



Anderson, W. (2017) Metaphor Across Time and Conceptual Space by James J. Mischler III. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 32(1), pp. 55-56.  
(doi:[10.1080/10926488.2017.1272921](https://doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2017.1272921)) [Book Review]

This is the author's final accepted version.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/144837/>

Deposited on: 24 August 2017

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow  
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

## BOOK REVIEW

***Metaphor across Time and Conceptual Space*. James J. Mischler III. Amsterdam, The Netherlands and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, 2013. 237 pages, \$143.00 (hardcover), ISBN 978-9027204066.**

At the heart of this book is the interaction of embodiment and cultural context in accounting for the changing meaning and use of metaphors over time. Mischler expresses this as “the embodied core and the cultural periphery” (p. 199). While this may downplay the very significant role of cultural mediation illustrated by the book’s many contextualized examples, it is nevertheless a powerful metaphor in itself and should serve to help nudge metaphor studies in the more culturally-aware direction that scholars such as Caballero and Ibarretxe-Antuñano (2013) have also recently signaled.

The focus here is narrower than the title suggests. The study is based on the *Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English* (PPCEME) and *A Representative Corpus of Historical English Registers* (ARCHER) which, combined, enable a diachronic span of nearly five hundred years, so the research can certainly be said to address metaphor across time. The conceptual space covered, however, is much more limited. The “main study” looks within a single domain to two particular metaphors of ANGER (the “blood” and “spleen” metaphors), while the studies in the surrounding chapters situate this within the broader domain matrix of EMOTION.

ANGER is probably the emotion that has received most attention in recent years from metaphor scholars and other linguists, with foundational work on English including that by Kövecses (2000), Gevaert (2007) and Geeraerts, Gevaert and Speelman (2011), among many others. Indeed, the interest in a historical perspective on ANGER continues, with more recent work including that by Izdebska (2015). But despite the progress made in the treatment of specific semantic domains, we are still scratching at the surface of the respective roles of embodiment and cultural models in metaphor.

The book is based on the author’s PhD thesis, but with much fuller discussion and some additional material, most notably two “micro-studies” based on nineteenth-century data. The book is divided into four parts. The three chapters of part 1, “Theoretical foundations”, together form an extensive literature review spanning the cognitive-functional stance adopted here, conceptual metaphor and diachronic metaphor. This part also presents a detailed justification for the research. Parts 2 and 3 set out the core research of the book. Part 2 offers a “macro-study of human emotion in cultural context” covering the period 1500-1990; this is complemented in part 3 by “micro-studies of emotion”. The macro-study involves both the main study of ANGER and what Mischler describes as an “ancillary” study of the cultural model of the four humors. Calling this “ancillary” because it draws on nonlinguistic data seems unfortunate, given that one of the aims of the book is to argue for the close intertwining of cognition and culture in the development of metaphor.

The research adopts a broadly Corpus-Assisted Discourse Studies approach, with a strong focus on contextualization. Automatic identification of metaphor in corpora is notoriously difficult, as the author explains in chapter 4 (see also Stefanowitsch and Gries 2006). Here, metaphor is identified through four key words, selected to bring to light the competing “blood” and “spleen” metaphors (*vent-*, *spleen*, *blood* and *boil-*). This approach inevitably limits the scope of the study, as it means that other ANGER metaphors (from semantic domains such as TEMPERATURE, WEATHER, LIGHT and so on)

that may interact with the “blood” and “spleen” metaphors are hidden from view. The study also uses both qualitative and quantitative methods: while the latter are useful in giving an overall perspective, they are nevertheless here quite minimal, and the strength of the book lies in the close qualitative analysis of textual – and contextualized – examples.

The accompanying studies are interesting in their own right, and open up a number of avenues for further research, even if occasionally they do not feel fully integrated into the overall structure of the book. These focus on the spleen metaphor in the broader domain matrix of EMOTION, and the metaphor of bubbling liquid in a number of emotion domains including HAPPINESS.

Part 4 outlines conclusions and discusses the implications of the research. The book then ends with a brief epilogue calling for further research into the teaching of metaphor to second language learners, an area in which the author has practical experience. The proposed research, however, is less focused on such practical applications than might be expected and covers some of the same ground as the earlier conclusions. Nevertheless, there is certainly value in reminding the reader of the applications of metaphor research, and it is to be hoped that scholars will take up some of Mischler’s suggestions.

The book’s origins as a PhD thesis come through in the structure and occasionally in the style. Rather too many discussions end with a note that further study is needed to corroborate the validity of the conclusions drawn and this is a little frustrating for the reader. In places, the tone is rather defensive, especially where there are direct responses to comments made by the peer reviewers (e.g. p. 98, p. 103). There are occasional errors: for example, the British National Corpus (BNC) is described as containing texts published between 1990 and the present and continuing to grow each year (p. 209), where in fact most of the texts in the BNC were published between the 1980s and 1993, and the corpus is static rather than expanding.

Such quibbles aside, *Metaphor across Time and Semantic Space* is a useful addition to a currently popular research area – the diachronic study of metaphors of emotion – and as such it should find a ready audience. Its particular contribution lies in the very explicit attempt to bring notions of embodiment together with cultural considerations, and it does so persuasively. It will be of relevance to scholars with an interest in the conceptualization of emotions, as well as historical linguists, and should also offer a useful perspective to historians, particularly early modern historians, given the use of corpora with a center of gravity in this period.

## References

- Caballero, R. & Ibarretxe-Antuñano, I. (2013). Ways of perceiving, moving, and thinking: Re-vindicating culture in conceptual metaphor research. In R. Fusaroli & S. Morgagni (Eds.), *Conceptual metaphor theory: Thirty years after*. *Journal of Cognitive Semiotics* 5(1-2), 268-290.
- Geeraerts, D., Gevaert, C., & Speelman, D. (2011). How *anger* rose: Hypothesis testing in diachronic semantics. In K. Allan & J. Robinson (Eds.), *Current methods in historical semantics* (pp. 109-132). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gevaert, C. (2007). *The history of ANGER. The lexical field of anger from old to early modern English*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Leuven, Leuven, Belgium.

Izdebska, D. W. (2015). *The semantic field of ANGER in old English*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland.

Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and emotion: Language, culture, and body in human feeling*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Stefanowitsch, A. & Gries, S. T. (Eds.). (2006). *Corpus-based approaches to metaphor and metonymy*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

Reviewed by Wendy Anderson, University of Glasgow, UK