



Conceptual metaphor theory and teaching English as a foreign language: A study on body part terms

Cemal Çakır^a *

^a *Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey*

APA Citation:

Çakır, C. (2016). Conceptual metaphor theory and teaching English as a foreign language: A study on body part terms. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 12(2), 253-279.

Abstract

Similarities and differences across languages can be observed in terms of the use of body part terms (BPTs) to express states, actions, emotions, and thoughts. This study primarily compared five best-selling English books with their Turkish translations and identified in both sets of books (a) the distribution of the literal and non-literal uses of BPTs, (b) the similarities and differences between the BPT-containing metaphorical linguistic expressions (MLEs), and (c) the similarities and differences between the conceptual metaphors (CMs) underlying the BPT-containing MLEs. Secondly, in relation to the content analysis of the corpus, Turkish speakers' understandings of a dead metaphor were studied. The results reveal that although there are overlapping uses of BPTs in the MLEs in both sets of books and there are similar CMs underlying the BPT-containing MLEs, Turkish translations include more non-literal uses of BPTs than the original English versions. Shifts in BPTs when translated into Turkish are also observed. As for the dead metaphor various scenarios concerning the etymological origin of the dead metaphor were expressed by the Turkish participants. The differences identified in the translation corpus indicate that English BPT-containing MLEs and CMs underlying them should be among the criteria in the selection and design of the materials to teach English lexicon, and that a crosslinguistic perspective would be useful while teaching the English MLEs to the learners of English as a foreign language.

© 2016 JLLS and the Authors - Published by JLLS.

Keywords: Conceptual metaphor theory; metaphorical linguistic expressions; body part terms; teaching English as a foreign language; crosslinguistic analysis

1. Introduction

Since the publication of Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) seminal work, *Metaphors We Live By*, cognitive scientists have considered metaphor a deeply rooted, motivated, fundamental part of human thinking (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, 1999; Johnson, 1987, 2007; Gibbs, 1994, 2005, 2008; Kövecses, 2005, 2010). Lakoff (2006, p. 185) describes the locus of metaphor not in language, but in the way

* Corresponding author. Tel.: + 0 312 202 84 90
E-mail address: ccakir@gazi.edu.tr

people “conceptualize one mental domain in terms of another”. Metaphor is a “cross-domain mapping in the conceptual system” (Lakoff, 2006, p. 186), and “a systematic mapping of entities and relations from a sensorimotor source domain to a target domain that is abstract” (Johnson 2007, p. 165). The difference between the conceptual metaphor (CM) and the linguistic metaphor is that while the former is “a set of correspondences that obtains between a source domain, and a target domain, where metaphorical linguistic expressions...manifest” (Kövecses, 2005, p. 27), the latter is “a linguistic expression (a word, phrase, or sentence) that is the surface realization of such a cross-domain mapping” (Lakoff, 2006, p. 186). For example, Love Is A Journey (henceforth, conceptual metaphors will be written in this format, initials of words in capital letters and other letters in lower case) is a conceptual metaphor, and the following metaphorical linguistic expressions (MLEs) can be its manifestations or surface realizations:

- 1-We may have to *go our separate ways*.
- 2-Our relationship is *off the track*.
- 3-The marriage is *on the rocks*. (Lakoff, 2006, p. 189)

Mapping or the set of correspondences from the source domain, journey, to the surface domain, love, is as follows:

THE LOVE-AS-JOURNEY MAPPING

- The lovers correspond to travelers.
- The love relationship corresponds to the vehicle.

he lovers' common goals correspond to their common destinations on the journey. (Lakoff 2006: 190)

In the case of love, knowledge about journeys is mapped onto knowledge about love. Love is not the only target domain onto which journey can be mapped. Other possible target domains can be life, business, career, and so on. This is possible because Love Is A Journey is “a complex metaphor constructed on the basis of the primary metaphor “PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS”” (Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez & Pérez Hernández, 2011, p. 167), which also underlies the complex metaphors of Life Is A Journey, A Career Is A Journey, and A Business Is A Journey. Purposes Are Destinations has such a productive capacity because this primary metaphor “correlates purposes and destinations on the grounds of common experience ... when people move towards their destination they are at the same time achieving the goal of reaching their destination” (Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez & Pérez Hernández, 2011, p. 167). Primary conceptual metaphors are formed basically “because of the nature of our bodies (with brains, sense organs, motor systems, and emotions) as they interact with our environments” (Johnson, 2007, p. 178). More complex metaphors like Life Is A Journey “appropriate, build on, blend, and extend our primary metaphors” (Johnson, 2007, pp. 178-179). Of a great number of primary metaphors, we can give the following: Knowing Is Seeing, Understanding Is Seeing, States Are Locations, Happy/More/Control Is Up, and Affection Is Warmth (Johnson, 2007, p. 179).

More basic to primary metaphors and complex metaphors are image schemas. An image schema is “a dynamic, recurring pattern of organism-environment interactions” (Johnson, 2007, p. 136). Image schemas are “basic “abstract” structures that recur in our construals of the world” (Clausner & Croft, 1999, p. 4, quotation marks original). Center-Periphery, Verticality (Up-Down) and Balance, and Source-Path-Goal are examples of image schemas (Johnson, 2007).

The theory of conceptual metaphor has undergone “modifications and refinements ever since its inception in 1980” (Kövecses, 2013, p. 11) – blending theory, the neural theory of metaphor, and discourse analytical theory of metaphor, to name just a few. In this study, I will take “standard” conceptual metaphor theory (“standard” in original quotation marks by Kövecses, 2013) as the basis for the analyses of the translation data, leaving other alternatives discussed by Kövecses (2013) and Steen (2007, 2013) for further studies. Following the cognitive scientific, standard conceptual metaphor theory, I will analyse the body part terms (BPTs) used in MLEs in the corpus of five best sellers written in English and the BPTs used in MLEs in the Turkish translations of these five best sellers. I will check whether (a) there are matches and shifts in the BPTs used in MLEs in both original English sentences and their Turkish translations, and (b) there are matches and shifts in the CMs underlying original English sentences and their Turkish translations. I will limit my analysis to the BPT-containing English MLEs and their Turkish translations, and to the BPT-containing Turkish translations of the English sentences that contain no BPTs. In other words, the tertium comparationis of my study will be the BPTs in the MLEs in both the Source Text (ST) and the Target Text (TT) and the CMs alleged to underlie BPT-containing MLEs. All other MLEs are beyond the scope of my paper.

I chose body part terms in my study as a reference point for comparison and contrast between Turkish and English because human body is a universal since, as Wierzbicka (2007, p. 17, p. 58) describes, it is central to human beings’ existence in general, providing for people “a reference point in interpreting the world and orienting ourselves in it”, and a spatial framework for orientation in and interpretation of the world. Even though body is both a ‘physical universal’ and a ‘conceptual universal’ (p. 58), “there are considerable differences in the conceptualization and categorization of body parts across languages and cultures” (p. 18), and “cultures differ in the amount of interest they show in the concept of ‘part’” (p. 26) (quotation marks original). Depending on the geography, economy, and other factors, certain body parts may be or have been more relevant to the recurring acts of the people who use a particular language. For instance, it should not be surprising to discover that BPTs may be used by steppe people differently than desert people or than seafaring people or than hunting people because their very ways of living, moving, warring, family/community forming, engaging in the landscape, contacting plants and animals, and so on have (had) peculiarities. It is not impossible that unique psychological, physical, social, and cultural behaviors have emerged along with universal ones. BPTs do appear to be one of the best candidates to be used as linguistic tools to express the psychological, physical, social, and cultural peculiarities.

By the same token, the CMs underlying the BPT-containing MLEs are likely to vary from culture to culture, even from subculture to subculture. The suprapersonal level variational reasons, as Kövecses (2005) enumerates, could be closely related to physical environment, social context, cultural context, social history, social concerns and interests, experiential focus, viewpoint preference, and prototype and framing. Although there may be big differences among languages in the use of BPTs in MLEs, almost complete overlaps can be observed in even very distant languages. For example, there are similarities between Turkish, English, and Chinese in various conceptualizations of face (Yu 2001, 2008b, 2009; Ruhi & Işık-Güler, 2007). *beng-lian* (stretch-face) in Chinese is *yüzünü as-* (face-3SG.POSS-ACC hang) in Turkish and *pull a long face* in English. (Full versions of the abbreviations for glosses are provided in Appendix A).

1.1. Conceptual metaphors and their linguistic manifestations in Turkish

Over the past decade, a considerable amount of literature has been published on the MLEs in Turkish and the CMs underlying them, with a special focus on the similarities and differences between Turkish and English (for example; Özçalışkan, 2003, 2007; Aksan & Kantar, 2008; and Can & Can 2010). Özçalışkan (2003) examined the metaphorical structure of the domains of death, life, sickness, body, and time in Turkish, and compared and contrasted English and Turkish in terms of the aforementioned conceptual domains. Her data reveal that between Turkish and English, a “cross-linguistic similarity is observed not only in primary but also in complex mappings. ...[and that] primary metaphors are shared by all human languages” (p. 308). She relates the presence of metaphorical domains of birth as arrival, life as a purposeful journey, and death as departure in both Turkish and English to the “similarity between the two cultures both in terms of the way society is structured (western, secular, literate), and the dominant religion” (p. 310).

As for variation, she maintains that “there does seem to be some observable variation between the two languages in the details of the source-domain structure; and [that] the cross-linguistic variation in the source-domain structure becomes evident in the poetic uses of the metaphorical mappings outlined; [f]or example, LIFE IS A JOURNEY constitut[ing] a basic metaphorical mapping for both English and Turkish, where the source domain of journey is mapped onto the target domain of life” (p. 310) (italics are originally the author’s). When she details the specific features of the journey, she enumerates the differences between the journeys in Turkish and English, and makes the generalization that “[u]nlike English, in Turkish folk poetry this journey is frequently conceptualized (i.e., by several poets) as a shared journey”, and that the “typical image is that of a kervan ‘caravan’, where a group people ‘walk their life’ together, heading towards death” (p. 310) (italics and quotation marks are originally the author’s). She finds the cross-linguistic diversity “in the more detailed aspects of the source-domain structure (e.g., type of person, type of journey)” (Özçalışkan, 2003, p. 310), and emphasizes two basic schemas: a motion trajectory (source-path-goal schema), or on natural cycles (cyclical event schema). She identifies the trajectory metaphors and further extends them by specifying some aspects of the trajectory in finer detail, as in LIFE IS A BURDEN/STRUGGLE (p. 311). She finally highlights that “metaphors that conceptualize life as a cycle rely on cyclical or stage-like natural events, such as seasons, night and day, and the life cycle of plants” (Özçalışkan, 2003, p. 310).

Özçalışkan (2003, 2005)’s metaphor of caravan is highly significant because it was one of the most fundamental activities of nomadic, semi-nomadic, and agro-pastoral steppe Turks until they were overwhelmingly sedentarized in the 20th century (Bates, 1972, 1980; Khazanov, 1994; Khazanov & Wink, 2001; Findley, 2005; Toksöz, 2010). It is also interesting to note here that Findley describes, under a subsection entitled ‘Of Buses, Caravans, and Carpets’, “the whole phenomenon of Turkishness (Türklük) resembl[ing] a bus travelling across Asia from east to west” (p. 5) (italics are original). Indeed, the depiction of a group of people walking their life together is to be more likely related to the Turks’ code of conduct typical of the first era categorized by Findley (2005) than the subsequent two eras. Furthermore, Source-Path-Goal Schema and Cyclical Event Schema perfectly match the millennia-long continental migrations of the Turks from the Central Asia to the west at the macro level, and the seasonal vertical and/or horizontal sheep herding movements between winter quarters and summer grazing quarters at the micro level (Dyson-Hudson & Dyson-Hudson, 1980; Cribb, 1991; Barfield, 1993; Lindner, 1997; Johansen, 2005). Summer grazing is significant in the form of ‘a specialized mountain form of herdsman husbandry’ at the plateaus of high altitudes (Cribb, 1991, p. 16, p. 134).

Aksan and Kantar (2008) investigated the love metaphors of Turkish and English from a cross-cultural perspective of two typologically unrelated languages. Their results indicate that many metaphorical source domains of English and Turkish from which the linguistic instantiations for romantic love are derived are the same. They identified the following specific level metaphorical source domains unique to Turkish: Pain/Suffering, Ineffability, Deadly Force, and Sacrifice. They finally make the claim that the specific source domains that they found only in Turkish love metaphors are motivated from medieval Sufi traditions, and emphasized that all of the source domains of love metaphors unique to Turkish implicate the Love Is Çile Çekmek (Pain/Suffering). Again, the conceptualization of love as a journey that is characterized by obstacles, uncertainties, difficulties and the like is parallel with Özçalışkan's (2003, 2005) caravan journey of a camp of people from winter quarters to summer quarters, and vice versa, that pose a lot challenges to semi-nomadic Turks who have to take good care of the herd of sheep, pack animals, and camp people. In a way, when the source domain of journey is mapped onto the target domain of life and love, all negative features of caravan journey are also mapped.

Can and Can (2010) made a cross-cultural contrastive analysis of chat in English and its dictionary translation *sohbet* in Turkish in order to find out “the source domains in the metaphorical expressions of chat in Turkish and English and what these source domains reflect regarding the two cultures” (p. 35). They concluded from their results that “Turkish *sohbet* and English chat have different connotations, although they are translated interchangeably” (p. 51). They demonstrated the similarities and differences between chat and *sohbet*.

It follows from the results of the studies reported above that even though Turkish and English are typologically different languages; there are a lot of similarities between them in terms of MLEs and CMs underlying the MLEs. For instance, Love Is A Constructed Object, and Love Is An Economic Exchange (Aksan & Kantar 2008), and Chat/*Sohbet* As A Whole For Its Part, Chat/*Sohbet* Is A Constructed Object, and Chat/*Sohbet* Is A Location (Can & Can, 2010) are common conceptual metaphors between Turkish and English. The differences between both languages are also evident in the details of the CMs. The best example for this phenomenon is observed in the conceptualizations of love as a journey. Whereas the English concept of journey “includes a predetermined goal and a path leading the lovers towards this goal (of union), whereas the “JOURNEY” metaphor in Turkish does not have to be purposeful when applied to love relationships” (Aksan & Kantar, 2008, p. 284). Also, Turkish conceptualization of life as a caravan journey of a group of people moving together, as Özçalışkan (2003, 2005) claims, can be labeled as the most significant differences between Turkish and English CMs.

1.2. Research questions

Following the line of research focusing on the similarities and differences between Turkish and English, I compared and contrasted English and Turkish corpora in terms of the BPTs used in MLEs and the CMs underlying the MLEs. To address the problem, the answers to the following questions were sought:

- 1- What is the distribution of the BPTs in the five best-selling English books chosen and in their Turkish translations in terms of literal and non-literal uses of the BPTs?
- 2- What are the matches and shifts in the BPTs in the metaphorical linguistic expressions (MLEs) as they are translated from English to Turkish?
- 3- What are the similarities and differences in terms of the conceptual metaphors (CMs) when the English texts are translated into Turkish with the BPTs in the MLEs?
- 4- After the content analysis of the two sets of books, the following question was addressed:
- 5- How do Turkish speakers perceive an allegedly dead metaphor (i.e. *bir şeyle başa çıkmak*), which emerged as a shift from English to Turkish translation in the present study?
- 6- The final question to be dealt with in my study is concerned with the possible implications of CMT for teaching English as a foreign language in Turkey:
- 7- What are the implications of the crosslinguistic study of BPTs in MLEs and of the CMs underlying them for teaching English as a foreign language in Turkey?

2. Method

2.1. Materials and participants

The data were collected in three ways. Firstly, the basic corpus comprised all of the BPT-containing sentences in five English bestsellers, and their Turkish translations, as well as the BPT-containing Turkish sentences whose English originals do not contain BPTs in them. The list of the five English bestsellers and their Turkish translations is in Appendix B. Books 1E, 2E, and 3E were chosen and analysed first because of their structure and content. Each book is divided into 100 numbered units comprising 2-3 pages, which makes it easy to quickly find and compare the BPTs in both versions. The unit topics are virtually universal and the language used in both books is pitched to the general public. Books 4E and 5E were randomly selected from a list of bestsellers provided by one of the largest bookstores in Turkey to crosscheck against the first three books. The only criterion for the selection of all five English books was the availability of their Turkish translations.

Secondly, Task Sheet I (see Appendix C), given to 100 English Language Teaching (ELT) Program students, sought to find out the participants' understanding of the dead metaphor of *bir şeyle başa çıkmak* (something-with head-DAT climb up/reach-INF). What is special with this dead metaphor is that it is the Turkish expression which represents a significant shift from the English BPT-containing MLEs of *to handle something* when *to handle something* is translated as a Turkish MLE containing the BPT of *head*. I asked the participants to read the idiom, and write down what comes to their minds when they hear it. I found *bir şeyle başa çıkmak* as one of the key MLEs to unravel a set of CMs unique to the Turkish language. The CMs that I believe underlie many MLEs like *bir şeyle başa çıkmak* in Turkish are discussed in detail in Subsection 3.1.2.

Thirdly, I gave Task Sheet II (see Appendix D) to 30 native Turkish academicians (professors, ELT research assistants, Turkish-speaking instructors of English) and graduate students (MA and PhD

degree candidates in ELT), and asked them to read the aforementioned Turkish idiom and to write down the possible scenario in which they thought it was born and started to be used. The task aimed at investigating the understandings of the participants about the etymological origins of *bir şeyle başa çıkmak*. This was done to check the validity of the traditional view that idioms “might once have been metaphorical, but over time have lost their metaphoricity and now exist in our mental lexicons as frozen, lexical items” (Gibbs et al, 1997, p. 142), and that idiomatic “expressions, such as blow your stack, flip your lid, hit the ceiling, are “giant lexical items” whose meanings result from “dead” metaphors” (Gibbs, 2003, p. 7, quotations marks are original).

2.2. Procedures

The BPTs in Books 1E-5E and 1T-5T were counted manually, and, therefore, it is acknowledged that minor mistakes resulting from the manual count could be a limitation of the study. I followed the steps below to identify the number of the BPTs in both sets of books, all of the matches between English BPT-containing MLEs and Turkish BPT-containing MLEs, and all of the shifts from English BPT-containing MLEs to Turkish BPT-containing MLEs:

- 1- All of the literal and non-literal uses of BPTs in the English books (1E-5E) were identified and counted.
- 2- All of the literal and non-literal uses of BPTs in the Turkish books (1E-5E) were identified and counted.
- 3- All of the BPTs of *head, eye, hand, mouth, face, foot, and tongue* in the English books (1E-5E) were identified (see below the reason for choosing only the seven BPTs for detailed analysis for the literal and non-literal use).
- 4- Their Turkish translations were identified and checked.
- 5- All of the BPTs of *head, eye, hand, mouth, face, foot, and tongue* in the Turkish books (1T-5T) were identified.
- 6- Their original English forms were identified and checked.

All of the BPTs of *head, eye, hand, mouth, face, foot, and tongue* in the English and Turkish books were checked whether they were used literally or non-literally. By ‘literal’ I mean the use of the BPT to refer to the very body organ denoted by the word. For example, in Book 4E (i.e., Malcolm Gladwell’s *Outliers*), *head* is literally used in the sentence of “Lift up your heads...and look at the image of a man who rose from nothing, ...” (p. 19). On the other hand, by ‘non-literal’, I mean the use of the BPT to express something beyond the very body organ denoted by the word, as exemplified by the use of *head* in the sentence of “They can hold more numbers in their heads and do calculations faster, ...” (*Outliers*, p. 269). In the latter, *head* is no more the body part above the body trunk; instead, it figuratively means mind or mental capacity.

All of the matches in BPTs between the English BPT-containing MLEs and similar/the same Turkish BPT-containing MLEs were identified and counted (the seven BPTs plus all other BPTs).

All of the shifts in BPTs from English BPT-containing MLEs to different Turkish BPT-containing MLEs were identified and counted (the seven BPTs plus all other BPTs).

The BPTs whose exact literal and non-literal totals were counted are *head, eye, hand, mouth, face, foot, and tongue*. The criterion for choosing only the seven afore-mentioned BPTs for total count is that they are used most extensively in Turkish idioms and proverbs according to the Turkish Language

Association's Online Dictionary of Idioms and Proverbs (TLAODIP). I have set 100 as the bar and considered the BPTs that are used in more than 100 Turkish idioms and proverbs. After the extraction of BPTs from the books, and the identification of the matches and shifts in terms of the use of the BPTs in MLEs, the reasons for the shifts were sought through an investigation into a possible difference between the historical, and socio-cultural backgrounds of the English and Turkish peoples. To find out the Turkish speakers' understanding and awareness levels about a dead metaphor that is used in shifts, namely *bir şeyle başa çıkmak*, the participants were given the task sheets. The responses were analysed by different coders to satisfy the intercoder reliability. Finally, conclusions and implications for teaching English as a foreign language in Turkey were made.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Use of the BPTs in five English books and their Turkish translations

Table 1 shows that the total number of BPTs in the Turkish translations of the five English books is greater than that in the original English versions. As expected, the numbers of literal uses of BPTs in both sets of five books are close to each other, 357 to 405. However, a striking difference observed from the analysis is that the percentages of non-literal BPTs in the published Turkish translations are much higher than those in the English books: Turkish non-literal BPTs are more than three times as much as English non-literal BPTs. One reason for this is that many English MLEs containing no BPTs were translated into Turkish as MLEs containing BPTs. The significant differences between the non-literal uses of BPTs in English sentences and those in their Turkish translations stem from the fact that many English expressions containing no BPTs were translated into Turkish as expressions containing *baş*, *el*, and *göz* (*head*, *hand*, and *eye*) (see Table 2 below). The greatest difference in the frequency of *baş* occurs in Books 1E and 1T, and Books 4E and 4T. In Book 1T, *baş* is non-literally used more than eight times as often as the term *head* in Book 1E. Similarly, the non-literal use of *baş* in Books 4T and 5T is more than six-fold the use of *head* in Books 4E and 5E.

Table 1. Totals of BPTs in five English books and their published Turkish translations

Book	Total Number of BPTs	Literal BPTs		Non-literal BPTs	
		N	%	N	%
Book1E	138	48	34,78	90	65,22
Book1T	456	59	12,94	397	87,06
Book2E	194	45	23,20	149	76,80
Book2T	428	48	11,21	380	88,79
Book3E	174	23	13,22	151	86,78
Book3T	513	34	6,63	479	93,37
Book4E	241	92	38,17	149	61,83
Book4T	579	118	20,38	461	79,62
Book5E	323	149	46,13	174	53,87
Book5T	648	146	22,53	502	77,47
Total					
1E-5E	1070	357	33,36	713	66,64
1T-5T	2624	405	15,43	2219	84,57

Table 2. Total numbers of seven BPTs in five English books and their published Turkish translations (L: Literal / NL: Non-literal)

Book	Head N(L-NL)	Eye N(L-NL)	Hand N(L-NL)	Mouth N(L-NL)	Face N(L-NL)	Foot N(L-NL)	Tongue N(L-NL)
Book1E	21(1-20)	7(3-4)	19(4-15)	1(0-1)	7(1-6)	8(3-5)	4(1-3)
Book1T	166(1-165)		79(5-74)	2(0-2)	17(1-16)	21(5-16)	17(1-16)
Book2E	27(2-25)	10(3-7)	39(7-32)	8(2-6)	11(4-7)	7(3-4)	3(0-3)
Book2T	103(1-102)	77(4-73)	71(4-67)	16(2-14)	17(6-11)	27(6-21)	18(0-18)
Book3E	29(0-29)	11(3-8)	45(7-38)	0(0-0)	5(1-4)	0(0-0)	0(0-0)
Book3T	130(1-129)	68(9-59)	164(7-157)	8(2-6)	10(1-9)	19(2-17)	3(0-3)
Book4E	38(4-34)	18(14-4)	56(18-38)	2(2-0)	21(3-18)	13(0-13)	0(0-0)
Book4T	220(2-218)	74(19-55)	76(22-54)	2(2-0)	15(3-12)	20(13-7)	41(0-41)
Book5E	29(1-28)	15(2-13)	43(4-39)	1(1-0)	27(3-24)	31(0-31)	0(0-0)
Book5T	174(2-172)	110(5-105)	111(4-107)	3(1-2)	38(2-36)	36(4-32)	9(0-9)
Total							
1E-5E	144	61	202	12	71	59	7
556	(8-136)	(25-36)	(40-162)	(5-7)	(12-59)	(6-53)	(1-6)
(L-NL)							
(97-459)							
1T-5T	793	362	501	31	97	123	88
1995	(7-786)	(40-322)	(42-459)	(7-24)	(13-84)	(30-93)	(1-87)
(L-NL)							
(140-1855)							

Throughout the translations of all five books, there are a considerably greater number of non-literal uses of *head*, *hand*, *eye*, and *tongue* in Turkish than in English, but this trend is not observed in the non-literal use of the term *face*. Indeed, with this BPT, the Turkish translations contain fewer non-literal uses of BPTs than the original English. It occurs in Book 4T, which contains only 12 MLEs containing *yüz* (face), while the English version contains 18 non-literal uses of *face*. In the remaining four books, there are more non-literal uses of *face* in the Turkish versions than in the English. When used as a verb in English, *face* was rarely translated into Turkish by an MLE containing *yüz*. When *face* is involved in translation, cases of Metaphor→Metaphor (M→M) are fewer than those of Metaphor₁→Metaphor₂ (M₁→M₂). This is also a finding that may lead to the claim that the metaphorical use of the BPT of *face* is more central to English than it is to Turkish. Tables 3 and 4 below not only illustrate matches of *face* with *yüz* that occur in Books 2E-2T, 4E-4T, and 5E-5T, but also translations of *face* without the corresponding Turkish BPT of *yüz* that occur in Books 1E-1T, 2E-2T, 4E-4T, and 5E-5T:

Table 3. Examples for English MLEs containing *face* and their Turkish translations containing *yüz*

Books	English MLE	Turkish translation
2E & 2T	whatever you fear, face it head on	<i>her neden korkuyorsanız, onunla yüzleşin</i> (every what-ABL fear-PRS-if-2SG.SUBJ, 3SG-with face-RECP-2SG.SUBJ)
4E & 4T	face it, my dear	<i>bununla yüzleşmelisin canım</i> (this-with face- RECP-OBLG-2SG.SUBJ dear-1SG.POSS
5E & 5T	face the ways in which we add to the onslaught against the natural world	<i>doğal aleme yönelik şiddetli saldırıdaki rolümüzle yüzleş</i> -(natural world-DAT towards violent attack-LOC-REL role-1PL.POSS-with face-RECP

Table 4. Examples for English MLEs containing *face* and their Turkish translations not containing *yüz*

Books	English MLE	Turkish translation
1E & 1T	face a day	<i>bir günü karşıla-</i> (one day-ACC meet)
2E & 2T	face the world with a positive air	<i>dünyayı pozitif bir ruh haliyle karşıla-</i> (world-ACC positive one psychology manner-3SG.POSS-with meet)
4E & 4T	facing the square	<i>meydanın karşısında</i> (square-GEN opposite-3SG.POSS-LOC)
5E & 5T	adapt to the challenges we face	<i>karşılaştığımız sorunlara uyum sağla-</i> (opposite-DER-RECP-REL-PRS-1PL.POSS problem-PL-DAT harmony make)

In most cases, the English verb *face* was translated into Turkish as *karşı karşıya ol-* (‘opposite opposite-DAT be’), *karşı karşıya kal-* (‘opposite opposite-DAT remain’) or *karşı karşıya gel-* (‘opposite opposite-DAT come’) ($M_1 \rightarrow M_2$). This reversal of the trend to greater BPT in Turkish than English is the most salient difference in BPT translation in the five books. It is very interesting for the Turkish translations to prefer a non-BPT-containing MLE when translating the English MLEs containing *face*.

3.1.1. BPTs in the English expressions and in their Turkish translations: Matches and shifts

After the examination of overall differences in the non-literal uses of BPTs in the five selected English books and their Turkish translations, it is now time to deal with the cases of matches between BPTs in MLEs found in Books 1E-5E and their translations in Books 1T-5T, and the cases of shifts from BPTs in MLEs found in Books 1E-5E to their translations in Books 1T-5T. Table 5 illustrates some examples of the matching BPTs, and gives the metaphorical mappings involved. There are totally 203 matches and all other matches than head=hand and hand=hand, and their examples can be seen in Appendix E. As may be noted, the match between *head* and *baş*, or *kafa* is greatest in number, followed by matches of *hand=el* and *foot=ayak*. In most cases, it is evident that the CMs underlying the BPT-containing English MLEs and their Turkish translations are the same. For example, *hold your head up* in Book 1E is translated into Turkish as *başını dik tut-* (head-2SG.POSS-ACC upright hold), and both *hold your head up* and *başını dik tut-* can be said to be the manifestations of the CM of Good Is Up. Many such overlaps in CMs in both languages can be observed for such other CMs as Control Is Holding In The Hand, Bad Is Down, To Guide Or Direct Is To Point With The Finger, and Thinking Is Speaking. The extensive use of $M \rightarrow M$ translation from English to Turkish in our corpus gives ample support to the claim that many CMs are universal across languages.

Table 5. BPT matches between MLEs in Books 1E-5E and their translations in Books 1T-5T

BPT in English MLE = BPT in its Turkish translation	Number of matches	Book Number: Example for the BPT in the English MLE (<i>Metaphorical Mapping, if any</i>) (N/A: <i>Not Applicable</i>)	Book Number: Turkish translation of the example for the BPT in the English MLE (<i>Metaphorical Mapping, if any: Identical? or Different?</i>) (N/A: <i>Not Applicable</i>)
head=head	40	1E: hold your head up (<i>Good Is Up</i>)	1T: başımı dik tut- (head-2SG.POSS-ACC upright hold) (<i>Identical</i>)
hand=hand	32	2E: underhand means and methods (<i>Control Is Holding In The Hand</i>)	2T: el altından araçlar ve yöntemler (hand under-3SG.POSS -ABL tool-PL and method-PL) (<i>Identical</i>)

With respect to the shifts from the BPTs in MLEs in Books 1E-5E to different BPTs in Turkish translations in Books 1T-5T, most striking is the case of English MLEs containing the verb *handle*, which are translated as Turkish MLEs containing *baş* (head). Table 6 presents some examples for hand→head, and the metaphorical mappings involved. Of the total of 26 shifts, there are six cases of shifts from English *hand* to Turkish *baş* (head), followed by shifts from *finger*→*mouth* (2 cases), *mouth*→*jaw* (2 cases), and *back*→*foot* (2 cases). All other shifts than hand→head and their examples can be seen in Appendix F. In line with the findings reported by Yu (2009), the shift from *finger* to *mouth* is also observed here. Comparing Chinese and English, Yu points out that “the metaphor CONTROL IS HOLDING IN THE PALM OF THE HAND is not richly manifested at the linguistic level in English, although it is in Chinese” (pp. 149-150). In our case, *cash in your hand* in Book 1E is translated as *avucunuzdaki para* (palm-2SG.POSS-LOC-REL money) in Book 1T just as it is in Chinese. Conversely, the metaphor The Finger Is The Doer, which Yu (2000) finds well manifested in English, is used in English and Turkish when *have a hand in papal Bull* in Book 1E is turned into *papalık seçiminde parmağınız ol-* (pope-DER election-3SG.POSS-LOC finger-2SG.POSS be) in Book 1T.

Table 6. BPT shifts in MLEs from Books 1E-5E to their translations in Books 1T-5T

BPT in the English MLE → Different BPT in its Turkish translation	Book Number: Example for the BPT in the English MLE (<i>Metaphorical Mapping, if any</i>) (N/A: <i>Not Applicable</i>)	Book Number: Different translation of the BPT in the English MLE (<i>Metaphorical Mapping, if any: Identical? or Different?</i>) (N/A: <i>Not Applicable</i>)
hand → head	4E: handle reservation (<i>Solving Problems Is Manipulating Objects With Hands</i>)	4T: rezervasyonla başa çık- (reservation-with head-DAT climb up/reach) (<i>Problem-Solving Is A Journey To/From The Yayla With A Herd Of Sheep, With Pack Animals, And With A Group Of People = Yayla Journey Metaphor</i>)
	4E: handle challenges (<i>Solving Problems Is Manipulating Objects With Hands</i>)	4T: zorluklarla başa çık- (difficulty-PL-with head-DAT climb up/reach) (<i>Yayla Journey Metaphor</i>)
	5E: handle challenges (<i>Solving Problems Is Manipulating Objects With Hands</i>)	5T: meydan okumalarla başa çık- (challenge-PL-with head-DAT climb up/reach) (<i>Yayla Journey Metaphor</i>)

In sum, the analyses of the data concerning the matches and shifts show that even though there are differences in five English books and their Turkish translations in terms of the number of literal and non-literal uses of BPTs, there are similarities between English books and their Turkish translations in terms of metaphorical mappings involving MLEs that contain BPTs. While there are more than two hundred matches between BPT-containing English MLEs and their translations, there are only twenty-six shifts from English BPT-containing English MLEs to different Turkish BPT-containing English MLEs. However, when the shifts are analysed in detail, some metonymic relations can be observed in brain → head, mouth → jaw, hand → finger, hand → palm, lip → mouth, finger → hand, fist → hand, brow → forehead, and embody → flesh and bone. These also contribute to the similarities between English and Turkish.

In matches between the BPTs in English MLEs and their Turkish translations, similar metaphorical mappings are observed, as presented in Table 5. For example, in Book 1E, *head* is used in the MLE *hold your head up* manifesting the metaphorical mapping Good Is Up; likewise, *baş* (head) is used in its translation as *başını dik tut-* (head-2SG.POSS-ACC upright hold), manifesting the same metaphorical mapping: Good Is Up. These results confirm Özçalışkan's (2005) conclusion that "in terms of the target domains and metaphorical mappings", there is a "striking degree of similarity between English and Turkish" (p. 238). On the other hand, some examples in Table 6 confirm Yu (2008a) in that "different body parts or bodily experiences are selected to map onto and structure the same abstract concepts" (p. 393). For example, while *hand* is used in Book 1E in the MLE *cash in your hand* manifesting the metaphorical mapping Possession Is Holding In The Hand, in Book 1T *avuç* (palm) is used in its translation as *avucunuzdaki para* (palm-2SG.POSS-LOC-REL money), still manifesting the same metaphorical mapping: Possession Is Holding In The Hand. Here, *palm* metonymically stands for *hand* in a part-for-whole relationship. Hence, this study confirms the

principle that there may be universality in metaphor on the one hand, and culture-specificity, flexibility and diversity on the other.

Furthermore, although there are similarities in metaphorical mappings of the non-literal uses of BPTs in English and Turkish, the actual construction of MLEs may not be totally identical, as earlier found by Özcalışkan (2003, p. 223). For instance, *hand things over* (Control Is Holding In The Hand) in Book 3E is translated into Turkish as *ipleri başkasının eline bırak-* (rope-PL-ACC other-3SG.POSS -GEN hand-3SG.POSS-DAT leave) (Control Is Holding In The Hand), in which *ip* ‘rope’ is also used. The same can be observed in *kılı kırk yaran tartışmalar* (hair-ACC forty split-REL debate-PL) *hair-splitting debates* in Books 5E and 5T, and *gözlerinizi dört aç-* (eye-PL-2PL.POSS-ACC four open) (Paying Attention Is Looking At) *keep your eyes open* (Paying Attention Is Looking At) in Books 2E and 2T. Although the same BPTs are used in the Turkish versions of the English MLEs, numbers are added to them: *kırk* ‘forty’ in the first and *dört* ‘four’ in the other example.

In the next subsection, the shifts from English *handle* to Turkish *başta çıkmak*, the most significant shift from English CMs to Turkish CMs, will be discussed.

3.1.2. From *handle* to *başta çıkmak*: The most significant shift from English CMs to Turkish CMs

As Table 6 indicates, the most striking shift from English BPT-containing MLE to the Turkish BPT-containing MLE is observed when *handle something* is translated into Turkish as *bir şeyle başta çıkmak*. According to the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (LDCE), the former means the following:

to deal with a difficult situation or problem, to deal with something by doing what is necessary, to deal with somebody, to pick up/touch/feel something with your hands, to control with your hands, and to be in charge of something.

The possible CMs behind all these meanings are Control Is Holding In The Hand and Solving Problems Is Manipulating Objects With Hands. On the other hand, the Turkish Dictionary of the Turkish Language Association (TDTLA) defines *bir şeyle başta çıkmak* (something-with head-DAT climb up/reach) as:

bir şeye gücü yetmek (one thing-DAT power-POSS suffice-INF) ‘to have enough power to do something’, and defines *birisiyle başta çıkmak* (someone-with head-DAT climb up/reach) as *güçlükler çıkaran biriyle olan işini, kendi istediği yolda sonuçlandırabilmek* (difficulties make-REL one-with be-REL deal-POSS-ACC, own desire-REL-POSS way-LOC finalise-ABIL-INF) ‘to finalise a deal in one’s desired way with someone who makes difficulties’.

Control Is Holding In The Hand and Solving Problems Is Manipulating Objects With Hands, the CMs behind *handle* in English, seem to be very distant to the meanings provided by the TDTLA because the BPT in *başta çıkmak* is *head* and the TDTLA definitions do not strongly refer to the BPT of *hand*. Hence, a different CM is likely to be operating behind the Turkish MLEs of *bir şeyle/birisiyle başta çıkmak*.

In various social and cultural settings, *baş* is a key term in set phrases. For example, *başın sağ olsun* (head-2SG.POSS alive be-may) ‘I extend my condolences to you.’ is said as a condolence to the relatives and/or friends of a person who has recently died. Many governmental and military posts are termed by words/phrases containing *baş*, e.g. *cumhurbaşkanı* (people-head-DER-3SG.POSS) (Aksan, 2011, p. 248). My thesis concerning the centrality of *baş* in the Turkish cognition, society, culture, and politics is that it is commonly used in the MLEs that are instantiations of the image schemas, the primary metaphors, and the CMs that represent the most fundamental aspects of recurring patterns of

life for the Turkish people at large. The most central activities that the substantial segments of the Turkish people historically practiced were related to agro-pastoralism and semi-nomadism. The habitats for the agro-pastoral and semi-nomadic Turkish people were basically the steppes and high plateaus, where they lived on agriculture, animal husbandry, and sheep herding. They had horizontal cyclical short- and long-distance journeys from certain grazing pastures to others, and/or vertical cyclical short- and long-distance journeys from winter quarters on the lowlands and plains to summer quarters on high plateaus called *yayla*. These recurring events form in the cognition of the Turkish people in question the bases of the image schemas of Source-Path-Goal and Cyclical Event, which Özçalışkan (2003) also emphasizes.

Since the size of steppe pastures was vast and flat, horizontally speaking, every entry into a point of steppe plain was regarded as the head of it. Therefore, instead of one single head or starting point, there were countless heads or starting points for the herd movements depending on the dialectics of herd management. Hence, in the cognition of the sheep herding Turks, there was not a well-defined entry or starting point of a flat area. This issue is also addressed by Taneri (1989, p. 114), who states that “in most expressions, the deictic use of baş indicates ‘top, starting point, beginning’” (underlining in the original), and that there are “expressions... which challenge this observation, as these require further thinking”. She gives the following expressions to highlight the complexities posed by the various conceptualizations expressed by the BPT of *head*:

- (1a) *odanın üst başı*
 room-GEN top head-3SG.POSS
 ‘the part of the room opposite to the door’
- (1b) *odanın alt başı*
 oom-GEN bottom head-3SG.POSS
 ‘the part of the room with close proximity to the door’

These examples are in line with my suggestion that journeys taking place in millenia-long steppe and *yayla* recurrences are mapped onto the minds of the Turkish people, and the underlying image schemas and primary metaphors derived from these experiences are projected to the descriptions of other events or positions of objects. It would not be impossible to claim that the image schemas of Source-Path-Goal and Cyclical Event, and the primary metaphors of States Are Locations and Purposes Are Destinations form the bases of the CMs of Life Is A Semi-Nomadic Journey, Life Is An Agro-Pastoral Journey, Life Is Sheep Herding, Life Is A Cyclical Journey To And From Yayla, Life Is A Semi-Nomadic Journey With A Herd Of Sheep, Life Is A Journey To/From The Yayla With A Herd Of Sheep, and Life Is A Journey To/From The Yayla With A Herd Of Sheep, With Pack Animals, And With A Group Of People, Problem-Solving Is A Journey To/From The Yayla With A Herd Of Sheep, With Pack Animals, And With A Group Of People. In short, we can label these metaphors as *Yayla* Journey Metaphor. Mapping from the source domain, *yayla* journey, to the general target domain of life and to the specific target domain of problem solving, is as follows:

THE LIFE/PROBLEM SOLVING-AS-YAYLA-JOURNEY MAPPING

- The people/problem solvers correspond to yayla travelers.
- The life/problem corresponds to the herd, pack animals, camp people.
- The people's/problem solvers' common goals correspond to safely reaching the top of the yayla with the herd, pack animals, camp people.

We can further propose that a great number of still popular dead metaphors – including *gözden geçirmek*, *göz atmak*, *ele almak*, and so on which we have identified in this study – actually belong to the culture of the recently modernized nomadic, semi-nomadic, and agro-pastoral Turks, whose language has contributed to the today's standard Turkish that has emerged as a republican practice in the last century (Findley, 2005).

3.2. Task sheet I: What comes to Turkish participants' mind about the dead metaphor of *bir şeyle başa çıkmak*

In Task Sheet I responded by 100 Turkish speaking trainee teachers of English, they were asked to express what comes to their mind when they hear *bir şeyle başa çıkmak* (something-with head-DAT climb up/reach-INF) 'to cope with something'. The aim in administering Task Sheet I was to see if the current native Turkish speakers are aware of the etymological origins of the MLE of *bir şeyle başa çıkmak*, and if they have in their minds the Yayla Metaphor.

None of 100 participants made direct reference to the Yayla Metaphor or any other. Instead, the participants used synonyms of *bir şeyle başa çıkmak*, without any association with the events. The top five mostly used synonyms are *üstesinden gelmek* (top-POSS-ABL come-INF) 'to overcome' (30 participants), *mücadele etmek* 'to struggle' (20 participants), *uğraşmak* 'to try' (10 participants), *çözmek* 'to solve' (9 participants), and *başarmak* 'to succeed' (8 participants). These are all general abstract definitions of *bir şeyle başa çıkmak*, and are in line with the definitions of *bir şeyle başa çıkmak*, given by Turkish Language Association Grand Turkish Dictionary. The results of Task Sheet II confirm the traditional view that idioms "might once have been metaphorical, but over time have lost their metaphoricity and now exist in our mental lexicons as frozen, lexical items" (Gibbs et al, 1997, p. 142), and that idiomatic "expressions, such as blow your stack, flip your lid, hit the ceiling, are "giant lexical items" whose meanings result from "dead" metaphors" (Gibbs, 2003, p. 7, quotations marks are original).

3.3. Task sheet II: Native Turkish speakers' scenarios for the first-time use of the MLE of *bir şeyle başa çıkmak*

Different from Task Sheet I, Task Sheet II seeks to find the possible scenarios that the native Turkish speakers may think of regarding the etymological origin(s) of the MLE of *bir şeyle başa çıkmak*. Another difference is that the participants of Task Sheet II are not BA students, but BA/MA/PhD holders, and/or faculty members. I was expecting from the participants the following themes: semi-nomadism, agriculture, carpet weaving, and horse racing/riding. The results of the Task Sheet II (given in Appendix G) show that only Participant 28 wrote a scenario that exactly matched my expectation: climbing up the top of a mountain; a person carrying something on his/her back to the top of a mountain. This is in line with the *Yayla Journey Metaphor* that I think to underlie the MLE of *bir şeyle başa çıkmak*. Similarly, Participant 5 developed a scenario in which a farmer, using a tool, cultivated manually a difficult piece of land from one edge to another, and Participant 7 thinks that someone either plows a land or mowes grass, but Participant 7 does not mention the instrumentality of anything in the action of plowing or mowing. Participant 18 speculates that two people race on a horse and one reaches the target, here the horses being the instrument with which they reach the end. Other general themes written by the participants are as follows: family (4 scenarios), wrestling sport (2), war (2), running competition (2), community affairs (2), government (2), conflict resolution (2), picking fruits (1), knitting (1), repair work (1), problem solving (1), house building materials (1), fighting (1), water drawing from a well (1), water carrying (1), game (1), and school setting (1).

Even though the results of Task Sheet II confirm the traditional view that idioms “might once have been metaphorical, but over time have lost their metaphoricity and now exist in our mental lexicons as frozen, lexical items” (Gibbs et al, 1997, p. 142), Task Sheet II partly nullifies the view, as the scenarios of Participants 5, 7, 18, and 28 reveal. Since many of BA students who responded to Task Sheet I live in urban areas and do not experience any *yayla* experience any more, it is possible to claim that the idiom *bir şeyle başa çıkmak* is a dead metaphor in their minds. The same can be true for those who speculated scenarios different from what I expected.

4. Conceptual metaphor theory and teaching English as a foreign language

In recent years, there has been an increasing interest in the applicability of cognitive linguistics to L2 teaching and learning. The examples of the comprehensive discussions of the issue include Archard and Niemier (2004), and Boers and Lindstromberg (2008). Archard and Niemier (2004) suggest that “the cognitive linguistics model... offers important contributions to second language pedagogy because the kinds of generalizations it posits to describe linguistic organization can easily be made explicit, and thus incorporated into classroom practices” (p. 7). This view is supported by Boers and Lindstromberg (2008) who maintain that cognitive linguistics-inspired teaching “will help learners attain a more profound understanding of the target language, better remember more words and phrases (owing to greater depth of processing in general and to dual coding in particular), appreciate the link between language and culture, and become more confident (once they realize that – because language is not entirely arbitrary – pathways for insightful learning are available as alternatives to blind memorisation)” (p. 27). Other authors (for example, Deignan, Gabrys and Solska, 1997; Charteris-Black and Ennis, 2001; Charteris-Black, 2003; Boers, 2013a) also point to the applicability of cognitive linguistics to L2 teaching and learning. CM appears to be one of the tangible cognitive elements to be transferred to L2 classrooms.

To help L2 learners cope with the challenges posed by the metaphorical, figurative stock of L2 – in our case English – the stepping stone would most likely be consciousness raising activities based on the metaphorical, figurative stock in L2 learners’ own language, L1. This kind of approach will go parallel with the recent trend that challenges the monolingual assumption and suggests “a reassessment of the merits of relating the language being taught to students’ own languages” (Hall & Cook, 2012, p. 272). It is almost certain that consciousness raising on the basis of L1 background is central to other activities to teach metaphorical expressions in L2 because L2 learners will be able to recognise what have already acquired and used metaphorically in their L1. The reality is that “metaphorical competence in L1 develops without instruction, or conscious identification of either source or target domains, or mappings...[and that] [i]dentifying CMs appears to be a much more demanding task for language learners than cognitive linguists would expect.” (Berendi, Csabi & Kövecses, 2008, p. 88). Our performance with L1 metaphors is such that “[i]n our native language, we are capable of understanding the meanings of metaphorical utterances effortlessly, [and] [i]n most cases, we do not even have to consciously process the underlying metaphors; the surface form seems to be translated into meaning almost instantly” (Saygın, 2001). There would therefore seem to be a definite need for the L2 learners to be made aware of the metaphor-related cognitive capacity in their L1 that they have already developed and are using.

As specifications of developing metaphor awareness in L2 learners, Boers (2004, p. 211) enumerates the following mental acts that will help L2 learners:

(i) recognition of metaphor as a common ingredient of everyday language; (ii) recognition of the metaphoric themes (conceptual metaphors or source domains) behind many figurative expressions;

(iii) recognition of the non-arbitrary nature of many figurative expressions; (iv) recognition of possible cross-cultural differences in metaphoric themes; and (v) recognition of cross-linguistic variety in the linguistic instantiations of those metaphoric themes. (italics are original)

Boers (2004, 2013b) further discusses the factors concerning the teaching of metaphors in L2 in terms of the proficiency levels and cognitive styles of L2 learners, receptive and productive skills, and degrees of vagueness and transparency of the MLEs to be taught as vocabulary items, and concedes that many of these factors need investigating. He makes the legitimate warning that “[k]nowledge of the existing metaphoric themes of the target language does not entail mastery of its standard linguistic instantiations” (Boers, 2004, p. 218). Similarly, Andreou and Galantomos (2008) remind that “the existence of conceptual metaphors/metonymies in the mind is not a sufficient factor by itself for high performance in L2 acquisition. Thus, it is important for L2 learners to be sensitized about the pervasiveness of metaphor in language and the special aspects that constitute the cognitive linguistic approach before they are asked to apply it” (p. 72). Still, awareness raising is the crucial beginning for L2 learners to come to terms with the vast amount of figurative metaphorical expressions of L2 while it is a fact that “a one-off eye-opener is not sufficient to turn metaphor awareness into a learning strategy for the future processing of figurative lexis” (Berendi, Csabi & Kövecses, 2008, p. 87). After having given the general considerations about how to handle metaphorical expressions in L2, it is now time to enumerate a few specific considerations to keep in mind while covering metaphorical expressions in L2 settings.

Firstly, it is common sense that similar CMs and their linguistic instantiations in L1 and L2 are most likely to be easily comprehended and produced by L2 users. For example, soft-hearted in English corresponds to Turkish yumuşak kalpli ‘soft heart-with’ because both phrases stem from the same universal conceptual basis: The State Of The Feelings Is The Material State Of A Vital Organ (Charteris-Black, 2002, p. 129). Similarly, change hands in English, pindah tangan ‘change hand’ in Malay (Charteris-Black, 2002, p. 129), and el değıştir- ‘hand change’ in Turkish mean the same thing: a change in ownership, which is conceptually based on the metonymies of Hand For The Person and Hand For Control. We would expect that L2 learners will easily understand and use them – a hypothesis that is of course subject to further investigation. Different from the examples above where the examples represent one-to-one correspondences between the three languages, i.e. English, Malay, and Turkish, there may be other cases where the teachers are strongly recommended to be always watchful about the divergences between L1 and L2 in terms of conceptual bases and linguistic realizations. The reason is that “although some expressions operate in a similar way in L2, the existence of similar metaphors in L2 cannot be taken for granted” (Deignan, Gabrys & Solska, 1997, p. 356) and may lead to misinterpretations. For example, off the top of my head, according to LDCE, means answering a question or providing information immediately without checking the facts. But in the case of the similar Turkish expression baş(ım) üstüne ‘head(my) top.POS.DAT’, the speaker simply means “Yes, sir/madam!” or “Your request/wish is an order to me and I will fully comply with it”. This exemplifies Type 3 (i.e. Equivalent Linguistic Form, Different Conceptual Basis) of the six relationships between the figurative, metaphorical expressions of different languages, enumerated by Charteris-Black (2002, pp. 129-132). The other three types relevant to our study are (Type 5 and Type 6 are not dealt with here since they they can be the subject matter of an established further study):

Type 1: Equivalent Conceptual Basis, Equivalent Linguistic Form, e.g. change hands as discussed above

Type 2: Similar Linguistic Form, Equivalent Conceptual Basis, e.g. look down one’s nose in English, hidung tinggi ‘nose high’ in Malay, and burnu büyük/havalarında ‘nose big/in the airs’ in Turkish, all meaning ‘consider oneself better than others’, based on the CM of Physical Position Is Mental Attitude

Type 4: Different Linguistic Form, Equivalent Conceptual Basis, e.g. pickpocket in English, panjan tangan ‘long arm’ in Malay, and eli uzun ‘hand long’ in Turkish, all figuratively denoting a person who steals by sleight of hand

Secondly, if a CM is absent in L1 culture of L2 learners, it would be highly beneficial to remind the learners of the absence of the CM in their L1 (Boers and Demecheleer, 2001), especially in cases where the learners’ L1 is distant from L2. For Turkish learners of English as a foreign language (TLEFL), this is the case because Turkish is a member of Altaic family whereas English is an Indo-European language (Dalby, 1998; Price, 1998; Campbell, 2000). English, for example, has a great number of metaphorical expressions related to sailing, ships, navigation, and sea (Boers, 2000, p. 568; Boers and Demecheleer, 2001, p. 256; Charteris-Black & Ennis, 2001, p. 262; Boers & Stengers, 2008, p. 358), which seem to instantiate the CM of Living Life Is Going On A Journey By Sea (McElhanon, 2006 p. 47). On the other hand, Turkish, as I have already discussed in the previous sections, has a lot of metaphorical expressions instantiating Yayla Journey CMs, Agro-Pastoralism CMs, and Carpet Weaving CMs. The same difference can also be seen in the rather more frequent use of metaphorical expressions related to cricket and baseball in English (Boers & Stengers, 2008, p. 357) than Turkish that has a tendency towards metaphors for a sport of wrestling – which is now being enriched by soccer-related expressions due to the popularity of soccer in Turkey.

Thirdly, along with the elaborated aspects of metaphorization in L1, L2 teachers can show the motivation behind the metaphorical expressions of L2. In this respect, Boers and Demecheleer (2001, p. 261) suggest highlighting the etymological origin of metaphorical expressions to supplement the motivation behind the metaphors. To illustrate, they give an English example from sailing, namely, showing someone the ropes, which originally means ‘an experienced sailor instructing a novice’. Similar etymological explications can be made for the motivation behind the Turkish metaphorical expressions so that their knowledge about the links between CMs and their linguistic instantiations can be reinforced in their mind. For instance, the students are given the expression birşeyle başa çıkmak in Turkish, helped to brainstorm about its origins and provided with the CM of Life Is A Cyclical Journey To And From Yayla.

Next, even though the presentation of “target phrases in sets, grouped according to the conceptual metaphors they are believed to instantiate or according to the source domain they are believed to derive from” (Boers, 2013b, p. 251) is “an established procedure in the teaching of vocabulary” (Lazar 1996, p. 44), there is criticism against the practice of teaching vocabulary in lexical sets such that “it is not likely to facilitate learning” (Boers, 2013b, p. 251). This procedure can be utilized for frequently used linguistic metaphors supplemented by pictorials to illustrate a literal reading of the figurative expressions, line drawings, photographic visuals, mime and enactment techniques, and video clips. These supplementary techniques are expected to “make figurative phrases...more memorable...more amenable to dual coding” (Boers, 2013b, p. 232).

Finally, considering the implications made so far, it seems evident that a translation course would be of crucial importance for a comparative study of BPTs-in-MLEs in Turkish and English. While selecting the course materials, BPTs-in-MLEs would be one of the criteria. The learners can be assigned to compare and contrast authentic, written or oral English texts and their translations from the perspective of BPTs-in-MLEs. For example; English materials like lyrics of songs, film scripts, editorials, short stories, and brochures, and their Turkish translations can be analysed and documented by the learners. The results found by the learners can be presented and discussed in class. In this way, cross-linguistic and cross-cultural awareness of BPTs-in-MLEs can be raised and certain MLEs can be acquired.

5. Conclusions

Even though Turkish and English belong to different language families, there are a lot of similarities between them in terms of the use of BPTs in MLEs and in terms of the CMs underlying the BPT-containing MLEs. As my study also shows, there are differences between the two languages in the lexicalizations of the BPT-containing MLEs and in the CMs underlying them. The plausible explanation for this difference may be that it is possible to observe variation between Turkish and English due to peculiarities in their native speakers' physical environment, social context, cultural context, social history, social concerns and interests, experiential focus, viewpoint preference, and prototype and framing. For example, while the sea-related objects, and activities are more likely to be relevant to English, semi-nomadic objects, and activities would predominantly be expressed in Turkish. The Turkish MLE of *birşeyle başa çıkmak* systematically used as the translation of to handle something in our present corpus is of great significance because it has the capacity to uncover the set of CMs that I allege to underlie many frequent BPT-containing MLEs in modern Turkish. As for the etymological origins of the so-called dead metaphors, my study partly confirmed the claim that idioms lose their metaphoricity and that they remain as frozen, lexical items in our current mental lexicons.

In contexts like Turkey, where English is taught as a foreign language, MLEs in general, and BPT-containing MLEs in particular could be among the central elements of the lexical content of English. A global introduction to CMT can be made to the TLEFL, followed by consciousness raising activities based on the metaphorical, figurative stock in TLEFL's own language, Turkish. Next, if a CM is absent in the culture of TLEFL, it is recommended that the TLEFL be reminded of the absence of the English CM in Turkish. The absence is possible because of the distance between Turkish and English. To reinforce learning, TLEFL can be shown the motivation behind the metaphorical expressions of English by highlighting the etymological origins of English metaphorical expressions. Furthermore, sets of English MLEs grouped under certain CMs can be provided for TLEFL accompanied by various activities. Finally, a translation course, L1 ↔ L2 and/or L2 ↔ L1, would be a great opportunity for the learning of MLEs of English.

References

- Achard, M., & Niemeier, S. (2004). Introduction: Cognitive linguistics, language acquisition, and pedagogy. In M. Achard & S. Niemeier (Eds.), *Cognitive linguistics, second language acquisition, and foreign language teaching* (pp. 1-11). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Aksan, M. (2011). The apocalypse happens when the feet take the position of the head: Figurative uses of 'head' and 'feet' in Turkish. In Z. A. Maalej & N. Yu (Eds.), *Embodiment via body parts: studies from various languages and cultures* (pp. 241-255). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Aksan, Y., & Kantar, D. (2008). No wellness feels better than this sickness: Love metaphors from a cross-cultural perspective. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 23(4), 262-291.
- Andreou, G., & Galantomos, L. (2008). Designing a conceptual syllabus for teaching metaphors and idioms in a foreign language context. *Porta Linguarum* 9, 69-77.
- Barfield, T. J. (1993). *The nomadic alternative*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Bates, D. G. (1972). Differential access to pasture in a nomadic society: The yörük of southeastern Turkey. In W. Irons & N. Dyson-Hudson (Eds.), *Perspectives on nomadism* (pp. 48-59). Leiden: E. J. Brill.

- Bates, D. G. (1980). Yoruk settlement in southeast Turkey. In P. C. Salzman (Ed.), *When nomads settle: Processes of sedentarization as adaptation and response* (pp. 124-139). New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Berendi, M., Csabi, S., & Kövecses, Z. (2008). Using conceptual metaphors and metonymies in vocabulary teaching. In F. Boers & S. Lindstromberg (Eds.), *Cognitive linguistic approaches to teaching vocabulary and phraseology* (pp. 65-99). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Boers, F. (2000). Metaphor awareness and vocabulary retention. *Applied Linguistics*, 21, 553-571.
- Boers, F. (2004). Expanding learners' vocabulary through metaphor awareness: What expansion, what learners, what vocabulary? In M. Achard & S. Niemeier (Eds.), *Cognitive linguistics, second language acquisition, and foreign language teaching* (pp. 211-232). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Boers, F. (2013a). Cognitive Linguistic approaches to teaching vocabulary: Assessment and integration. *Language Teaching*, 46, 208-224.
- Boers, F. (2013b). Cognitive semantic ways of teaching figurative phrases: an assessment. In F. Gonzalvez-Garcia, M. S. P. Cervel & L. P. Hernandez (Eds.), *Metaphor and metonymy revisited beyond the contemporary theory of metaphor* (pp. 229-263). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Boers, F., & Demecheleer, M. (2001). Measuring the impact of cross-cultural differences on learners' comprehension of imageable idioms. *ELT Journal*, 55(3), 255-262.
- Boers, F., & Lindstromberg, S. (Eds.). (2008). *Cognitive linguistic approaches to teaching vocabulary and phraseology*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Boers, F., & Lindstromberg, S. (2008). How cognitive linguistics can foster effective vocabulary teaching. In F. Boers & S. Lindstromberg (Eds.), *Cognitive linguistic approaches to teaching vocabulary and phraseology* (pp. 1-61). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Boers, F., & Stengers, H. (2008). A quantitative comparison of the English and Spanish repertoires of figurative idioms. In F. Boers & S. Lindstromberg (Eds.), *Cognitive linguistic approaches to teaching vocabulary and phraseology* (pp. 355-374). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Can, H., & Can, N. (2010). The inner self desires a friendly chat: Chat metaphors in Turkish and English. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 25(1), 34-55.
- Campbell, G. L. (2000). *Compendium of the world's languages*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2002). Second language figurative proficiency: A comparative study of Malay and English. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(1), 104-133.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2003). Speaking with forked tongue: A comparative study of metaphor and metonymy in English and Malay phraseology. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18(4), 289-310.
- Charteris-Black, J., & Ennis, T. (2001). A comparative study of metaphor in Spanish and English financial reporting. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20, 249-266.
- Clausner, T. C., & Croft, W. (1999). Domains and image schemas. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 10(1), 1-31.
- Cribb, R. (1991). *Nomads in archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalby, A. (1998). *Dictionary of languages: The definitive reference to more than 400 languages*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

- Deignan, A., Gabrys, D., & Solska, A. (1997). Teaching English metaphors using cross-linguistic awareness-raising activities. *ELT Journal*, 51, 352-360.
- Dyson-Hudson, R., & Dyson-Hudson, N. (1980). *Nomadic pastoralism*. *Ann. Rev. Anthropology*, 9, 15-61.
- Findley, C. V. (2005). *The Turks in world history*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gibbs, R. W. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbs, R. W. (2003). Embodied experience and linguistic meaning. *Brain and Language*, 84, 1-15.
- Gibbs, R. W. (2005). *Embodiment and cognitive science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbs, R. W. (Ed.). (2008). *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbs, R. W. (1996). Evaluating conceptual metaphor theory. *Discourse Processes*, 48(8), 529-562.
- Gibbs, R. W., Bogdanovich, J. M., Sykes, J. R., & Barr, D. J. (1997). Metaphor in idiom comprehension. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 37, 141-154.
- Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2012). Own-language use in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 45, 271-308.
- Johansen, U. (2005). *50 yıl önce Türkiye'de yürüklerin yayla hayatı*. Ankara: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Johnson, M. (2007). *The meaning of the body: Aesthetics of human understanding*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Khazanov, A. M. (1994). *Nomads and the outside world*. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Khazanov, A. M., & Wink, A. (Eds.). (2001). *Nomads in the sedentary world*. Surrey: Curzon.
- Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2013). Recent developments in metaphor theory: Are the new views rival ones? In F. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. S. P. Cervel & L. P. Hernandez (Eds.), *Metaphor and metonymy revisited beyond the contemporary theory of metaphor* (pp. 11-25). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lakoff, G. (2006). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In D. Geeraerts (Ed.), *Cognitive linguistics: Basic readings* (pp. 185-238). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lazar, G. (1996). Using figurative language to expand students' vocabulary. *ELT Journal*, 50(1), 43-51.

- Lindner, R. P. (1997). *Nomads and ottomans in medieval Anatolia*. London: Curzon Press.
- Özçalışkan, Ş. (2003). In a caravanserai with two doors I am walking day and night: Metaphors of death and life in Turkish. *Cognitive linguistics*, 14(4), 281-320.
- Özçalışkan, Ş. (2005). Metaphor meets typology: Ways of moving metaphorically in English and Turkish. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 16(1), 207-246.
- Özçalışkan, Ş. (2007). Metaphors we move by: Children's developing understanding of metaphorical motion in typologically distinct languages. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22(2), 147-168.
- Price, G. (Ed.). (1998). *Encyclopedia of the languages of Europe*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Ruhi, Ş., & Işık-Güler, H. (2007). Conceptualizing face and relational work in (im)politeness: Revelations from politeness lexemes and idioms in Turkish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 681-711.
- Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, F. J., & Pérez Hernández, L. (2011). The contemporary theory of metaphor: Myths, developments and challenges. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 26(3), 161-185.
- Saygın, A. P. (2001). Processing figurative language in a multi-lingual task: Translation, transfer and metaphor. Proceedings of the Workshop on Corpus-based and Processing Approaches to Figurative Language 2001: Held in Conjunction with Corpus Linguistics (UCREL Technical Papers). Retrieved on December 4, 2014 from <http://www.cs.bham.ac.uk/~jab/CorpusLinguistics2001/Abstracts/saygin.htm>
- Taneri, M. (1989). Socially deictic use of a body-part term in Turkish. In J. Ok & M. Taneri (Eds.), *Kansas working papers in linguistics* (pp. 105-122).
- Toksöz, M. (2010). *Nomads, migrants and cotton in the eastern mediterranean: The making of the Adana-Mersin region 1850-1908*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Wierzbicka, A. (2007). Bodies and their parts: An NSM approach to semantic typology. *Language Science*, 29, 14-65.
- Yu, N. (2000). Figurative uses of finger and palm in Chinese and English. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 15, 159-175.
- Yu, N. (2001). What does our face mean to us? *Pragmatics and Cognition*, 9, 1-36.
- Yu, N. (2008a). The relationship between metaphor, body and culture. In R. M. Frank, R. Dirven, T. Ziemke & E. Bernárdez (Eds.), *Body, language, and mind volume 2: Sociocultural situatedness* (pp. 387-407). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yu, N. (2008b). Metaphor from body and culture. In R. W. Gibbs (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought* (pp. 247-261). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yu, N. (2009). *From body to meaning in culture*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Appendix A. Abbreviations for gloss

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
ABIL	ability
ABL	ablative
ACC	accusative
CAUS	causative
DAT	dative
DER	derivational suffix
GEN	genitive
GER	gerund
INF	infinitive
LOC	locative
NEG	negative
OBLG	obligation
PASS	passive
POSS	possessive
PST	past
PL	plural
PTCP	participle
PROG	progressive
PRS	present
RECP	reciprocal
REL	relative
SUBJ	subject

Appendix B. List of five best-sellers and their Turkish translations

Book 1E: Richard Templar. (2009). *The Rules of Love*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc. (237 pages)

Book 1T: Richard Templar. (2009). *Aşkın Kuralları*. İstanbul: Optimist Yayınları. (Turkish version of Book 1E, translated by Elif Özsayar, 239 pages)

Book 2E: Richard Templar. (2006). *The Rules of Life*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited. (235 pages)

Book 2T: Richard Templar. (2008). *Yaşamın Kuralları*. İstanbul: Optimist Yayınları. (Turkish version of Book 2E, translated by Leyla Aslan, 235 pages)

Book 3E: Richard Templar. (2007). *The Rules of Wealth*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited. (242 pages)

Book 3T: Richard Templar. (2007). *Zengin Olmanın Kuralları* İstanbul: Optimist Yayınları. (Turkish version of Book 3E, translated by Ümit Şensoy, 244 pages)

Book 4E: Malcolm Gladwell. (2009). *Outliers*. London: Penguin Books. (376 pages)

Book 4T: Malcolm Gladwell. (2011). *Çizginin Dışındakiler*. İstanbul: MediaCat Kitapları. (Turkish version of Book 4E, translated by Aytül Özer, 224 pages)

Book 5E: Daniel Goleman. (2010). *Ecological Intelligence*. London: Penguin Books. (288 pages)
 Book 5T: Daniel Goleman. (2010). *Ekolojik Zeka*. İstanbul: Optimist Yayınları. (Turkish version of Book 5E, translated by Seda Toksoy, 243 pages)

Appendix C. Task sheet I

A TASK SHEET ON IDIOMATIC LANGUAGE

Read the following idiom, and write down in the space WHAT COMES TO YOUR MIND when hear the idiom.

birşeyle başa çıkmak:

.....

Appendix D. Task sheet II

A TASK SHEET ON IDIOMATIC LANGUAGE

Read the following idiom, and write down in the space THE POSSIBLE SCENARIO IN WHICH THE IDIOM WAS BORN AND STARTED TO BE USED.

birşeyle başa çıkmak:

.....

Appendix E. Further examples for BPT matches

BPT in English MLE = BPT in its Turkish translation	Number of matches	Book Number: Example for the BPT in the English MLE (<i>Metaphorical Mapping, if any</i>) (N/A: <i>Not Applicable</i>)	Book Number: Turkish translation of the example for the BPT in the English MLE (<i>Metaphorical Mapping, if any: Identical? or Different?</i>) (N/A: <i>Not Applicable</i>)
foot=foot	30	1E: be back on your feet (<i>Good Is Up</i>)	1T: ayaklarınızın üstünde kalk- (foot-PL- 2PL.POSS-GEN top-2PL.POSS-LOC get up) (<i>Identical</i>)
face=face	22	2E: fall flat on face (<i>Bad Is Down</i>)	2T: yüzüstü yere seril- (face-top-3SG.POSS ground-DAT sprawl-PASS) (<i>Identical</i>)
eye=eye	19	2E: keep your eyes open (<i>Paying Attention Is Looking At</i>)	2T: gözlerinizi dört aç- (eye-PL-2PL.POSS- ACC four open) (<i>Identical</i>)
tongue=tongue	6	1E: bite your tongue (<i>Thinking Is Speaking</i>)	1T: dilini tut- (tongue-2SG.POSS-ACC hold) (<i>Identical</i>)
mouth=mouth	4	2E: foul-mouthed (<i>The State Of The Thoughts Is The Material State Of A Vital Organ</i>)	2T: ağzı bozuk (mouth-3SG.POSS improper) (<i>Identical</i>)

others=others 50 2E: turn the other cheek (N/A) 2T: öteki yanağını çevir- (other cheek2SG.POSS-ACC turn) (N/A)

Appendix F. Further examples for BPT shifts

BPT in the English MLE→ Different BPT in its Turkish translation	Number of shifts	Book Number: Example for the BPT in the English MLE (<i>Metaphorical Mapping, if any</i>) (N/A: <i>Not Applicable</i>)	Book Number: Different translation of the BPT in the English MLE (<i>Metaphorical Mapping, if any: Identical? or Different?</i>) (N/A: <i>Not Applicable</i>)
finger→mouth	2	2E: get their fingers burnt (N/A)	2T: ağızları yan- (mouth-3PL.POSS burn) (N/A)
mouth→jaw	2	1E: keep your mouth shut (<i>Thinking Is Speaking</i>)	1T: çenenizi kapalı tut- (jaw-2PL.POSS-ACC shut keep) (<i>Identical</i>)
back→foot	2	3E: get up off our backside (<i>Good Is Up</i>)	3T: doğrulup ayağa kalk- (rise-PTCP foot-DAT get up) (<i>Identical</i>)
foot→eye	1	1E: put your foot down (N/A)	1T: gözünüzü kapat- (eye-2SG.POSS-ACC shut) (N/A)
nose→eye	1	5E: hard-nosed business thinkers (N/A)	5T: kendi çıkarını gözetken iş kurucular (own interest-3PL.POSS-ACC eye-DER-REL business founder-PL) (N/A)
ear→eye	1	3E: keep their ear to the ground (<i>Paying Attention Is Listening</i>)	3T: gözlerini dört aç- (eye-PL-3PL.POSS-ACC four open) (<i>Paying Attention Is Looking At</i>)
hand→palm	1	1E: cash in your hand (<i>Possession Is Holding In The Hand</i>)	1T: avucunuzdaki para (palm-2SG.POSS-LOC-REL money) (<i>Identical</i>)
ass→head	1	4E: a pain in the ass (N/A)	4T: baş belası (head trouble-3SG.POSS) (<i>Person Is Head</i>)
brain→head	1	1E: engage brain (<i>Head As Control Center</i>)	1T: kafanı çalıştır- (head-2SG.POSS-ACC work-CAUS) (<i>Identical</i>)
hand→finger	1	1E: have a hand in papal Bull (<i>Solving Problems Is Manipulating Objects With Hands</i>)	1T: papalık seçiminde parmağınız ol- (pope-DER election-3SG.POSS - LOC finger-2SG.POSS be) (<i>To Guide Or Direct Is To Point With The Finger</i>)
lip→mouth	1	3E: keep a tight lip (<i>Thinking Is Speaking</i>)	3T: ağız sıkı tut- (mouth-ACC tight keep) (<i>Identical</i>)
finger→hand	1	3E: fate's fickle finger (<i>To Guide Or Direct Is To Point With The Finger</i>)	3T: talihin vefasız eli (fortune-GEN loyalty-without hand-3SG.POSS) (<i>Control Is Holding In The Hand</i>)

fist→hand	1	3E: tight-fisted (<i>The Psychological Characteristic Of A Person Is The Physical Characteristic Of His/Her Hand</i>)	3T: eli sıkı (hand-3SG.POSS tight) (<i>Identical</i>)
nose→teeth	1	3E: keep their nose to the grindstone (<i>N/A</i>)	3T: canlarımı dişlerine tak- (life-PL-3PL.POSS-ACC tooth-PL-3PL.POSS-DAT fix) (<i>N/A</i>)
brow→forehead	1	3E: the honest sweat of your brow (<i>N/A</i>)	3T: alın teriyle dürüstçe çabala- (forehead sweat-3SG.POSS -with honestly try) (<i>N/A</i>)
mouth→throat	1	4E: He had four mouths to feed (<i>N/A</i>)	4T: Dört boğazı beslemesi gerekiyordu (four throat-ACC feed-GER-3SG.POSS need-PST) (<i>N/A</i>)
embody→flesh and bone	1	5E: The forces of unreason are embodied in activists (<i>Person Is Body</i>)	5T: Aktivistler akıldışılığın ete kemiğe bürünmüş halidir (activist-PL unreason-DER-GEN flesh-DAT bone-DAT wrap up-PTCP way-3SG.POSS-be-PRS) (<i>Identical</i>)

Appendix G. Native Turkish speakers' scenarios for the original events in which the MLE of *bir şeyle başa çıkmak* was born and started to be used

Participant No.	Scenario
1	Picking fruits
2	Family, with their children, visiting another family
3	Conflict between two villages
4	Repair work in a house
5	Agriculture
6	Wrestling sport
7	Agriculture
8	Community affairs
9	Community affairs
10	Knitting
11	Problem solving
12	House building materials
13	Government
14	Government
15	Fighting
16	War
17	Drawing water from well
18	Horse racing
19	Carrying water
20	Race among farmers in a field
21	Family meeting
22	Family setting
23	A trouble in a tribe
24	Wrestling match
25	Running competition
26	School setting
27	Family setting

28	Climbing up mountain top
29	Soldiers on duty in wartime
30	Game

Kavramsal metafor kuramı ve İngilizce'nin yabancı dil öğretimi olarak öğretimi: Vücut parçalarıyla ilgili kelimeler üzerine bir çalışma

Öz

Durumları, eylemleri, duyguları, ve düşünceleri ifade etmek için, vücut parçalarıyla ilgili kelimelerin kullanımı açısından, diller arasında benzerlikler ve farklılıklar gözlenebilir. Bu çalışmada, ilk olarak, çok satan beş İngilizce kitap ve onların Türkçe çevirileri incelenerek, (a) vücut parçalarıyla ilgili kelimelerin birincil ve mecazi kullanımları, (b) vücut parçalarıyla ilgili kelimeleri içeren metaforik sözlerdeki benzerlikler ve farklılıklar, ve (c) vücut parçalarıyla ilgili kelimeleri içeren metaforik sözlere temel oluşturan kavramsal metaforlardaki benzerlikler ve farklılıklar belirlenmiştir. Daha sonra, derlemin içerik incelemesine bağlı olarak, ana dili Türkçe olan katılımcıların bir ölü metafor konusundaki düşünceleri üzerinde durulmuştur. Bulgular, bir taraftan, her iki kitap setinde vücut parçalarıyla ilgili kelimeleri içeren metaforik sözlerde ve vücut parçalarıyla ilgili kelimeleri içeren metaforik sözlere temel oluşturan kavramsal metaforlarda örtüşmelerin olduğunu ortaya koyarken; diğer taraftan, kitapların Türkçe çevirilerinde, İngilizce asıllarından daha fazla sayıda vücut parçalarıyla ilgili kelimenin mecazi olarak kullanıldığını göstermiştir. Vücut parçalarıyla ilgili kelimelerin Türkçeye aktarımlarında değişimler de gözlenmiştir. Ana dili Türkçe olan katılımcılar, ölü metaforun çıkışına ilişkin farklı öyküler üretmişlerdir. Bu derlem incelemesinde belirlenen farklılıklar, vücut parçalarıyla ilgili kelimeleri içeren metaforik sözlerin ve vücut parçalarıyla ilgili kelimeleri içeren metaforik sözlere temel oluşturan kavramsal metaforların, İngilizce'nin söz varlığını öğretmede kullanılan malzemenin seçiminde ve düzenlenmesinde izlenecek ölçütlerden olması gerektiğine, ve İngilizce'nin metaforik sözlerinin yabancı dil öğrencilerine öğretiminde diller arasında karşılaştırmalı bir bakışın yararlı olacağına işaret etmektedir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Kavramsal metafor kuramı; metaforik sözler; vücut parçalarıyla ilgili kelimeler; İngilizce'nin yabancı dil olarak öğretimi; diller arası inceleme

AUTHOR BIODATA

Dr. Cemal Çakır is currently working as an assistant professor in the department of English Language Teaching at Gazi University. His main interests are pragmatics and foreign language teaching, lexicology, and intercultural communication.