

HEALTH Metaphor in Political and Economic Discourse: a Cross-Linguistic Analysis

Justina Urbonaitė, Inesa Šeškauskienė

Abstract. The present paper sets out to examine the conceptual metaphor of HEALTH through its linguistic realisation in English and Lithuanian political and economic discourse. The investigation relies on the cognitive theory of metaphor and applies its main theoretical principles alongside with the frequency count and cross-linguistic comparison. The results have revealed that HEALTH metaphors are twice as frequent in English; however, both languages are equally prone to conceptualise political and economic difficulties in terms of health problems. Of the seven types of HEALTH metaphors, the most numerously represented is the PROBLEM IS AILMENT/ MALFUNCTION metaphor. The same major tendencies of metaphorical reasoning have been preserved in both languages. The lexical realisation, however, remains in some types of metaphors very culture-specific. Overall, the results have demonstrated that the socio-economic discourse is conceptualised in accordance with the universal embodiment/ anthropocentric parameter of the cognitive linguistic theory of metaphor and has preserved some culture-specific features.

Key words: Cognitive linguistics (CL); HEALTH metaphor; metaphorical expression; source domain; target domain; economic and political discourse.

Introduction: The theory of metaphor

The cognitive approach to language study has opened new vistas for such areas of research as metonymy and metaphor, redefining these notions so as to include, in addition to poetic and often unexpected and bizarre expressions, which traditionally fell within the area of metaphorical language, such everyday expressions like *to fall in love*, *to take an examination* etc. The cognitive linguistics (CL) theory of metaphor equipped linguists with the instrument for research, which helped them grow out of the rigorous framework of generative grammar and proceed to another stage of linguistic analysis.

One of the central tenets in the CL theory of metaphor is a claim that people's reasoning is largely metaphorical. Language is one of many areas of human activity where this reasoning is reflected. Hence language exists closely tied to its immediate human context-bodily, social and cultural experience (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Ungerer and Schmid 1996; Kövecses 2002) and is therefore subjective, or experiential (see Jackendoff 1996). The close relationship is reflected in many areas of linguistic activity including meaning. Ibarretxe-Antuano, for instance, claims, that the way people interact with the world in spatio-temporal orientation, manipulation of objects, bodily movements strongly affects the way they construct and understand meaning (1999: pp29-30). Other researchers have identified a close relationship between human bodily experience and metaphorical meanings (Kövecses 2002; Lakoff and Johnson 2002). The relationship is often termed as the anthropocentric/ embodiment parameter of conceptualisation/ understanding. The parameter can thus help explain why people choose to speak about good mood, positive emotions as things that are up/ higher, whereas negative emotions and attitudes are conceptualised as being low or down. This is justified by the position of a human body: when people are happy and vigorous their

posture is erect, when they are sad or angry or tired, their bodies are limp and their heads down (Ungerer and Schmid 1996). So it is not the extra-linguistic objective reality that makes up the core of metaphorical thinking but rather subjective experiential approach of people, the way they see the extra-lingual world rather than what it really is.

Another major claim in the theory of metaphor is of methodological character and is concerned with identifying two facets of metaphors. In CL the metaphor, differently from traditional linguistics, is a matter of thinking and reasoning rather than a merely linguistic phenomenon. At the linguistic level it is realised through numerous metaphorical expressions (for further details see Lakoff 1993). For example, the well-known metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY¹ is realised in such utterances as *my way of life*, *obstacles on my road to success* etc. If treated the other way round, the study into linguistic metaphorical expressions usually leads to the understanding of metaphors at the level of reasoning. In other words, metaphors reveal how people think. Thus the CL theoretical framework is seen as very different from the traditional treatment where metaphors were limited to expressive, literally paraphrasable, unique items of the text; the distinction between metaphors and metaphorical expressions was not made.

Assuming that abstract notions and ideas are further advancements to the bodily sensations and actually are based on them, linguists working on the theory of metaphor have introduced the idea that metaphor is seen as a set of correspondences between two domains (areas of human experience): source, which is usually more concrete, physical, and target, which is more abstract, mental. The interconnection between the two is established through the

¹ Metaphors, following the tradition of cognitive linguists, are written in small capitals throughout the text of the whole article.

notion of mapping, i. e. the target is usually seen through the source. For example, the well-known and fairly extensively researched metaphor THE ARGUMENT IS WAR has WAR as the source domain and ARGUMENT as the target domain. So argument (target domain) is discussed in terms of war (source domain). Thus in the linguistic expression *after a long discussion he lost — he had no more arguments* the ARGUMENT is seen through a mapping between *losing a war* and *a lack of arguments*.

The third crucial idea in the CL theory of metaphor is its universal vs. culture-specific character. Generally, human experience can be seen as both — universal and culture specific. However, neither the first nor the second parameter can be dismissed as self-explanatory or independent of each other. The anthropocentric parameter of conceptualisation in CL is often interpreted as the universal basis for metaphors since all humans share common biological history. However, they live in communities with each of them having a different social history manifested in politics, economics, legal system, religion, cultural heritage, beliefs and values etc. All these aspects of social life make up the basis for culture-specific conceptualisation of the world which is reflected, among other things, in metaphors. Translation specialists find the culture-specific aspect of metaphorisation much more salient than universal anthropocentricity (Al-Hasnawi 2007). On the other hand, there is an opinion that since human bodily experience is more or less similar across the globe, image schemas are likely to be universal and shared by many different cultures (Boers 1999: p48).

The social measurement of human reasoning is also very often discussed in terms of political and economic discourses, which are areas of common interest for large communities transgressing national, religious and other borders. Therefore, the heightened interest in the study of metaphors in political and economic discourse (Boers 1999, 2003; Cibulskienė 2006; Vaičenonienė 2002; Cienki 1999, 2005; Lakoff 1991 etc.) is understandable. Ungerer and Schmid (1996: p149) explain it by claiming that political area is especially “adoptive” of metaphors; “political speech is one of the recognised types of classical rhetoric, of which metaphors are an integral part”. Kövecses (2002: p22) identifies the most frequent source domains for politics, such as games, sport and war; economics is often conceptualised via buildings, journeys and plants (ibid).

1. The metaphor of HEALTH: a niche for investigation

The metaphor of HEALTH is understood in this paper in line with the general principles of the theory of metaphor in CL. More specifically, it is a metaphor whose source domain is the functioning of human body and the target domain is the society's political or economic life. It should be pointed out that political and economic issues seem to give preference to conceptualising a variety of topical issues in terms of ailments, sickness and weaknesses of the human body rather than being in good shape and fit.

In linguistic literature, the metaphor of HEALTH has been only discussed in the framework of a higher-level metaphors STATE/ NATION IS A PERSON (Lakoff 1991), ECONOMY IS A PERSON (Chung et al 2003) and some others. The findings

of some authors suggest that in socio-economic domain both higher-level metaphors and their lower-level health-related features are pervasive (Boers 1999; Holmgreen 2003; Schmidt 2003). Some aspects of the ECONOMY IS A PERSON metaphor were researched cross-linguistically (ibid.). Boers' study, which is among the most interesting papers, investigates whether the frequency of health metaphors in socio-economic discourse depends on a season of the year (Boers 1999). The results confirm the author's expectations that between December and March socio-economic phenomena tend to be described in terms of illnesses and ailments much more frequently than in other seasons of the year.

However abundant into some types of metaphors, research into the metaphor of HEALTH is rather sporadic, mainly confined to the framework of higher-level metaphors STATE/ NATION IS A PERSON or ECONOMY IS A PERSON (see above) and in the majority of cases focusing on English.. Metaphorical reasoning in the English-Lithuanian political and economic discourse has been researched by several Lithuanian linguists (Cibulskienė 2006, Vaičenonienė 2002) who produced interesting results. However, the linguists did not specifically focus on the HEALTH metaphor. Moreover, rather conflicting results as to the prevalence of metaphors of either anthropocentric or culture-specific nature show that there is a need for more research. Therefore, this paper sets out to examine the frequency and nature of the HEALTH metaphor employed in economic and political discourse in the two languages, to identify its intersecting and culture-specific features and to account for the motivation behind one or another way of conceptualisation, particularly in culture-specific cases. Also an attempt will be made to compare the findings of the present research to the results described in Boers' paper (1999).

2. Data and methods

The materials for the present research were collected from two quality papers and two magazines in English and Lithuanian, namely *The Economist (E)*, *the Financial Times (FT)*, *Veidas (V)* and *Verslo Žinios (VŽ)*. While selecting the articles an attempt was made to objectify the process by the random choice of the articles the only restriction being the topic, i.e. economic and political issues. All articles taken for the analysis were published between the year 2000 and 2005. The number of articles amounted to 300 in English and the same number in Lithuanian. The sub-corpus of the English data consisted of ca. 350,000 words, the Lithuanian sub-corpus was slightly smaller and had ca. 330,000 words.

The procedure of investigation consisted of several stages: first, the frequency count of HEALTH metaphors was carried out and second, the HEALTH metaphors were classified into subtypes considering the particular mappings between source and target domains. Later, the investigation focused on identifying similar/ culturally intersecting and culture-specific metaphorical expressions in the English and Lithuanian corpora. Overall, the methodology of research included quantitative and qualitative parameters as well as the general procedure of hypothetical deduction and cross-linguistic comparison.

3. Results of investigation: overall frequencies

In this section the results of quantitative analysis will be provided. For that purpose, the overall frequencies will be presented in the whole corpus of data, frequencies in English and Lithuanian sub-corpora and the number of metaphorical expressions per article and per 1,000 words.

Thus the overall number of metaphorical expressions in 600 articles in the two languages amounted to 393 thus yielding 0.655 metaphorical expressions per article (Table 1). The number of items per 1,000 words was 0.573. Quite unexpectedly and counter to the general findings of a number of scholars who claim that metaphors are pervasive in economic and political discourse (cf. Boers 1999; Kövecses 2002), the HEALTH metaphor turned out to be only moderately frequent. Boers', who researched English data, findings suggest that the number of health-related metaphorical expressions fluctuates between 1.12 in winter and 0.60 in all other seasons (Boers 1999: 51); thus the mean value is 0.86 metaphors per 1,000 words.

Table 1. Metaphorical expressions (ME) of HEALTH in English and Lithuanian sub-corpora

	TOTAL NUMBER	PERCENTAGE	ME PER ARTICLE	ME PER 1,000 WORDS
EN	257	65%	0.856	0.734
LT	136	35%	0.453	0.412
TOTAL	393	100	0.655	0.573

The difference between the frequencies in Boers' and our data could be partially accounted for by the choice of languages. Thus English manifests comparable results (cf. 0.734 items per 1,000 words in our data and 0.86 in Boers'). However, Lithuanian seems to be much less inclined to metaphorical reasoning in political and economic discourse, which is why the Lithuanian sub-corpus makes up slightly more than one third of the total data. The reasons behind such preferences might be related to further developed (older tradition of) newspaper language and hence more frequent metaphorical clichés in English and more straightforward, less metaphorical reasoning in the socio-economic discourse of Lithuanian.

Another feature of the findings obtained is concerned with individual features of the articles. It should be noted that Table 1 reflects the mean values of frequency counts, whereas actually the number of metaphorical expressions varies from 0 to 5 per article. It obviously testifies to very different individual preferences of the authors.

4. Types of HEALTH metaphors

In accordance with the CL view, metaphors are a matter of mind, which is why they are often referred to as conceptual rather than linguistic (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Lakoff 1993; Kövecses 2002). They are also understood as having a hierarchical structure and rendered from higher level to lower level. Thus STATE IS A HUMAN is a super-ordinate (higher-level) metaphor for A POLITICAL PROBLEM IS PAIN, for example. However, it should be noted that the classification (or categorisation) is an open-ended process, there are no established sets or classes; they emerge in the

process of analysis. Thus in the collected English and Lithuanian data corpus HEALTH metaphors fall into 7 types:

1. PROBLEM IS ILLNESS/ MALFUNCTION.
2. (MEANS OF) IMPROVEMENT IS MEDICAL TREATMENT.
3. PROBLEM IS PAIN.
4. (GOOD) CONDITION IS (GOOD) HEALTH.
5. RECURRENT/ LASTING TOO LONG IS CHRONIC.
6. EVALUATION IS DIAGNOSIS.
7. INTEREST/ SPREAD OF IDEAS IS CONTAMINATION.

The distribution of the above types in the data of both languages is given in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Types of HEALTH metaphors in English and Lithuanian

TYPE AND EXAMPLES (health domain elements are underlined)	EN	LT
1. PROBLEM IS ILLNESS/ MALFUNCTION E.g.: <i>post-election paralysis, economic recovery; sušluobuoty</i> rezervo linija.	165 64%	86 63%
2. (MEANS OF) IMPROVEMENT IS MEDICAL TREATMENT E.g.: <i>the largest of a few big donors</i> (=countries, banks); <i>Europos reanimacijos programma</i> .	50 19%	23 17%
3. PROBLEM IS PAIN E.g.: <i>the political fallout is giving the party its biggest headache; Darbo partijos sopoliai</i> .	24 9%	15 11%
4. (GOOD) CONDITION IS (GOOD) HEALTH E.g.: <i>health of its trading partners; kaina priklausys nuo euro zonos sveikatos</i> .	12 5%	1 1%
5. RECURRENT/ LASTING TOO LONG IS CHRONIC E.g.: <i>chronic under-funding of higher education; chroniškos reformos virto chronišku nereformavimu</i> .	4 2%	3 2%
6. EVALUATION IS DIAGNOSIS E.g.: <i>diagnosing the ills of the sugar industry; nauja diagnozė: visuomenės santykis su korupcija – šizofreniškas</i> .	2 1%	4 3%
7. INTEREST/ SPREAD OF IDEAS IS CONTAMINATION E.g.: <i>panašiu ambicingumu užsikrētusi ir Tėvynės sąjunga</i> .	–	4 3%

As can be seen from the above table, both English and Lithuanian metaphors of HEALTH are strikingly similar. The first two types of HEALTH metaphors manifest the same tendency. So the absolute majority of HEALTH metaphors (over 60 percent in each of the two languages) tend to conceptualise economic and political problems in terms of illnesses. Solutions to problems or improvement of an unfavourable situation are seen as medical treatment (almost 1/5 of metaphors in both languages).

The other five types of HEALTH metaphors are not that numerous, which is why any generalisations about them are of somewhat tentative character. So in both English and Lithuanian economic and political problems can be thought of as pain (type 3), (good) condition is seen as

(good) health (type 4), something that lasts too long is thought of as chronic (type 5) and giving evaluation to a situation, usually bad or generally unfavourable or causing tension, is discussed in terms of medical diagnosis (type 6). The last type of the metaphor of HEALTH, where an interest, a spread of ideas or inclination is thought of as contamination, was only employed in the Lithuanian press. So to be able to understand the mechanism of metaphorical reasoning and some culture-specific features of its linguistic realisation, the subsequent sections will give more details about each type of HEALTH metaphors.

4.1 Problem is illness/ malfunction and improvement is medical treatment

As noted by several researchers (Kövecses 2002; Boers 1999), there is a clear tendency to metaphorise events and phenomena which cause problems, tension or are generally thought of as experiencing difficulties. Therefore, it is quite natural that the majority of economic and political problems are conceptualised through HEALTH metaphors referring to illnesses or malfunction of a human body. The PROBLEM IS ILLNESS/ MALFUNCTION metaphor, as the most numerous type, offers the greatest diversity of metaphorical expressions in both languages.

So the process of deterioration or problems occurring in industry, market, economics or politics in general are conceptualised as an ailing, disease, sickness or weakness, any improvement is conceptualised as recovery. In a number of cases, however, the details of the malfunction are given or the illness is specified. For example:

1. *Post-election paralysis has dashed the hope that Germany could build quickly on its economic recovery and embrace reform.* (E, Sep 24, 2005)².
2. *Japan's ailing economy* [headline]. (E, May 31, 2001).
3. *Jeigu Lietuvai pasitelkus rezervą imtų ir sušlubuotų viena iš linijų jungiančių Rusiją su Baltarusija, kiltų rimtų problemų.* (V, Nov 4, 2004).
4. *Būtų politinė trumparegystė pasikliauti tik šiuo vienu informacijos šaltiniu.* (VŽ, Feb 23, 2005).

The disease chosen for the source domain through which political and economic problems are described can be very serious (like *cancer*, *paralysis* or *plague*) or just a *cold*. It obviously depends on the situation which might be thought of as very bad or experiencing temporary difficulties. Interestingly, one can come across different physical and mental ailments, whose choice might depend on the language and the background culture. Sometimes it is merely the author's preference.

The English data include quite varied instances where problems are conceptualised either as an ailment of general character or as specific diseases. However, the Lithuanian sub-corpus has hardly any instances referring to a general description/ identification of bodily/ mental malfunction, like *weakness* or *ailing*. In the majority of Lithuanian

instances political and economic problems are thought of in terms of concrete diseases and bodily harm, mainly *schizophrenia*, *nearsightedness/ myopia*, *farsightedness*, *limp*. They were the most frequent in the Lithuanian sub-corpus; each lexical item occurred four times or more. Out of them, only *myopia* and *limp* were used in the English sub-corpus (one instance of each lexeme), whereas *schizophrenia* and *farsightedness* were not found at all. However, only English tends to favour *ailment* and *illness* (each had 17 and 6 instances respectively), whereas the preferred specific diseases include *depression*, *paralysis*, *pneumonia* and *sclerosis* (with each occurring 4 or more times). None of these four diseases were found in the Lithuanian sub-corpus.

Cross-linguistic similarities in the first type of HEALTH metaphors would include numerous instances referring to the *recovery* (*atsigauti* in Lithuanian) yielding 37 instances in English and 32 in Lithuanian. Other similarities, like *metastasis* found in the English corpus and *metastazės* in the Lithuanian sub-corpus, are very scarcely represented which is why at this stage of research writing about well-established tendencies would be fairly risky.

The second most frequent metaphor was (MEANS OF) IMPROVEMENT IS MEDICAL TREATMENT. It is quite natural since it is directly related to the previous metaphor — when an economy, a company or a state is seen as ailing, it needs measures to be taken to improve the situation. However, the frequency count is much lower than in the first type of metaphors (50 instances, or 19%, of the total English sub-corpus and 23 instances, or 17%, of the total Lithuanian sub-corpus). This is one of the reasons why the linguistic expression is much less varied, particularly in Lithuanian, which only had 23 instances in total.

One of the features of this metaphor is that financial sponsors are very often (19 cases) in English and sometimes (three cases) in Lithuanian thought of as *donors* and the financial aid as *injection* (eight instances in English and one in Lithuanian). For example:

5. *Goodale, flush with surplus cash in the current fiscal year, will also announce a \$25-million injection into the Canada Tourism Commission (CTC), an \$ 84-million-a-year Crown corporation based in Ottawa.* (FT Mar 3, 2005).
6. *Finansinės Europos injekcijos – tik „vitaminai“ Lietuvos ūkiui. Atrodo, pagaliau supratome, kad ne kas kitas, o mes patys turime išmokti protingai dozuoti tuos „vitaminus“.* (V, Jul 21, 2005).

Interestingly, when a country or a company is seen as requiring a reform or a shake-up, in English it is often perceived as surgery. Lithuanian does not seem to favour such a drastic change; it tends to give preference to smaller-scale innovations which are thought of as cosmetic modifications, e.g.:

7. *Harvard economist Jeffrey Sacks, (...) has applied in Russia the same macro-economic surgery as in Bolivia where he was economic advisor to the MNR government in 1985.* (FT, Aug 20, 2001).

² In this and subsequent examples the source is indicated by giving the title of the newspaper/journal (E, FT, V or VŽ) and the date of its publication.

8. *Lietuvai reikia ne kosmetinės, o staigios ir ryžtingos mokesčių reformos.* (V, Mar 3, 2005).

In many cases in English and Lithuanian improving a difficult situation is seen as curing it, (prescribing) medicine, remedial action, revitalisation; therefore, the most numerous lexical items employed in the metaphors are as follows: *cure, medicine, remedy, revitalise, revive* in English and *gaivinti, gydyti, reanimuoti* in Lithuanian.

Generally, the two most frequent metaphors are quite consistent in their mappings: economics and politics are personified when they encounter a problem, which is why they need a doctor's examination. Later, when the diagnosis has been established, the doctor chooses the proper treatment by prescribing medicine, giving injections, applying shock therapy etc.

4.2 Problem is pain, (good) condition is (good) health, recurrent/ lasting too long is chronic, evaluation is diagnosis, interest is contamination

Apart from a specific disease or general ailment, problems in economic and politics can be thought of as pain. This type of metaphor yielded 24 instances in English (9% of the total number of data) and 15 in Lithuanian (11%). The linguistic realisation clearly shows preference given to pain in general, in Lithuanian often called *sopulai*, which is fairly formal, archaic and quite unusual in everyday language. Also when dealing with problems in socio-economic discourse, both languages clearly show preference to *headaches*, for example:

9. *A surge in inflation brings policy headaches.* (E, Apr 28, 2005)
10. *Tačiau jo siūlymai radikalai sumažinti mokesčius bei privatizuoti pensijų fondus tapo pačių krikdemu galvos skausmu.* (V, Sep 15, 2005)

The other three metaphors ((GOOD) CONDITION IS (GOOD) HEALTH, RECURRENT/ LASTING TOO LONG IS CHRONIC, EVALUATION IS DIAGNOSIS) are not numerously represented; neither do they show any significant culture-specific peculiarities. Their lexical expression is confined to *health* (Lith. *sveikata*), *chronic* (Lith. *chroniškas*) and *diagnosis* (Lith. *diagnozė*), respectively.

The INTEREST IS CONTAMINATION metaphor in socio-economic discourse has manifested its national, or culture-specific, character. Despite the fact that the total number of instances in this class was limited to four, they were all found exclusively in the Lithuanian sub-corpus. Thus, it could be tentatively claimed that Lithuanians think about interest or spread of ideas in terms of contamination which can only be accounted for in the framework of the same metaphor of health.

Conclusion

The present cross-linguistic research into HEALTH metaphors in political and economic discourse has resulted in confirming the general hypothesis that many political and economic issues are described through human ailments, diseases and wounds. It would thus lead to a conclusion that HEALTH metaphors are deeply entrenched in the cognition and

reasoning of both cultures. However, English turned out to be much more inclined to metaphorical reasoning in socio-economic discourse, whereas in Lithuanian metaphors were less likely to occur: the difference in the frequency count of metaphorical expressions between the languages is quite marked (65% English and 35% Lithuanian in the total corpus).

Proponents of exclusively culture-specific approach to metaphorisation would be surprised to discover that the majority of HEALTH metaphors in English and Lithuanian were of the same type and thus produced the greatest majority of metaphorical expressions within the PROBLEM IS ILLNESS/ MALFUNCTION metaphor (over 60% in both languages). The second most frequent type in both languages was the (MEANS OF) IMPROVEMENT IS MEDICAL TREATMENT metaphor (almost 20 per cent in both languages). The other four types of metaphors were manifested only in 1-11 per cent of the total corpus of data in both languages: PROBLEM IS PAIN, (GOOD) CONDITION IS (GOOD) HEALTH, RECURRENT/ LASTING TOO LONG IS CHRONIC, EVALUATION IS DIAGNOSIS. The last but not least metaphor INTEREST/ SPREAD OF IDEAS IS CONTAMINATION was only found in the Lithuanian data.

The linguistic realisation of metaphors in both languages manifested some interesting culture-specific peculiarities. When conceptualising political or economic issues in terms of health problems, Lithuanian seems to give preference to specific diseases rather than describing them through ailments or disorders of more general character. However, both languages have numerous instances referring to the recovery of economics or more seldom, of politics.

When economics or politics require improvement, both languages seem to conceptualise it in terms of treatment. In both languages it is possible through donors and injections or general revitalisation and therapy. When problems are thought of in terms of pains and aches, both languages clearly tend to conceptualise them as headaches.

Thus the present study seems to have provided additional arguments for both: the universal anthropocentric/ embodiment and culture-specific parameter of metaphorisation, which is in line with the general principles of CL theory of metaphor. It should also be noted that in some cases overlapping conceptualisations in the two languages might also be due to their frequent contacts. Further research in the area could include other/ more languages and/or other/ more (professional) discourses (medical, religious, engineering etc.).

References

1. Al-Hasnawi, A. R. (2007) A Cognitive Approach to Translating Metaphors, Translation Journal 11/ 3. [Retrieved July 1, 2007 from <http://translationjournal.net/journal/41metaphor.htm>].
2. Boers, F. (1999) When a Bodily Source Domain Becomes Prominent: the Joy of Counting Metaphors in the Socio-Economic Domain, in Gibbs, R. W. & Steen, G. (eds), Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics, John Benjamins, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, pp47-56.
3. Boers, F. (2003) Applied Linguistics Perspectives on Cross-Cultural Variation in Conceptual Metaphor, Metaphor and Symbol 18/ 4, pp231-238.
4. Chung, S. F., Ahrens, K., Huang, C. R. (2003) Economy is a Person: A Chinese-English Corpora and Ontological-Based Comparison Using the Conceptual Mapping Model. [Retrieved April 18, 2005 from: http://ontology.teknowledge.com/ROCLING_4.pdf].

5. Cibulskienė, J. (2006) Conceptual Metaphor in the Election Discourses of Lithuania and Great Britain, Summary of doctoral dissertation, Vilnius.
6. Cienki, A. (1999) Metaphors and Cultural Models as Profiles and Bases, in Gibbs, R. W. & Steen, G. (eds). *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, pp189-203.
7. Cienki, A. (2005) Researching Conceptual Metaphors that (may) Underlie Political Discourse. [Retrieved February 16, 2006 from: <http://eis.bris.ac.uk/~potfc/Granada/Papers/Cienki.pdf>]
8. Holmgreen, L. L. (2003) Setting the Neo-Liberal Agenda: How Metaphors Help Shape Socio-Economic "Realities". [Retrieved October 8, 2005 from: <http://www.metaphorik.de/05/holmgreen.pdf>].
9. Ibarretxe-Antuano, I. (1999) Metaphorical Mappings in the Sense of Smell, in Gibbs, R. W. & Steen, G. (eds). *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, pp29-45.
10. Jackendoff, R. (1996) Conceptual Semantics and Cognitive Linguistics, *Cognitive Linguistics* 7/ 1, pp93-129.
11. Kövecses, Z. (2002) *Metaphor: a Practical Introduction*, Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York.
12. Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
13. Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (2002) Why Cognitive Linguistics Requires Embodied Realism. [Retrieved May 25, 2006, from: <http://www.extenza.com/WDG/doi/abs/10.1515/cogl.2002.016?journalCode=cogl>].
14. Lakoff, G. (1991) Metaphor in Politics. [Retrieved February 14, 2006, from: <http://www.uoregon.edu/~uophil/metaphor/lakoff-l.htm>].
15. Lakoff, G. (1993) The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor, in Ortony, A. (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, CUP, Cambridge, pp202-251.
16. Lakoff, G. (1995) Metaphor, Morality, and Politics, or, Why Conservatives Have Left Liberals in the Dust. [Retrieved May 15, 2006, from: <http://www.wwcd.org/ issues/Lakoff.html>].
17. Schmidt, C. M. (2003) Metaphor and Cognition: a Cross-Cultural Study of Indigenous and Universal Constructs in Stock Exchange Reports. [Retrieved January 24, 2006, from: <http://www.immi.se/intercultural/nr5/schmidt.pdf>].
18. Vaičenonienė, J. (2002) Metaphor in Political Language, *Kalbotyra* 51/3, pp153-162.

Justina Urbonaitė, Inesa Šeškauskienė

Konceptualioji sveikatos metafora politiniame ir ekonominame diskurse: gretinamoji analizė

Santrauka

Straipsnyje nagrinėjamos sveikatos metaforos anglų kare ir lietuviškame politiniame ir ekonominame diskurse, kai politinės ir ekonominės problemos konceptualizuojamos kaip liga ar negalavimas. Tyrimė remiasi kognityvine metaforos teorija. Jo metu buvo atliki skaičiavimai, siekiant nustatyti metaforinių pasakymų bendrą skaičių anglų ir lietuvių kalbose. Taip pat išskirti septyni sveikatos metaforų tipai, paskaičiuotas jų santykinis dažnumas. Nustatyta, kad bendras metaforų skaičius kalbose gerokai skyrėsi: lietuvių kalboje jų pasitaikė du kartus mažiau nei anglų. Tačiau iš išskirtų septynių sveikatos metaforų tipų du pagrindiniai abiejose kalbose sutapo: ir anglų, ir lietuvių kalbose dažniausiai pasitaikančios metaforos buvo PROBLEMA YRA SUSIRGIMAS/NEGALAVIMAS ir GERINIMAS/SPRENDIMAS YRA MEDICININIS GYDYMAS. Viena metafora – SUSIDOMĖJIMAS YRA UŽKRATAS – buvo būdinga tik lietuvių kalbai. Tieki dažnesnių, tiek retesnių metaforų tipų leksinė realizacija dažniausiai skyrėsi: lietuviškai apie politines ir ekonominės problemos rašoma kaip apie konkretūs ligas, tuo tarpu anglų kai labiau linkstama problemas apibūdinti kaip bendro pobūdžio negalavimus. Taigi galima teigti, kad tyrimu patvirtinama vienas svarbiausių kognityvinės lingvistikos postulatų, kad metaforose atispindi tiek universalusis antropocentrinis, tiek specifinis kultūrinis matmuo.

Straipsnis įteiktas 2007 07
Parengtas spaudai 2007 11

About the authors

Justina Urbonaitė, MA (English Linguistics). She works as assistant lecturer at the Department of English Philology, Vilnius University.

Academic interests: cognitive linguistics, contrastive linguistics, ELT.

Address: Universiteto g. 5, Vilnius LT-01513, Lithuania.

E-mail: justina.urbonaite1@flf.vu.lt

Inesa Šeškauskienė, PhD (linguistics), Vilnius University. She works as associate professor of the English Philology Department, Vilnius University.

Academic interests: cognitive linguistics, linguistic semantics, ESP, EAP, ELT, contrastive linguistics.

Address: Universiteto g. 5, Vilnius LT-01513, Lithuania.

E-mail: inesa.seskauskienė@flf.vu.lt

