

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

Patrik Austin<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Helsinki

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

This article argues that Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) is too narrow in scope and must be complemented with concepts from Text World (TW) and Discourse World (DW) Theory, based on the author's analysis of examples of political discourse. TW and DW are well explained, and the material supports the author's conclusion. The selected political discourses are fascinating to read in.

I suggest two changes. First, please avoid using abbreviations in the abstract because it discourages readers from outside your sub-field. I suggest presenting TW and DW with their full names also making it clear early on that the subject is discourse analysis.

More importantly, there is a problem in the way that this paper presents CMT, especially Lakoff's neuroscientific claims on p. 4. Lakoff advocates an extreme materialism and claims to be supported by neuroscience. However, he is a linguist and has to my knowledge no expertise in brain sciences. The claims of CMT by Lakoff, Turner and Fauconnier have been studied in psychology and neuropsychology, finding insufficient support. Therefore, the neuroscience claims should be followed by a disclaimer based on e.g. Holyoak & Stamenkovic's 2018 review on the research on metaphor comprehension.<sup>[1]</sup>

To summarize, Lakoff's idea was that rational thinking is automated thanks to the conceptual metaphor. Unsurprisingly, researchers found, on the one hand, that true metaphors are actually more difficult and more time consuming to process, so not automatic at all. On the other, the 'trite' or conventionalized metaphors tend to lose their status as metaphors and becoming an ordinary part of the vocabulary. Holyoak & Stamenkovic's suggestion is that CMT (and "Cognitive Linguistics") is linguistics, not psychology. This realization should support the overall argument that CMT should become closer to established frameworks of discourse analysis.

## References

- <sup>1</sup> ^ Keith J. Holyoak, Dušan Stamenković. (2018). *Metaphor comprehension: A critical review of theories and evidence.. Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 144 (6), 641-671. doi:10.1037/bul0000145.