

Review of: "Crossing between Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Text World Theory"

Rubén Sampieri¹

¹ Universidad Veracruzana

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In what follows, I will try not to repeat what has already been mentioned in the previous reviews.

Dr. Nelly Tincheva's paper is a very interesting and thought-provoking document that challenges the scope of the broadly accepted idea of Lakoff and Johnson (1980) according to which meaning, experience, and even understanding and reasoning arise cognitively from *image schemata* (i.e., embodied, unconscious, prelinguistic, spatiotemporal interaction frames: *containment*, *path*, *attraction*, *source-path-goal*, just to mention a few) through which we experience the surrounding world and project via analogy these basic sensi-motor experiences onto more abstract domains (metaphorical mapping) which ultimately allow us to develop an understanding of abstract concepts.

The aim of the paper is to point out a limitation of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) as proposed by Lakoff and Johnson regarding political speech. The author claims that other complementary cognitive processes are needed to account for how meaning within political discourse is constructed. She argues that the meanings of co-dependent words need to be determined with the help of Text Worlds (TW) and Discourse World (DW) overlap to indicate and select their proper contextual meaning. For example, "we" and "us" when they occur within speeches about "crossroads", "paths", and "ways forward" may imply reference either to the speaker and their addressees *only* (DW) or to a group of people in the present or *future* facing the crossroads or choosing the path (TW). (The example used by the author is: "We stand at the crossroads of our future. Not only our future but those of generations to follow us depend upon choosing the right path..." - Michael Anchram, 2001.)

For the author, chain of switches from TW to DW and vice versa disambiguate their overlap (with indicators like *tonight*, *good evening*, *my friends*, *We in Britain*, *world peace*, *our fate*, etc) and would ultimately help to make sense of the *state* of a political goal according to its Source-Path-Goal structure. They act fixing points of reference against ambiguity, helping to make sense of *movement* and *progression* from an initial point, different steps, and a political goal. The chain of switches "enact the SOURCE-PATH-GOAL requirements from the metaphoric mapping" according to the author.

In pursuing this goal, the paper is well-balanced, presenting sound argumentation of the issue, with relevant and high-quality references; it explains the theory and concepts and present the discussion and the author's own critique and proposal in a clear way.

Thus, I think the paper may be a valuable academic contribution to its field with a novel proposal as well as possible interesting implications for CMT.

Suggestions:

- Among the previous reviews, I agree that a more precise and detailed definition of DW and TW is needed, along with an illustration of their differences through at least two more examples.
- I would argue that it's important for the strength of the argument to show why Source-Path-Goal type political speeches *are not* merely complex metaphors.
- From a philosophical standpoint, the most important aspect is to demonstrate that TW and DW belong to the horizon of concept and meaning formation, which is the explanandum of CMT (so the political speech would be its limit). However, it seems that this is not the case. In my humble opinion, TW and DW, along with their levelled-overlap, are a matter of *decision* and *intention* regarding the *interpretation* of deictic instances (such as "we," "us," "here," "now," etc.) within a discourse or speech. Therefore, they pertain to pragmatics rather than semantics. They do not construct meaning or concepts but rather *redirect* or *adjust* meaning and concepts that have already been formed and constructed via cognitive processes, which CMT accounts for.

Rubén Sampieri.