Duyumsal veya Duyumdışı Temeller?
Metaforların Kaynak Kavramlarının Deneyimsel Özelliklerine İlişkin bir Çalışma

Yeliz Demir[a, b]

Özet

Bu çalışmanın amacı, metaforların kaynak kavramlarına karar verirken kişilerin ne tür deneyimlerden yararlandıklarına ışık tutmaktır. Bu bağlamda şu araştırma sonusuna yanıt aranmıştır: Kaynak kavramların belirlenmesinde duyumsal mı yoksa duyum-dışı deneyimler mi etkilidir? Katılımcılardan, bir dizi metaforu kendilerine uygun gelen kaynak kavramlarla tamamlamaları istenmiştir. Katılımcılar, soyut kaynak kavramlarını, her defasında somut kavramlara göre daha yoğun olarak tercih etmişlerdir. Çalışmanın sonuçları göstermektedir ki, 'daha deneyimsel' olan kavramlar mutlaka 'duyularla algılanarak oluşturulan' kavramlar demek değildir. Deneyimsel dünyamız karmaşıktır ve duygu, düşünce ve fikirleri gösteren pek çok soyut kavram bilişimize somut kavramlardan daha yakın olabilmektedir.

Sensory or Extra-Sensory Input?
A Study on the Experiential Nature of Source Concepts of Metaphors

Abstract

The aim of this study is to shed light on the type of experience people use in choosing the source concepts of their metaphors. To this end, the following research question is posed: Are sensory or extra-sensory experiences more determinative in choosing the source concepts of metaphors? Participants of the study were asked to complete a number of metaphors with possible source concepts. Abstract source concepts predominated at all times the use of concrete ones by the participants. Results of this study indicate that what is more 'experiential' does not necessarily mean 'what is attained through sense experiences'. Our experiential world is complex and incorporates many feelings, emotions, and ideas which can be closer to our cognition than sensory experiences in choosing the source concepts of metaphors.

[a] Contact Author: ylzdemir@gmail.com

[b] Dr., Hacettepe University, Department of English Linguistics, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9306-0376.

Introduction

Metaphor has long been treated as a rhetorical device, taken advantage of by poets or literary figures with an attempt to enrich and deepen their writings by means of its very nature, addressing human thought and conceptualization. A stereotypical way of defining metaphor as "a figure of speech that attempts to describe one thing in terms of another based on a supposed similarity" does not suffice to tell us about its significance in understanding human conceptual organization.

Considerations on metaphor can be traced back to Ancient Greece, when literature was regarded as an inseparable part of philosophical concerns. At that time, Aristotle, who had a significant contribution to the development of the art of rhetoric, defined metaphor as "the application of an alien name by transference either from genus to species, or from species to genus, or from species to species, or by analogy, that is, proportion" (2008, p.41). Being one of the earliest definitions of metaphor, Aristotle's definition apparently comprised some phenomena (i.e., the first three conceptualizations) which were later studied under two related concepts: metonymy and synecdoche (Rapp, 2010). Analogy, however, remained a central issue which continued to be highlighted in more modern definitions of metaphor.

It was in the late 20th century that a shift of attention took place in the treatment of the metaphor concept. Scholars in cognitive linguistics drew the concept out of the monopoly of literary and rhetorical studies and put it at the center of cognitive studies exploring human conceptual organization. The groundbreaking work by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) drew attention to the function of metaphor in determining the ways we perceive, think, and act, thus bringing the issue beyond a naming process. Lakoff and Johnson noted that we are not generally aware of our conceptual system which plays a significant role in defining our everyday realities. Our concepts structure the way we perceive things, think about them, and determine our actions. Since human conceptual system is not open to observation, one way to understand its workings is by looking at language. By depending on linguistic evidence, Lakoff and Johnson concluded that much of our conceptual system is metaphorical in nature. The recognition of the power of metaphor in shedding light on human conceptual processes created great inspiration for scholars in cognitive linguistics who aim to explore human cognitive system by studying language. As Grady (2007) notes, metaphor served as a valuable construct in order to understand the ways in which some aspects of our experiences are related to another, for it has implications for the basic aspects of perception, thought, and neurological organization.

Thus, metaphor was redefined in cognitive linguistics with an emphasis on cognition and experience. Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) definition of metaphor as "understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another" (p.5) gained wide acceptance among scholars working in the area. Adopting a definition such as the one suggested by Lakoff and Johnson necessitates a careful look at the components of metaphor in order to understand the process governing how one thing can be taken to represent another thing.

A metaphor is composed of two parts in Lakoff and Johnson's conceptual metaphor theory (CMT): a target and a source concept (in some contexts, the former is called *tenor/topic* and the latter *vehicle*). For instance, in a metaphor like 'Beliefs are constructed stories', *beliefs* is the target concept represented via the source concept *constructed stories*. In a later work, Lakoff and Johnson (1999) state that metaphors involve conceptual mappings of knowledge and inference patterns from a concrete source domain to a typically more abstract target domain.

If we take into consideration the fact that in metaphors, experiential structure is projected between these two domains, the term *abstract* denotes the meaning 'less familiar to our experiences', and *concrete* denotes 'one which is more familiar to our experiences'. Lakoff and Johnson (1999) exemplify this by noting that everyday experience of attaining information through vision (i.e. watching, reading) gives rise to a conception of knowing in terms of seeing, as the expression "Do you see what I mean?". In this example, "understanding" is regarded as projected from a more abstract domain to a more concrete domain of "seeing".

Although understanding the dynamics of the source and target domains is central to working out the nature of metaphor, research addressing this issue is not abundant. In one of the earliest attempts to explore the functions of the components of metaphor from a cognitive linguistic perspective, Katz (1989) questioned the force that drives the choice of the source concepts (named 'vehicles') for metaphors. He has given sentence frames to the participants to complete, and made them choose from the alternative vehicles provided in order to make a comprehensible and aesthetically pleasing metaphor. As a result of the study, Katz has found out that the vehicles chosen by the participants to complete the metaphor were those that are moderately distant from the topic (or the target concept). In addition, participants displayed a tendency to choose vehicles (1) from referentially concrete domains, and (2) that are closer to the topic on domain-relevant distance.

Shen (1999), on the other hand, explored the principles of metaphor interpretation by reference to the notion 'domain'. He draws attention to two different models of metaphor comprehension in this respect: the 'domain-as-a-schema' model, and the 'domain-as-a-taxonomic' category model. Shen argues that there is an outstanding difference between these two models with respect to (1) their representational assumptions regarding the way knowledge is organized and represented in memory, and (2) their interpretation principles. In the study, Shen provides empirical evidence for the claim that neither of these models is sufficient to account for certain phenomena regarding metaphor interpretation. As an alternative, he proposes a hybrid model for metaphor comprehension, keeping to the explanatory power of both models.

In still another study about what constitutes a metaphor, Moore (2006) looks into space-to-time mappings in metaphorical constructions. Time is an abstract concept that usually undergoes a metaphorical mapping with spatial concepts. Moore draws attention to the fact that most research on metaphors that construe time as motion has focused on the question whether it is time or the person that moves. In his study, however, Moore focuses on an equally important distinction between metaphors that locate time concepts relative to ego and metaphors that locate time concepts relative to other time concepts. Rather than a single, abstract target domain of time, these two kinds of temporal metaphor metaphorize perspective-specific and perspective-neutral temporal concepts. Recognizing this distinction helps enhance the explanatory potential of CMT.

A rather neglected issue regarding the components of metaphor in the relevant literature is determining the nature of the experiences that may help to characterize the source domain. It has already been mentioned that experience is central to the characterization of each domain, and that the source domain is more familiar to our experiences (more understood) than the target domain (less understood); therefore, the former is used to characterize the latter. However, the type of experience that characterizes the source domain, and thus, gives rise to the production of source concepts is an issue that has not received the due attention in the

literature on metaphor. The aim of this study is to shed light on the type of experience that people make use of in choosing the source concepts for the metaphors they are building. To this end, the following research question is posed: Are sensory or extra-sensory experiences more determinative in choosing the source concepts for metaphors? One may claim that sensory experiences (i.e., perceptual experiences we attain through our senses) are more embodied, and therefore, they might be closer to our cognition when it comes to choosing the source concepts for our metaphors. However, we need empirical evidence to see if this is true or not.

Method

This study was designed in order to investigate whether people depend more on sensory experiences or extra-sensory experiences in choosing the source concepts of metaphors. This section specifies the instrument used to collect data, information about the participants, the ways in which the data were analyzed, and the limitations of the study.

The Instrument

A task sheet was prepared to be filled by the participants of the study. The sheet was prepared in Turkish in order to let the participants express themselves more naturally in their native language. The task contained six target concepts three of which were general concepts that are frequently mentioned in everyday life. The concepts were TIME (ZAMAN), LIFE (HAYAT), and LOVE (AŞK). The other three concepts were more specific concepts related to the aforementioned general concepts. These concepts were TOMORROW (YARIN), BIRTH (DOĞUM), and LOVER (SEVGİLİ), respectively. An example item in the task sheet reads as follows: TIME is (a) … The participants of the study were asked to complete each metaphor by filling in the space with an expression that they think would describe the given word the best. The task sheet included clear instruction as to how to complete the task, accompanied by an example ("Autumn is sorrow"). The participants were not restricted by the type or length of expressions they would choose.

Participants

The task was applied to a group of students at two universities in Turkey, namely Hacettepe University and İzmir University of Economics. A total of 77 informants participated in this study: 47 students and graduates of the Department of English Linguistics at Hacettepe University, and 30 students from three different departments at İzmir University of Economics, namely Psychology, International Trade and Finance, and Public Relations and Advertising. Some of the data were compiled in 2010 and some in 2019. Student informants ranged from freshman to senior level at the two universities. 27 informants were graduates of English Linguistics. The participants' ages ranged from 19 to 35. 57% of the participants were female (n=44), and 43% were males (n=33).

Data Collection and Analysis

The data were collected in printed forms from the students in the classes and via electronic forms shared with the graduate participants through social media. The replies in the task sheets were analyzed according to the participants' choice of 'abstract' and 'concrete' source concepts (i.e., stated in the form of abstract and concrete nouns) in order to complete each metaphor. The criteria for 'abstract' and 'concrete' were determined according to the lexical definitions of the words. The following definitions of the concepts in Cambridge English Dictionary were taken as a basis in the analysis of the source concepts:

Abstract: [1] not perceivable through senses

[2] existing as an idea, feeling, or quality, not as a material object:

Concrete: clear and certain, or real and existing in a form that can be seen or felt; perceivable through five senses

Note, however, that the classification 'abstract vs. concrete' used in the analysis of the data is distinct from Lakoff and Johnson's (1999) use of these terms to refer to the extent of experiential familiarity with the target and source domains of metaphors (see p.2 of this article). That is to say, during data analysis, a source concept is noted as 'concrete' if it denotes an object, event, or phenomenon which is perceivable through human senses (i.e., the senses of vision, hearing, smell, taste, and touch). On the other hand, a source concept is categorized as 'abstract' if it denotes feelings, emotions, ideas, or notions that are not readily accessible to our senses (i.e. not observable). In the light of all these, if an informant chooses a concrete concept while completing a metaphor, he is taken to use his sensory experiences as a source. If he chooses an abstract concept to complete a metaphor, he is accepted to use extra-sensory experiences as a source. An illustration of 'concrete vs. abstract' categorization is as follows:

(1) Time is water. [Zaman bir sudur.] (concrete source concept)

(2) Tomorrow is/means curiosity. [Yarın bir meraktır.] (abstract source concept)

In accordance with the aim of the present study, source concepts that referred to senses were distinguished from source concepts that referred to feelings, emotions, or ideas that are not graspable through senses. Three categories emerged from this kind of analysis: concrete concepts (C), abstract concepts denoting feelings and emotions (AE), and abstract concepts denoting other ideas or notions (AO) (i.e., those that do not denote feelings and emotions). A tripartite distinction was favoured over a bipartite distinction such as between concrete concepts and abstract ones in general, for a AE concepts can be cognitively more salient and have a different experiential status than general AO concepts. On the other hand, some of the seemingly concrete source concepts may in fact be abstract ones depending upon the nature of the adjectives used to modify the concrete nouns. Study for example:

(3) Time is a harsh road with no turning back. [Zaman acımasız ve geri dönüşü olmayan bir yoldur.]

In example (3), the concrete word "road" is modified with adjectives "harsh" and "having no turning back", which, from a holistic perspective, add an abstract sense to the noun (i.e., in reality, the roads that we take usually have a turning back). Therefore, such a source concept was categorized as AO.

During the analysis of data, frequency of each occurrence (i.e. concrete words (C), abstract words indicating feelings and emotions (AE), and other abstract words (AO)) was calculated, and indicated on a table with the percentages.

Limitations

This study is an attempt to understand the nature of the source concepts used in constructing metaphors. It is preliminary for a more detailed future quantitative empirical study designed to provide statistical evidence for the structuring of the source concepts drawing on a wide range of data. The scale of the present study is relatively small and the way the data were collected may not reflect spontaneous language use (as the informants are asked to complete a task sheet to form metaphors); however, it does give us an idea about informants' preferences in choosing the source concepts for their metaphors. The incorporation of numerical data and frequency analysis into this study helps us work out the general tendency among the replies of the informants. For a more comprehensive and explanatory study, without doubt, the scale of the study needs to be enlarged by increasing the population and the scope of the task applied to the informants, and introducing variety by adding natural data to the study.

Findings

The participants of the study filled in the task sheet with expressions (i.e., source concepts) to complete each metaphor. They decided what can best describe the target concepts TIME, LIFE, LOVE, TOMORROW, BIRTH, and LOVER analogically. The source concepts they chose to write their metaphors were categorized into three groups as denoting concrete concepts (i.e., expressed in the form of concrete nouns), abstract concepts denoting feelings or emotions, and abstract concepts denoting other ideas or notions than emotions or feelings (i.e., the latter two were expressed in abstract nouns).

The following table indicates the number and percentage of these three categories in the source domain of the metaphors constructed by the participants.

Table 1. Number and Percentage of C, AE, and AO Concepts in the Source Domain of the Metaphors Constructed by the Participants.

TARGET CONCEPTS	C #	C %	AE #	AE %	AO #	AO %	Total number of metaphors formed
TIME [ZAMAN]	38	49%	10	13%	29	38%	77
LIFE [HAYAT]	30	39%	18	23%	29	38%	77
LOVE [AŞK]	17	22%	45	59%	15	19%	77
TOMORROW [YARIN]	6	8%	54	70%	17	22%	77
BIRTH [DOĞUM]	9	12%	20	26%	48	62%	77
LOVER [SEVGİLİ]	26	34%	39	51%	12	15%	77

C: Concrete source concepts indicating sensory experience; AE: Abstract source concepts indicating feelings and emotions; AO: Other abstract concepts used as a source to define the target concepts.

In the following subsections, each target concept will be treated separately. The category of source concepts used to complete a metaphor will be discussed by reference to the frequency of occurrence. Each category of source concepts will be illustrated with random examples.

a. TIME

As Table 1 indicates, the target concept TIME was completed most frequently with a concrete source concept (49%). In fact, concretization of the abstract concept 'time' is not a new finding (c.f. Lakoff and Johnson, 1980; Ramscar, Boroditsky, & Matlock, 2009; Margolies, 2008). Evidence has already been presented supporting that people have a tendency to understand the concept 'time' in terms of concrete concepts. Time is rarely associated with abstract concepts expressing feelings and emotions (13%). However, as a second most common choice, participants opted for some other abstract concepts to denote 'time' (38%). In the following examples time is defined in terms of concrete concepts, namely moving objects or entities:

(1) Concrete concepts (C)

Time is a *sandglass*. [Zaman bir kum saatidir.]

Time is *water*. [Zaman bir sudur.]

Time is a *river*. [Zaman bir nehirdir.]

"Time" is understood in the given examples in terms of a "sandglass", "water", and "river", respectively. All of these source concepts help to identify time with a moving entity.

In the construction of time metaphors, though rare, there are also instances of abstract source concepts referring to feelings and emotions:

(2) Abstract source concepts indicating feelings and emotions (AE)

Time is *consolation*. [Zaman bir tesellidir.]

Time is a *need*. [Zaman ihtiyaçtır.]

Time is *expectation*. [Zaman bir bekleyiştir.]

In each of the above examples, "time" refers to a feeling or emotion. It is identified with "consolation", "need", and "expectation", respectively.

As it was mentioned above, the second most common category of source concepts after concrete ones is abstract source concepts denoting ideas or notions other than feelings and emotions. The following examples show that time is associated with "a loop", "a journey", and "a routine":

(3) Other abstract concepts used as a source to define the target concept (AO)

Time is a *loop*. [Zaman bir döngüdür.]

Time is a *journey*. [Zaman bir yolculuktur.]

Time is a *routine*. [Zaman bir rutindir.]

b. LIFE

The target concept LIFE was another item which was represented most often with concrete concepts (39%). The case with 'time metaphors' may be true of 'life metaphors' as well. That is, people may have a tendency to understand abstract concepts that refer to processes with more concrete concepts. The following examples illustrate this:

(1) Concrete concepts (C)

Life is a *present* unjustly distributed to people. [Hayat insanlara adilce verilmeyen bir ödüldür.]

Life is a long, rough and tiring *road*. [Hayat engebelerle dolu, uzun, yorucu bir yoldur.]

Life is a *labyrinth*. [Hayat bir labirenttir.]

In the first example above, life is identified with a "prize unjustly distributed" by God, while in the second and third examples, with things that are progressive, long, and complicated in nature: "a tiring road" and "a labyrinth".

"Life" is associated the least frequently with abstract concepts denoting feelings and emotions (23%). Some of those cases can be exemplified with the following:

(2) Abstract source concepts indicating feelings and emotions (AE)

Life is a *complication*. [Hayat bir karmaşadır.]

Life is a *physical and psychological awareness*. [Hayat fiziksel ve ruhsal farkındalıktır.]

Life is an *illusion*. [Hayat bir illüzyondur.]

"Life" is understood as "complication", "physical and psychological awareness", and "illusion" in the examples above.

The second most frequent choice of source concepts fell on abstract concepts denoting notions other than feelings and emotions (%38). In the following examples "life" is explained through the abstract source concepts "game", "struggle", and "journey", respectively.

(3) Other abstract concepts used as a source to define the target concept (AO)

Life is a *game* you want to take pleasure in no matter who the winner or loser is. [Hayat, keyif almaya çalıştığın, kazanan ya da kaybedenin önemsiz olduğu bir oyundur.]

Life is a *struggle*. [Hayat bir mücadeledir.]

Life is a *journey*. [Hayat bir yolculuktur.]

c. LOVE

Being directly related with feelings and emotions, the target concept LOVE was explained heavily in terms of AE concepts. 59% of all times participants chose an abstract source concept denoting feelings and emotions to complete the 'love metaphor'. Only 22% of the source concepts were concrete in nature. Three of the cases when concrete concepts were used to complete the metaphors are as follows:

(1) Concrete concepts (C)

Love is a *tool* to socialize. [Aşk sosyalleşme aracıdır.]

Love is a *knife*. [Aşk bir bıçaktır.]

Love is an *incomplete song*. [Aşk yarım kalan bir şarkıdır.]

In these examples "love" is taken to denote "a tool", "a knife", and "a song", all of which are concrete concepts.

The most frequently preferred way to characterize a love metaphor was to choose the source from among abstract concepts that denote feelings and emotions. 45 of the total 77 participants displayed such a pattern in forming a 'love metaphor'. The following examples are illustrations of this widespread choice:

(2) Abstract source concepts indicating feelings and emotions (AE)

Love is a *passion*. [Aşk bir tutkudur.]

Love is *riding a swing carousel with a full stomach*. [Aşk, dolu bir mideyle dönme dolaba binmektir.]

Love is an *excitement*. [Aşk bir heyecandır.]

The target concept "love" was completed with "passion", "riding a swing carousel with a full stomach", and "excitement" as the source concepts in the given examples.

The third category, that is abstract source concepts falling outside the ones denoting feelings and emotions, comprised 19% of the participants' choices. Consider the following examples in which love is identified with abstract concepts such as "an insidious friend", "an adventure", and "a dream":

(3) Other abstract concepts used as a source to define the target concept (AO)

Love is an *insidious friend* who tries to knock your reason out. [Aşk mantığı devredışı bırakmaya çalışan sinsi arkadaştır.]

Love is an *adventure*. [Aşk bir maceradir.]

Love is a *dream*. [Aşk bir rüyadır.]

The task also involved asking participants to complete metaphors that involved more specific target concepts (i.e., tomorrow, birth, lover), which are semantically related with the general abstract target concepts (i.e., time, life, love). The following subsections will discuss the findings of this analysis and draw on a number of examples to illustrate each.

d. TOMORROW

Cases when participants identified TOMORROW with a concrete concept is quite rare. Only 8% of the participants preferred a concrete source concept to form a metaphor about "tomorrow". Three of the rare examples are as follows:

(1) Concrete concepts (C*)*

Tomorrow is a *mist*. [Yarın bir buğudur.]

Tomorrow is an *exciting book* you can't help reading, for you are very curious about the ending. [Yarın, sonunu merak ettiğin için heyecanla okumayı bırakamadığın kitaptır.]

Tomorrow is a *pathway*. [Yarın bir patikadır.]

The examples above illustrate an analogy between the target concept "tomorrow" and source concepts "mist", "an exciting book", and "a pathway".

An outstanding 70% of the participants chose abstract concepts denoting emotions in order to describe "tomorrow". Tomorrow is a target concept that frequently evokes unknown happenings, and a question mark about what it will bring. At times it evokes positive feelings and expectations, and at times negative. Consider the following instances in which "tomorrow" is associated with "worry", "vagueness", and "hope":

(2) Abstract source concepts indicating feelings and emotions (AE)

Tomorrow is a *worry*. [Yarın bir endişedir.]

Tomorrow is *vagueness*. [Yarın belirsizliktir.]

Tomorrow is *hope*. [Yarın bir umuttur.]

22% of the participants opted for abstract concepts expressing ideas other than feelings or emotions. These ideas also point at the unknown nature of tomorrow; it may bring about different possibilities or chances. To illustrate:

(3) Other abstract concepts used as a source to define the target concept (AO)

Tomorrow is a *new beginning*. [Yarın yepyeni bir başlangıçtır.]

Tomorrow is a *probability*. [Yarın, bir olasılıktır.]

Tomorrow is a *second chance*. [Yarın, ikinci bir şanstır.]

In these examples, tomorrow is identified with "a new beginning", "a probability", and "a second chance", respectively.

e. BIRTH

The target concept BIRTH was defined most often with AO concepts. 62% of the source concepts chosen in this context displayed such a pattern. Second most often choice was AE concepts, comprising 26% of the participants' replies. The least common preference in this context was choosing a C concept to form a metaphor about "birth" (12%). Some of the few C concepts used to set an analogy with "birth" are as follows:

(1) Concrete concepts (C)

Birth is a *bud*. [Doğum bir filizdir.]

Birth is *sun*. [Doğum bir güneştir.]

Birth is *bitter and sweet*. [Doğum acı ve tatlıdır.]

"Birth" usually evokes an idea about new beginnings and freshness. The concrete notions preferred to define "birth" correspond to these ideas. In the examples given above, birth is associated with "a bud", "sun", and "something bitter and sweet" at the same time.

On the other hand, "birth" is an event that usually connotes positive feelings and emotions. Therefore, one may expect that a metaphor about "birth" must often make reference to such feelings. Interesting enough, the choice for AE concepts as a source for "birth metaphor" does not reach a notable rate: only 22%. One reason for the relatively low frequency of AE concepts

in this connection can be that "birth" is less associated with the feelings or emotions of individuals unless they take it literally to refer to a particular event such as the birth of their own baby. Nevertheless, there are still clear cases in which AE concepts are preferred to make a 'birth metaphor'. In the following examples, "birth" is associated with "happiness", "refreshment", and "hope", respectively:

(2) Abstract source concepts indicating feelings and emotions (AE)

Birth is *happiness*. [Doğum sevinçtir.]

Birth is *refreshment*. [Doğum bir yenilenmedir.]

Birth is *hope*. [Doğum bir ümittir.]

Quite a significant proportion of the participants resorted to AO concepts to define "birth". 48 of 77 participants displayed such a choice. An explanation for this high frequency might be that the notion of birth seems to reflect more general abstractions associated with the event like a "new beginning". Below are some illustrations of this case:

(3) Other abstract concepts used as a source to define the target concept (AO)

Birth is a *miracle*. [Doğum bir mucizedir.]

Birth is a *rebellion*. [Doğum bir başkaldırıdır.]

Birth is *not only the beginning but also the end of everything*. [Doğum, her şeyin başlangıcı, fakat aynı zamanda sonudur.]

f. LOVER

The last target concept LOVER was associated most frequently with AE concepts (51%). This finding is not surprising as "love" itself is an emotion and "lover" is its object. Therefore, one might rightfully expect these two terms to be characterized with concepts denoting feelings and emotions. There were also cases when the participants associated a lover with a concrete entity. This was the second most frequently chosen source concept for the 'lover metaphor' (34%). Consider the following examples in which a "lover" is identified with "a flower", "a fellow traveler", and "a second eye":

(1) Concrete concepts (C)

A lover is a *flower*. [Sevgili bir çiçektir.]

A lover is a *fellow traveler*. [Sevgili bir yol arkadaşıdır.]

A lover is a *second eye* with which you look in the same direction. [Sevgili aynı yere baktığın ikinci bir gözdür.]

Below, on the other hand, are instances of AE source concepts, which are the most frequently preferred ones to partner with "a lover":

(2) Abstract source concepts indicating feelings and emotions (AE)

A lover is/means *trust*. [Sevgili güvendir.]

A lover is/means *trouble*. [Sevgili derttir.]

A lover is/means *longing*. [Sevgili özlemdir.]

The examples above set an analogy between "a lover" and the source concepts "trust", "trouble", and "longing", respectively. These are among the feelings a lover evokes on the one who loves him/her.

Finally, AO concepts are the least frequently preferred sources to match with a "lover" (15%). To mention some AO concepts used to form a "lover metaphor", the followings can be used for illustration:

> (3) Other abstract concepts used as a source to define the target concept (AO)
>
> A lover is the *one for whom you make sacrifices*. [Sevgili uğruna fedakarlık yapılandır.]
>
> A lover is a *luxury*. [Sevgili bir lükstür.]
>
> A lover is your *soul-mate*. [Sevgili ruh eşidir.]

A lover is regarded as "a person for whom you make sacrifices", "a luxury" for the beloved one, and "a soul-mate" for his/her partner.

Discussion and Conclusion

The general idea in CMT is that the source domain is a more familiar domain (i.e., more concrete) to human experience than the target domain (i.e, less familiar, and therefore, more abstract). Conceptual metaphors are embodied. Therefore, we have a tendency to understand abstract notions like "time" with concrete ones. Most of our undeliberate use of metaphors in daily life involves examples of embodiment (consider some examples presented by Kövecses (2017) such as *exploding* with anger, *wandering aimlessly* in life, having a *cold* personality). Sense experiences are the main source to embodied knowledge; therefore, one might expect people to apply more often to concrete source concepts in characterizing abstract concepts that are less understood. The findings of this study, however, serve to question this prejudgment at least in the case of deliberate metaphors.

This study was designed as a conditioned study in which the participants were asked to form metaphors deliberately (as opposed to natural occurrences of metaphor). We adopted a mainstream definition (i.e., dictionary definition) of the notions "concrete" and "abstract"; any concept that was constituted through sense data was categorized as "concrete", and any one lacking this feature was categorized as "abstract". The findings of this study reveal that in choosing the source concepts for metaphors, the participants went for abstract concepts (the totality of AE and AO concepts used) more often than concrete concepts. Therefore, it does not follow from the fact that a target concept is abstract that it is necessarily characterized by concrete source concepts. This is only partially true with respect to the present study.

For instance, "time" was most frequently matched with concrete concepts in our tripartite classification, which is in line with the general trend in the literature on this topic. However, when we consider the totality of the abstract source concepts including AE and AO ones, let's say A in general, we see that they are almost equal in number, even slightly higher than C concepts. "Tomorrow", as a more specific time concept, on the other hand, evokes largely AE concepts and very rarely concrete ones. Similarly, "life" is associated most often with C concepts in our tripartite classification, but the totality of A concepts overtake the C ones. Especially, AO concepts come very close to the rate of the C concepts. This means "life", as an abstract concept, can be better understood in terms of concrete concepts; that is to say,

associating it with concrete concepts can help us attribute a tangible quality to it. However, the fact that it is almost equally matched with AO concepts may well show us the abstract, vague, and progressive understanding of "life". "Birth", on the other hand, is matched remarkably with AO concepts and very rarely with C ones. It shows that "birth" as a stage of "life" has quite diferent connotations than "life" when it comes to forming metaphors. It is usually associated with abstract positive ideas but less with AE concepts. Finally, the metaphors of "love" and "lover" are most often associated with AE concepts. Considering the thematic value of these two concepts, associating them with concepts denoting feelings and emotions is not surprising. A notable difference between these two concepts is that while "love" is least frequently connected with a concrete entity, a "lover" has a higher rate of association with a concrete entity, as it is the object of love.

All in all, when we take into account the total number of A concepts and compare them with C ones, thus adopt a bipartite comparison, we see that at all times A concepts predominate over the C concepts used as the source concepts for the metaphors. However, we reckon that retaining a tripartite distinction in this study is functional as AE concepts such as "hope, trust, longing" can be cognitively more salient and have a different experiential status than general AO concepts such as "miracle, rebellion, and probability".

This paper was an attempt to examine the nature of the source concepts that are used to refer to some target concepts in metaphorical pairings. The main conclusion of the paper is that extra-sensory experiences have more dominant force in determining the source concepts of metaphors when individuals are confronted with a task to form deliberate metaphors. Considering the findings of this study, the following suggestions can be provided for future empirical research into the nature of source concepts of metaphors: (1) concept-specific treatment can be needed for the target components of metaphors, as notions like "experientially less familiar" and "experientially more familiar" are vague and need refinement. (2) The more "experiential" concepts should not be equated with concepts constituted through sense experiences. Our experiential world is complex and incorporates many feelings, emotions, and ideas which can be closer to our cognition than sensory experiences in choosing the source concepts of metaphors. (3) Undelibarate and deliberate use of metaphors may reflect different kinds of motivation in terms of the choice of source concepts. In deliberate metaphors, people might be more concerned with finding source concepts that can be aesthetically pleasing for the receiver, or their metaphors may reflect a deeper level of introspection. For these reasons, abstract concepts may be more frequently chosen than concrete ones in deliberate metaphors. This prediction needs, however, further evidence.

This study is only a preliminary attempt to understand the nature of the source concepts of metaphors. However, it does give us some clue about how much abstract notions that denote feelings, emotions, and ideas can be closer to our cognition than concepts that we form based on our physical experiences through five senses. Further research that increases the population, enlarges the scope of the data collection tool, and incorporates natural data will, no doubt, widen our knowledge in this topic and enable grounded generalizations.

References

Aristotle (2008). *Poetics* (S. H. Butcher, Trans.). New York: Cosimo Classics (Original work published 1895).

Grady, J. E. (2007). Metaphor. In D. Geeraerts, & H. Cuyckens (Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of cognitive linguistics* (pp.188-213). New York: Oxford University Press.

Katz, A. N. (1989). On choosing the vehicles of metaphors: Referential concreteness, semantic distances, and individual differences. *Journal of Memory and Language, 28*(4), pp.486-499.

Kövecses, Z. (2017). The conceptual metaphor. In E. Semino & Z. Demjen (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of metaphor and language* (pp.13-28). New York: Routledge.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought.* New York: Basic Books.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Margolies, S. O. (2008). Event valence and spatial metaphors of time. *Cognition & Emotion, 22* (7), pp. 1401-1414.

Moore, K. E. (2006). Space-to-time mappings and temporal concepts. *Cognitive Linguistics*, *17*(2), pp. 199-244.

Ramscar, M., Boroditsky L., & and Matlock, T. (2009). Time, motion and meaning: The experiential basis of abstract thought. In K. S. Mix, L. B. Smith, and M. Gasser (Eds.), *The spatial foundations of language and cognition* (pp. 67-82). Oxford: OUP.

Rapp, C. "Aristotle's Rhetoric", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2010 Edition), E Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2010/entries/ aristotle-rhetoric/>.

Shen, Y. (1999). Principles of metaphor interpretation and the notion of 'domain': A proposal for a hybrid model. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *31*(12), pp.1631-1653.

Appendix: The task

Cinsiyet:

Yaş:

Kavramsal Metaforlar

Gündelik hayatımızda bazı kavramları açıklarken benzetmelerden (metaforlardan) yararlanırız. Bir başka deyişle bir kavramı diğeri yerine kullanırız (örn. Sonbahar hüzündür). Aşağıda verilen kavramları tanımlarken size uygun gelen benzetmelerden yararlanınız.

Zaman (bir) …………………………………………………..

Hayat (bir) …………………………………………………....

Aşk (bir) …………………………………………………...

Yarın (bir) …………………………………………………....

Doğum (bir) ………………………………………………….

Sevgili (bir) …………………………………………………..