Metaphor and Pedagogy

Larysa Bobrova
James P. Lantolf
The Pennsylvania State University

with the assistance of Sheng-Hsun Lee, Jiyun Kim and Julieta Fernandez

Working Paper No. 11
November 2012

iBooks Author

Please cite as: Bobrova, L., & Lantolf, J. P. (2012). Metaphor and Pedagogy. (CALPER Working Paper Series, No. 11). The Pennsylvania State University: Center for Advanced Language Proficiency Education and Research.

Metaphor and Pedagogy

Contents

1 Introduction

The science of applied linguistics has witnessed a deep dissatisfaction with what might be defined as the lack of "naturalness" and "native-likeness" in L2 learners' discourse despite the fact that L2 teaching often represents a sophisticated and highly-advanced learning environment in terms of instructional methodology that may even integrate the most recent uses of technology (Danesi & Mollica, 1998, p. 2). The problem lies in the inability of L2 learners to think in terms of the L2 conceptual system while at the same time having to rely on the conceptual system of L1. To resolve this conflict, Danesi (1995), Danesi and Mollica (1998), Littlemore and Low (2006), and Littlemore (2009) argue that metaphorical competence should become a central focus of L2 teaching and acquisition because, as the extensive research on metaphor shows, reasoning is metaphorical by its nature, given that metaphor constitutes a fundamental cognitive ability to think and talk about abstract phenomena, such as time, emotions, economic inflation, and education process (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

In this working paper we will outline the potential relevance of metaphor and metaphorical competence for L2 teaching and acquisition. To achieve this, we will first present the main claims of conceptual metaphor theory; next, we will discuss the structural components of conceptual metaphor; we will then contrast conceptual metaphor and linguistic metaphor as two distinct phe-

nomena; we will then consider the two types of conceptual metaphor, primary and complex, including cross-cultural and cross-linguistic variations of the latter type. Finally, we will discuss some ways of adapting conceptual metaphor for pedagogical purposes through demonstrating the interplay of metaphoric competence, generated as conceptual fluency, with communicative competence: grammatical competence, textual competence, illocutionary competence, sociolinguistic competence, and the strategic competence of L2 learners.

2 Metaphor is more than words

Metaphor is no longer considered "a matter of extraordinary rather than ordinary language" because it is more than a rhetorical ornamental device restricted to literature and poetry (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 3). Metaphor is recognized as a fundamental cognitive ability that we think and live by.

The metaphors "we live by", i.e., conceptual metaphors, are so deeply rooted in thinking and action that some of them have become conventionalized conceptual structures that play a central role in specifying our cultural realities. Cognitive Metaphor Theory contends that our conceptual system, in terms of which we perceive reality and relate to each other and to the world, is metaphorical. In other words, metaphorical concepts construe our daily interaction in and with the world by enabling us to think about, understand and talk about abstract phenomena,

such as time, emotions, and moral values, in terms of more concrete entities, even though we are not normally aware of the metaphorical concepts that we rely on (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

Inspired by Lakoff and Johnson's seminal work *Metaphors We Live By,* a robust body of research demonstrates that metaphor is "deeply ingrained in cognitive processes, social acts, and verbal usage" as "a constitutive factor of all mental constructions and reconstructions of reality" (Dirven & Paprotte, 1985, p. viii).

To illustrate what it means for a concept to be metaphorical and to structure an abstract everyday experience, we will consider the concept of TIME[1]. Time is mostly made sense of, and talked about, as space and motion in space (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999; Goatly, 2007). Spatial conceptualizations of time can be presented by such conceptual metaphors as TIME ELAPSING IS TRAVEL[2] (Goatly, 2007, p. 60). This way of conceptualizing the passage of time as physical movement in space is reflected in our everyday language by a wide variety of linguistic expressions:

> (1)   Christmas *is coming* soon. The time for a lesson *has arrived*. The deadline *is approaching*. Time *goes by/ passes by* fast when a lecture is interesting. Time *dragged on* as we waited to take the exam. Time *flies* during summer vacation.

In these metaphorical expressions, time is conversed about as if it were an object of some kind moving in space. In reality, Christmas is not a real object and therefore it cannot move. However, we can think about, and therefore talk about, this holiday as if it were indeed a real object that had the ability to move, just as a car, or as a person. Similar to a car moving along a street, we can think about an abstract event such as Christmas, as if it were moving along in time. This leads us to produce such utterances as "Christmas is coming" just as we would say "A car is coming."

Moreover, as with a vehicle or person, we can conceive of and talk about abstracts events as moving at different speeds. Thus, we can say "Christmas is fast approaching" or "The week went by slowly" just as we can say "The train is fast approaching" and "The car went by slowly."

In addition, time, as an actual moving object, can move in various manners, for example, it can fly, drag, slip, or sneak – "Time flies when you're having fun," "Time drags on and on when you don't like your job," "Before we realized, the wedding day had sneaked up on us."

It is in this sense that the metaphor TIME ELAPSING IS TRAVEL is one that we live by in our culture. It structures our comprehension of time, our reasoning about it, and our way of talking about it. It is also possible to conceive of time through other metaphorical structures, such as TIME IS A HUNGRY ANI-MAL, which results in expressions such as "Time is nibbling away at her beautiful facial features." However, in English, we most frequently conceive of and talk about time as movement in space.

It seems impossible to make any sense of time in terms of any expressions that are not culturally sanctioned or that have a different causal and overall event structure (Lakoff, 2006, p. 218). The causal aspect of motion consists of movement in space that results in the change of location. The causal aspect of eating is not only taking nutrition into one's body, but it also entails reduction in the entity that is devoured. The overall shape of the event of movement includes an entity that changes its location moving from one point to another. The overall shape of an eating event entails devouring food but also the reduction of the food source. We will say more about this later, when we explain how metaphors are actually formed. For now it is important to understand that constructing a metaphor is not a completely unconstrained process.

To give another example of the pervasiveness and unconscious use of metaphor in everyday life, let us consider one of the most frequently discussed and experienced emotions – love. It is usually recognized as "a mysterious emotion which is notoriously difficult to pin down" (Kövecses, 1986, p. 61). Kövecses notes that one of the ways of structuring love in many cultures is as a UNITY OF TWO COMPLEMENTARY PARTS[3], which he

points out, is so natural that its linguistic manifestations do not seem metaphorical at all:

> (2)   We are *made for each other*. We *are one*. She is *my better half*. Theirs is *a perfect match*. We function as *a unit*. They are *inseparable* (p. 62).

He explains that it is natural and obvious to understand love metaphors through the similarity between love experiences and the unity of physical, chemical, etc. elements or constituents. Similar to a perfect fit or match of automobile parts, or building blocks, or the parts of any modern appliance that enable them to function, the two loving parts form a unity maximally complementing each other in harmony (1986, p. 63). The view that one half is incomplete without the other in the love experience and that true love is perfect harmony, as Kövecses (1986) emphasizes, are not something inevitable or that cannot happen the other way around (p. 63). We think about love relationships and converse about them as we do because the metaphor, LOVE IS THE UNITY OF TWO COMPLEMENTARY PARTS, governs our thinking about the emotion (p. 63).

2.1 Components of metaphor

Lakoff & Johnson (1999) define metaphor as "understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another" (p. 5) The central assumption of their approach to metaphor is that abstract concepts are understood through concrete experiences

of the human body in and with the world (Lakoff & Johnson 1999). Time, as we discussed above, is not a subcategory of space, nor is love a subcategory of the unity of physical and chemical parts. Time and space, love and the unity of physical and chemical parts are different things. Space is a concrete phenomenon. It is a three-dimensional construct that can be characterized by length, width, latitude, particular terrain, administrative division, etc. In the time metaphor, our concrete bodily experiences of moving in space, e.g., the speed of motion, directionality, the mode of motion, are transmitted to our perception of time. Moreover, as Lakoff (2006) points out, our understanding of time as metaphorical motion is supported by our biological knowledge. Our visual system allows us to detect the motion of objects and their location. This might explain why time should be reasoned about in the sense of space (p. 11). Time, a purely abstract phenomenon, is an invention of mankind. Moreover, the technological changes in the measurement of time, as Goatly (2007) notes, influence the historical development of society in terms of distribution of power. For example, the shift from the natural measurement of time by observation of natural phenomena to the non-natural measurement of time by calendar marks the relationship of time to power. The knowledge of the calendar, therefore the right time for particular actions, was the prerogative of the Emperor in medieval China (Goatly, 2007, p. 61). The invention of the mechanical clock (the actual materialization of the spatial metaphor of time in the sense of

the motion of clock hands) in the Benedictine monasteries of Europe, eventually resulted in a view of time as money and a valuable commodity in the forms of time sheets, work schedules, hourly wages, hotel room rates, etc. Time became the tool of secular power that facilitates industry and economic tyranny (Goatly, 2007, p. 64). Thus, the metaphorical conceptualization of time as motion across actual existing physical space or distance toward a point on the line at least in part gives rise to consequences in social acts.

Similarly, love, as one of the emotions, is an abstract phenomenon, while the unity of physical or chemical parts is a concrete physical closeness that entails the matching of their shape. Thus, love is conceived and talked about as the unity of two people as if it were the unity of physical or chemical parts of a physical object. This conceptualization likely originates from the embodied experience of spatial proximity to caretakers in childhood, as when our parents embraced us, and separation from those same individuals as we grew up. The conventional ways of thinking and talking about time and love are structured by metaphors we are hardly conscious of because they are grounded in our often unconscious embodied experiences. Not only do we think and talk metaphorically, but we behave metaphorically as well.

The metaphorical expressions in (1) and (2) above share some common ground, even though on the face of it, they seem quite different. In addition to depicting time and love, they also rely on expressions that relate to the domain of space in (1) and unity as proximity in (2). Lakoff (2006) hypothesizes that there are generalizing principles that govern these metaphors. They take the form of conceptual mappings across domains (p. 185). In the examples in (1), the mapping is from the domain of TRAVELING to the domain of TIME ELAPSING. In the examples in (2), the mapping from the domain of UNITY to the domain of LOVE. Thus, TRAVELING, defined as the source domain, structures TIME ELAPSING, the target domain. UNITY, the source domain, conceptualizes LOVE, the target domain. Lakoff stresses that conceptual mappings reside neither in the lexicon nor in the grammar of a language, but they are the part of the cognitive system that underlies a language (p. 189). The metaphor involves the understanding of the target domain, TIME ELAPSING, in terms of the source domain, TRAVELING and of perceiving of the target domain of LOVE in terms of the source domain of UNITY.

Lakoff (2006) also points out that "mapping is tightly structured" by ontological correspondences of both domains (p. 190). Each domain includes distinct roles. Consider the metaphor TIME ELAPSING IS TRAVELING. The source domain, TRAVELING, entails A TRAVELING ENTITY, MOVEMENT OF THE ENTITY, DISTANCE COVERED, SPEED OF TRAVEL, MANNER OF TRAVEL, and DESTINATION. Similarly, the target domain, TIME ELAPSING, consists of, THE AMOUNT OF TIME, THE

iBooks Author

QUALITY OF TIME SPENT, and TIME FOR AN EVENT. The roles of the source domain correspond systematically to the roles of the target domain (p. 190).

The metaphor works by mapping the roles from the source domain onto the roles in the target domain: time is viewed as a traveling entity (The time for a lesson *has arrived*.), that travel happens at a certain speed (Time *goes by/passes* by fast when a lecture is interesting), or in a certain manner (Time *dragged* when waiting for an exam. Time *flies* by during summer vacation.), covering some distance (Time was crawling from 2 PM to 5 PM unbearably slowly.) (The exam period covers two weeks.), heading to some destination (Christmas *is coming* soon. The deadline *is approaching*.). These examples show that a metaphorical link between two domains is made by the correspondences perceived between the target and its source.

These correspondences are referred to as **mappings** that constitute the one-way relationship between both domains, i.e., projecting specific properties of the source domain onto the target domain. These mappings are illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1 Conceptual mappings for the metaphor TIME ELAPSING IS TRAVEL

Source domain **TRAVEL**	Mappings	Target domain **TIME ELAPSING**
A TRAVELING ENTITY	→	TIME
MOVEMENT OF AN ENTITY	→	THE LAPSE OF TIME
DISTANCE COVERED	→	THE AMOUNT OF TIME
SPEED OF TRAVEL	→	THE QUALITY OF SPENT TIME
MANNER OF TRAVEL	→	THE QUALITY OF SPENT TIME
DESTINATION	→	TIME FOR AN EVENT

Mappings allow us to reason about one phenomenon, e.g., TIME, by using the knowledge we have about another phenomenon, e.g., TRAVEL. We do this because TIME is rather abstract and difficult to conceptualize using everyday language. Therefore, we relate it to a concept that we are likely to know about or something we have experienced. Most people have traveled at some time in their lives and understand reasonably well what is involved in traveling; thus, they can use their understanding to talk about the process.

In addition to the discrete mappings that give rise to conceptual metaphors, the mappings elaborate additional knowledge be-

iBooks Author

yond the basic correspondences. Basic mappings do not explicate all the possible aspects of the source domain, though they imply them. This additional information that can be inferred from the mappings is defined as **rich inferences** or **entailments**. For example, let's reconsider the metaphorical expressions in (2) that elaborate the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS THE UNITY OF TWO COMPLEMENTARY PARTS. In this metaphor, LOVERS correspond to TWO COMPLEMENTARY PARTS, and the metaphor LOVE RELATIONSHIPS is associated with PHYSICAL BOND/ATTACHMENT. In the source domain THE UNITY OF TWO COMPLEMENTARY PARTS, the connections between two parts can be strong, weak or even broken (Kövecses, 1986, p. 63). Hence, the association between the source and the target domain evokes the entailment (the rich inference) that these events can also apply in the target domain LOVE. This entailment is illustrated in (3):

> (3)   She has a *strong attachment* to him. The *romantic ties between* them are weakening. Sally and John *broke up* yesterday.

This entailment provokes, in turn, specific actions on the lovers' part, depending on their decision either to continue or to terminate their relationship.

2.2 Conceptual metaphor and linguistic metaphor

Conceptual metaphor and linguistic metaphor constitute two distinct, though related, phenomena. As discussed above, conceptual metaphor is a cognitive/mental phenomenon, while linguistic metaphor (the term "a metaphorical expression" is used for the sake of clarity) is a language phenomenon. Given the distinction, Lakoff (2006) explains that the locus of conceptual metaphor is the subconscious mind while the locus of linguistic metaphor is language. Conceptual metaphor is a system of cognitive mappings that structure an abstract concept by projecting particular similarities from the source domain to the target domain, while linguistic metaphor is a set of words that structure a phrase or a sentence (p. 186).

Littlemore (2009) nicely defines the difference between the two phenomena as "the drawing together of incongruous *domains*" in the case of conceptual metaphor and "the drawing together of incongruous *words*" in the case of linguistic metaphor [italics added] (p. 98). For instance, the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS THE UNITY OF TWO COMPLEMENTARY PARTS draws together two incongruous domains: LOVE and THE UNITY OF TWO COMPLEMENTARY PARTS. The linguistic metaphor "*weak romantic ties between somebody*" draws together five incongruous words to describe the stability of love relationships. This linguistic metaphor is one of many surface realizations of

this conceptual metaphor. The function of the linguistic metaphor "*weak romantic ties between somebody*" is to make a point about a love relationship. The function of the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS THE UNITY OF TWO COMPLEMENTARY PARTS is to constitute a conceptually structured system upon which the abstract notion of LOVE is grounded.

Littlemore and Low (2006) emphasize another difference between conceptual and linguistic metaphor. For the latter, exact words are crucial to constitute a metaphor, while for the former, the precise words are important but not crucial to describe two domains. Linguistic metaphors tend "to fossilize" in a sense of collocating with the same words and the same parts of speech (pp.13-15), while in the case of conceptual metaphor, this rigidness is absent because conceptual metaphors are formulations drawn from guesswork that attempts to generalize across examples standing apart from actual linguistic examples (p.13). For this reason, the words used in conceptual formulations might vary. For example, in the formulation LOVE IS THE UNITY OF TWO COMPLEMENTARY PARTS replacing the word 'parts' with the word 'elements' or 'constituents' does not affect the conceptual meaning of the metaphor. However, it is impossible to replace the word 'half' with the words 'an equal part' in the linguistic metaphor '*She is my better half*', though they are synonymous.

2.3 Primary and complex conceptual metaphors

As discussed in section 1, conceptual metaphors are grounded in embodied experiences of our interaction in, and with, the world. However, the nature of relationships between embodied experiences and abstract phenomena varies in different conceptual metaphors. As Grady (1999) points out, some conceptual metaphors are grounded in the straightforward correlation between embodied experiences and abstract phenomena, while the experiential motivation of other metaphors is indirect and therefore the correlation between two concepts is less obvious. Let's compare the metaphors MORE IS UP, LESS IS DOWN (Lakoff, 2006, p. 226) and STRONG DESIRE IS HUNGER (Grady, 1999, p. 85) with the metaphor TO SPEAK IN A MAXIMALLY INFORMATIVE WAY IS TO TRANSFER WORDS ALONG A STRAIGHT PATH (Cienki, 1998, p. 116).

The experiential basis for the metaphor MORE IS UP (Prices *jump up*. The rate of employment *goes up*.) is motivated by the common experience of adding things to a pile and cognitively perceiving the pile increasing vertically or by the experience of pouring liquid to a container and observing the level go up. Contrast this with the metaphor LESS IS DOWN (The criminal rate *goes down*. The profit *fell*.), where the interrelationship between quantity and verticality is in the opposite direction (Lakoff, 2006, p. 226). Judging quantity by a simple, scalar vertical parameter

iBooks Author

is pervasively encountered in our daily lives (Lakoff, 2006, p. 226). This type of embodied experience, Grady (1999) argues, is directly connected to a specific sensory-motor experience, i.e., visual-perceptual experience. As a fundamental bodily and cognitive experience, it gives rise to "basic low-level metaphorical correspondences" that Grady (1999) calls **primary metaphors** (p. 81). Another typical example of a primary metaphor is STRONG DESIRE IS HUNGER elaborated in the linguistic metaphors: The football team is *hungry for* a victory. John is *starved for* love. This man *hungers for* power. Grady (1999) notes the correlation between the physical sensation of hunger and the conscious desire to win, to become loved, and to obtain power. HUNGER is comprehended as "a basic cognitive-emotional state" and as such its attributes are easily recognized (p. 86). Practically, target domain concepts, MORE, LESS, and STRONG DESIRE are projections of subjective embodied and cognitive responses to sensory-perceptual input of the source domain concepts, UP, DOWN, and HUNGER (p. 96).

In contrast to primary metaphors that relate two simple concepts, such as quantity and verticality, desire and hunger, the metaphor TO SPEAK IN A MAXIMALLY INFORMATIVE WAY IS TO TRANSFER WORDS ALONG A STRAIGHT PATH (Cienki, 1998, p. 116) relates to the entire complex of sensory-motor experiences: the experiences of transference in space, transference along a path, experience with containment, and the emotional-cognitive experience of candidness. These direct experiences motivate an array of metaphors: IDEAS ARE OBJECTS, WORDS/SENTENCES/TEXTS ARE CONTAINERS, IDEAS ARE OBJECTS IN WORD/SENTENCE/TEXT CONTAINERS, COMMUNICATION IS TRANSFERRING WORD/SENTENCE/TEXT CONTAINERS that structure the metaphor of candid communication (Cienki, 1998, p. 117). Our experiences with physical objects in reality, putting them into containers, transferring those containers in space along a straight path (it is logically justified because it is the shortest path) are mapped onto candidly communicated ideas in the form of words, sentences, and texts. Following Lakoff's (2006) assumption of an inheritance hierarchy whereby metaphors lower in the hierarchy can inherit experiential basis indirectly from metaphors higher in the hierarchy (p. 227), the metaphor TO SPEAK IN A MAXIMALLY INFORMATIVE WAY IS TO TRANSFER WORDS ALONG A STRAIGHT PATH inherits the experiential basis of IDEAS ARE OBJECTS, WORDS/SENTENCES/TEXTS ARE CONTAINERS, IDEAS ARE OBJECTS IN WORD/SENTENCE/TEXT CONTAINERS, COMMUNICATION IS TRANSFERRING WORD/SENTENCE/TEXT CONTAINERS. Grady (1999) defines this type of metaphor as **complex or compound**.

In addition to the difference in experiential motivation, primary metaphors differ from compound metaphors with regard to the lack of mapping gaps. The primary metaphor MORE IS UP includes two concepts, and those two concepts are directly

mapped onto each other. There is no gap in mapping. The compound metaphor TO SPEAK IN A MAXIMALLY INFORMATIVE WAY IS TO TRANSFER WORDS ALONG A STRAIGHT PATH relies on two complex domains, each of which can be divided into component parts. For example, TRANSFERANCE might take place with the help of a VEHICLE or other INDIVIDUALS, however these concepts fail to map onto the target domain. The occurrence of mapping gaps qualifies the metaphor in question as compound.

The consequences of the differences between primary and compound metaphors consists of the fact that primary metaphors are candidates for cross-linguistic and cross-cultural universals, while compound metaphors are more likely to exhibit variation across languages and cultures and may appear in one culture but not another.

2.4 Cross-cultural variations in conceptual metaphor

The universality of primary metaphors lies in shared basic human physiological experiences. For instance, in most cultures an increase in the level of something such as water is associated with the accumulation of greater quantities, evoking the primary metaphors MORE IS UP and LESS IS DOWN discussed in the previous section. In most communities, physical size refers metaphorically to degree of importance, giving rise to the primary metaphor SIGNIFICANCE IS LARGE (e.g., a big deci-

sion, a big day, to have big ideas [Goatly, 2007, p. 35]). As Grady (1999) notes, this metaphorically-grounded conceptualization of importance is observed in many languages including Zulu, Hawaiian, Turkish, Malay, and Russian, in addition to English (p. 80). Despite the ubiquity of this metaphor, it is not attested in Korean culture because, as Cho (1994) explains, it disagrees with fundamental values of the culture. Drawing on knowledge of the dependence of degree of spiciness on the size of a pepper strength crystallized in the Korean proverb: 'Small peppers are sharper', Koreans believe that a person might be small in body, but stronger than a large person (p. 198). For that reason, the conceptual metaphor SMALLER IS BETTER is more coherent in Korean culture than the metaphor BIGGER IS BETTER or SIGNIFICANCE IS LARGE.

To give other examples of the metaphors that might be good candidates for universal or near-universal metaphorical conceptualization, Kövecses (2005) reports on the occurrence of the same conceptual metaphors for happiness in unrelated languages, such as English, Chinese, and Hungarian. These cultural communities conceptualize HAPPINESS as UP (I'm feeling up.), LIGHT (She brightens up.), and A FLUID IN A CONTAINER (He's bursting with joy.) (p. 36-37). Kövecses (2005) explains the reason for similar conceptual associations for happiness by such universal experiences as jumping up and down for joy, smiling and expressing happiness with a sort of light in

iBooks Author

the eyes or face (p. 38). It should be noted that Russian and Argentinian Spanish also share these views of happiness.

In contrast to primary metaphors, compound metaphors are hypothesized to be susceptible to cross-cultural variations (Grady, 1999, Kövecses, 2005), and for this reason are particularly relevant for second language instruction. Conceptual compound metaphors can vary with regard to (1) the construal of a source domain incorporated into the same conceptual metaphors in different cultures, (2) the mapping of a particular source domain to a set of different target domains and vice versa, (3) the preference for some metaphors in specific cultures (Kövecses, 2005, pp. 67-68), and (4) value-judgments evoked by the same metaphors in different cultures (Boers, 2003, p. 232). We consider each of these factors in turn below.

2.4.1 Construal of Source Domain

The first type of cross-cultural variation occurs when two or more languages display the same source and target domain, but with markedly different construals, or interpretations, of the source domain. This means that the general schema of the metaphor is filled out with culturally specific elements. Although the conceptual metaphor THE ANGRY PERSON IS A PRESSURIZED CONTAINER occurs in many cultures and languages, e.g. English, Japanese, Chinese, Zulu, the instantiations of this metaphor differ with respect to the kind of con-

tainer, the kind of substance creates pressure, whether the pressure results in an explosion, etc. (Kövecses 2005).

In English, the kind of container is not specified, but it is found pressurized with hot liquid: You make my blood *boil. Simmer* down! Let him *stew.* He was *bursting with* anger. (p. 39-40). In Japanese, anger is also a pressurized heated liquid; however, contrary to English, the container is specified. Pressurized heated liquid is contained in the *hara* (literally: belly), a concept unique to Japanese culture: *Ikari ga hara no soko o guragura, saseru.* 'Anger boils the bottom of the belly' (Matsuki, 1995, p. 140).

Yu (1995) reports that the Chinese anger metaphor draws on the cultural concept of *qi. Qi* corresponds to substances such as gas, meaning the energy that flows through the body (p. 63). Unlike in English, where heated fluid exerts pressure inside the container, in Chinese, gas is indifferent to heat; however, it is also able to create pressure in a container specified as the heart, spleen, or liver, resulting in an explosion: *Ta pi-qi hen da* (he spleen-gas very big) 'He's got big gas in his spleen,' 'He is hot-tempered.' *Ta xin-zhong you qi* (he heart-inside have gas) 'He has gas (anger) in his heart,' 'He is angry.' *Ta zuijing gan-qi yujie* (he recently liver-gas pent-up) 'He's been irritated recently,' 'He's been in an irritable mood' (p. 64).

Zulu metaphors for anger involve the heart as the container for emotion (Kövecses 2005), and anger is therefore conceptual-

ized as a substance that overloads the container of a limited capacity, resulting in an explosion. In such cases, a person becomes very angry, incapable of controlling pressurized emotion. A notable difference with the English heart metaphor lies in the type of emotion that resides in the heart. In English, the heart metaphor usually relates to such emotions as love and affection, but not to anger (Kövecses, 2005, p. 69).

Russian also conceptualizes THE ANGRY PERSON as A PRESSURIZED CONTAINER. However, in this case, anger is located in a person's chest/breast or behind the ribs: Скрытый *гнев разрывал грудь* ('Hidden anger *was tearing the breast/ chest*'), Нерастраченная *злость давила на ребра*, и Дима, оглянувшись на дверь, сказал одно только слово ('Unspent *anger was pressing his ribs* and Dima, after looking back at the door, said only one word'). Anger is likely viewed as a substance similar to air or gas that exerts pressure from the inside: Клим молчал, чувствуя, что его *раздувает злость*, а девушка недоуменно, печально говорила… ('Klim was silent, feeling that *anger was inflating* him, and the girl was speaking perplexedly and sadly'). It should be noted that anger might also reside in the soul if it fills the container without exerting pressure. This marks the gradual growth of emotion: И я чу́вствовал, что ядовитая *злость* мало-помалу *наполняла мою душу* ('And I felt that poisonous *anger was filling* my soul little by little').

Argentinian Spanish also conceptualizes THE ANGRY PERSON as A PRESSURIZED CONTAINER with no restriction to a particular area of the body: *Cuando la conductora se enteró de la infidelidad de su marido estalló en cólera* ('When the (television) host found out about the infidelity of her husband she *exploded in anger*'). The metaphor indicates that the internal pressure results in an explosion as in English elaborations of the metaphor.

2.4.2 Mapping source to variable targets

The second type of cross-cultural variation in metaphorical conceptualization relates to the mapping of a particular source domain to a set of different target domains and vice versa. The set of target domains that can be applied to a particular source domain is defined as the *scope* of the source domain. The differences with regard to the inclusiveness and exclusiveness of source domain scope are obvious across different languages (Kövecses, 2005, p. 72).

To illustrate these differences, let's consider the source domain UP/DOWN that is relevant to Western languages (e.g., English, Russian) [Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Luodonpaa-Manni & Viimaranta, 2010] and Asian languages (Chinese) [Chun, 2002]. Among other target domains, in English, Russian, and Chinese, the scope of the

iBooks Author

UP/DOWN domain includes such typical target domains as EMOTIONAL STATE, QUANTITY, MORALITY, and FORESEEABLE FUTURE EVENTS. The physical experience of erect posture and stooping posture is conventionalized in the metaphors HAPPY IS UP, SAD IS DOWN in English: I am feeling *up(low)*, My spirits *sank* (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 15). The same metaphors occurs in Russian: *поднять* дух (*raise* the spirit), насторение *падает* (mood *is falling*) (Luodonpaa-Manni & Viimaranta, 2010, p. 77). Chinese also uses verticality for happiness and sadness: *ta hen gao-xing* (he very high-spirit), 'he is very *high-spirited*/happy,' *tā xīnqíng dīluò* (he mood low falling) 'he is in a low mood' (Yu, 1995, p. 71).

Physical verticality also applies to quantity in English, Russian and Chinese, and is conceptualized in the metaphor MORE IS UP, LESS IS LOW: My income *rose* last year, he is *under*age (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 16); *высокий* урожай (*high* yield) *снизить* расходы (*lower* the expenses) (Luodonpaa-Manni & Viimaranta, 2010, p. 80); *gongzi shangtiao* (liter salary up adjust) '*a rise* in salary,' *xiaofei xia jiang* (consumption down fall) '*a drop* in consumption' (Chun, 2002, p. 160-161).

Moral virtues are associated with up/down in all three languages as well. This is reflected in the linguistic manifesta-

tions of the metaphor VIRTUE IS UP, DEPRAVITY IS DOWN: she has *high* standards, that was a *low* trick (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 16); **высоко** нравственный (*highly* moral), **низко** лгать (lie *lowly*) (Luodonpaa-Manni & Viimaranta, 2010, p. 84); **shang** de (up virtue) *great* virtue, **xia** jian (down humble) of *low* morality (Chun, 2002, p. 166).

The scope of UP/DOWN differs when it is applied to the target FORESEEABLE FUTURE EVENTS in the three languages under consideration. In English, the scope of UP includes the target FORESEEABLE FUTURE EVENTS. This is elaborated in such expressions as All *up*coming events are listed in the paper, what's coming *up* this week? (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 16). This conceptualization of FORESEEABLE FUTURE EVENTS ARE UP/DOWN apparently does not occur in Russian (Luodonpaa-Manni & Viimaranta, 2010), although one expression Russian expression is to some extent close to the English with regard to inclusion of verticality. The preposition *pod* (under) in the accusative case designates the time period close to an event: *под* воскресенье (under Sunday) 'right before Sunday,' *под* праздник (under a holiday), 'right before a holiday' (Luodonpaa-Manni & Viimaranta, 2010, p. 81).

iBooks Author

As preceding examples show, in Russian, future events are conceptualized through the metaphor TEMORAL PROXIMITY IS DOWN (Luodonpaa-Manni & Viimaranta, 2010, p. 81). In Chinese, this metaphor is reversed: A LATER TIME IS UP, AN EARLIER TIME IS DOWN: *you ci* **shang***su dao hanchao* (from here up trace to Han dynasty) 'trace to the Han Dynasty from this point,' *jianchi* **xia** *qu* (insist down go) 'carry on till the future' (Chun, 2002, p. 164). In contrast to English and Russian, in Chinese the scope of UP/DOWN includes the target STATE associated with PUBLIC/ PRIVATE realized by the metaphor IN PUBLIC IS SHANG/ IN PRIVATE IS HIA: **shang** *ban* (up office) 'go to work,' **xia** *ban* (down office) 'leave work' (Chun, 2002, p. 166).

The difference in the availability of the set of source domains for a particular target domain in different languages is defined as the *range* of the target domain. This difference often occurs in metaphors dealing with emotion (Kövecses, 2005. p. 70). As mentioned above, English, Hungarian, Russian, and Argentinian Spanish share the basic source domains for the target domain HAPPINESS: UP, LIGHT, and FLUID IN A CONTAINER. While Chinese also conceptualizes HAPPINESS as LIGHT, and FLUID IN A CONTAINER, the target domain UP is not applicable because in Chinese culture being up, off the ground means

being out of self-control and therefore contradicts the conventional virtues of modesty and steadiness (Yu 1995). Thus when someone is described as floating, as in *ta piaopiaoran* 'he is floating', or *ta you zai yunli-wuli le* 'he is again in the clouds and fog', it means that the person is so smug that he lost his senses (Yu, 1995, p. 64). On the other hand, Chinese, has a source domain to express happiness that is not available in English, Russian, or Argentinian Spanish: FLOWERS IN THE HEART (Yu 1995, p. 74).

2.4.3 Preferential Conceptualization

The third type of cross-cultural variation, *preferential conceptualization*, occurs when two or more languages/ cultures share the same set of conceptual metaphors for a given target domain, but the speakers of these languages prefer to use some of the metaphors over others (Kövecses, 2005, p. 82). For example, sports metaphors differ in their productivity across cultures. The source domain BASEBALL proves very productive for conceptualizing social relations such as love and marriage, in American culture, where baseball is one of the most popular sports: *I can't get to first base*, *I made a big hit with him* (Shore, 1996, pp. 88-89). In Korean, Russian, and Chinese, where other sports are popular, baseball metaphors are irrelevant. For example, in Russian culture, soccer and chess are quite popular; consequently, soccer and chess

metaphors are also productive in Russian political discourse for talking about various political issues including elections: *На выборах мы видим желание политиков **играть рукой** (а то и **обеими** сразу)* (During the election we can see a desire of politicians *to play with a hand* (or *with both hands* simultaneously), whereby an illegal use of hands in soccer is mapped onto illegal behavior in political elections. *Иванов **сделал ход конем** и набрал много голосов для утверждения нового закона о газе.* (Ivanov *took an L-shaped move* and accumulated many votes by adopting new gas regulation), whereby the movement of the Knight in chess is mapped onto an unexpected political move designed to increase votes. Korean political discourse also employs sports metaphors to characterize elections: *4월 총선에서 뛸 대표선수 면면이 드러나고 있다.* (Literal: Representative *players* who will be *running* in the April presidential election are beginning to declare their candidacy). In Chinese, the sports metaphor *tī píqiú* (literal: kick rubber ball) is used to point out that one is shirking one's responsibilities.

Similarly, HEALTH metaphors (e.g., *The market cure*) are more preferable in English than in Dutch; GARDENING metaphors (e.g., *Pruning costs*) are more productive in English than French; whereas FOOD metaphors (e.g., *Gobbling up small companies*) are frequent, though

HEALTH, GARDENING, and FOOD source domains are available in all three of these cultures (Boers, 2003, p. 48). The source domain HEALTH is also relevant in Russian: *здоровье экономики* (the health of the economy), *Время – **прекрасный** лекарь* (Time is an excellent doctor), in Korean: 죽어가는 한국경제 제가 살리겠습니다 (I will *revive/bring to life* the dying economy in Korea.), and in Chinese: *xiǎokāng* (literal: small health) means peaceful, happy, well off. The GARDENING metaphor is also productive in Russian: *Они быстро двигались по служебной лестнице там, где честные **пахари** шли от ступеньки к ступеньке долгими годами.* (They moved up an official staircase fast where for honest *plowmen* took long years to move from one step to another), in Korean: 농부된 마음으로 잡초를 뽑아내듯이 반개혁적인 정치인을 제거해 나가겠습니다. (I will have *a farmer's mind* and eradicate anti-innovation politicians as if getting rid of weeds.), and in Chinese: *zāipéi* (literal: to cultivate, plant) means to educate or train someone for a particular skill, attitude, or quality.

The FOOD source domain is relevant for Russian culture: ***голод души*** (*the hunger of a soul*), *любовь и слава **питают душу**, а не тело* (love and fame *nourish* a soul not a body), for Korean: 여러분의 뜨거운 관심과 사랑을 먹고 저희 프로그램이 이렇게 컸습니다 (Our program has grown this much after *eating* your hot interest and love),

and for Chinese: *fǎnchú* (literal: ruminate) is used to mean the process of rethinking knowledge or ideas carefully and deeply.

2.4.4 Value judgements

Finally, a fourth type of cross-cultural variation, relates to different *value judgments* evoked by the same metaphors, or the same source or target domain in different cultures (Boers, 2003, p. 235). Cross-cultural discrepancies in value systems can often lead to the misinterpretation of metaphors and the generation of wrong value judgments derived from them. For example, Littlemore (2003) discusses a misunderstanding arising from use of the metaphor GOOD IS UP in a British university classroom. The instructor used the expression *freeing up external trade*, which in English has the positive valence of creating conditions whereby trade between countries can flow more freely. However, his Bangladeshi students interpreted the expression meaning that it is 'unclear' whether trade is open and free. The reason for this lies in the fact that the idea of liberation as a cure-all for problematic economies was foreign to the Bangladeshi students because it is not salient in their economic schemata due to strong protectionism in the country's fragile economy (Littlemore, 2003, p. 280).

The conceptual difference in the construal of the source domain HOUSE with regard to political circumstances also gives rise to different interpretative values in different cultures. During the closing days of the Cold War, what at first glance appeared to be one and the same metaphor, EUROPEAN COUNTRIES ARE THE COMMON EUROPEAN HOUSE, political leaders in Russia, France, and Germany constructed widely divergent policies as a consequence of how the concept of HOUSE was interpreted in each country (Chilton & Ilyin 1993). Using the house metaphor in which the source domain is construed as a building with a large number of individual apartments, Gorbachev viewed the idea of a European House as positive and therefore attempted to promote the external policy of increased communication and cooperation among Russia, France, and Germany. In French political discourse, however, even though the house metaphor is used, it carries a different value connotation—one of cooperation but with strong control of interaction with the Soviet Union. German politicians, on the other hand, did not employ the house metaphor relating to welcoming cooperation with Russia, but rather used it primarily to solve their internal political issues of territory and identity.

The cross-cultural and cross-linguistic variations in metaphors bring both obvious challenges and opportunities to

second language educators (Littlemore, 2009, p. 98). Despite the complexities involved in understanding and using metaphors, both conceptual and linguistic, when approaching another culture and its language, it is clear that metaphor is a pervasive feature of everyday life and language. If learners are to develop high levels of proficiency in a language and if they are to understand the culture that uses the language, they will need to develop the ability to understand and use metaphorical language. Yet, it is only within the past ten years or so that educators and researchers have begun to pay attention to the importance of metaphor in language education. Moreover, with a few exceptions, most of the effort has focused on teaching English as a second and foreign language. Foreign language teachers, nevertheless, can benefit from this work. In the remainder of this working paper, we will focus on the teaching of metaphorical proficiency. Numerous studies show that conceptual metaphor, as a pedagogical tool, not only facilitates vocabulary leaning (Littlemore & Low, 2006) and grammar (Tyler and Evans, 2001, Danesi, 2003, Janda, 2002, Janda, 2004, Tyler, 2008, Daiber, 2009, Kalyuga, 2002), but develops metaphorical competence that, in its turn, contributes to all areas of communicative competence: grammatical competence, textual competence, illocutionary competence, sociolinguistic competence, and

the strategic competence (Littlemore & Low, 2006a) of L2 learners.

3 Conceptual metaphor and SLA pedagogy

3.1 Metaphorical competence

The general research on metaphor has highlighted four interrelated facts that are consequential for L2 learners: (1) metaphor comprises high-order cognitive ability to reason and discourse about abstract concepts and phenomena, (2) use of metaphor is everyday language is pervasive both in spoken and written modalities, (3) use of metaphor is generally a non-conscious process; that is, speakers are usually unaware of the prevalence of metaphor use and consequently tend to believe that meaning is literal rather than figurative, and (4) metaphor is a cultural phenomenon that has significant impact on human psychology and how we conceive of and act in the world. The ability of native speakers to think and converse metaphorically gives naturalness to their discourse, which is often absent in L2 speech.

Danesi and Mollica (1998) point to the frustration of teachers because, though their students display the knowledge of grammatical structures, vocabulary and verbal fluency, their discourse

sounds unnatural. The cause of this artificiality, as Danesi and Mollica (1998) articulate it, lies in the inability of learners to "go beyond the textbook literalness," and when they do infuse their performance with metaphorical meanings it tends to reflect the conceptual aspects of the L1 system (pp. 3-4). Thus, even though L2 users may employ L2 words and grammar, they do not exhibit L2 conceptual meanings. They often have similar difficulties detecting and appropriately interpreting metaphors when they are used by native speakers of the target language (Littlemore & Low, 2006a, p. 269)

As Danesi (1995) argues, the development of L2 metaphorical competence is normally the focus of language instruction. In an early pilot study conducted in Italian as a foreign language at the University of Toronto, Danesi (1995) demonstrated that most students exhibit a strong tendency to interpret metaphors literally rather than figuratively. Danesi (1995) proposed that one of the importance sources of the problem is that most of the language usage displayed in textbooks reflects literal rather than metaphorical meaning. Similarly, Littlemore and Low (2006a) also express their concern regarding the marginalization of metaphor in pedagogical practice and in the design of instructional materials. They point out that only a few commercial L2 courses teach metaphor as more than a decorative, rhetorical device (p. 268).

Danesi and Mollica (1986), Danesi (1995 and 1998), Littlemore and Low (2006a), and Boers (2003), among others, argue that metaphorical competence can no longer be considered an obscure and complex aspect of language, the study of which should be reserved for only the most advanced, and perhaps even, literary oriented learners. Metaphor, they insist, should take its rightful place in the L2 curriculum from the earliest phases of instruction, and the development of metaphorical competence should become a cornerstone of any pedagogy that seeks to stress the integrated nature of language and culture.

3.2 Conceptual fluency

In order to generate an approach to second language instruction (SLI) that would harmoniously combine language, cognitive processes, and culture through focus on the development of metaphorical competence, Danesi (1995) suggests reconsidering SLI in terms of conceptual rather than in purely linguistic and/or communicative terms. To achieve this, he proposes the introduction of *conceptual fluency* into SLI, which he defines as the ability to know how L2 "encodes" concepts via metaphorical reasoning and to apply this knowledge to conceptual programming discourse in L2 using the conceptual system of L2 rather than the conceptual system of L1 (p. 5). Hence, "to be "conceptually fluent" means to be able to organize

"common experiences into conceptually and linguistically appropriate models" in L2 discourse (p. 12). The goal should be for L2 learners to be able to recognize metaphors, to identify basic experiences (i.e., source domains) in terms of which abstract phenomena (e.g., time, love, life, etc.) are conceptualized in L2 discourse, and to imbue their own L2 discourse with conceptually appropriate metaphors. In practical terms, L2 learners will need to learn how target domains are elaborated as source domains and instantiated as lexical constructions and grammatical categories and they will then need to be able to apply this knowledge to their own discourse.

Danesi (1995) points outs that the absence of "conceptual appropriateness" in learners' discourse, even if it is semantically and grammatically correct, imparts a sense of "unnaturalness." The problem lies in learners' reliance on their own native language concepts when constructing L2 discourse. This incongruence usually leads to a clash between L1 and L2 conceptual systems resulting in an asymmetry between language form and conceptual content in the L2 (Danesi, 1995 p. 5). The source of the conceptual clash and resulting asymmetry likely lies in cross-cultural variations in the conceptual structure of metaphors: different construals of a source domain incorporated into the same conceptual metaphor in different cultures, differ-

ences in the scope of source domains, and the range of target domains (see discuss above). To give an example, let us consider the difference in the conceptualization of HAPPINESS in English, Chinese, and Korean. As we have mentioned, among the ways that English speakers conceptualize is HAPPINESS as UP, while Chinese and Korean speakers conceptualize and talk about the same emotion as HAPPINESS IS IN[4] (Cho, 1994, p. 206). If Chinese and Korean learners of English are not aware of this difference in metaphorical thinking about HAPPINESS, they will likely use lexical and grammatical carriers congruent with the conceptual structure of containment as opposed to the conceptual structure of the UP and DOWN orientation inherent in English view of HAPPINESS. This will result in an asymmetry between the linguistic form and the conceptual content of discourse that incorporates discussion of HAPPINESS produced by learners of Chinese and Korean.

Projecting an L2 learning environment to intercultural communication, Danesi & Rocci (2009) stress the detrimental effect of a conceptual clash for intercultural contacts, while at the same time emphasizing the importance of conceptual fluency for successful intercultural communication. In

their words, successful communication implies the conscious use of the conceptual system of L2 without intrusion of their native language conceptual system (pp. 166-167). Thus, conceptual fluency enables L2 learners to participate in L2 cultural comprehension of the physical and social world and, therefore, to interact with it in a conceptually appropriate way.

Rethinking SLI methodology in terms of conceptual fluency requires a new focus on culture (Danesi, 1995, p. 6). Learning L2 from the perspective of culture, as Lantolf (1999) notes, implies more than acquiring the behavioral (linguistic or otherwise) patterns of the community. Lantolf (1999) elaborates this new perspective as appropriating L2 cultural models, consequently, conceptual metaphors, thereby (re)mediating L2 learners' psychological and, by implication, their communicative activities.

3.3 Metaphorical awareness

Building L2 metaphorical competence requires that metaphorical structures be made accessible to learners. For learners to be able to comprehend metaphorical discourse in an L2 and to metaphorize their own L2 discourse it is critically important to draw their attention to the presence of metaphors in both spoken and written language and

then to explain the conceptual structure underlying the linguistic metaphors instantiated in the discourse. It is also necessary to carry out cross-culture and cross-linguistic comparisons to help learners understand the similarities and differences between the metaphorical properties of their own language and the L2 (Danesi, 1995, Danesi & Mollica, 1998, Littlemore, 2009, Boers, 2000, 2003). To enhance the metaphorical awareness of learners, Boers (2000, p. 140) suggests a strategy of drawing learner attention to the source domains that serve as the origin of figurative expressions. This complies with the assumption that L2 learners process metaphor in a more mechanical way than native speakers by decomposing metaphorical expressions into basic meanings because basic meanings are more salient for them than for L1 speakers (Littlemore, 2009, p. 95).

On the basis of the findings of his experiments, Boers (2000) claims that the proposed strategy has three benefits for L2 learners: first, it facilitates the comprehension of L2 discourse, in general; second, it aids in understanding the inferences and value judgments associated with metaphorical expressions, and, third, it helps learners recall unfamiliar metaphorical expressions by organizing them into systematic semantic themes according to source domains (pp. 145-146). Aligning with Boer's (2000) claim, Littlemore

iBooks Author

(2009) states that a significant body of research on the utilization of a conceptual-metaphor approach to teaching vocabulary is confirmed to be more effective than less systematic approaches. Learners exposed to a metaphorical approach are able to acquire new vocabulary by extrapolating already acquired metaphorical units to new ones (p. 99).

Moreover, Boers (2003) emphasizes the importance of metaphorical awareness for SLA by demonstrating the impact of metaphor variations across cultures. For example, French-speaking learners of English might experience more difficulties in understanding metaphorical expressions that elaborate SAILING as a source domain than EATING because the former domain is much less productive and less frequent in French culture than is the latter. Boers (2003, pp. 234-235) appropriately notes that such awareness "might even serve as a window into a community's 'culture'."

Littlemore and Low (2006a) argue for integrating both conceptual and linguistic approaches in SLT in order to develop the metaphorical competence of learners. To achieve this end, it is important for L2 educators to bear in mind that conceptual and linguistic metaphor are not the same thing. One is psychological and the other relates to language. Again, the two categories are related but they are not identical. L2 learners might need to operate simultaneously on more than one level to comprehend jokes, advertisements, headlines, stories, etc. where meaning emerges from the blend of metaphorical and non-metaphorical senses of the same word, while the context might bear conventional meaning. To resolve the incongruity of a linguistic metaphor, a reader or a listener may need to analyze its linguistic context together with the conceptual metaphor that underlies it (p. 271). Thus, L2 learners need to be able to access standard meanings of L2 discourse to maintain reading and listening fluency, while, simultaneously, they need to recover underlying metaphoric structures in order to interpret L2 discourse correctly (p. 273). Thus, as Littlemore (2009) states, the complete and correct understanding of the metaphor *slavery was well on the road to extinction* requires L2 learners to view it in terms of the conceptual metaphor PROGRESS THROUGH TIME IS FORWARD MOTION. The conceptual level allows L2 learners to understand that significant progress has been made while the linguistic and cultural contexts allow L2 learners to understand that this political and economic change cannot be turned backwards (p. 98).

To give another example, the correct comprehension of the Russian color metaphor in the sentence: *Развод – это*

черный пиар *для политиков*. (Divorce is *the black PR* (public relations) for politicians) involves understanding that the conceptual metaphor BLACK IS NEGATIVE and at the same time recognizing that in Russian political discourse black PR has rather positive consequences for the career of Russian politicians as opposed to, for example, American politicians.

3.4 Metaphorical competence as a central domain of communicative competences

Dedicating class time to the development of metaphorical competence is justified by the ubiquity of metaphor in all aspects of communicative activity. Littlemore and Low (2006) argue that metaphorical competence permeates all five dimensions of communicative competence proposed by Bachman (1990) namely sociolinguistic, illocutionary, textual, lexico-grammatical, and strategic.

Sociolinguistic competence implies "sensitivity to, or control of, the conventions of language use" sanctioned by various linguistic contexts (Littlemore & Low, 2006, pp. 90-91). Littlemore & Low (2006) elaborate their definition as the ability to interpret cultural references and figures of speech appropriately. This means that in order to understand metaphor and L2 discourse by extension, "learners

need to appreciate the extended meanings and evaluations given by a specific culture to particular events, places, institutions, or people" (Littlemore & Low, 2006a, p. 274). Thus the development of sociolinguistic competence necessitates cultural awareness of shared cultural references in L2, which allows learners to recognize the cross-cultural and cross-linguistic differences related to metaphor and to use this knowledge for discourse interpretation.

At the level of interpretation, lack of cultural knowledge is likely to lead L2 learners to misinterpret not only the meanings but also the value judgments imparted by metaphorical expressions. For example, consider a culturally-based interpretation error that the Bangladeshi learner of English made relating to the positive connotation of the metaphorical expression *"freeing up external trade"* discussed in section 1.5 above. As a further example, consider the conceptual metaphor AN ANGRY PERSON IS A PRESSURIZED CONTAINER. As discussed in section 1.5, in English ANGER is conceptualized as pressurized heated liquid in an *unspecified* container, while in Chinese the conceptualization of ANGER is grounded in the cultural notion that *qi* 'gas' moves in a *specific* bodily container, e.g. the heart, spleen, or liver. Lack of awareness of these cultural references like to lead English-speaking learners of Chinese as

well as Chinese-speaking learners of English to misunderstand linguistic elaborations of the conceptual metaphor and their value-laden inferences, which, in turn, might well result lexico-grammatical errors. As Danesi (1995) points out, lack of awareness of L2 cultural concepts and their subsequent replacement by L1 cultural concepts results in a clash of the L1 and L2 conceptual systems making the discourse of learners sound unnatural.

Littlemore & Low (2006) note that sociolinguistic competence with respect to figurative language also entails sensitivity to dialect/variation, register, and naturalness (p. 101). For example, English metaphorical language varies in American and British speech communities, in communities of lawyers and teachers, and among scholars and students or teenagers. Littlemore & Low (2006, p. 101) caution that these are also important factors that need to be taken account of when introducing conceptual and linguistic metaphor into the L2 curriculum.

The ability to communicate in L2 necessitates that L2 learners develop the ability to go beyond the set of words that compose a message in order to understand the meanings that a speaker or writer attempts to convey with a specific purpose (e.g., to perform ideational functions: to evaluate an object, to reveal feelings and emotions; to fulfill ma-

nipulative functions: to affect and control someone's behavior or a situation; to perform heuristic functions: to extend knowledge about the world; and to execute imaginative functions: to entertain others by playing with language. These abilities constitute illocutionary competence (Littlemore & Low 2006, p. 112). Via numerous examples Littlemore & Low (2006) illustrate the central role of metaphorical thinking in the performance of the functions, referring to the studies on metaphor in different social contexts and discourses. Surely, if learners are to attain advanced levels of proficiency in a second language, they must develop a reasonable level of interpretive and productive control over this central component of language and cultural competence.

Metaphorical language is indispensable for conveying feelings and emotions because feelings and emotions are complex abstract phenomena that can be figured out only in terms of concrete embodied experiences. Kövecses (2000) effectively shows the powerful role that metaphor plays in communicating about the basic human emotions of anger, fear, sadness, joy, and love through an insightful comparative examination of metaphorical expressions in English, Hungarian, and other languages, and the account of how embodied experiences are manifested in their conceptualizations. The embodied experiences of motion and

iBooks Author

being inside of a container are indispensible to talk about emotions in English: She *went* crazy, He *flew into* a rage (Kövecses, 2005, p. 154), in Hungarian: *Túlcsordult a szíve a boldogságtól* (His heart overflowed with joy) (Kövecses, 2005, p. 37), and in Russian: Такая ***злость поднималась*** во мне (Such *anger was moving up* in me), В моей душе ***заколыхался гнев*** (In my soul *anger fluctuated*). The experience of warmth underlies the emotion of happiness: That *warmed* my spirits (Kövecses, 2000, p. 24) and in Russian: ***Радость*** встречи ***согрела*** его душу. (*Happiness* of the meeting *warmed* his soul).

Manipulative functions of discourse cannot be performed without resorting to metaphorical language, as Goatly (2007) illustrates in his detailed exploration of the use of metaphor for brainwashing and exercising hidden ideology. Since each metaphor highlights and suppresses selected perceptions, thereby making people focus on the desired consequences of, e.g., a new government or social policy, while leading people to ignore potentially unfavorable outcomes, the diversity of metaphors, as Goatly (2007) points out, is essential for ideological manipulation in politics, business, education, and other social practices. Preferring one source domain over another, for example in an educational reform proposal, different philosophies of education come to life leading to different practices.

Among other identified metaphors in the Hong Kong's educational reform proposals, Goatly (2007) empathizes with the negative effect of conceptualizing education as a commodity, as cultural capital, or as an investment, and viewing the teacher as a provider of a consumable commodity, while restricting the student activities to "chewing and digesting" (p. 209). This metaphorical approach to policy implementation undermines the reform effort to encourage student creativity, internal motivation, and the development of "well-rounded balanced personalities," because such conceptualizations align with the traditional idea of encouraging of student passivity in the learning process (p. 209). Elaborating on this metaphor, Goatly (2007) suggests reformulating the target domain. The teacher can be positioned as a *resource* available for students to fulfill their educational purposes. This conceptualization could align with the progressive changes that the educational reform targeted (p. 210).

Littlemore & Low (2006) argue that metaphorical thinking can serve as a powerful heuristic device in educational contexts. It has been shown that for those students who were taught through metaphor, it is less complicated for them to comprehend new phenomena and to discover solutions to problems by transferring their knowledge to new domains than those students who were not taught through

metaphor (p. 126). Figurative thinking is confirmed to be beneficial, especially for teaching language for academic purposes. Different academic communities employ various conceptual metaphors in their research activities. To be able to understand the reasoning of a particular academic community, students should be aware of that community's use of metaphors (p. 127). For example, the medical community favors military metaphors in their discussion of diseases. Students should be familiar with the conceptual metaphor DISEASE IS WAR/INVASION to make sense of the following excerpt from typical medical discourse: "Gene therapy gets the body *to attack cancer. An army* of immune cells that *can punch through the defenses* of tumors has been created by genetic engineering…" (Goatly, 2007, p. 49). If learners deal with education discourse they should be aware of metaphors that educators often use to talk about learning: LEARNING AS A CLICK (it just *clicked* together, it *clicked in his mind*, it all *clicked straight away*) and LEARNING IS MOVEMENT (he *got off* on his reading, they are not going *to move that much*, you can see *a spurt forward*) (Cortazzi & Jin, 1999, pp. 159-160).

Imaginative functions involve the ability to "play[…] with language for humorous and aesthetic purposes" by extending and elaborating existing metaphors (Littlemore & Low, 2006, p. 129). For example, in journalism, the metaphor of the "invisible hand of Adam Smith" is extended playfully as "the invisible hand versus the iron fist," "does the invisible hand need an invisible glove," and "a green thumb on the invisible hand" (Littlemore & Low, 2006a, p. 281). Littlemore and Low (2006) state that L2 learners should be given an opportunity to "play around linguistic forms" because language play is argued to have "a crucial cognitive function" similar to the effect produced on children who learn their L1 playing with language (p. 129). It is quite ambitious to expect L2 learners to use creative language, as Littlemore and Low (2006a) note, but the main pedagogic implication for L2 learners is that they need to be aware of extended meanings of conventional metaphors and the reasons for such transgressing of convention. Learners need to deal with extensions and elaborations of metaphors primarily to cope with reading and listening tasks (p. 281).

Textual competence relates to the ability to understand overall the conceptual and rhetorical structure of discourse (Littlemore & Low, 2006, p. 90) along with the ability to produce "well-organized and cohesive" discourse in L2 (Littlemore & Low, 2006a, p. 282). These two abilities are informed by the overall metaphoric awareness and conceptual fluency of L2 learners. Researchers have repeatedly claimed that metaphors do not occur evenly across dis-

iBooks Author

course, but that they appear in clusters (Littlemore & Low, 2006, p. 135). Clusters have been found to perform several structural functions: they signal the start and end of a text, the transition to a new paragraph or a new topic; they index key points in a text, especially if they sound problematic in terms of invoking a negative attitude of a speaker toward them; metaphorical clusters are employed to establish, or even change, the purpose for speaking or writing, or to conceptualize and reconceptualize a topic (Littlemore & Low, 2006, p. 140-141). However, the general function of metaphoric clusters, Littlemore and Low (2006) note, is to evaluate a solution of a problem articulated in a text (p. 141).

To give an example, let us consider several lines of the dialogue between Hugh and Liz borrowed from Littlemore & Low (2006a):

> Hugh: Yeah I will do. Yeah. That's great. Mm.
> Liz: Uh ... Yeah. **Takes a bit of digesting**.
> Hugh: It will do. Yes.

Commenting on these lines, Littlemore and Low (2006a) identify the function of the metaphorical phrase "takes a bit of digesting" as summarizing, and/or evaluating. Liz informs Hugh of her intention to break off because she wants to spend some time contemplating what Hugh has just said (p. 282).

Pointing to the significant role of metaphor for textual coherence, Littlemore and Low (2006) hypothesize that to develop textual competence, educators should help L2 learners detect figurative clusters, understand their textual function, and identify the overarching conceptual metaphors that underlie their appearance in texts. They should also help learners use the metaphors in their own discourse (p. 134).

Grammatical competence implies the learner's knowledge of the grammatical system of the L2 and the ability to use it properly in a newly developed discourse. Littlemore and Low (2006) explain that grammar is used in a broad sense that also covers systemic aspects of word meaning (p. 90). Littlemore and Low (2006) stress a strong interconnection between grammatical and metaphorical competence. Recent developments in metaphor theory and cognitive grammar reveal that many grammatical forms and categories are conceptually structured in terms of metaphorical mappings from source to target domains. For example, English prepositions and particles have always been complicated for learners of English due to the unclear relations between the prepositional meanings that learners simply had to memorize. Extensive research on the conceptual structure of prepositions and particles has uncovered con-

ceptual metaphors that underlie most English prepositions and particles as well as their straightforward links to their prototypical meanings, i.e., location or position extension. The particle "up" in the phrasal verb "eat up" can be explained by the conceptual metaphor of the vertical filling of a container (Littlemore & Low, 2006, p. 159).

To provide another example, Russian aspect has always been a notorious problem for L2 learners due to the lack of systematic way of explaining its semantic features. Using a cognitive metaphor approach, Janda (2004) suggests a straightforward explanation of Russian aspect in terms of two conceptual metaphors: IMPERFECTIVE IS FLIUD SUBSTANCES, PERFECTIVE IS DISCRETE SOLID OBJECTS. A range of Russian examples illustrates the conflation of the semantic features of Russian aspect with these two conceptual metaphors. Janda (2004) argues that as a discrete, solid, and heterogeneous object the Perfective verb *увлекся* (became fascinated) designates the change of state as a complete, unique, bounded, discrete, and no longer divisible into stages object: *Он **увлекся*** (Perfective) *выращиванием грибов* (He *became fascinated* with cultivating mushrooms). Similar to a fluid that can be described as an entity with no inherent edges, uniform, and continuous, the Imperfective verbs *стояли* (stood) and *смотрели* (looked) describe unbounded and ongoing ac-

tivities that lack reference to their beginning or/and end in an utterance such as *Мы **стояли*** (Imperfective) *по разным сторонам пруда и **смотрели*** (Imperfective) *друг на друга* (We *stood* on opposite sides of the pond and *looked* at each other) (pp. 476 and 478).

The review of the studies on the relationship between concrete and abstract senses of prepositions, phrasal verbs, grammatical tenses, demonstratives, aspect, and modality suggests that these grammatical areas are easier for learners to perceive if they are taught via metaphor than through rules-of-thumb that apply in some circumstances but not in others (Littlemore and Low, 2006).

The final dimension of communicative competence is strategic competence. Adopting two approaches, the psycholinguistic and interaction approaches, Littlemore and Low (2006, pp. 177-178) define strategic competence as the speaker's ability to strategize an interaction in a certain way to compensate for lack of his/her knowledge as well as the ability to manipulate a conversation and negotiate shared meaning. The researchers point to some overlap between strategic and illocutionary competence in terms of their overt interactional aspect, manipulation, persuasion, and building interactional relationships (p. 178). They also note that strategic competence, similar to illocutionary

competence, relies heavily on metaphorical language. In order to cope with gaps in knowledge in the target language, a speaker may use compensation strategies, such as circumlocution, transfer from L1, paraphrase, and word coinage. The last two are of a metaphorical nature. Word coinage, often used when learner experience vocabulary gaps, implies the creation of a new word or word combination by extending the meaning of available words beyond their conventional boundaries. For example, when a learner does not know the word *scissors* he/she might create the word *cutter* to maintain a conversation (Littlemore and Low, 2006, p. 178). In order for L2 learners to use word coining effectively, they should at least be made aware of language-specific preferences for particular types of coinage. English speakers, for instance, prefer Noun + Noun compounds (e.g., ski boots, dog house, etc.) while Spanish speakers prefer Noun + Prepositional Phrase (e.g., *zapatos para esquiar* 'shoes for skiing,' *caseta del perro* 'house of the dog.' With regard to paraphrasing, consider the English learners who paraphrased the words 'squid' and 'dragonfly' as 'like a lit candle' and 'like a helicopter' respectively (Littlemore & Low, 2006a, p. 288).

The main idea of an interaction strategy is the speaker's ability to maintain communicative interaction, negotiate meaning and, in general, shape an interaction in a certain way in order to achieve a particular purpose. The strategy involves the use of metaphorical language in terms of initiating a change of a topic, evaluating an interlocutor's opinion, persuading someone to adopt a particular view, etc. (Littlemore & Low, 2006a, p. 288). Interactive strategic competence is tightly intertwined with other communicative competences necessary for initiating and sustaining a conversation. Metaphors used with different strategic purposes play a significant role in both written and oral discourses.

4 Conclusion

Relevant studies on metaphor show that metaphorical conceptualization is an intrinsic feature of discourse. Grounded in culture, metaphorical reasoning permeates all aspects of language while shaping discourse in a particular way. The pedagogical implications of this, as Danesi (1995), Danesi and Mollica (1998) outline, are to teach L2 learners "new ways" of metaphorical thinking to make them conceptually fluent, and to teach them to construct and interpret discourse in a conceptually appropriate way. The studies by Danesi (1995), Danesi and Mollica (1998), Littlemore and Low (2006), Boers (2003), and Littlemore (2009) suggest that conceptual fluency viewed as metaphorical competence is teachable. This can be

iBooks Author

achieved by designing a conceptually-based syllabus in which units of study are structured around conceptual domains (e.g., time, love, etc.) and by teaching communicative and grammatical patterns as the reflexes of these domains (Danesi, 1995; Danesi & Mollica, 1998).

Littlemore and Low (2006) suggest a well-developed set of activities for promoting metaphorical competence in the L2 classroom context. To make L2 learners aware of metaphorical language, researchers have outlined a range of consciousness-raising activities that demonstrate the link between metaphorical meanings and the prototypical, more basic, meanings of a word, e.g., engaging learners in generating examples of specific conceptual metaphors, querying the meaning of metaphorical expressions, discussing and illustrating entailments through drawing and physical activities and using computer-aided activities (pp. 27-37). To sensitize learners to different but related meanings of a word, a corpus-based approach can also be beneficial (Littlemore & Low, 2006, p. 110). To enhance learners' awareness of underlying conceptual metaphors, their functions in discourse, Littlemore and Low (2006) propose, among other activities metaphorical analysis of poems, advertisements, and cartoons. Awareness of underlying conceptual metaphors leads learners to a deeper understanding of L2 culture. Role-playing activities are also discussed as beneficial for encouraging learners to exercise metaphorical thinking in an L2 context. Littlemore & Low (2006, p. 28) emphasize that an explicit explanation of the meaning of a metaphorical expression and its underlying conceptual metaphor is more efficient than asking learners to engage in the extremely complex task of analyzing metaphorical properties of L2 texts (written or spoken) on their own without any guidance from the teacher. Identifying metaphors in a text is one thing, interpreting the semantic depth of metaphors and their entailments is quite another. Without this knowledge, however, it is difficult to understand how learners can attain advanced levels of reading, listening, speaking or writing proficiency. Metaphors matter!

5 References

Boers, F. (2000). Enhancing metaphoric awareness in specialized reading. *English for Specific Purposes, 19,* 137-147.

Boers, F. (2003). Applied linguistics perspectives on cross-cultural variation in conceptual metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *18*(4), 231–238.

Cienki, A. (1998). STRAIGHT: An image schema and its metaphorical extensions. *Cognitive Linguistics, 9*(2), 107-149.

Chilton, P. & Ilyin, M. (1993). Metaphor in political discourse: The case of the 'common European house'. *Discourse & Society, 4*(1), 7-31.

Cho, S. (1994). Metaphor and cultural coherence: A comparative study of Korean and English metaphors. *The Journal of Studies in Language*, *10*, 197-207. Retrieved from http://www.scribd.com/doc/65741760/Comparison-of-Korean-and-English-Metaphors

Chun, L. (2002). A cognitive approach to Up/Down metaphors in English and Shang/Xia metaphors in Chinese. In Altenberg, B. & Granger, S. (Eds.), *Lexis in contrast: Corpus-based approaches* (pp. 151-174). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Cortazzi, M. & Jin, L. (1999). Bridges to learning: Metaphors of teaching, learning, and language. In Cameron, L. & Low, G. (Eds.), *Researching and applying metaphor.* (pp. 149-176). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Daiber, T. (2009). Metaphorical use of the Russian imperative. *Russian Linguistics, 33*(1), 11-35.

Danesi, M. (1995). Learning and teaching languages: the role of "conceptual fluency." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 5*(1), 3-20.

Danesi, M. (2003). Metaphorical "networks" and verbal communication: A semiotic perspective of human discourse, *Sign Systems Studies, 3*(2), 341-364.

Danesi, M. & Mollica, A. (1998). Conceptual fluency theory and second language teaching. *Mosaic, 5*(2), 3-12.

Danesi, M. & Rocci, A. (2009). *Global linguistics: an introduction.* Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dirven, R. & Paprotte, W. (1985). Introduction. In Paprotte, W. & Dirven, R. (Eds.), *The ubiquity of metaphor* (pp. vii-xix). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Grady, J. (1999) A typology of motivation for conceptual metaphor: Correlation vs. resemblance. In Gibbs, R & Steen, G. (Eds.), *Metaphor in cognitive linguistics. Selected papers from the fifth international cognitive linguistics conference. Amsterdam, July 1997* (pp. 79-100). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Goatly, A. (2007). *Washing the brain metaphor and hidden ideology.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Janda, L. A. (2002). Concepts of case and time in Slavic. *Glossos,* 3. Retrieved from http://www.seelrc.org/glossos/issues/3/janda.pdf

iBooks Author

Janda, L. A. (2004). A metaphor in search of a source domain: The categories of Slavic aspect. *Cognitive Linguistics, 15*(4), 471-527.

Kalyuga, M. (2002). The use of different cases with Russian verbs of similar meaning. *Australian Journal of Linguistics, 22*(2), 191-205.

Kim, J. (2004). A study on cognitive differences between Korean and English. *Journal of Linguistic Science,* 28, 43-60.

Kövecses, Z. (1986). *Metaphors of anger, pride, and love.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and emotion.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,

Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: universality and variation.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, G. (2006). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In Geeraerts, D. (Eds.), *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings. Berlin* (pp. 185-238). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

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.

Lantolf, J. (1999). Second culture acquisition. Cognitive consideration. In: Hinkel, E. (Eds.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 28-46).New York: Cambridge University Press.

Littlemore, J. (2003). The effect of cultural background on metaphor interpretation. *Metaphor & Symbol*, *18*(4), 273-288.

Littlemore, J. (2009). Applying cognitive linguistics to second language learning and teaching. Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Littlemore, J. & Low, G. (2006). *Figurative thinking and foreign language learning.* Basingstoke [England], New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Littlemore, J. & Low, G. (2006a). Metaphoric competence, second language learning, and communicative language ability. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(2), 268–294 doi:10.1093/applin/aml004

Luodonpaa-Manni, M. & Viimaranta, J. (2010). Metaphoric expressions on vertical axis revisited: An empirical study of Russian and French material. *Metaphor and Symbol, 25*(2), 74-92.

Matsuki, K. (1995). Metaphors of anger in Japanese. In Taylor, J. R. & MacLaury, R. (Eds.), Language in the cognitive construal of the world (pp. 137-151) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Shore, B. (1996). *Culture in mind: Cognitions, culture, and the problem of meaning.* New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tyler, A. (2008). Cognitive linguistics and second language instruction. In Robinson, P. & Ellis, N.C. (Eds.), *Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 456–88). New York/London: Routledge.

Tyler, A. & Evans, V. (2001). The relation between experience, conceptual structure and meaning: non-temporal uses of tense and language teaching. In Niemeier, P. & Dirven, R. (Eds.), *Applied Cogni-*

iBooks Author

tive Linguistics II: Language Pedagogy (pp. 63–105). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Yu, N. (1995). Metaphorical expressions of anger and happiness in English and Chinese. *Metaphor & Symbolic Activity*, *10*(2), 59-92.

Endnotes

[1] Upper case letters are used to indicate the psychological/conceptual rather than the linguistic aspect of a metaphor.

[2] Goatly also discusses other spatial metaphors of time: PERIOD IS SPACE, TIME IS LENGTH/DISTANCE, POINT IN TIME IS POSITION (Goatly, 2007: 60). In addition to spatial metaphors of time, time is also conceptualized as money/commodity, as in the expressions "time is money" and "don't waste my time" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999, p. 163-164; Goatly, 2007, p. 68-69).

[3] In American culture, love is also viewed as FLUID IN A CONTAINER, FIRE, HEAT, A NATURAL FORCE, INSANITY, MAGIC, RAPTURE, A VALUABLE COMMODITY (IN AN ECONOMIC EXCHANGE), A HIDDEN OBJECT, AN OPPONENT (Kövecses, 1986).

[4] Cho (1994) does not mention that in addition to the conceptual metaphor HAPPINESS IS IN, Korean also employs the metaphor HAPPINESS IS UP manifested in the following expressions: 나 지금 기분이 최고(조)야. (literally: My feeling right now is at its climax.), 비행기 태우지 마세요. (literally: Don't put me on a plane.), and 너무 띄우지 말아요 (literally: Don't make me fly (or float) too much).

6 Glossary of Metaphor-Related Terminology

Compound metaphor is a conceptual metaphor constructed from two or more primary metaphors therefore being connected to two and more specific sensory-motor experiences.

Conceptual fluency is the ability to know how a language "encodes" concepts via metaphorical reasoning and to be able to apply this knowledge. With respect to second languages it is the ability to use the conceptual system of the L2 rather than the conceptual system of L1 when engaged in communicative activities.

Conceptual metaphor is a cognitive/mental phenomenon that allows understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another by projecting particular similarities from one phenomenon (usually concrete) to another phenomenon (usually abstract).

Embodied experience is the sensory-motor experience of human interaction in, and with, reality, e.g., the physical experience of adding things to a pile and visually perceiving the pile increasing vertically.

Entailment is an additional rich inference (detailed knowledge of a phenomenon) inferred from a conceptual mapping.

Illocutionary competence is constituted by the ability to convey a message with a specific purpose i.e., to perform ideational functions: to evaluate an object, to reveal feelings and emotions; to affect and control someone's behavior or a situation; to extend knowledge about the world; and to entertain others by playing with language.

Linguistic metaphor is a linguistic phenomenon constituted by a set of words that imbue a phrase or entire sentence with figurative rather than literal meaning. It may or may not reflect metaphorical thinking on the part of the user, depending on how conventionalized (commonly used) it is. For example, the English expression "I see what you mean" is so frequently used to indicate understanding that it most probably no longer reflects metaphorical thinking.

Mapping is a basic, essential, and systematic conceptual correspondence between the source and the target domain. **Mapping** constitutes the one-way relationship between the source and the target domain by projecting specific properties of the source domain onto the target domain.

Metaphorical competence is the ability to detect, interpret and use correctly metaphors in one's own discourse or to interpret appropriate the discourse produced by others.

Primary metaphor is a conceptual metaphor directly connected to one specific sensory-motor experience, i.e., visual-perceptual experience.

Range of a target domain is the set of source domains relevant for a particular target domain.

Scope of a source domain is the set of target domains that can be applied to a particular source domain.

Sociolinguistic competence implies the ability to interpret cultural references and figures of speech appropriately.

Source domain is the phenomenon in terms of which another phenomenon is conceived and understood. It reflects the basic metaphorical property expressed as "X is a Y."

Strategic competence implies the speaker's ability to strategize an interaction in a certain way to compensate for lack of his/her knowledge as well as the ability to manipulate a conversation and negotiate shared meaning.

Target domain is the phenomenon that is conceived and understood in terms of a source domain.

Textual competence is the ability to understand overall the conceptual and rhetorical structure of discourse along with the ability to produce well-organized and cohesive discourse.