



A Cognitive Study of Conceptual Metaphors in English and Persian: Universal or Culture-Specific?

Mahmood Hashemian (Corresponding Author),

*Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics, Department of English Language,
Faculty of Letters & Humanities, Shahrekord University, Iran*

E-mail: hashemian-m@sku.ac.ir

Razieh Salemi,

*Ph.D. Candidate in TEFL, Department of English Language, Faculty of Letters &
Humanities, Shahrekord University, Iran*

E-mail: raziehsalemi68@gmail.com

Aliakbar Jafarpour,

*Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics, Department of English Language,
Faculty of Letters & Humanities, Shahrekord University, Iran*

E-mail: aliakbar_jafarpour@yahoo.com

Abstract

In the last 2 decades, studies on conceptual metaphors have profoundly increased. The development in this field was followed by Lakoff and Johnson's (1980b) work on describing the conceptual role played by metaphors and their correspondence with language and thought. This study aimed to compare conceptual metaphors in Persian and English through a corpus-based approach as well as examining both the universality and culture-specificity of conceptual metaphors within Persian/English and describe in detail the Persian conception of some metaphorical concepts from the cognitive perspective. The cognitive theory of metaphor was resorted to and applied to a cross-cultural analysis of a randomly selected set of conceptual metaphors in English and Persian. To analyze the data, 12 conceptual metaphors introduced by Wright (1999) were investigated and gathered. Then, the metaphorical expressions in the 2 languages were grouped under their source and target domains. Results pointed to the fact that whereas there is a certain degree of universality in terms of the predominant conceptual metaphors, there are also variations between the 2 languages for cultural and linguistic reasons.

Keywords: Cognitive-Semantic View of Metaphors, Conceptual Metaphors, Universality/Culture-Specificity of Conceptual Metaphors

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: Thursday, December 19, 2019

Accepted: Tuesday, March 10, 2020

Published: Tuesday, June 16, 2020

Available Online: Tuesday, June 9, 2020

DOI: 10.22049/jalda.2020.26721.1155

Online ISSN: 2383-2460; Print ISSN:2383-591x

Introduction

For a long time, metaphor has been an interesting linguistic phenomenon that has attracted the attention of many linguists. Metaphor has been viewed differently from various viewpoints, and various definitions about metaphor have been proposed. Traditional schools of linguistics viewed metaphor as a figure of speech used in literature or as a rhetorical device or a stylistic device to achieve an aesthetic effect. However, the cognitive-linguistic view proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980b) presents a different view on metaphor and claims that metaphor is not just a matter of language of mere words. On the contrary, human thought processes are mainly metaphorical. They believed that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action.

In fact, for traditional schools of linguistics, metaphor was “a matter of extraordinary rather than ordinary language” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 1). Conversely, the contemporary view on conceptual metaphors has seen that the definition of metaphor has broadened from a rhetorical device in literary works to a common phenomenon of language in use. Their view is very different from the classical model of looking at metaphors that claims metaphors have nothing to do with meaning or understanding.

Thus, this field of study is important because it provides insights into the area of comparative studies. The attention of recent researchers has been oriented to the existence of conceptual metaphors among different languages around the world, and they have found out the possible conceptualization of similar metaphors. When it comes to the differences between the language and culture of the native speakers of English and Persian, there are some ideas, culturally prescribed rules of behavior, and some ways of social interaction that seem to be accepted by most English speakers and are observed differently by Persian speakers. So, this study was an attempt to compare a sample of conceptual metaphors in English and Persian and provide evidence for the presence of universal and culture-specific metaphors in English and Persian in favor of the idea that various cognitive, linguistic, social, and cultural forces shape people’s use and understanding of metaphoric discourse.

What Is Metaphor?

Metaphor is the use of one notion to describe another. In other words, it is the application of one element from one context of experience to another one. Thus, one transfers the meaning from one concept to another on the basis of provided similarities. Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980b) publication of *Metaphors We Live By* describes the conceptual role played by metaphor and its correspondence with language and thought. They define metaphor as a process by which we conceive “one thing in terms of another, and its primary function is understanding” (p. 36). Lakoff and Johnson (1980b) argue that “metaphor is not just a matter of language,

that is, of mere words. We shall argue that, on the contrary, human thought processes are largely metaphorical” (p. 6). In fact, our everyday language is filled with metaphors we may not always notice.

To see how metaphorical concepts give an accurate understanding of the nature of concepts, consider one of the commonly used conceptual metaphors and the following metaphorical expressions:

Love Is a Journey

Look *how far we've come*.

We're *at a crossroads*.

We'll just have to *go our separate ways*.

We can't *turn back* now.

I don't think this relationship is *going anywhere*.

Where are we?

We're *stuck*.

It's been a *long, bumpy road*.

This relationship is a *dead-end street*.

We're just *spinning our wheels*.

Our marriage is *on the rocks*.

We've *gotten off the track*.

This relationship is *foundering*.

The above linguistic expressions are the manifestations of the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY that is common in English. Lakoff and Johnson (1980b) refer to LOVE in terms of a JOURNEY in which a set of systematic correspondences are set: “The lovers correspond to the travelers,” “the love relationship corresponds to the vehicle,” “the lovers’ common goals correspond to their common destinations on the journey,” and “difficulties in the relationship correspond to impediments to travel.” In these examples, the notion of LOVE is used abstractly and elusively in terms of the notion JOURNEY. Cognitive linguists argue that thinking about the abstract concept of LOVE is facilitated by the concrete concept of JOURNEY. In this case, metaphors provide a means for understanding something abstract in terms of something concrete.

In this conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY, the expressions from the vocabulary of JOURNEY like *crossroads*, *going separate ways*, *bumpy road*, *dead-end street*, *spinning the wheels*, and so forth form the ordinary and everyday English expressions. Lakoff (1992) stated that these metaphorical linguistic expressions are not poetic, nor are they necessarily used for special rhetorical effect. In fact, he said that a conceptual metaphor is when we understand one conceptual domain in terms

of another conceptual domain as when we talk and think about LOVE in terms of a JOURNEY.

Cognitive linguists of metaphors (e. g., Kövecses, 1990; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Lakoff & Tuner, 1989) all believe that if we want to better understand a concept, it is better to use another concept that is more concrete, physical, or tangible than the former for this purpose. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980b), a conceptual metaphor consists of two conceptual domains in which one domain is understood in terms of another. Kövecses (2002) suggested that the conceptual domain from which we draw metaphorical expression to understand another conceptual domain is called the *source domain* and the *target domain* is the one we try to understand by use of or through the source domain. Thus, the source domain is a more physical, and the target domain a more abstract kind of domain. In the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY, LOVE is an abstract concept as the target domain and JOURNEY a more concrete, or physical, concept as the source domain.

Kövecses (2002) stated that there are basic and essential conceptual correspondences, or mappings, between the source and target domains. He said that in the metaphorical process A or the target domain is understood in terms of B or the source domain as follow:

A Is B
Love Is a Journey

In fact, Kövecses (2002) noted that there are a set of systematic correspondences between the source and target domains in the sense that the constituent conceptual elements of B correspond to the constituent elements of A. Technically, these conceptual correspondences are often used as *mappings*. In the best-known conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY, these systematic set of correspondences, or mappings, characterize the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY. When we use or hear these expressions in some contexts, we will interpret them to be about LOVE. We all know that we do not have in mind the real *travelers* but also *the lovers*, not a *real* and *physical journey* but the *events* in a *love relationship* or not a *physical destination* at the end of the journey but *the goals* or *purposes of the love relationship*. Thus, it is concluded that “constituent elements of conceptual domain A or the target domain are in systematic correspondence with constituent elements of conceptual domain B or the source domain” (Kövecses, 2002, p. 24).

People use and come up with these metaphors because there are preexisting similarities between the constituent elements in both domains. Kövecses (2002) confirmed that in the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY, many elements of

the target concept (i.e., LOVE) come from the source domain of JOURNEY and are not preexisting. He continued the target domain of LOVE did not have these elements before it was structured by the source domain of JOURNEY. Correspondingly, “it was the application of the *journey* domain to the *love* domain that provided the concept of *love* with this particular structure or set of elements” (Kövecses, 2002, p. 24). He emphasized that it was the concept of JOURNEY that created the concept of LOVE.

Consequently, we can conclude that, in all of the conceptual metaphor cases, a more abstract domain is conceptualized and expressed via the extension of a less abstract or concrete domain. Just as Lakoff (1992) indicates, the result is that metaphor, that is, cross-domain mapping, is absolutely central to ordinary natural language semantics, and the study of literary metaphor is an extension of the study of everyday metaphor.

Universality of Metaphor

First, it was Kövecses (2006) who made this claim that “the theory of primary metaphor is the clearest and most explicit statement concerning the universality of certain metaphors” (p. 11). Then, he refined and followed up the ideas of Lakoff and Johnson (1980b) and suggested several modifications to this general mode of explanation in his book *Metaphor in Culture, Universality, and Variation* (2006). He emphasized that if we consider that metaphor is based on the way the human body and brain function and we as human beings are alike at the level of this functioning, then most of the metaphors people use must also be fairly similar, that is, universal, at least, on the conceptual level. In addition, he maintained that there is no simple answer to the question whether there are any conceptual metaphors that can be found in all languages.

Kövecses (2002) proposed that the best approach to find an answer to this question is to look at some conceptual metaphors that one can find in some languages and then check whether the same metaphors exist in typologically very different languages. As Kövecses (2002) points out, if conceptual metaphors, too, exist in these languages, we can postulate that they may be universal. Further research should enable us to establish with reasonable confidence whether they are universal conceptual metaphors or not. Kövecses (2002) argues that “if we discover that the same conceptual metaphor exists in several unrelated languages, we are faced with an additional question why this conceptual metaphor exists in such different languages and cultures” (p. 163).

Above all, Lakoff and Johnson’s (1999) framework and their followers agreed that metaphors are based on embodied human experiences. For example, Kövecses (1986) viewed AFFECTION as WARMTH because of the correlation in our

childhood experiences between the loving embrace of our parents. To clarify the conceptual metaphor AFFECTION IS WARMTH, he claimed that thinking and talking of AFFECTION (e.g., *we have a warm relationship*) in terms of WARMTH arise naturally from our embodied experience. That is to say, “the correlation between *affection* and *warmth* is at the level of the body, and in this sense metaphor is as much in the body as it is in language or thought” (Kövecses, 2006, p. 18). So, no one would be surprised to hear that AFFECTION is universally conceptualized as WARMTH, rather than COLDNESS. Also, he claimed that such primary metaphors happen unconsciously and automatically. By this, he means universal primary experiences produce universal primary metaphors.

Kövecses (2006) searched and examined many of the linguistic expression examples of EMOTION concepts such as HAPPINESS and ANGER in English, Japanese, Hungarian, and Chinese, and showed that certain conceptual metaphors are potentially universal or can be near-universal at a generic level. His detailed analysis showed that the conceptual metaphors are simple or primary metaphors and/or complex metaphors that are based on universal human experiences. He emphasized that the four languages of English, Chinese, Japanese, and Hungarian are typologically and completely unrelated and represent very different cultures of the world.

Also, Kövecses (2006) noted that universal conceptual metaphors are as a result of the way our bodies interact with the physical environment. Kövecses (1991) analyzed a large number of conceptual metaphors for HAPPINESS in English and claimed that three of them stand out in importance: HAPPINESS IS UP (e.g., I’m feeling *up*), HAPPINESS IS LIGHT (e.g., She *brightened up*), and HAPPINESS IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER (e.g., He’s *bursting* with joy). Moreover, Yu (1995) found the same conceptual metaphors in Hungarian. Interestingly, it is very remarkable that the same metaphor exists in the three languages of English, Chinese, and Hungarian. Namely, these languages belong to very different language families and show very different cultures of the world. So, the question arose for Kövecses (2005) that how it was possible for such different languages and cultures to conceptualize HAPPINESS metaphorically in such similar ways. He pointed to the fact that it would not happen accidentally, and there must be some universal motivation that enables the metaphors to appear in these cultures and languages. As Kövecses (2002) believes, simple or primary metaphors are motivated by universal correlations in bodily experience, so we can be pretty sure that the third answer would be the correct one to the question. He emphasized when we are joyful, we tend to be up, moving around, be active, jump up and down, rather than down, inactive, and static. In fact, these experiences associated with HAPPINESS are universal experiences felt by most people, and they are likely to produce universal (or near-universal) simple or primary metaphors. So, the conceptual metaphor

HAPPY IS UP is considered as a generic-level metaphor that tends to be universal at this level. Conversely, cross-linguistically different metaphors are those which tend to be specific-level metaphors such as HAPPINESS IS BEING OFF THE GROUND that is a specific-level version of the metaphor HAPPY IS UP in English, and, in the same way, this specific metaphor does not exist in Chinese, as Yu (1995, 1998) observed.

Therefore, as supported by Kövecses (2017), we can say that, at least, some conceptual metaphors can be and are found in many languages, and if some kinds of conceptual metaphors are based on embodied experience that is universal, these metaphors should occur in many languages and cultures around the world.

Thus, to conclude this section, we cannot propose that these conceptual metaphors embodied in universal experience must be found in all languages; rather, we can argue that given the universal experience on which they are based, metaphors *can* potentially be universal and are basically universal in many languages around the world, but we should not expect them to show up in all languages.

Culture-Specificity of Metaphor

In addition to universality, there is also cultural variation in conceptual metaphors. Lakoff and Johnson (1980b) argued that the primary values in a specific culture are consistent with the metaphorical structure of the concepts in that culture. They claimed that the values which are fixed deeply in our culture are not independent. The values develop a coherent and consistent system with the metaphorical concepts in our everyday language. In fact, in the study of cultural variation, Kövecses (2010) argued that conceptual metaphors made us observe how these cultural variations occurred both cross-culturally and within a culture.

So, given the universal aspect of the conceptual metaphor theory, members of different cultures and languages may not conceptualize their experiences in a way that others do. Rather, they can choose to conceptualize their experiences in many different ways. Some researchers and scholars (e.g., Bratoz, 2012; Kövecses, 2002, 2006; Pérez, 2008; Siahaan, 2008; Sharifian, 2008) who have worked on the analysis of conceptual metaphors between different languages and cultures draw their attention to some important differences in language and conceptualization. Kövecses (2006) raises the question that “whether culturally embedded specific-level version, of the presumably (near-) universal generic-level metaphors are also likely to be candidates for (near-) universal metaphors” (p. 67). He showed that they were not. In fact, this is an obvious and expected result and we surely expect conceptual metaphors vary cross-culturally.

Besides, Kövecses (2006) introduced two forms of variations that could occur in the conceptualization of metaphors in different cultures or languages: congruent

metaphors and alternative metaphors. The first (i.e., congruence metaphor) is what obtains between a generic-level metaphor and several specific-level ones. Moreover, it is a case in which a culture uses a set of different source domains for a particular target domain, or conversely a culture uses a particular source domain for the conceptualization of a set of different target domains. For example, Matsuki (1995) compared Japanese and English metaphors and showed that all the metaphors for ANGER in English could also be found in Japanese. She said that there were a large number of anger-related expressions that grouped around the Japanese concept of HARA (literally, “belly”). She claimed the concept of HARA was unique to the Japanese culture, so the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS IN THE HARA was limited to Japanese. The second form (i.e., alternative metaphor) is “the differences in the range of conceptual metaphors (or more precisely, the range of source domains) that languages and cultures have available for the conceptualization of particular target domains” (Kövecses, 2005, p. 70). According to Yu (1995), the Chinese language shares with the English language all the basic metaphorical source domains for HAPPINESS (UP, LIGHT, AND FLUID IN A CONTAINER). But the Chinese language has a metaphor which is absent in the English language, that is, HAPPINESS IS FLOWERS IN THE HEART.

Empirical Studies

Since the development of the cognitive metaphor theory by Lakoff and Johnson (1980b), there have been a large number of empirical studies concerning the use and analysis of metaphors in different languages and cultures. In consequence, in the last decades, studies on metaphor and corpus linguistics have increased profoundly in which metaphor has become an interesting issue throughout the years (e.g., Bisang, Hock, & Winter, 2006; Deignan, 2008; Fiumara, 1995; Glucksberg, 2001; McGlone, 2007; Patterson, 2017; Stern, 2000). Several comparative studies have focused on the use and understanding of metaphors between two or more cultures and languages (e.g., Bratoz, 2012; Pérez, 2008; Siahaan, 2008; Sharifian, 2008).

Yu et al. (2017) carried out a linguistic study to investigate two primary metaphors of IMPORTANCE IS SIZE and IMPORTANCE IS WEIGHT with the same target-domain concept in English and Chinese. They focused on SIZE and WEIGHT adjectives in terms of their lexicalizations as found in dictionaries and how they were manifested and realized in naturally occurring discourses. They found that for both languages, some common words of SIZE and WEIGHT had conventionalized senses of importance, and those that did not have such senses in dictionaries had importance senses realized in naturally occurring discourses.

Safarnejad, Ho-Abdullah, and MatAwal (2014) examined and compared how metaphorical expressions of HAPPINESS were employed in English and Persian by supporting the conceptual metaphor theory introduced by Lakoff and Johnson

(1980b). They showed that English and Persian shared these conceptual metaphors: HAPPINESS IS UP, HAPPINESS IS LIGHT, HAPPINESS IS FLUID IN A CONTAINER, and HAPPINESS IS ANIMALISTIC BEHAVIOR. They concluded that these conceptualizations of HAPPINESS seemed to be the most universal metaphors. However, they found that there were some differences between Persian and English in the conceptualization of HAPPINESS and stated that Persian, in contrast with English, used different linguistic expressions in the conceptual metaphor HAPPINESS IS ENERGY.

More recently, Bratoz (2012) examined metaphors in the discourse of elections from a cross-linguistic perspective. He analyzed the Slovenian and American political systems based on a corpus of newspaper articles related to the elections held in 2008 in Slovenia and those in the U.S. in the same year. He maintained that there was a high degree of universality in the two cultures and great variations between the two languages and in the way speakers of the languages analyzed perceived elections which had cultural implications.

In another research by Lixia and Eng (2012), they aimed to explore SNAKE metaphors across Mandarin Chinese and British English in order to show the existence of both universality and individuality of metaphors by identifying certain similarities and differences between the metaphors in two languages. They investigated different aspects of the usage of SNAKE metaphorical expressions in Mandarin Chinese and British English when a snake was mapped onto humans. Their study provided evidence to show the existence of universality of SNAKE metaphors at the generic level and the individuality of the metaphors at the basic level.

Lu and Zhang (2012) investigated the universality and variation of the conceptual metaphor of LOVE in Chinese and English from the cognitive perspective. They argued that metaphorical concepts were different because of the influence of different cultures. They claimed that “the understanding of conceptual metaphor depends on the understanding of sociocultural backgrounds” (p. 1). They reported considering LOVE as a universal emotion shared by people from different cultures, and because the emotional experience is metaphorically constituted, English learners of Japanese should study and compare the metaphor system in both languages in order to conceptualize both the English and Chinese speakers’ experiences.

In the same way, PirzadPazhah, Pazhakh, and Hayati (2012) did a comparative study on basic EMOTION conceptual metaphors in English and Persian literary texts and investigated the universality of EMOTION metaphorical conceptualization and the dominant pattern in English and Persian based on Kövecses’s (2005) model for the linguistic expression of metaphor. They utilized the emotions of HAPPINESS, ANGER, SADNESS, FEAR, and LOVE and categorized the

expressions under their general and specific target and source domains. Also, they compared the metaphorical expressions based on their conceptual metaphors and literal meanings and identified three patterns of totally the same, partially the same, and totally different for the metaphorical expressions. These researchers concluded that as far as “emotion conceptualization is concerned, Persian and English have many features in common, and it could be claimed that both languages are 51% totally the same, 47% partially the same and 2% are totally different in conceptualizing these five emotions” (p. 7).

In a research by Hounig and Nhan (2011), the researchers summarized major views of metaphors in the light of traditional linguistics and cognitive linguistics and further investigated the representations of the cognitive metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY in English and Vietnamese. They explained what mechanism helped language users to metaphorize the abstract concept of LOVE on the basis of the concept JOURNEY that was easier to explain. Also, they showed that the representations of this conceptual metaphor were not identical in the two languages and the perception of the concept LOVE determined the way they talked metaphorically about LOVE in terms of JOURNEY. Hence, they summed up the existence of the metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY in both languages in the cognitive process of creating meaning extensions.

Likewise, Pérez (2008) studied the conceptualizations of the HEART in five languages: three Romance languages (i.e., French, Italian, and Spanish) and two Germanic languages (i.e., English and German). The study was concerned with the results of the metaphorical expressions gathered from dictionaries and thesauri, as well as their later examination and classification. Pérez showed that, in most cases, there were parallelisms in the languages studied. Generally speaking, she maintained “we hold that the mind, the body, and the language, on one hand, and culture, on the other hand, constitute an indissoluble whole which must be taken into account once we study the phenomenon of metaphor” (p. 28).

Method

Data Collection

The present study adopted the conceptual metaphor theory introduced by Lakoff and Johnson (1980b) as the framework to compare and contrast some conceptual metaphors in English and Persian. The research corpus was collected from several sources: from both written and spoken discourse in both English and Persian. Two sets of linguistic data were collected. One set from 12 conceptual metaphors that covered major areas of English, introduced by Wright (1999) in his book *Idioms Organiser, Organized by Metaphor, Topic, and Key Word*. The primary conceptual metaphors introduced by Wright (1999) were TIME IS MONEY, BUSINESS IS WAR,

SEEING IS UNDERSTANDING, LIFE IS A JOURNEY, LIFE IS GAMBLING, A COMPANY IS A SHIP, MOODS ARE WEATHER, THE OFFICE IS A BATTLEFIELD, A PROJECT IS A RACE, ECONOMICS IS FLYING, ORGANIZATIONS ARE GARDENS, and PEOPLE ARE LIQUID.

The other set (i.e., the Persian metaphorical expressions) was gathered from both written and spoken discourse in Persian, as well as the Persian literary text *Fahang-e Kenayat-e Sokhan* (Anvary, 2004) and *Amsal-Al-Hekam* (Dehkhoda, 1960).

So, in order to carry out a systematic analysis of the conceptual metaphors, a descriptive-comparative analysis of conceptual metaphors in the Persian and English cultures was done so that the researchers could properly use and understand the metaphorical expressions both in English and Persian.

Procedure

To conduct the research, the researchers, firstly, grouped the metaphorical expressions of the conceptual metaphors under their general and specific source and target domains. Then, following Lakoff and Johnson's (1980b) convention, a table of correspondences between the source and target domains was developed to determine the mappings for each metaphor. In this model, the relationship is in the form of A (target domain) IS B (source domain). After that, each Persian metaphorical expression with its English phonetic representation as well as its English literal translation was exemplified for each conceptual metaphor. Finally, considering the nature of the study, both universality and culture-specificity of the conceptual metaphors in Persian and English were examined, and the conception of the metaphorical concepts in the two languages was described in detail from the cognitive perspective.

Data Analysis

To analyze the data, the 12 conceptual metaphors introduced by Wright (1999) were investigated and gathered. Then, the metaphorical expressions in the two languages were grouped under their source and target domains. Then, having chosen Lakoff and Johnson's (1980b) conceptual metaphor theory, the data from the study were qualitatively analyzed to reveal certain degrees of similarity and culture-specificity between the two languages and, consequently, to pursue the aims of the study.

Results

This study aimed to show the existence of both similarity and variation of metaphors across English and Persian cross-linguistically by identifying certain similarities and differences between the selected conceptual metaphors in the two languages. For

this, the results were obtained from analyzing the linguistic data collected from both written and spoken discourse in both English and Persian.

More specifically, with regard to the 12 primary conceptual metaphors introduced by Wright (1999), the source domain, the target domain, and the metaphorical expressions generated from the specified conceptual metaphors were grouped and explained separately. In addition, each Persian expression with its English phonetic representation and its English literal translation were listed for each conceptual metaphor.

As an example, the first major area of English conceptual metaphors that is very common is related to the conceptual metaphor TIME IS MONEY. This conceptual metaphor is reflected in contemporary English and Persian as follows:

- **English Expressions:**
 - You're *wasting* my time.
 - Let's get a taxi; we'll *save* our time.
 - I *spend* six hours a day in front of my computer.
 - Hurry up, we're *short* of time.
 - Can you *spare* a minute or two?
 - Although I'm busy now, I can *make* time for you.
- **Persian Expressions:**
 - وقتم هدر می‌رود
/vaGtam hadar miravad/
(Trans., "waste of time")
 - در وقتت صرفه‌جویی کن
/dar vaGtet sarfedžuji kon/
(Trans., "save time")
 - همه‌ی وقتمو پشت رایانه می‌گذرونم
/hameje vaGtamo pošte rajane migzarunam/
(Trans., "spend time")
 - عجله کن وقت نداریم
/?adžale kon vaGt nadarim/
(Trans., "short of time")
 - همیشه چند لحظه وقتتو بگیرم
/miše tʃand lahze vaGtetuno begiram/
(Trans., "spare time")

- فردا وقتی رو برای صحبت با شما میذارم
/farda **vaGti** ro baraje sohbat ba foma **mizaram**/
(Trans., “make time”)

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980b), TIME in the English culture is a valuable commodity and it is a limited resource that is used to accomplish the goals. In the conceptual metaphor TIME IS MONEY, TIME is metaphorically expressed as MONEY. That is to say, TIME IS MONEY is a metaphorical concept that shows experiencing TIME as the kind of thing that can be *spent, wasted, saved, shortened, spared, made*, and so on. In fact, the target domain that English speakers try to understand is TIME and MONEY is used as the source domain for this purpose. Understanding TIME in terms of MONEY involves a set of correspondences, technically called mappings, that provide much of the meanings of the metaphorical linguistic expressions. Expressions such as *wasting time, saving time, making time*, and so forth make the conceptual metaphor TIME IS MONEY manifested and easy to understand. These mappings include:

Mappings:

Source: MONEY		Target: TIME
a valuable, limited commodity	—————>	a valuable, limited resource
having money	—————>	having time
spending money	—————>	spending time
making money	—————>	making time
wasting money	—————>	wasting time
losing money	—————>	losing time
saving money	—————>	saving time

Comparing English and Persian expressions, as can be noticed, in all cases where English has a metaphorical expression or word, Persian also has a metaphorical expression or word with the same or similar literal meaning. For example, the sentences *I spend six hours a day in front of my computer* in English and *هجمه‌ی وقتمو پشت رایانه می‌گذرونم* /hameje **vaGtamo** poste rajane **migzarunam**/ (Trans., “spend time”) in Persian indicate that the perception of the concept of TIME by speakers of both languages is the same, and this conception determines the way they talk and think metaphorically about TIME in terms of MONEY. In other words, Persian shares precisely the same conceptual metaphor and has a number of metaphorical expressions that express TIME in terms of MONEY. So, the

perception of the conceptual metaphor TIME IS MONEY in the two languages is similar.

Another conceptual metaphor BUSINESS IS WAR reflects the intensity of BUSINESS competitions. The basic elements of BUSINESS are companies, market, business policy, and commercial activities. Equally, the elements of WAR contain forces, battleground, targets, casualties, and so forth. So, the BUSINESS competition can be described by using some expressions related to WAR. Some linguistic expressions of BUSINESS in terms of WAR in English and Persian are as follow:

➤ **English Expressions:**

- The company has *set* business *targets*.
- Our manager needs to *reinforce* our market position.
- It's essential to *win* the battle against inflation.
- I think the boss is in a bad mood just get on with your work and *keep your head down*.
- Is European bank about to *attack* Japan?
- Firms may use advertising to *defend* their existing position.

➤ **Persian Expressions:**

- شرکت اهداف تجاری زیادی را مد نظر دارد
/ferkat ?ahdafe tedžarije zijadi ra madde nazar darad/
(Trans., “set a target”)
- سازمان نیاز به تقویت نیروی خود دارد
/sazman nijaz be taGvijate niruje Эod dArad/
(Trans., “reinforcement”)
- می‌بایست علیه تورم جنگید
/mibAjest ?alajhe tavarrom džangid/
(Trans., “winning the war”)
- سرت به کار خودت باشه و با رئیس صحبت نکن
/saret be kAre Эode tbASe vo bA re?is sohbat nakon/
(Trans., “keep your head down”)

- بانک اروپایی ایران را مورد حمله قرار داد
/bAnke ?orupaji irAn rA morede hamle GarAr dAd/
(Trans., “attacking”)
- علی در جلسه‌ی هیئت رئیسه از جایگاه خود در شرکت دفاع کرد
/?ali dar dZalaseje hej?at re?ise ?az dZAjgAhe Eod dar Σerkat defA? kard/
(Trans., “defending”)

The abovementioned expressions in English and Persian make it obvious that competitions between companies or organizations or among the businessmen in the market are just like the flight between armies in a war. In the conceptual metaphor BUSINESS IS WAR, the abstract concept of BUSINESS is clearly understood through the source domain of WAR. In fact, using words like *attack*, *defend*, *set targets*, *reinforce*, *win*, and so forth does not mean there is a physical battle between the parties. In fact, by comparing the two languages' expressions above, we can see that using the expressions from WAR terms to talk about BUSINESS exists in both English and Persian. Alternatively, existing some linguistic expressions of WAR terms in *b* BUSINESS situations means that many abstract concepts of BUSINESS are clearly understood through the source domain of WAR.

The systematic set of correspondences, or mappings, of the conceptual metaphor BUSINESS IS WAR, as introduced by Lakoff and Johnson (1980b), is in the source and target domains of WAR and BUSINESS. In the same way, ARMIES correspond to COMPANIES, SOLDIERS to BUSINESSMEN, BATTLES to PRICE COMPETITION, BATTLEFIELD to MARKET, WINNING A WAR to SEIZING MARKET, LOSING A WAR to LOSING MARKET, and so on. Lakoff and Johnson (1980b) argued that:

It is important to see that we don't just talk about *arguments* in terms of *war*. We can actually win or lose arguments. We see the person we are arguing with as an opponent. We attack his positions and we defend our own. We gain and lose ground. We plan and use strategies Many of the things we do in arguing are partially structured by the concept of war.
(p. 5)

Therefore, according to the analysis above, we can suggest that English and Persian express the conceptual metaphor BUSINESS IS WAR linguistically in much the same way.

By comparing the linguistic expressions of other conceptual metaphors, namely SEEING IS UNDERSTANDING, LIFE IS A JOURNEY, LIFE IS GAMBLING, A COMPANY IS A SHIP, MOODS ARE WEATHER, THE OFFICE IS A BATTLEFIELD, A PROJECT IS A RACE, ECONOMICS IS FLYING, ORGANIZATIONS ARE GARDENS, and PEOPLE ARE LIQUID, the two languages of English and Persian use many concrete concepts of a target domains in terms of abstract ones. For example, in the metaphor PEOPLE ARE LIQUID, there is the idea in the mind that when A CROWD IS WATER, it can *flow*, *flood*, or *trickle*. The target domain of PEOPLE is understood in terms of the source domain of LIQUID in English, as in *There's a constant stream of people coming into the stadium* and, in Persian, as in *موج عظیمی از مردم آمده بودند* /*modje ʔazimi ʔaz mardom ʔamade budand*/ (Trans., “stream of people”). In English, the metaphorical expression of *stream of people* encodes the conceptual metaphor PEOPLE ARE LIQUID. In a similar way, Persian also utilizes the LIQUID expression *موج عظیمی از مردم* /*modje ʔazimi ʔaz mardom*/ (Trans., “a crowd of people”) to talk about a large group of people who gather together.

The above analysis of the 12 conceptual metaphors in English and Persian reveals the fact that the notion of universality in the conceptualizations of these conceptual metaphors is highly supported, because almost all of the English and Persian expressions used in describing the conceptual metaphors are shared by the two languages.

Discussion

In terms of number, 140 linguistic expressions in English and Persian were analyzed to find out the existence of similarities and differences of the 12 conceptual metaphors between the two languages. Kövecses (2010) noted that to see and appreciate the relationship between metaphor and culture, we could go beyond looking at metaphorically used linguistic expressions in different languages, and, instead of linguistic metaphors, look at conceptual metaphors.

Adopting the conceptual metaphor theory (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) as the analytical framework and through a detailed analysis of the metaphorical use of the expressions, we can conclude that English and Persian share most of the general primary conceptual metaphors of TIME IS MONEY, BUSINESS IS WAR, SEEING IS UNDERSTANDING, LIFE IS A JOURNEY, LIFE IS GAMBLING, A COMPANY IS A SHIP, MOODS ARE WEATHER, THE OFFICE IS A BATTLEFIELD, A PROJECT IS A RACE, ECONOMICS IS FLYING, ORGANIZATIONS ARE GARDENS, and PEOPLE ARE LIQUID.

Regarding previous studies on analyzing conceptual metaphors between different languages around the world, as presented before, we can observe that many conceptual metaphors appear in a wide range of languages. For example, Yu (1995) found the same conceptual metaphors of HAPPINESS IS UP (e.g., I'm feeling *up*),

HAPPINESS IS LIGHT (e.g. She *brightened* up), and HAPPINESS IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER in Hungarian and English. Similarly, Safarnejad, Ho-Abdullah, and MatAwal (2014) examined and compared how the metaphorical expressions of HAPPINESS were employed in English and Persian and found the same results. Likewise, Pérez (2008) studied the conceptualizations of the HEART in five languages of French, Italian, Spanish, English, and German and found the same metaphors in different languages and cultures. In fact, she reported a high degree of parallelism in the languages studied.

In the same way, English and Persian are almost similar in conceptualizing the primary conceptual metaphors. For instance, in the conceptual metaphor TIME IS MONEY, the conceptualization of TIME in terms of MONEY is very similar in both languages. Comparing the English and Persian expressions of this conceptual metaphor, it can be noticed that, in all cases, where English has a metaphorical expression or word, Persian also has a metaphorical expression or word with the same or similar literal meaning. This indicates that the perception of the concept TIME by speakers of both languages is the same, and this conception determines the way they talk and think metaphorically about TIME in terms of MONEY. This comparison of mappings, or correspondences, between the domains of the conceptual metaphor TIME IS MONEY is also employed in the other metaphors.

Rather, English and Persian are two completely unrelated languages, and they represent very different cultures of the world. This similarity derives from the universal aspect of the human body. As Kövecses (2002) maintains, primary metaphors are motivated by universal correlations in people's experiences. So, the implication is that there is some universal motivation that enables the metaphors in English and Persian to appear and be used by the speakers of these two languages in the same way.

For the other conceptual metaphors such as BUSINESS IS WAR, SEEING IS UNDERSTANDING, LIFE IS A JOURNEY, LIFE IS GAMBLING, MOODS ARE WEATHER, THE OFFICE IS A BATTLEFIELD, A PROJECT IS A RACE, ECONOMICS IS FLYING, ORGANIZATIONS ARE GARDENS, and PEOPLE ARE LIQUID, we can observe the same matter, too. Generally, the conceptual metaphors related to ECONOMICS, ORGANIZATIONS, COMPANIES, and OFFICE domains are much more common in Persian. Overall, the analysis showed that the conceptual metaphors structuring the field of ECONOMICS in Persian and English were very similar.

Effectively, in the conceptual metaphor A COMPANY IS A SHIP, just a few Persian expressions were found in our corpus. One of the expressions observed in Persian media discourse was *کششی به گل نشسته‌ی شهرداری را نجات می‌دهیم* /kæʃtiije be gel nefæsteje ʃæhrdari ra nejat midæhim/ (Trans., “we would save the wrecked ship of the municipality”). The use of this expression in Persian shows that ECONOMY is seen as a SHIP that should be managed very efficiently not to be *run aground* or

stuck in a place. But in Persian, unlike other conceptual metaphors, the set of correspondences, or mappings, between the target domain of COMPANY and the source domain of SHIP was not observed.

However, for the other conceptual metaphors, nearly most shared the same correspondences between the target and source domains of the metaphors to be conceptualized with English. As a consequence, although there are some cultural differences in conceptualizing the conceptual metaphors between English and Persian due to the emphasis laid on some aspects of metaphors and mappings, the two languages share most of the primary conceptual metaphors.

Moreover, most Persian metaphorical expressions can be seen exactly the same as English and vice versa, such as *هدر میرود* /væɔtæm hæðær mirævæð/ (Trans., “waste of time”), *بانک اروپایی ایران را مورد حمله قرار داد* /banke orupajii iran ra morede hæmle gærar dad/ (Trans., “attacking”), *موضوع روشن نیست واضح تر صحبت* /mozu? rofæn nist vazehtær sohbæt kon/ (Trans., “speak clearly”), *رابطه ما به جایی* /rabeteje ma be jajii næxahæð resid/ (Trans., “going nowhere”), *شغل آزاد داشتن به جور غمار است* /fole azad daftæn je dʒur gomar æst/ (Trans., “a bit of a gamble”), *آنان نسبت به ما خوشامدگویی گرمی داشتند* /anan nesbæt be ma xofamæð gu?iije gærmi daftænd/ (Trans., “a warm welcome”), *رئیس جدید مدال مدیریت را از آن خود کرد* /reiise jædid medale modirijjæti ra æz ane xod kærd/ (Trans., “deserve a medal”), *قیمت مسکن سقوط یافت* /gejmæte mæskæn sogut yaft/ (Trans., “nosedive”), *شرکت ما در حال رشد و پیشرفت است* /ferkæte ma dær hale rofd væ piʃræft æst/ (Trans., “growing”), and *مردم آمده بودند* /modʒe ʔazimi æz mærdom amæde budænd/ (Trans., “stream of people”). This similarity supports the notion of universality in the conceptualizations of the conceptual metaphors.

Conclusion

Conceptual metaphors are basic to human understanding, thinking, and reasoning. As the conceptual metaphor theory is concerned, conceptual metaphors shape the way we think and act, along with our communication. This study was an attempt to describe, in detail, the linguistic expressions of the conceptual metaphors to give insights into the way how these conceptual metaphors were conceptualized. As Lakoff and Johnson (1980a) put it, we can emphasize that conceptual metaphors are likely to be universal, because there is a universal motivation for different cultures and languages to use a series of universals related to the human body experiences. And above all, differences may arise because of differences in environments, cultures, and in the experiences of human kinds. As a result, according to Kövecses (2005):

The metaphor is not only cognitively but also culturally motivated. As the cultural factors change from culture to culture, so does the metaphor and its

linguistic expression. In it, the cognitive and the cultural are fused into a single conceptual complex. In this sense, what we call conceptual metaphors are just as much cultural entities as they are cognitive ones. (p. 11)

This study would shed light on the impact of metaphors in learning an L2. Because of the fact that learning is communicated through language, it is important that L2 teachers become aware of the cultural aspects of certain metaphors and understand the social and environmental contexts of language and metaphors. As most social, moral, and emotional experiences are metaphorically constituted, we suggest that English learners study and compare the metaphor systems in both their L1 and L2, which, in this study, conceptualize the English speakers' experience as well as the Persian experience. Additionally, as Carter (1997) puts it, for full fluency in any language, it is very important for L2 learners to use the metaphorical expressions in the L2, especially those used in whatever special domain like BUSINESS. Hence, L2 teachers need to include conceptual metaphors in their teaching, so that their students can learn to use them in everyday communication. Regarding the fact that most conceptual metaphors analyzed in this study are related to the BUSINESS discourse of company, organization, office, and economy, the findings of this research could aid L2 teachers as well as L2 learners to use English metaphors in their professional life.

Besides, this comparative study, like any other research study in this contemporary world, failed to fully take all the important aspects of the phenomenon under investigation. There is no doubt that future inquiries on the subject of cross-cultural studies on metaphor are still needed. Thus, further research in this field could extend the analysis of metaphors by studying and comparing them based on the classification of structural metaphors, oriental metaphors, ontological metaphors, and container metaphors suggested by Lakoff and Johnson (1980b). Also, future research could be on considering (probable) differences between economic genres such as financial newspapers, magazines, and research articles. Similarly, further research can be conducted on different areas including EMOTION, LIFE, HEART, ANIMAL, BUSINESS, POLITICS, and so forth concepts among different languages and cultures around the world.

Moreover, having and setting an appropriate Persian corpus are essential for future researchers to analyze the different domains of conceptual metaphors in a way that is more systematic and practical. Due to the important role of religion among people's life, further studies could be done in the field of religion and theology to investigate the (possible) existence of conceptual metaphors between the different domains of religions and subcultures around the world. Future research could be conducted on metaphor and the teaching of language with the view of highlighting the effects of embodiment and cultural differences in the learning of an L2.

References

- Anvary, H. (2004). *Farhang-e-kenayat-e-sokhan*. Tehran, Iran: Sokhan.
- Bisang, W., Hock, H. H., & Winter, W. (2006). *Corpus-based approaches to metaphor and metonymy*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bratoz, S. (2012). Slovenian and US elections in metaphors: A cross-linguistic perspective. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines*, 5(2), 120-136.
- Carter, R. (1997). *Investigating English discourse: Language, literacy, and literature*. London: Routledge.
- Dehkoda, A. (1960). *Amsal-al-hekam*. Tehran, Iran: Amir Kabir.
- Deignan, A. (2008). Corpus linguistic data and conceptual metaphor theory. In M. S. Zanotto, L. Cameron, & M. C. Cavalcanti (Eds.), *Confronting metaphor in use* (pp. 149-163). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Fiumara, G. C. (1995). *The metaphoric process: Connections between language and life*. London: Routledge.
- Glucksberg, S. (2001). *Understanding figurative language*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Houng, P. T., & Nhan, D. T. (2011). The metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY in English and Vietnamese. *TRUONG DAI HOC VIEH*, 40, 11-20.
- Kövecses, Z. (1990). *Emotion Concepts*. New York, NY: Springer New York.
- Kövecses, Z. (1991). Happiness: A definitional effort. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 6(1), 29-47.
- Kövecses, Z. (1986). *Metaphors of anger, pride, and love: Pragmatics and beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2006). *Language, mind, and culture: A practical introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A practical introduction* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Kövecses, Z. (2017). Conceptual metaphor theory. In E. Semino & Z. Demjén (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of metaphor* (pp.13-27). Oxford: Routledge.
- Lakoff, G. (1992). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 202-25). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980a). Conceptual metaphor in everyday language. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 77(8), 453-486.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980b). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lixia, W., & Eng, W. B. (2012). A corpus-based study on snake metaphors in Mandarin Chinese and British English. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 12(1), 311-324.
- Lv, Z., & Zhang, Y. (2012). Universality and variation of conceptual metaphor of love in Chinese and English. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(2), 355-359.
- Matsuki, K. (1995). Metaphors of anger in Japanese. In J. Taylor & R. MacLaury (Eds.), *Language and the cognitive construal of the world* (pp. 137-151). Berlin: Gruyter.
- McGlone, M. S. (2007). What is the explanatory value of a conceptual metaphor? *Language & Communication*, 27, 109-126.
- Patterson, K. J. (2017). When is a metaphor not a metaphor? An investigation into lexical characteristics of metaphoricity among uncertain cases. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 32(2), 103-117.
- Pérez, R. G. (2008). A cross-cultural analysis of heart metaphors. *Revista Alicantina de EstudiosInglese*, 21, 25-56.
- PirzadPazhak, S., Pazhakh, A., & Hayati, A. (2012). A comparative study of basic emotions in English and Persian literary texts. *International Education Studies*, 5(1), 200-207.
- Safarnejad, F., Ho-Abdullah, I., & MatAwal, N. (2014). A cognitive study of happiness metaphors in Persian and English. *Procedia–Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118, 110-117.

- Sharifian, F. (2008). Conceptualizations of *del* 'heart-stomach' in Persian. In Sharifian, F. et al. (Eds.), *Culture, body, and language: Conceptualizations of internal body organs across cultures and languages* (pp. 247-267). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Siahaan, P. (2008). Did he break your heart or your liver? A contrastive study on metaphorical concepts from the source domain organ in English and in Indonesian. In Sharifian, F. et al. (Eds.), *Culture, body, and language: Conceptualizations of internal body organs across cultures and languages* (pp. 45-75). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Stern, J. (2000). *Metaphor in context*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Wright, J. (1999). *Idioms organiser: Organised by metaphor, topic, and key word*. UK: Thomson Heinle.
- Yu, N. (1995). Metaphorical expressions of anger and happiness in English and Chinese. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 10, 59-92.
- Yu, N. (1998). *The contemporary theory of metaphor in Chinese: A perspective from Chinese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Yu, N., Yu, L., & Lee, Y. C. (2017). Primary metaphors: Importance as size and weight in a comparative perspective, *Metaphor and Symbol*, 32(4). 231-249.

Author's Biography



Mahmood Hashemian is an Associate Professor at Shahrekord University. His area of research includes Cognitive-Semantic Linguistics, Sociolinguistics, Discourse Analysis, Pragmatics, and Applied Linguistics. He has published in *JTLS*, *IJAL*, *IJLS*, *IJALS*, *Linguistik-Online*, *JLTR*, *TPLS*, *Iranian EFL Journal*, *IJEL*, *International Journal of Social Sciences*, *JLRLTR*,

IRJABS, LCT, RALs, IJLTR, ILT, and Studies in Educational Evaluations. Also, he has given lectures in TELLSI (4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16), LDP2010, LDP2013, LDP2015, LDP2017, LDP2019 (Ahvaz, Iran), ELT in the Islamic World (Tehran, Iran), 2nd International Language Conference 2011 (Malaysia), The 1st Thammasat ELT International Conference: Voices in ELT (Thailand), 1st International Akdeniz Language Studies Conference 2012 (Turkey), 1st Conference on Language Learning & Teaching: An Interdisciplinary Approach (Mashhad), National Conference on Language, Teaching, and Literature (Malayer), 1st National Conference on Teaching English, Literature, and Translation (Shiraz), 1st International Conference on TESOL, isPAL (Tehran), 7th Conference on Issues in English Language Teaching in Iran (Tehran), and Global Conference on Linguistics & Foreign Language Teaching (Dubai, 2014).



Razieh Salemi is currently a Ph.D. candidate of Applied Linguistics at Shahrekord University. Her areas of interest include Metaphor Studies, Cognitive-Semantic Linguistics, and Language Skills. And, she has been teaching English at various universities and language institutes for more than 10 years. Also, she has given lectures in international conference.



Aliakbar Jafarpour is an Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics at Shahrekord University. His areas of research include ESP, ELT, and SLA research. He has published articles in both national and international journals as well as a book on Academic Writing. Also, he has given lectures in national and international conferences.