff et al., 1989 & 1991) are basic to both abstract cognition and concrete cognition.

Considering the importance of metaphor analysis, assisting language learners in recognizing the metaphoric bases underlying common linguistic expressions and drawing their attention to the ubiquity of metaphor in their everyday productions of language should constitute pedagogical objectives in their own rights. In this spirit, the present study would inform language teachers, textbook designers, and course designers to recognize the importance of metaphorical language, and to incorporate metaphor awareness raising activities into language learning syllabi.

The Building of Literacy, Cognitive Linguistics, and the Role of Conceptual Metaphors

The necessity of raising metaphorical awareness on an intellectual and literacy level has been recognized by many scholars including Deignan et al. (1997), Boers (2000a, b), Cameron (2003) and Zanotto et al. (2008). The fact that conceptual metaphors constitute an integral component of human mind tallies with the need to raise the consciousness-awareness of learners in terms of knowledge structures held by them over and above mere ability in language. Conceptual metaphors play a crucial role here, in ‘building’ literacy. CMs are a profound component in ‘shaping’ and building cognitive structures in the mind, with proponents of CMT maintaining that knowledge is born metaphorically (Kövecses, 2015, 2005, 2006), that literacy too is shaped and sculpted in metaphorized cognitive templates in the mind.

Thus, in shaping, sculpting and breathing life into literacy in schools, there is a need to practice and engage the minds of the learners in metaphorical ways of thinking, so that there are allowances made for the claim of conceptual metaphor theory to the effect that primary emotions, for instance, are given cognitive status in metaphorized reality to begin with, which are then, similarly, born into linguistic existence and realization in the form of a linguistic metaphor; ANGER is not given cognitive life in early first language acquisition just as a lexical cognitive in-vitro meaning-form signifier; rather, what is more plausible for cognitive linguists is that the very first cognitive and conceptual ‘life’ of ANGER begins as A HOT LIQUID IN A CONTAINER (Kövecses, 2015, 2005, 2000) and its parallel linguistic expression WILL carry that cognitive origin.

Therefore, literary practices WILL need to allow for and remain sensitive towards the need to incorporate such cognitive involvement as will introduce the learners’ critical abilities and thinking to metaphorized ways of reality, thinking and linguistic creation NOT as alternative meaning-making practices but rather moving equal and parallel to non-metaphorical ones, at the very least, if at all such

non-metaphorical cognitive templates could be envisaged for primary linguistic and semantic content. In this regard, it seems urgent to respond to Seitz's (1999) call for curriculum reform and literacy practices by means of metaphor research, the least epistemological base of which is maintaining and presenting metaphorized cognition as alternative reality, if not the primary one.

CONCLUSION

This study was dedicated to the analysis of common source and target domains within two samples taken from two novels, namely Jane Austen's *Persuasion* (1818) and John Green's *The Fault in Our Stars* (2012), which belong to 19th and 21th centuries, respectively. It was observed that the majority of the source and target domains identified in the two samples were the same, suggesting that human conceptualization does not change significantly over time. Moreover, the identified domains matched with the common source and target domains proposed by Kövecses (2010a). There were a few common source and target domains identified in both samples, which are not listed in Kövecses's framework. The review of literature revealed that these domains have been recognized and evaluated by different metaphor enthusiasts. Therefore, Kövecses might consider adding these domains to the original framework.

In addition, some source and target domains were also identified in one sample, which did not match with the ones identified in the other. The presence of these domains was explained in terms of the creativity of the writer. Furthermore, the creativity had been induced by contextual factors, especially the topic of the stories.

It should be noted that metaphor study is a vast area of research and it can be addressed from different perspectives. The present study sought to make a small contribution to this broad field of research. Future scholars might address diachronic variation or universality of metaphor in various genres and different time periods.

REFERENCES

- Andreev, V., & Fomicheva, Z. (2016). Metaphorical modeling in fictional prose as a reflection of its thematic focus. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(3), 263-267.
- Austen, J. (1818). *Persuasion* [pdf]. Retrieved from <https://www.planetebook.com/ebooks/Persuasion.pdf>
- Boers, F. (2000a). Enhancing metaphoric awareness in specialised reading. *English for Specific Purposes*, 19(2), 137-147.
- Boers, F. (2000b). Metaphor awareness and vocabulary retention. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(4), 553-571.
- Boers, F. (1999). When a bodily source domain becomes prominent: The joy of counting metaphors in the socio-economic domain. In R. W. Gibbs & G. J. Steen (Eds.), *Metaphor in cognitive linguistics* (pp. 47-56). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cameron, L. (2008). Metaphor and talk. *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought*, 197, 211.
- Cameron, L. (2003). *Metaphor in educational discourse*. London: Continuum.
- Christison, M.A. (2003) Learning styles and strategies. In D. Nunan (ed.) *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Dorst, A.G. (2011). *Metaphor in fiction: Language, thought and communication*. Oisterwijk: Uitgeverij BOXPRESS.
- Deignan, A., Gabrys, D., & Solska, A. (1997). Teaching English metaphors using cross-linguistic awareness-raising activities. *ELT Journal*, 51(4), 352-360.
- Gentner, D., & Grudin, J. (1985). The evolution of mental metaphors in psychology: A 90-year retrospective. *American Psychologist*, 40(2), 181-192.
- Gibbs, R. W., Jr. (2017). Metaphor Wars. In *Metaphor Wars: Conceptual Metaphors in Human Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbs, R. W., Jr. (2006). *Embodiment and cognitive science*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goatly, A. (2002). Text-linguistic comments on metaphor identification. *Language and Literature*, 11(1), 70-74.
- Green, J. (2012). *The fault in our stars* [pdf]. New York: Penguin Group. Retrieved from <https://www.twirpx.com/file/1637474/>
- Hampe, B. (2005). Image schemas in cognitive linguistics: Introduction. In B. Hampe (Ed.), *From perception to meaning: Image schemas in cognitive linguistics* (pp. 1-12). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Izdebska, D. W. (2015). *Semantic field of ANGER in Old English*. PhD thesis, University of Glasgow.
- Jamrozik, A., McQuire, M., Cardillo, E. R., & Chatterjee, A. (2016). Metaphor: Bridging embodiment to abstraction. *Psychonomic bulletin & review*, 23(4), 1080-1089.
- Johannessen, H. K. (2014). *Humanity is a pack of cards: A study on the use and translation of creative metaphorical expressions in the language pair Norwegian Bokmål and American English* (Master's thesis, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway). Retrieved from <https://bora.uib.no/bitstream/handle/1956/7966/119572781.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Knowles, M., & Moon, R. (2006). *Introducing metaphor*. New York: Routledge.
- Kövecses, Z. (2019). Metaphor, Culture, and Embodiment. In *Ten Lectures on Figurative Meaning-Making: The Role of Body and Context* (pp. 29-41). Leiden: Brill.
- Kövecses, Z. (2017). Conceptual metaphor theory. In E. Semino & Z. Demjén (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of metaphor and language* (pp. 13-42). London: Routledge.
- Kövecses, Z. (2015). *Where metaphors come from: Reconsidering context in metaphor*. USA: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2014). The metaphorical conceptual system in context. In K. Burridge & R. Benczes (Eds.), *Wrestling with words and meanings: Essays in honour of Keith Allan* (pp. 141-158). Clayton, Victoria, Australia: Monash University Publishing.
- Kövecses, Z. (2010a). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Kövecses, Z. (2010b). A new look at metaphorical creativity in cognitive linguistics. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 21(4), 655-689.
- Kövecses, Z. (2006). Embodiment, experiential focus, and diachronic change in metaphor. In R. W. McConchie et al. (Eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 2005 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX)* (1-7). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and emotion: Language, culture, and body in human feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (1995). The “Container” metaphor of anger in English, Chinese, Japanese and Hungarian. In Z. Radman (Ed.), *From a metaphorical point of view: A multidisciplinary approach to the cognitive content of metaphor* (pp. 117-145). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kövecses, Z. (1990). *Emotion concepts*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Lakoff, G., Espenson, J., & Goldberg, A. (1989). Master metaphor list. Compilation. *University of California, Berkeley*.
- Lakoff, G., Espenson, J., & Schwartz, A. (1991). Master metaphor list. Second draft copy. *University of California, Berkeley*.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mischler, J. (2013). *Metaphor across time and conceptual space*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Moder, C. L. (2008). It's like making a soup: Metaphors and similes in spoken news discourse. *Language in the context of use: Discourse and cognitive approaches to language*, 301-320.
- Musolff, A. (2017). Metaphor and cultural cognition. In *advances in cultural linguistics* (pp. 325-344). Singapore: Springer.
- Musolff, A. (2009). Metaphor in the history of ideas and discourses: How can we interpret a medieval version of the *Body-State* analogy? In A. Musolff & J. Zinken (Eds.), *Metaphor and discourse* (pp. 233-247). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Musolff, A., & Zinken, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Metaphor and discourse* (pp. 233-247). Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nabeshima, K. J. (2017). Domains in cognitive metaphor theory and metaphor processing. *International Journal of Computational Linguistics Research*, 8(3), 123-131.
- Pearson, P. D., Raphael, T. E., TePaske, N., & Hyser, C. (1981). The function of metaphor in children's recall of expository passages. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 13(3), 249-261.
- Philip, G. (2006). Metaphor, the dictionary, and the advanced learner. In E. Corino et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of EURALEX XII international lexicography congress*, (pp. 895-905). Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Picken, J. (2007). *Literature, metaphor and the foreign language learner*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pragglejaz Group, (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22(1), 1-39.
- Reddy, M. J. (1993). The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 164-201). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seitz, J. E. (1999). *Motives for metaphor: Literacy, curriculum reform, and the teaching of English*. Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Shakespeare, W. (2011). *As you like it*. Werstine, P., & Mowat, B. (Eds.). New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Steen, G. J. (2007). *Finding metaphor in grammar and usage: A methodological analysis of theory and research*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Steen, G. J., Dorst, A. G., Herrmann, J. B., Kaal, A. A., Krennmayr, T., & Pasma, T. (2010). *A method for linguistic metaphor identification: From MIP to MIPVU*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sticht, T. G. (1993). Educational uses of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 621-632). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tendahl, M. (2009). The Hybrid Theory of Metaphor. In *A Hybrid Theory of Metaphor* (pp. 192-247). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Thibodeau, P. H., Hendricks, R. K., & Boroditsky, L. (2017). How linguistic metaphor scaffolds reasoning. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 21(11), 852-863.
- Trim, R. (2011). *Metaphor and the historical evolution of conceptual mapping*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Weisberg, L. F. (2012). *More than words: Metaphor in the mind, brain, and literature* (Doctoral dissertation, Brown University). Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/7326/50288cbd877378c31c551012017db47fc2e9.pdf>
- Wong, L. L., & Nunan, D. (2011). The learning styles and strategies of effective language learners. *System*, 39(2), 144-163.
- Yamina, A. (2016). *Analysis of metaphor in Charles Dickens' Hard Time* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Ouargla). Retrieved from <https://bu.univ-ouargla.dz/master/pdf/Akermi-Yamina.pdf?idmemoire=3976>
- Zanotto, M. S., Cameron, L., & Cavalcanti, M. C. (Eds.). (2008). *Confronting metaphor in use: An applied linguistic approach* (Vol. 173). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Common source and target domains of conceptual metaphors outlined by Kövecses (2010a)

Common Source Domains	Common Target Domains
1. THE HUMAN BODY	1. EMOTION
2. HEALTH AND ILLNESS	2. DESIRE
3. ANIMALS	3. MORALITY
4. PLANTS	4. THOUGHT
5. BUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION	5. SOCIETY/NATION
6. MACHINES AND TOOLS	6. POLITICS
7. GAMES AND SPORTS	7. ECONOMY
8. MONEY AND ECONOMIC TRANSACTIONS (BUSINESS)	8. HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS
9. COOKING AND FOOD	9. COMMUNICATION
10. HEAT AND COLD	10. TIME
11. LIGHT AND DARKNESS	11. LIFE AND DEATH
12. FORCES	12. RELIGION
13. MOVEMENT AND DIRECTION	13. EVENTS AND ACTIONS

APPENDIX B

- “Captain Benwick had been seen *flying* by their house...” (Austen, 1818, p. 134)
Flying is a word used for describing the movement of an animal, namely a bird. In this context, a person has been conceptualized as an animal. Therefore, the conceptual metaphor A PERSON IS AN ANIMAL is at work.
- “Mr Elliot...had been prompting and encouraging expenses which could end only in *ruin*; and the Smiths accordingly had been *ruined*.” (Austen, 1818, p. 251)
In this context, the narrator is talking about the economic condition of a family. Economy has been described in terms of a building, yielding the conceptual metaphor ECONOMY IS A BUILDING.
- “...she was not *ill-used* by anybody...” (Austen, 1818, p. 266)
Here, a person has been conceptualized as a tool, representing the conceptual metaphor A PERSON IS A TOOL.
- “...the only winter which she had afterwards *spent* there with herself.” (Austen, 1818, p. 17)
Here, time is understood in terms of money, yielding the conceptual metaphor TIME IS MONEY.
- “...she was convinced of sailors having more worth and *warmth* than any other set of men in England...” (Austen, 1818, p. 120)

In this sentence, a kind and friendly quality in someone has been described as warmth. The conceptual metaphor MORALITY (KINDNESS) IS HEAT manifests itself here.

- “Her happiness was from within. Her eyes were *bright* and her cheeks *glowed*.” (Austen, 1818, p. 222)
In these sentences, happiness has been conceptualized in terms of light, based on the conceptual metaphor EMOTION IS LIGHT.
- “There was never any *burst* of feeling...” (Austen, 1818, p. 192)
Emotion concepts are primarily understood in terms of forces (Kövecses, 2010a) based on the conceptual metaphor EMOTION IS FORCE, as shown by the above expression.
- “...they would have *found* it most difficult to cease to speak to one another.” (Austen, 1818, p. 76)
- Conceiving something to be difficult has been conceptualized as finding a palpable thing. In other words, the use of *found* in this context denotes the conceptual metaphor THOUGHT IS PERCEPTION.“...he *brought* senses and nerves that could be instantly useful...” (Austen, 1818, p. 135)
The conceptual metaphor EVENT (CAUSATION) IS MOVEMENT underlies the use of the term *brought* in this context.
- “Anne found herself by this time growing so much more *hardened* to being in Captain Wentworth’s company...” (Austen, 1818, p. 120)
In this context, being unsympathetic and indifferent is understood in terms of hardness. The conceptual metaphor EMOTION IS A SUBSTANCE underlies the use of the term *hardened* in this example.
- “His opinion of Louisa Musgrove’s inferiority, an opinion which he had seemed solicitous to *give*...” (Austen, 1818, p. 222)
This sentence is based on Reddy’s (1993) conduit metaphor, who saw communication as a conduit along which ideas move. Ideas or meanings are seen as objects in this metaphor. The author’s use of the term *give* in this sentence signifies the conceptual metaphor IDEAS ARE OBJECTS.
- “...she was very *far* from conceiving it to be of equal pain.” (Austen, 1818, p. 75)
Having ideas about something has been conceptualized here as a path, making evident the conceptual metaphor THOUGHT IS A PATH.
- “He wasn’t looking at me, and it felt *invasive* of me to look at him.” (Green, 2012, p. 72)
Invasive is a term used to describe a fast spreading disease. Here, it has been used to describe the act of looking at someone as annoying. Thus, the author has relied on the conceptual metaphor ACTION IS AN ILLNESS.
- “...the treatments and disease *racing* to kill her...” (Green, 2012, p. 22)

The conceptual metaphor ILLNESS IS A SPORT is evident in this context.

15. "...slowly working his *way* toward a master's degree..." (Green, 2012, p. 4)

The life of a person can be described in terms of a journey, or more generally, in terms of movement, as manifested by the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS MOVEMENT (A JOURNEY) used here.

16. "You're sure he's *hot*?" (Green, 2012, p. 40)

The conceptual metaphor DESIRE IS HEAT has been employed in this context.

17. "...speaking in a *soft* voice so no one else would hear..."

(Green, 2012, p. 34)

Softness is a property of substances, but it has been used here to describe the quality of human voice. Therefore,

the conceptual metaphor VOICE IS A SUBSTANCE is at work.

18. "That's what bothers me most, is being another unremembered *casualty* in the ancient and inglorious *war* against disease." (Green, 2012, p. 125)

Clearly, illness has been conceptualized here as war, representing the conceptual metaphor ILLNESS IS WAR.

19. "My thoughts are *stars*..." (Green, 2012, p. 125)

Here, the author has explicitly used the direct metaphor IDEAS ARE STARS.

20. "The *iepen* throw confetti to *greet* the spring." (Green, 2012, p. 66)

Iepen is a Dutch word meaning "elms". Therefore, the trees have been personified using the conceptual metaphor PLANTS ARE A PERSON.