Reseñas / *Book reviews*

Since the emergence of conceptual metaphor theory (henceforth, CMT) (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), metaphor came under the spotlight by being envisioned not only as an ornamental device in language but a cognitive phenomenon. Nevertheless, CMT has been profoundly and unceasingly criticized for the past 40 years. In this regard, Kövecses manifests from the outset that no existing theory of metaphor, including CMT, has been able to fully grasp the sheer complexity of metaphor thus far. In order to refine and further develop on certain issues of CMT, Kövecses poses five major questions, each of which is shrewdly addressed in a different chapter of the book.

In Chapter 1, the author briefly outlines the main tenets and the current state of the art of what he regards as the "standard" view of CMT. Kövecses remarks that since Lakoff and Johnson's *Metaphors We Live By* (1980), a large body of research has confirmed, added to and adapted their initial ideas. Therefore, the current version of CMT cannot be considered as equivalent to *Metaphors We Live By*.

Moreover, the author tries to shed light on many of the critiques that metaphor scholars have raised against CMT in the past decades. Despite being a complex and coherent theory of metaphor, Kövecses proceeds to introduce the main points of "standard" CMT that could be further explored and developed. Those weaknesses pose a number of questions that are thoroughly tackled in the subsequent chapters of the book. The author refers to the new view he proposes in the book as "extended conceptual metaphor theory" (hereafter, extended CMT).

Chapter 2 revolves around the question of whether concrete concepts can be understood figuratively or only abstract concepts are. In this regard, Kövecses convincingly argues that even our most basic and concrete experiences can be conceptualized figuratively, not only literally. In turn, those figuratively conceptualized concrete experiences can be utilized as source domains for metaphorical

conceptualization. As the author points out, "we reuse this apparently concrete but figuratively understood conceptual material to comprehend and construct abstractions without being aware of their original figurative (metaphorical or metonymic) cognitive status" (2020, p.22). Hence, the author's view brings about a substantial reduction of the extent of the literal.

On the basis of the evidence he shows, Kövecses proposes that the meaning of a concept consists of two parts: (1) an ontological part based on tangible experience (i.e. embodied content) and (2) a cognitive part that specifies how concepts are cognitively construed (see also Langacker 2008: 43 for the distinction between content and construal in linguistic meaning). Therefore, both abstract and concrete concepts have an ontological part and a cognitive-construal part but their proportions differ. While the ontological part prevails over the cognitively construed one in concrete concepts, the construal part predominates over the ontological one in abstract concepts.

Chapter 3 addresses the issue of whether metonymies play a role in the emergence of conceptual metaphors. In his view, Kövecses claims that some correlational metaphors "emerge from frame-like mental representations thorough a metonymic stage" (p.35) (see also Grady, 1997a, b, 1999, 2005). He distinguishes two ways in which a conceptual metaphor can arise from a metonymy: (1) when a frame that becomes the target contains a frame element that turns into the source domain by means of the cognitive operation of generalization or schematization; (2) when a frame that turns into the metaphoric source comprises a frame element that is generalized and emerges as the metaphoric target. Kövecses' view accounts for why a great deal of metaphors can be conceived of as metonymies and

why many metonymies can be interpreted as metaphors.

In chapter 4 Kövecses punctiliously elucidates the way image schemas, domains, frames and mental spaces differ from one another and provides a new comprehensive framework for the study of metaphor, which he calls the "multilevel view of conceptual metaphor". According to this view, conceptual metaphors "simultaneously involve conceptual structures, or units, on several distinct levels of schematicity" (p.51). At the interlocking vertical hierarchy, image schemas are at the highest level of schematicity, followed by domains, frames and mental spaces. Moreover, Kövecses divides those four types of conceptual structures into analogue (image schemas) and propositional (domains, frames and mental spaces). Another division made by the author is that of the mental structures stored in long-term memory (i.e. image schemas, domains and frames), and those which function online in working memory (i.e. mental spaces). With regard to the best methodology for the study of metaphor within the multilevel view framework, the author claims that each of the four levels of metaphor is associated with a given aim, and, consequently, with a particular method. Nevertheless, most of the approaches discussed in this chapter may be applied to several levels of metaphor, contributing complementary insights to them.

In chapter 5, Kövecses eloquently explains the need of a contextual component within CMT, as the conceptual and the contextual aspects of metaphor are inextricably intertwined. The author distinguishes four types of context: situational context, discourse context, bodily context and conceptual-cognitive context. Each of these types of context comprises a variety of contextual factors, which "prime conceptualizers to (unconsciously) choose their metaphors in discourse" (p.104).

Therefore, some conceptual meta-

Esbrí-Blasco, Montserrat
Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory, de Zoltán Kövecses. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.

331

phors do not only stem from bodily experience, but can be motivated by various context types and their corresponding contextual aspects (i.e. they are context-induced metaphors). The author holds that the level of schematicity at which context mostly influences metaphor creation in discourse is the mental spaces level in specific communicative situations.

Chapter 6 tackles the question of whether CMT is merely an offline theory of metaphor. Kövecses begins by asserting that in online communication, metaphors occur at the mental spaces level. Mental spaces, in turn, activate the decontextualized conceptual structures in long-term memory that are higher up in the vertical hierarchy (image schemas, domains, frames) so as to join the production and comprehension of metaphorical expressions. As he suggests, "the offline and online metaphorical structures are all needed for a (more or less) complete understanding of how conceptual metaphors work in natural discourse" (p. 149). Consequently, Kövecses' extended CMT regards metaphor as both an offline and an online phenomenon. The following two chapters provide an overall account of the main ideas discussed in the book.

Chapter 7 outlines the main components of the extended CMT, the interrelations between them and the main distinctions that characterize this extended and more comprehensive view of metaphor. By way of conclusion, in the last chapter, Kövecses gives response to the five major questions posed at the beginning of the book. Last but not least, the author compares the extended view of CMT to other theories of metaphor, concluding that the most similar theory is definitely the dynamic systems view of metaphor (Gibbs 2013,2017, Gibbs and Cameron 2007) by wisely seeking synergy between them.

On the whole, Kövecses' thoughtfully structured book is a milestone publication that enriches the field of metaphor by presenting a coherent and comprehensive new version of CMT. Not only does the author provide well-argued distinctions and illustrate his proposals, but he also eloquently compares his new insights with the theories and approaches that have been prevailing thus far. Moreover, despite relying heavily on his previous work, the author brilliantly integrates his previous ideas and innovative insights into his new view of metaphor.

Even though the formulations in the analysis of some of his examples might be subtly refined, putting forward such a painstaking distinction among conceptual structures within the four levels of schematicity is a praiseworthy feat. Further research should be aimed at finding the best way of combining methodologies to confirm Kövecses' bold suggestions, especially in languages other than English.

All in all, although the extended view of CMT approves of much of the "standard" CMT, Kövecses' monograph updates and refines this theory and offers some unique and thought-provoking insights into the cognitive phenomenon of metaphor that should undoubtedly be taken on board by metaphor scholars and researchers in Cognitive Linguistics as well as in other disciplines.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Gibbs, Raymond W. 2013. «Metaphoric cognition as social activity: Dissolving the divide between metaphor in thought and communication». *Metaphor and the Social World*, 3, 54–76. https://doi.org/10.1075/msw.3.1.03gib

Gibbs, Raymond W. 2017. «The embodied and discourse views of metaphor: Why these are not so different and how they can be brought closer together». In *Metaphor: Embodied Cognition and Discourse*, Hampe, Beate, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 319–35. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108182324.018

Gibbs, Raymond W. and Cameron, Lynne. 2007. «Social-cognitive dynamics of metaphor performance». *Cognitive Systems Research*, 9, 64–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogsys.2007.06.008

Grady, Joseph E. 1997a. *Foundations of Meaning: Primary Metaphors and Primary scenes*. Ph.D. diss., University of California at Berkeley.

Grady, Joseph E. 1997b. «THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS revisited». *Cognitive Linguistics* 8, 267–90. https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.1997.8.4.267

Grady, Joseph E. 1999. «A typology of motivation for conceptual metaphor». In *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*. Gibbs, R., and Steen, G. eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 79–100. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.175.06gra

Grady, Joseph E. 2005. «Primary metaphors as inputs to conceptual integration». *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 1595–614. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2004.03.012

Kövecses, Zoltán. 2020. *Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781108859127

Lakoff, George and Johnson, Mark. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Langacker, Ronald. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.