THE LANGUAGE OF RESEARCH: ARGUMENT METAPHORS IN ENGLISH AND LITHUANIAN

Inesa Šeškauskienė

Department of English Philology
Faculty of Philology
Vilnius University
Lithuania
inesa.seskauskiene@flf.vu.lt

The paper sets out to examine the lemma *argument** in English and Lithuanian academic discourse. Supporting the claim that academic discourse is largely metaphorical, the present investigation is driven by the conceptual theory of metaphor and aims to uncover the metaphors manifested in the contexts of *argument/s* and *argumentation*. The data has been collected from the academic section of the British National Corpus (BNC) and the Corpus of Academic Lithuanian (CoraLit). The results have demonstrated that English and Lithuanian share a number of metaphors, such as RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS AN OBJECT, RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS A BUILDING / STRUCTURE, RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS A PERSON, RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS VERBAL COMMUNICATION and some others. However, the image rendered by the argument in both languages seems to be different—English gives preference to the 'embodied' *argument*, whereas Lithuanian is more confined to treating it as an object. The research has also uncovered interesting language-specific realisation of all metaphors.

ACADEMIC DISCOURSE: A CHANGE OF FOCUS

Studies of academic discourse in recent decades have largely focused on such aspects as the author's voice or visibility, his positioning in relation to the reader, creating interpersonal relations, etc. (see, for example, Kuhi, Behnam 2011; Lores-Sanz 2011, and the list of references at the end of the article). All of these have observed interesting tendencies not only in the study of discoursal features of research articles, but also in the general paradigm of science development. As rightly noted by Elżbieta Tabakowska (1999, 74), science has been gradually turning from the accumulation of knowledge and facts to discussion, which in attempting to communicate the results of research to the reader has eventually led to an apparent shift from a monological to a largely dialogical character. It seems especially relevant to the 'soft' sciences, such as sociology, linguistics or literature studies. The truth that any research is pursuing seems to lie not in a newly discovered fact or figure but rather in what it means to the people, society, a professional community, etc.

The rapidly developing information technologies contribute to the increasing 'dialogicalization' of any discourse, and research discourse in particular. This does not and cannot modify in any way the impetus, the underlying driving force, of research to discover the truth and communicate it to the reader. However, the two tendencies—a slightly modified focus of the subject of research (from facts to their meaning to people) and an increasingly dialogical character of research writing—has not changed a generally held belief that academic discourse is or should be, rigid, unemotional, unambiguous and free of metaphor.

THEORY OF CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR: ANOTHER CHANGE

The advent of Cognitive Linguistics, and the theory of conceptual metaphor in particular, seems to have undermined the general belief that metaphor is mostly the product of individual creativity, textual embellishment, and not subject to any linguistic investigation (for an interesting discussion focusing on how its understanding differs from generative grammar see Taylor 1995, 131). The seminal book by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980/2003) seems to have shattered the foundations of the so-called autonomous approach.

The theory of conceptual metaphor (TCM) offers a completely different understanding of metaphor. One of its central tenets refers to treating metaphor not as 'embellishment' or 'decoration' of the text by an individual author but rather as an instrument, a mechanism occurring at the level of thinking, reasoning and experiencing, which is mostly universal in humans. To quote Lakoff and Johnson (1980/2003, 5), 'the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another'. The first of the two is referred to as the target and the other as the source domain. Its general formula is A (target) is B (source), as in LIFE IS JOURNEY, manifested in the expression *In my life I have met many good friends*. The theory has been further developed in a huge number of works by Lakoff and his colleagues (see Lakoff 1987; Lakoff, Johnson 1999; Lakoff, Nunez 2000, to mention just a few). Language thus appears as one of many manifestations of metaphor; it is not an inherently linguistic phenomenon (for a more exhaustive overview see Grady 2007).

METAPHOR AND ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

At this point it seems to be worth noting that academic discourse, and research articles in particular, address their peers in their professional community, which largely determines the specificity of language of that communication. By 'specificity' I mean the professional vocabulary consisting of professional terms and expressions. The 'specificity' also presupposes specific grammar; however, it is much less confined to

a single professional field. Rather, it refers to several 'clusters of fields', most of which share a set of grammatical features, such as complex, longer-than-average sentences, prevailing passive structures, etc., which help identify texts as belonging to a written rather than spoken register (for more on register see Biber, Conrad 2009).

None of the above processes contradict the tendencies of general language usage. Following the cognitive linguistic approach, one of its characteristic features is metaphoricity, which is understood as underlying our reasoning and other forms of experience and is reflected in language. Academic discourse is not devoid of metaphors either. What is more, recent empirical research into the metaphoricity of different registers has revealed that of the four registers (academic, news, fiction and conversation) academic texts are most metaphorical and conversation is least metaphorical (Steen, Dorst, Herrmann, Kaal, Krennmayr 2010, 765). One of the reasons for such findings could be concerned with the instrumental, rather than embellishing, role of metaphor. Another could be related to what cognitivists identify as 'the cognitive commitment' (cf. Evans, Green 2006, 27–28) claiming that language is one of many cognitive faculties, and language and linguistic organisation follows principles that are not unique to it. Other cognitive faculties and disciplines are structured according to the same principles. Thus metaphor is not confined to language; it occurs at the level of reasoning; abstract concepts are metaphorically structured. A major source of such structuring is the sensual experience of the human body, or embodied meaning (for more on embodied meaning see, for example, Johnson 2007, 176–206).

Recent metaphor studies have also uncovered some interesting tendencies, one of which is concerned with the language of each professional field, such as music, philosophy, mathematics, engineering, medicine, linguistics, and education, and shows that each of them develops its own metaphors. There has been a wealth of interesting findings concerning many of the above fields (Lakoff, Johnson 1999; Lakoff, Nunez 2000; Low 2008; Nunez 2008; Zbikowski 2008, etc.). Academic discourse is no exception. The findings suggest (see Semino 2008, 125–167 on metaphors in science and my article on the discourse of linguistic research, Šeškauskienė 2008) that academic discourse employs its own metaphors differing from, for example, conversational or newspaper metaphors.

METAPHOR AND CULTURE. TRANSLATION

Right from the start cognitive linguists, especially those working on metaphors, took a genuine interest in cross-linguistic studies. One of the key reasons for this was that the TCM helped identify a number of near-universal and culture-specific metaphors as well as interesting language and culture-specific realizations of largely universal metaphors (for more on culture specificity of metaphorical expressions see Deignan 2003).

An interest in cross-cultural studies of metaphors naturally leads to translation, which in itself seems to be based on the mechanism of conceptual metaphor, when one culture / language has to be 'experienced' in terms of another. What is crucial in this experience is the retrieval of meaning lying beyond the words (Monacelli 2011). Metaphors are part of the realm of meaning; thus the retrieval of meaning presupposes the retrieval of metaphorical meaning as well. Frequently, this involves the interpretation of the underlying image, which is treated by Tabakowska as a translation unit; metaphor, according to her, functions as the main 'image builder' (Tabakowska 2011).

The translation of academic texts presupposes an understanding of text and discourse-specific images, uncovering the underlying cultural background and rendering those images in the target language and culture by selecting an appropriate image of the target culture. Metaphor understanding becomes paramount in being able to maintain the dialogue between the source and target cultures.

FUNCTION OF METAPHOR. PRESENT RESEARCH

Recent investigation into metaphor has demonstrated that its function might vary depending on the text / discourse type. As extensively discussed by Elena Semino (2008), in political speeches metaphor is used for persuasion, in educational materials its main function is explication, while in scientific articles metaphor is a tool of persuasion and occasionally of humour and of modelling and explanation. Interestingly, in terms of the functions of metaphor, academic discourse seems to be most versatile. It is hardly surprising considering the above-mentioned fact that, of the four registers, this type is particularly prone to metaphorisation.

The metaphorisation of academic discourse is the key issue of the present investigation. To be more precise, it focuses on *argument*, one of the most frequent lemma in academic discourse. Arguments can be supported, based, raised, etc. Their contextual 'behaviour' seems to be compatible with the metaphor IDEAS ARE OBJECTS, or rather well-known conduit metaphor discussed in English (cf. Grady 1998) and Lithuanian (Vaičenonienė 2000). However, previous investigation focusing on the conduit metaphor has excluded any reference to *argument* and *argumentation*, which are among the most frequent words in academic discourse.

METAPHOR AND COMBINABILITY: SOME ISSUES OF METHODOLOGY

As noted earlier, language is one of many manifestations of metaphor. At a linguistic level, we regularly deal with heavily context-bound metaphorical expressions. For

example, the metaphorical expression *we are at a crossroads* in the context of a love relationship refers to the metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY. In line with the methodology established and consistently defined by a group of cognitive linguists studying metaphor (Pragglejaz Group 2007, also cf. Steen 2002), I claim that word combinability is an indicator of metaphoricity (and in broader terms, also of meaning). Thus contextual clues lead us to metaphorical expressions and help uncover the underlying metaphors.

The methodology is compatible with the methodology of frame semantics, the proponents of which rely on indicative contexts. According to Sue Atkins, Charles J. Fillmore and Christopher R. Johnson (2003, 251–252), obligatory and optional companions of the keyword are important indicators of its meaning; on the other hand, the occurrence of the companions depends on the meaning of the keyword (*ibid.*).

In case of argument/s, the surrounding words like *raise*, *based*, *supported*, *goes*, *extensive*, etc., help identify the meaning of *argument*; in cases of metaphor, it means that they help identify the image of *argument* in the text. Language-specific combinability might be an indicator of culture-specific images of arguments. In translation, they seem to be paramount. Thus further in the article an attempt is made to identify cross-linguistic and language-specific *argument*-metaphors and their linguistic realization in English and Lithuanian.

FRAMEWORK OF THE PRESENT RESEARCH: DATA AND METHODS

Academic communities could hardly disagree that the word *argument* is very frequent in the language of research. This largely intuitive claim was verified in the BNC. On the basis of a purely formal parameter, it has been attested that the frequency of the lemma *argument* in the seven registers in the BNC is highest in its academic section. The frequency of the lemma amounts to over 30 per cent of all cases. Thus, at least in English, the lemma is most frequent in the academic register.

In the present investigation, the academic section of the BNC served as the source for the English data. The Lithuanian data has been drawn from the Corpus of Academic Lithuanian (CoraLit). The two corpora are very different in size. The BNC (ca. 100 m words) is about 10 times larger than the CoraLit (9 m words); the academic section of the BNC (16 m words) is almost two times larger than the CoraLit.

In the academic section of the BNC the lemma *argument* has amounted to 5175 hits. The number of hits in the CoraLit was only 233. To study the metaphoricity of *argument* and *argumentation*, the formal parameter is insufficient. Trying to objectify the investigation, it is important to solve the puzzle of polysemy and to cope with multiple word-building patterns. The first issue is more problematic in English and the second in Lithuanian.

Thus in English, *argument* can refer to (1) a discussion, (2) a reason to prove or disprove something or (3) a mathematical term. Of the three meanings, only the second is relevant for the present research. To make the two corpora (English and Lithuanian) comparable and to avoid ambiguity, a manual selection of the English data had to be undertaken. The overall number of English strings of texts with the lemma *argument* was reduced to 230.

In the English corpus, *argument* was mostly used as a noun (both singular and plural, 87 per cent). It also occurred in its derivative noun *argumentation* (6.5 per cent) and in the adjective *argumentative* (6.5 per cent). The proportions of each usage conform to the proportions of *argument* in the academic section of the BNC.

In the Lithuanian corpus, the noun 'argumentas' (sg.) and 'argumentai' (pl.) in all case forms (the nominative singular and the accusative plural being the most frequent) occurred in 60 per cent of all cases, the others being verbs (ca. 16 per cent), participles (15 per cent), adverbs (7 per cent) and a few cases of abstract nouns 'argumentavimas', 'argumentacija'. In the Lithuanian corpus mathematical terms, such as 'funkcijų argumentas', and some other clearly non-metaphorical cases, were excluded. As a result, the Lithuanian corpus was reduced to 228 strings of texts.

In the data collected, metaphorical expressions were identified and the underlying metaphors reconstructed. Patterns of usage were identified in both languages; so were cross-linguistic similarities and differences by the images rendered by the linguistic behaviour of *argument/s*.

Further in the text the examples are given from the BNC (English) and the CoraLit (Lithuanian). No references to any of the sources are made.

ARGUMENT METAPHORS: COMPATIBLE WITH OTHER METAPHORS OF RESEARCH

The investigation has shown that not all cases of *argument* were metaphorical. The Lithuanian verb 'argumentuoti' ('to provide arguments') was mostly non-metaphorical. In both languages the noun *argument* and its derivatives have been employed in most metaphorical expressions and indicated the underlying metaphors. Both languages seem to employ metaphors previously identified in academic discourse (see Šeškauskienė 2010); only their frequency of employment is slightly different.

In the present investigation, the most frequent metaphor in English and Lithuanian has been RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS AN OBJECT. Lithuanian seems to favour it slightly more than English. Then goes RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS A BUILDING / STRUCTURE, which is a little more frequent in English. RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS A PERSON is clearly favoured by the English academic discourse, whereas RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS VERBAL (SPOKEN) COMMUNICATION seems to be given preference in Lithuanian.

Other, rather occasional, metaphors include RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS A JOURNEY, RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS PERFORMANCE and some others. Further in the article each metaphor is going to be discussed; overlapping and language-specific features of their realisation are going to be identified.

RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS AN OBJECT

This metaphor is compatible with what Michael Reddy (discussed in Grady 1998) and later Joe Grady called 'conduit metaphor' (Grady 1998); applying the cognitive linguistic formula A is B, the conduit metaphor refers to IDEAS ARE OBJECTS. In the data of the present research, the metaphor is frequent in English and Lithuanian, although it is slightly more numerously represented in the Lithuanian data. Objects are seen as items that humans use in their everyday life. Thus in Lithuanian, arguments can have physical properties like weight and breadth; they can be perceived either as individual or a mass of scattered items, they can be put or provided (but not given or taken, for some reason), and they can also be used. Arguments can also have dimensions; therefore, they can be expanded, or put in a sequence. These features have been identified in the combinability patterns of *arguments*, cf.:

(1) (...) *liepos 1 dienos nutarimo motyvuojamosios dalies argumentų pobūdis ir jų loginė seka nusipelno ypatingo dėmesio.*
('the nature of arguments of the motivation of the court judgement of July 1t. and their logical sequence deserve special attention.')

(2) (…) *reikia rasti svarių argumentų.*
('[one] needs to find weighty arguments.')

(3) (...) *autorė nuolat siekia pateikti solidžių argumentų.*
('the author always seeks to give / provide solid arguments.')

Interestingly, the last combinability pattern seems to be very productive in Lithuanian. The verb '*(pa)teikti*' (32 hits in the corpus) is a formal version of the more neutral '*duoti*' ('give') and is mostly used in contexts referring to abstract notions, such as arguments or ideas. The primary meaning of giving in '*teikti*' seems to have bleached out (cf. another case of semantic bleaching: '*teikti medicinos pagalbą*'—'to provide medical help').

In English, arguments have weight, are often thought of as solid objects, can be put, given, deployed, brought, removed, made. They can also be put in a sequence, often in a line, put forward, be close to something, etc. For example:

(5) (...) *although they are of great interest, they are also inevitably weak points in your argumentation.*

(5) *I think (…) having heard the arguments <u>put forward</u> from (…) both sides, what we're really talking about is a policy that (…). If we <u>bring</u> the argument <u>back</u> to consent to non-fatal physical harm, we may recall that (...).*

(6) *(…) an analysis supported by Coates (...), who <u>gives</u> a similar argument for the meaning of can in her discussion.*

The combinability pattern with '*svarus*' in Lithuanian and *weighty* in English only refers to arguments having weight; they can neither be heavy nor light. Weight signals importance. A large variety of motion verbs combined with *argument* in English evokes an image of mobility. Interestingly, in English arguments can also be deployed. This military image was not found in Lithuanian. However, Lithuanian had another interesting case—the verb '*plaukti*' ('swim, float, flow') used in reference to argument, cf.:

(7) *(...) trečias ne mažiau svarbus argumentas <u>išplaukė</u> iš konkrečios situacijos analizės.*
('the third no less important argument flowed from the analysis of a concrete situation.')

As we see, the image of argument as an object is largely universal. However, in English it seems to be more mobile and can be given. In Lithuanian it can be provided as well as being able to flow, thus making it very culture-specific.

RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS BUILDING / STRUCTURE

The metaphor seems almost equally favoured by Lithuanian and English, with the first being slightly more prone to this metaphor. In both languages its realization is mostly confined to contexts referring to the foundation of a building. Thus we usually speak of the foundation, support, and basis of research, but hardly ever mention its windows, doors, roofs or balconies. As rightly pointed out by Grady and Johnson in reference to the metaphor THEORY IS BUILDING and to the conduit metaphor (1997), this depends on human experience, which is the basis for forming ties between the target and source domains in the so-called primary metaphors (Grady 2005). Since the whole source domain is not mapped onto the target, we inevitably have gaps in the target domain.

In *argument* metaphors, the salience of the lower part of a building is obvious. Thus arguments make up parts of the foundation of a building or are seen as buildings themselves. The image is constructed with the help of context. In Lithuanian, the key words surrounding *argument*/s are verbs such as '*grįsti*' ('ground', 25 items), '*remti*' ('support', 21 items), '*sustiprinti*' ('reinforce', 3 items) and '*konstruoti*' ('construct', 1 item). In English, we tend to *support* claims by arguments or to *support* arguments

by data; we also *structure* arguments and they are frequently *based on* something. Let us have a look at a couple of examples in Lithuanian and English:

(8) (...) *vertinimai dažniausiai* <u>*grindžiami*</u> *spekuliatyviais argumentais, rodančiais tik vertinančiojo pasaulėžiūrą.*

('evaluations are usually grounded by speculative arguments showing the attitude of the evaluator.')

(9) *There were plenty of* <u>*supporting*</u> *arguments in the works of Marx and Engels for such an endeavour.*

(10) *Darwin's strategy in* <u>*structuring*</u> *his argumentation to conform to the vera causa ideal shows why it is not.*

Interestingly, in Lithuanian the most frequent combinability pattern in the realization of this metaphor is with the verb '*grįsti*' ('ground, pave'; 25 items, see example **(9)** above), which originally refers to road building, especially ancient, historical roads which are reinforced with stones and not covered with asphalt. Thus the realization of the metaphor in Lithuanian is not confined to houses but might involve other structures as well.

In English, the metaphor is almost exclusively realized in contexts referring to buildings. In one example there was a reference to steps, an element not found in any other contexts, cf.:

(11) *The first stage involved only the* <u>*opening steps*</u> *in Darwin's overall argumentation from individual generation to species formation.*

However, the latter example might well be interpreted as a metaphorical expression of the metaphor RESEARCH IS A JOURNEY or a case of blending (for more details see Grady 2005), when there are more than one source domains onto which the target is mapped. Without going into the details of this not entirely unproblematic field, let us proceed with other metaphors identified in the data.

RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS A PERSON

This metaphor, sometimes referred to as personification, seems to have been very much debated by many authors (see, for example, Low 1999). One of the key reasons is its equally plausible interpretation as a case of metonymy; as claimed by Barcelona, almost all metaphors can be interpreted as metonymic (cf. Barcelona 2000). The personification metaphor seems to be the most fundamental, constituting the core of the embodiment thesis of cognitive linguistics.

Thus, previously discussed metaphors, such as RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS AN OBJECT can be interpreted under the same metaphor, since most objects are perceived as objects used by humans. A closer look reveals that this is not always the case, and the personification, or RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS A PERSON, metaphor subsumes cases when research (paper) or argument demonstrates clearly identifiable human characteristics. In many academic papers the metaphor is realised in the pattern 'inanimate subject + active verb', such as *the paper suggests*, *research claims*, etc. (for more details see Šeškauskienė 2009).

In the present research the metaphor has been found in both English and Lithuanian discourses, but English seems to be much more 'embodied'. *Argument* collocates with the adjectives '*silpnas*' ('weak') and '*stiprus*' ('strong') in Lithuanian, while *weak*, *strong*, *sound* and *powerful* are used in English. Both languages employ mental verbs, such as *generalise*, *overview*, but only English makes use of verbs of movement, such as *go* or *run*, cf.:

(12) *Ankstyvieji psichofizikos ir sensorinės fiziologijos atradimai atskleidė empirinių argumentų silpnumą.*

('Early discoveries in psychophysics and sensory physiology have revealed the weakness of empirical arguments.')

(13) *Vienas šių argumentų teigia, kad emocijos yra šališkos.*

('One of the arguments claims that emotions are biased.')

(14) *Taigi ir šis argumentas sveria pasirinkimo svarstykles tarimo formos naudai.*

('Thus this argument tips the scale in favour of the form of pronunciation.')

(15) *Another more powerful kind of argument goes as follows.*

(16) *But my argument seems to be running in opposite directions.*

(17) *Sound argument based on long-term interest carries little weight against a sound economic argument based on short term interest.*

As seen in example **(14)**, *argument* in Lithuanian can be personified and have such human abilities as tipping the scale. Example **(17)** is an interesting case in that it demonstrates several conceptualisations. *Sound argument* and *carrying little weight* are indications of personification and *based on* signals a building metaphor.

The RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS A PERSON metaphor is manifested in English and Lithuanian; however, English offers a more detailed image of a person. This is seen from the variety of collocates of *argument/s.*

RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS VERBAL (SPOKEN) COMMUNICATION

The metaphor could be interpreted under the umbrella metaphor of RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS A PERSON, since communication is usually exclusively human. Still the communication metaphor is seen as more distinct than the overall image of a human being. Spoken communication is foregrounded and human, as its main participant, is backgrounded; written discourse is treated as spoken.

In Lithuanian the argument is usually spoken out ('*išsakomas*') or remains unsaid ('*nutylimas*', lit. 'kept silent'); in English, arguments can be *heard*, *addressed* and sometimes also *read*. The latter is an element contributing to the image of written discourse, which shows that often the images are seen as merged, or blended. The following examples illustrate most typical manifestations of the communication metaphor:

> **(18)** *Individų visuma tampa informacijos vartotojų rinka, kurioje <u>išsakomi</u> argumentai* (…).
>
> ('The totality of individuals become the market of information users, where arguments are spoken out (…).')
>
> **(19)** *As far as I can <u>read </u>her argument, it is precisely this…*
>
> **(20)** *The argument that in certain circumstances a similar development could take place in Germany <u>can be heard</u>.*

The above collocates highlight the argument's verbal expression, whereas their primary meaning is much more abstract and mostly related to a reason or several reasons used to show that something is true. The linguistic expression of arguments is seen as much more concrete; hence the metaphorical interpretation of *argument* in the above type of contexts.

This metaphor and especially its manifestation in language/s supports the initial claim of this article that research discourse is becoming increasingly dialogical. The dialogue is usually maintained through spoken discourse; hence the frequent metaphorical expressions referring to speaking. Interestingly, what intentionally remains not spoken in Lithuanian is expressed as '*nutylimas*' ('kept silent'), which in English is usually rendered as *remains unsaid*.

PERIPHERAL METAPHORS:

RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS A JOURNEY AND RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS PERFORMANCE

These metaphors were rather sporadic in both English and Lithuanian texts. Contextual indicators of their manifestation are words like *going to* (*the argument*) and *being back at* (*the argument*) as well as *arena* (*of argumentation*) or *role* (*of an argument*). They are not numerously represented in either English or Lithuanian, which might be due to the paucity of data for the present investigation. In previous research (Šeškauskienė 2009; *idem* 2010), based on exclusively linguistic papers in English and Lithuanian, both metaphors were clearly attested to in both cultures. This might have been due to the image of a writer producing a written text portrayed as an actor performing a role or the texts focusing on language teaching / learning issues. In these articles learning / teaching is often conceptualised as a journey.

CONCLUSIONS. IMPLICATIONS FOR TRANSLATION

The present investigation has focused on the metaphoricity of academic texts and, specifically, on the metaphoricity of the contexts containing the lemma *argument**. The findings are not strikingly different from the findings about the metaphoricity of one type of academic text—papers on linguistics (Šeškauskienė 2008; *idem* 2009; *idem* 2010). Moreover, both English and Lithuanian seem to employ the same metaphors with slightly differing preferences. Thus the major metaphors employed in both English and Lithuanian are as follows: RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS AN OBJECT, RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS A BUILDING / STRUCTURE, RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS A PERSON, RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS VERBAL (SPOKEN) COMMUNICATION.

However, an overall tendency is that English favours the conceptualisation that *argument/s* and *argumentation* are exclusively human, whereas Lithuanian is more likely to conceptualise them as objects. In the realisation of each metaphor there are interesting culture-specific instances of conceptualisation. Thus in RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS AN OBJECT Lithuanian sees arguments as having weight (weighty), those that can be put or provided (but not given or taken). In English arguments can also be weighty but they can also be given. In RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS A BUILDING / STRUCTURE both languages highlight the foundation, or the lower part of a building; however, English does that more consistently, whereas Lithuanian expands the foundation to the construction of roads, which is reflected in the frequent combinability pattern '*grįsti*' ('ground, pave') + '*argumentais*' ('arguments' pl. instr.). In the realization of the metaphor RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS A PERSON English offers a more elaborate view of a person than Lithuanian. So arguments in English can be *strong*, *weak* and *powerful*, they can *go* and *run*, *highlight* and *generalise*. The metaphor RESEARCH / ARGUMENT IS

VERBAL (SPOKEN) COMMUNICATION is relevant for both English and Lithuanian, since arguments can be spoken out or heard. Interestingly, in Lithuanian they can also be kept unsaid ('*nutylėti*'—'kept silent').

All of the above culture-specific realisations of metaphors are paramount for translators and interpreters who in the process of translation have to uncover the underlying image of one or another metaphor by selecting appropriate collocates in each language. Before uncovering a metaphor, it is important to fully understand the image. In many cases it has both universal and culture-specific features. Thus where arguments are most often supported in English, they can be supported, but are more often grounded, paved ('*grįsti*') in Lithuanian. In English they can be powerful, but in Lithuanian they can only be strong. In English they are given or provided, in Lithuanian they are only provided ('*pateikti*'), never given.

Cases of blending might cause even more problems. In such cases an in-depth knowledge of the language and culture triggering human creativity is paramount. Linguistic imagery is not always straightforward; sometimes it requires extra effort on the part of the translator. However, the effort is worth it—even academic texts, when properly translated, gain in persuasive power.

The present research has been limited to a small amount of data and to the academic discourse with no differentiation between areas of research. Further research could make a distinction between the humanities and exact sciences and go further in exploring other collocates in larger corpora and other languages.

Sources

BNC (academic section). <http://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/> [accessed 15-11-2011].
CoraLit. <http://coralit.lt/> [accessed 15-11-2011].

References

Atkins S., Fillmore Ch. J., Johnson Ch. R. 2003. Lexicographic Relevance: Selecting Information from Corpus Evidence. *International Journal of Lexicography* 16 (3), 251–280.

Barcelona A. 2000. On the Plausibility of Claiming a Metonymic Motivation for Conceptual Metaphor. *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads. A Cognitive Perspective*, ed. Barcelona A. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 31–58.

Biber D., Conrad S. 2009. *Register, Genre, and Style.* CUP.

Deignan A. 2003. Metaphorical Expressions and Culture: An Indirect Link. *Metaphor and Symbol* 18 (4), 255–271.

Evans V., Green M. 2006. *Cognitive Linguistics. An Introduction.* Edinburgh University Press.

Grady J. 1998. The 'Conduit Metaphor' Revisited: A Reassessment of Metaphors for Communication. *Discourse and Cognition. Bridging the Gap*, ed. Koenig J.-P. Stanford: CSLI, 205–218.

Grady J. 2005. Primary Metaphors as Inputs to Conceptual Integration. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37, 1595–1614.

Grady J. 2007. Metaphor. *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, eds. Geeraerts D., Cuyckens H. OUP, 189–213.

Grady J., Johnson Ch. 1997. Converging Evidence for the Notions of Subscene and Primary Scene. *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 123–136.

Johnson M. 2007. *The Meaning of the Body. Aesthetics of Human Understanding*. The University of Chicago Press.

Kuhi D., Behnam B. 2011. Generic Variations and Metadiscourse Use in the Writing of Applied Linguists: A Comparative Study and Preliminary Framework. *Written Communication* 28 (1), 97–141.

Lakoff G. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things.* University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff G., Johnson M. 1980/2003. *Metaphors We Live By.* University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff G., Johnson M. 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh.* Basic Books.

Lakoff G., Nunez R. E. 2000. *Where Mathematics Comes from.* Basic Books.

Lores-Sanz R. 2011. The Construction of the Author's Voice in Academic Writing: The Interplay of Cultural and Disciplinary Factors. *Text and Talk* 31-2, 173–193.

Low G. 1999. 'The Paper Thinks…': Investigating the Acceptability of the Metaphor AN ESSAY IS A PERSON. Cameron L., Low G. *Researching and Applying Metaphor.* CUP, 221–248.

Low G. 2008. Metaphor and Education. *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Gibbs R. CUP, 212–231.

Monacelli C. 2011. The Language of Interpreting. International Conference '*Translation is the Language of Europe*' *(U. Eco)*, held in Vilnius, October 6–7, 2011.

Nunez R. 2008. Conceptual Metaphor, Human Cognition, and the Nature of Mathematics. *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Gibbs R. CUP, 339–362.

Pragglejaz Group. 2007. MIP: A Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol* 22 (1), 1–39.

Semino E. 2008. *Metaphor in Discourse*. CUP.

Šeškauskienė I. 2008. The Language of Linguistic Research: Is There Room for Meaning Extension? *Kalbotyra* 59 (3), 271–280.

Šeškauskienė I. 2009. The Paper Suggests: Inanimate Subject + Active Verb in English Linguistic Discourse. *Kalbotyra* 60 (3), 84–93.

Šeškauskienė I. 2010. Who Discusses: The Paper or the Author of the Paper? Inanimate Subject + Active Verb in Lithuanian Linguistic Discourse as Compared to English. *Respectus Philologicus* 18 (23), 83–99.

Steen G. 2002. Towards a Procedure for Metaphor Identification. *Language and Literature* 11 (1), 17–33.

Steen G. J., Dorst A. G., Herrmann B., Kaal A. A., Krennmayr T. 2010. Metaphor in Usage. *Cognitive Linguistics* 21 (4), 765–796.

Tabakowska E. 1999. New Paradigm Thinking in Linguistics: Meaning is the Context. *The Problem of Context*, ed. Dilley R. Berghahn Books, 73–84.

Tabakowska E. 2011. Translation as Imagery, Imagery as Translation. International Conference '*Translation is the Language of Europe*' *(U. Eco)*, held in Vilnius, October 6–7, 2011.

Taylor J. 1995. *Linguistic Categorization*. CUP.

Vaičenonienė J. 2000. Conduit Metaphor in English and Lithuanian: A Corpus-Based Approach. *Darbai ir dienos* 24, 143–168.

Zbikowski L. M. 2008. Metaphor in Music. *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Gibbs R. CUP, 502–524.

Inesa Šeškauskienė

MOKSLINIŲ TYRIMŲ DISKURSAS: ARGUMENTŲ METAFORIZACIJA ANGLŲ IR LIETUVIŲ KALBOSE

Inesa Šeškauskienė

Santrauka

Tradicinėje lingvistikoje mokslinis tekstas laikomas iš esmės nemetaforiniu, nes tai prieštarautų esminiam mokslo siekiui ieškoti tiesos ir ją adekvačiai pateikti skaitytojui. Tokį požiūrį lemia tradicinis metaforos supratimas, kai ji laikoma teksto „pagražinimu", vaizdine priemone, dėl to esą vartojama tik grožiniame tekste. Kognityvinės lingvistikos, ypač konceptualiosios metaforos teorijos kūrėjai metaforą supranta kitaip – kaip vienos srities suvokimą per kitą sritį, kai pirmoji yra suvokimo tikslas, o antroji – suvokimo šaltinis; šis suvokimas vyksta remiantis žmogaus patirtimi, kuri atsispindi kalboje ir kitose žmogaus pažinimo srityse.

Remdamiesi šia metaforos samprata, mokslininkai išsiaiškino, kad mokslinis tekstas yra vienas labiausiai metaforizuotų. Šio tyrimo tikslas – atskleisti mokslinių tekstų metaforizacijos polinkius anglų ir lietuvių kalbomis kontekstuose, kuriuose aptinkama lema „*argument*"*, ypač dažnai pasitaikanti akademiniame diskurse. Duomenys tyrimui surinkti iš Britų nacionalinio tekstyno (BNC) ir lietuvių akademinės kalbos tekstyno (CoraLit). Tyrimas grindžiamas Charles'o Fillmore'o interpretacinių rėmų teorija ir jos pagrindu George'o Lakoffo sukurta konceptualiosios metaforos teorija. Rezultatai rodo, kad tiek angliškuose, tiek lietuviškuose tekstuose išryškėja iš esmės tos pačios metaforos: TYRIMAS / ARGUMENTAS YRA OBJEKTAS / DAIKTAS, TYRIMAS / ARGUMENTAS YRA PASTATAS, TYRIMAS / ARGUMENTAS YRA ŽMOGUS, TYRIMAS / ARGUMENTAS YRA ŽODINĖ (SAKYTINĖ) KOMUNIKACIJA. Jų realizacija anglų ir lietuvių kalbomis turi panašių ir skirtingų bruožų, atsispindinčių junglumo modeliuose. Lietuvių kalba labiau linkstama *argumentą* konceptualizuoti kaip daiktą, o anglų – kaip žmogų. Manytina, kad „atkoduoti" metaforinius įvaizdžius ir parinkti konkrečiai kultūrai būdingus junglumo modelius ypač aktualu vertėjams.