The Conduit Metaphor in English and Lithuanian
A CORPUS-BASED APPROACH

1. INTRODUCTION

Communication is one of the central human activities, as it helps to keep social contacts among people. The frequency of the Lithuanian nouns ‘žodis’ (‘word’) and ‘kalba’ (‘language’) reflects the significance of this unique phenomenon of communication. ‘žodis’ is the seventy-fourth and ‘kalba’ is the seventy-fifth word in the frequency list of all the Lithuanian words (Grumadienė and Žilinskienė 1998, p. 1). Thus, naturally, such an important human intercourse gives impetus to different disciplines to analyse the perception of communication and to define the concept itself. The means to accomplish these tasks in the present article is the analysis of conceptual metaphors that are retrieved from the Lithuanian and English computer corpora. Hence the attempt of this article is to combine computer linguistics and cognitive linguistics that emphasises the interrelation between language and mental processes. The statistical data derived from huge corpora allow us to make a well-substantiated analysis. The study of metaphors obtained from collocations and supported by statistical evidence becomes more reliable and less intuition based. If the examples for analysis are chosen accidentally, they can be just occasionalisms that are not frequently used in language. Numerous computer data allow a linguist to select the most typical cases and to observe the least frequent ones. On the other hand, data from corpora become not merely statistics because cognitive linguistics allows us to make broader generalisations about our thinking or our conceptual system. Furthermore, the data from the corpora of two different languages make it possible to compare and contrast the two languages.

1.1. THE DEFINITION OF METAPHOR AND THE CONDUIT METAPHRPH

Before the analysis of the computer data, we should specify how metaphor is understood in the present article. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson in their book *Metaphors We Live By* present metaphors as concepts structuring our thinking and the way we act. Metaphors allow us to understand less concrete or abstract ideas in terms of more concrete concepts. When we use terms of one domain to speak about another domain, we employ a metaphor that “highlights certain features while suppressing others” (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, p. 141) and is based on similarities as well as contrasts between the two domains.

One more aspect of metaphor that Lakoff observes in his article *Contempo-
rary theory of metaphor is that metaphorical systems can be either universal, widespread or culture specific (Lakoff 1993, p. 245). The present analysis, hence, is expected to reveal that the so-called conduit metaphor is at least widespread if not universal. The huge amounts of empirical evidence available in the computer corpus make such a comparison of languages possible.

Michael J. Reddy calls the framework that English has for conceptualising communication ‘the conduit metaphor’. This complex understanding of communication consists of the following notions:

1) ideas or meanings are objects;
2) words are containers for inserting the content (ideas or meanings);
3) communication is sending. (Reddy 1993, p.164)

The structure is derived from numerous English expressions that the author analyses. In this model of communication the role of the speaker is to encode his or her meaning in words whereas the addressee’s task is to decode it by unwrapping the package or words. Hence reified words and ideas travel from one person to another through a channel. Their transference seems to be independent of any human effort. However, Reddy notices that this is a misleading understanding of communication because in reality it requires people’s competence and effort to make it successful.

In addition to this ‘major’ framework of understanding communication, Reddy distinguishes the ‘minor’ framework which ‘overlooks words as containers and allows ideas and feelings to flow, unfettered and completely disembodied, into a kind of ambient space between human heads’ (Reddy 1993, p. 170). Hence in this framework ideas are still treated as tangible objects although they are not inserted into words before sending them and do not have the material shape when they are already in space. Also they exist independently of people and may or may not get back into people’s heads. Although Reddy provides a detailed structure of communication, his examples are single citations not from a computer corpus. Therefore, the framework needs verification.

1.2. THE INTERRELATION BETWEEN METAPHOR AND COLLOCATION

For the analysis of metaphor it is important to distinguish between metaphor and collocation and to define the terms as they will be employed in this article. Collocation and metaphor are the keywords in computer corpus linguistics and cognitive linguistics. The definition of metaphor is provided above. Via metaphors abstractions are perceived whereas collocation is their verbal expression. Collocation is understood as a common combination of words used together. John Sinclair notices that the word meaning is never centred in the word itself but is shared among the words that it collocates or keeps company with (Sinclair 1996, p. 80). Hence these linguistic combinations are a source of metaphorical cases in language.

Computer corpus-based analysis is advantageous because it helps to avoid subjectivity and limits the role of intuition. When collocations are taken from a representative computer corpus, they form an objective source of metaphors that are most often used in language. Furthermore, the proportion of metaphoric and non-metaphoric cases in the total number of collocations reveals how much our language is metaphorised. The main difficulty in such an analysis is that the distinction between collocation and metaphor is rather obscure. In this pa-
per the criterion to determine metaphoric cases is the collocational range of the words under investigation. A collocation becomes metaphoric when a word collocates with lexemes that have a restricted collocational range. (Marcinkevičienė 1999, p. 115) For example, the verb ‘austi’ is usually restricted to the words referring to cloth. Thus when it is used with the noun ‘idea’, it metaphorises the latter noun as woven material.

Both cognitive and corpus-based linguistic analyses observe that in multiword linguistic expressions the meaning is ‘shared between its components’ (Schoenefeld 1999, p.157). The procedure of combining different concepts is called differently by different linguists, i.e. ‘delexicalization’, ‘constructional meaning’, ‘blending’ or ‘composition’ (Schoenefeld 1999, p.153). In metaphor the interaction between the primary and secondary subjects is its basis and one of the essential features. Corpus linguistics also admits that in a collocation the meanings of words used together overlap to form complex expressions.

In addition to collocation, one more specifying term used by John Sinclair should be introduced and defined. He suggests employing the concept of colligation defined as the co-occurrence of grammatical choices in corpus-based analysis. Sinclair calls collocation ‘physical evidence’ whereas colligation is defined as ‘structural evidence’ (Sinclair 1996, p. 98). The grammatical categories that are mainly important here are prepositions collocating with verbs and adjectives in noun phrases. Some of the words related to communication under analysis show a great tendency to appear in collocation with a possessive adjective as it will be illustrated further in the article.

1.3. SOURCES OF DATA FOR THE ANALYSIS OF METAPHORIC LANGUAGE ABOUT LANGUAGE

For the analysis of the Lithuanian language the corpus available on the Internet has been used. It consists of 50 million words. The examples have been collected not from all its parts, but only from newspapers in order to limit the number of sample sentences, which become unmanageable if taken all together.

The analysis of conduit metaphor in English is based on the data taken from Collins COBUILD English Collocations on CD-ROM. It contains 10,000 headwords that are illustrated by 2,600,000 authentic examples. Up to 20 most frequent collocates are provided for each headword thus giving 140,000 collocations all in all. All the data are taken from the Bank of English, which is a corpus that numbers 200 million words.

2. THE ANALYSIS OF THE CONDUIT METAPHOR IN ENGLISH AND LITHUANIAN

2.1. IDEAS OR MEANINGS ARE OBJECTS

This analysis is based on the examination of two nouns, i.e. ‘mintis’ in Lithuanian and ‘idea’ in English. Of all the words used to talk about what exists during the mental processes ‘idea’ is the most general term, ‘applicable to almost any part or aspect of mental activity’ (Hayakawa 1987, p. 277). Therefore, this noun rather than the noun ‘thought’ has been chosen for the analysis as the equivalent of ‘mintis’. It also should be noted that all the examples provided in this practical study of the metaphor are authentic phrases or
sentences from the corpora. They appear in the corpora more than once. Metaphors that occur only once are left out or it is indicated that they are occasionalisms. In order to limit the scope of analysis less typical cases are not dwelt upon in detail. Besides, if there were no corresponding English metaphors for the Lithuanian ones in the corpus, we relied on dictionary information in order not to draw too categorical conclusions about the differences in the framework.

Before the detailed analysis of the conceptual metaphor IDEAS ARE OBJECTS, other ways of metaphorising ideas should be presented. The study of the linguistic evidence in both languages has revealed that the following major metaphoric models can be distinguished:

1. IDEAS ARE PLANTS
   (1) this was the germ of the idea and when it came to full fruition Monet registered the changes.
   tai puikiausia dirva minties augimui; mintis prigijo, minties brandumas.

2. IDEAS ARE HUMAN BEINGS
   (2) revolutionary ideas; outrageous ideas; the idea came from a few ground personnel; ideas are destined to come at a certain time; many rival ideas.
   maištingos mintys; neperši minties; gimė mintis, aplankydavo mintys; įkyruolė mintis; piktos mintys.

3. IDEAS ARE MOVING OBJECTS
   (3) ideas flow to you.
   Mintys sukasi; vingiuojanti mintis; minties judėjimo.

4. IDEAS ARE LIVING CREATURES
   (4) we are always on the hunt for new ideas; sparnuota mintis; minties geluonis; spiečius minčių.

5. IDEAS ARE A FORCE
   (5) The idea struck like a lightning;
   mintys kamuojai/kankina

   In addition to the above groups of metaphors, in Lithuanian there are a number of cases of the metaphor IDEA IS A MEANS OF TRAVELLING IN VIRTUAL REALITY:
   (6) mintimis grižti (kur nors)
   ieškoti (ko) mintimis
   mintimis nusikelti/nuskristi (kur)

Thus the perception of our mental activities is very complex and its exhaustive analysis could be the aim of a separate study. However, here these different metaphors are provided above just to give a more general picture of the way ideas are metaphorised, but they are not the aim of a more detailed analysis. The conceptual metaphor that is directly related to the study of the conduit metaphor is the metaphor IDEAS ARE OBJECTS. Only when ideas are understood in this way, they can be packed in words and sent to the addressee. It also should be noted that it covers the greatest number of metaphors in the sources of both languages.

As George Lakoff observes, people understand abstract notions in terms of concrete objects and substances. He groups a great variety of metaphors based on representing abstract experiences as substances under the title of ontological metaphors (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, p.25). When abstract things are metaphorically materialised, it is possible to measure them, define their boundaries and to perceive them with the help of our five senses, i.e. smell, taste, touching, hearing and seeing. Communication is one of the abstract phenomena in our life that needs to be categorised and referred to in some terms. Thus ideas expressed in communication and meanings of words are viewed as objects and made tangible. The data from the corpora give enough evidence that ideas are systematically reified both in Lithuanian and English.

2.1.1. IDEAS ARE TANGIBLE

Reification of ideas is reflected even in the dictionary definition of the English word ‘idea’ where it is defined as “a product of mental activity” (CCD, p. 641). Similarly, Collins COBUILD Student’s Dic-
tionary in the definition of the verb 'de-
liver' defines one metaphor via another
metaphor:

If you deliver a lecture or speech, you give
it. (COBUILD, p. 434)

The fact that lexicographers are not able
to avoid such circular definitions of
metaphoric cases via metaphors supports
the fact that the conduit metaphor is very
deeply rooted in our perception of com-

Hence these dictionary definitions and
other data that have been collected for
the analysis show that in English thoughts
are often metaphorically perceived as
products as it can be seen in the follow-
ing examples from the corpus:

(7)… colonial period itself produced new ideas
… hot bath produces good ideas
Gucci is constantly generating new ideas.
a sparky design to turn good ideas into mar-
ketable products.
No matter how many policy ideas Mr. Clin-
ton produces …

Similarly, ‘mintis’ is perceived as a
product in Lithuanian:

(8) … galvoje pradėdame ‘gaminčių’ mintis.
… perdirba kažkieno kitos mintis.
... formuojama viena pagrindinė mintis …
Retrospektiškai tarsi generuoja mintis …

Thus ‘mintis’ is produced, shaped, re-
cycled or generated. It is interesting to
notice that in the first example in (8) the
verb is put in inverted commas which
shows that the speaker is aware of the
metaphor.

The fact that ideas are treated as ob-
jects is evident in the common modifier
‘concrete’ collocating with the word ‘idea’
in English,

(9) He didn’t have any concrete ideas yet.
… with no new concrete ideas to discuss …

These examples can be paralleled to
the following sentence in Lithuanian:

(10) … prezidentas… konkrečia dar pirmų-
jamę numyrėje pradėtas mintis …

In the metaphorical model under analy-

objects can be moved from one place to
another. These cases should be disting-

iished from the conceptual metaphor

IDEAS ARE MOVING OBJECTS, which is pre-
sented above. The latter conceptual meta-

phor covers expressions where ideas move
themselves, independently of human in-

terference. Here we are going to look at
a number of metaphors that represent
ideas as objects, which are moved by
someone. The following examples show
that in English ideas are treated as por-
table or movable objects:

(11) It seemed as if he was bringing me a new
idea every other week…
the first Americans who brought his ideas
back to New York.
The members of the group throw in ideas…
Danford hadn’t brought any ideas with him…
Parents bring with them many different ideas
on discipline…
… now it’s time to bring out the ideas.
The defence agency dropped the idea…

Similarly, in Lithuanian there are a
variety of metaphorical cases where ideas
are handled as physical objects as the
italicised verbs show:

(12) dėliojo mintis vienaip ir kitaip
lengviau įsilaikyti savo mintis
nešasi savo širde kliñias mintis
moksleivių mintys bus 'perkeltos’ į artimiau-
šią pedagogų tarybos posėdį.
Iš konkurso moksleiviai parsivežė mintį…
Tada griežtasi kitos minties…
Minties šiuo keliu pasiektų stovyklą nemo-
tame…
… parsivežė daug minčių apie naujoves…

In contrast to these examples when ideas
are perceived as movable objects, there
are a number of cases when ideas are
viewed as stable and immobile entities.
In such cases ideas are situated some-
where and people can find or discover
them as in the following Lithuanian ex-
amples:

(13) … grįždama prie savo minties…
Ši mūsų kritinė apžvalga atveda prie tos vie-
nos svarbios minties…
Ir vėl grįžtu prie tos pačios minties…
In English ideas are also represented as stable objects:

(14) Women have so many fixed ideas about what they can and cannot wear. One of my father’s fixed ideas was that other people had some strange desire...

Hence such an abstract notion as idea is turned into a very stable and concrete thing. Furthermore, this abstraction is materialised via verbal expression. When it is put into a certain linguistic form, it becomes fixed and possible to return to.

When ideas are viewed as tangible entities, they can be not only moved, but also made of a certain material as all physical objects. The analysis of the Lithuanian corpus has revealed that ideas are perceived as being woven. There are a number of sentences where ‘mintis’ or idea is represented as a thread. A phrase that appears very often in the corpus is ‘mintis nutraukė’. In addition to that, the following examples illustrate the same concept:

(15) Dėl to minties gija tarpais lyg ir nutraukė...

... sunkiai suregzta mintis...

Mintį... audėme jau seniai
Ir vėrė tokią siūlą-mintį...

... nesugeba rišliai dėstyti minčių...

viršininkas M. Stabingis rezga mintį...

... seniai audžia dar profesoriaus K. Pakšto austą mintį...

mintys pynęs
tavo minčių audinį

Among the examples on CD-ROM no similar cases in English have been found but this does not allow us to generalise that the associations of ideas with threads and weaving do not exist in this language. Therefore, dictionaries as a supplementary source of linguistic information were used to carry out a more thorough analysis. For that purpose three words were checked, i.e. ‘weave’ as the equivalent of ‘austi’ and ‘regzti’ in Lithuanian, ‘thread’ as the equivalent of ‘gija’ and ‘tangle’ as the equivalent of ‘raizginys’.

In the entry of the verb ‘weave’ the following example is provided:

(16) He wove a fascinating story from a few forgotten incidents. (LDCE, p.1139)

This sentence clearly demonstrates that in English the same conceptual model of thinking exists although it sometimes uses different lexical means to express it. Furthermore, this point can be supported by the way the same dictionary distinguishes the third meaning of the lexeme ‘thread’ that is subdivided into:

a line of reasoning connecting the parts of an argument or story: I’m afraid I’ve lost the thread of your argument.

b a repeated pattern or idea: There is a consistent thread running through all these policies. (LDCE, p.1105)

In addition to this detailed definition, the example in the entry of the headword ‘tangle’ should be quoted:

(17) He got into an awful tangle with his homework and had to ask me to help. (LDCE, p.1081)

Hence the person is in a complicated situation because he is confused in his mind. The vague and intangible confusion of the mind is compared to a confused mass of fibres that is a very concrete and very expressive visual image.

The perception of putting ideas together as in the process of weaving is expressed by the adjective ‘coherent’ that is so commonly used to speak about speech or a piece of writing to say that it is logically orderly. The first meaning of the verb ‘cohere’, from which the adjective is derived, is ‘to hold or stick firmly together’ (CCD, p.257). Not only the core meaning of the verb reveals the treatment of ideas as physical objects, but also its Latin origin, i.e. co- means ‘together’ and herēre means to ‘cling’ (CCD, p.257). Similarly, in Lithuanian the adjective ‘rišlus’ is used...
to describe a logical text. The adjective could be translated into English as ‘tied up’ if we want it to contain its literary meaning.

The dictionary examples and definitions above show that the mechanism of thinking is paralleled to weaving and thread in both languages under analysis. This way of perceiving thinking reveals the importance of connection between ideas and their order. When ideas are disorderly, they become tangled like threads and are understood with difficulty. Therefore, it is important to combine them properly the way weavers interlace yarn to make a fabric.

However, in Lithuanian ideas are not just made of fibres, but are also produced of gold as in the following phrases:

(18) ‘auksinës mintys’; ‘šovė galvon auksinë mintis’; ‘prisimeni kitą auksinë mintį’.

The English data on CD-ROM provide no cases of metaphors where ideas were represented as objects made of gold. Nevertheless, English speakers treat ideas as precious things as the dictionary example ‘brilliant idea’ (LDCE, p.120) suggests. Thus, although ideas are made of different materials in the two languages, their perception again follows the same metaphoric structure. Ideas are products made of precious and shiny material.

Ideas as tangible objects that are made of some material can be perceived with the help of one of our five senses, i.e. seeing. This way of conceiving them seems to be essential as the notion of ideas as visual objects is hidden in the very word ‘idea’. It originates from the Greek word idein, which means ‘to see’. Therefore, ideas can be transparent or not transparent. A very common collocate of the noun ‘idea’ is the adjective ‘clear’. The word does not appear in the list of twenty most frequent collocates but it is recurrent in the example sentences on CD-ROM. As the opposite of it the attribute ‘foggy’ is used although it does not appear very often,

(19) I had a pretty clear idea.
People representing me haven’t the foggiest idea what …

These cases can be easily compared to similar Lithuanian metaphors:

(20) mintis aiški ir be žodžių žadinantis neaiškias mintis bandydamas atsigailtis ir praskaidrinti mintis paaškinà jo minties vaiskls skaidrumà

These few examples reveal certain differences between the two languages. Although the idea of transparency is observed in both English and Lithuanian, word by word translation of the phrases from one language into another does not sound very natural. The equivalent of ‘clear’ is ‘aiškus’ but its opposite is ‘neaiškus’ or ‘miglotas’. The latter word is the equivalent of ‘foggy’ but it is mainly used to talk not about ideas but understanding (e.g. ‘miglotas suvokimas/supratimas). Nevertheless, these are minor differences and collocational peculiarities that do not affect the general metaphorical model of communication.

The fact that ideas are visually perceived is obvious in the metaphoric cases where ideas have colour. The following Lithuanian examples can illustrate this tendency:

(21) Visi jokios tamsios minties atskirà minties atspalvjà be jokios tamsios minties karà su pilkomis kalbanèlijàmintimis pats laikas pradèti dalijasi su paènekovais tokiomis juodomis mintimis Klekvièia mintis turi savo spalvà I galva lenda juodos mintys

Actually, the adjectives ‘tamsus’ and ‘juodas’ are rather recurrent collocates of the noun ‘mintys’ in the Lithuanian corpus. Among the example sentences of the nouns ‘idea’, ‘thought’ and
'thoughts' on CD-ROM no similar metaphors have been found. Therefore, it could be tentatively stated that in English thoughts or ideas have no colour. Nevertheless, this is just one aspect that does not coincide with Lithuanian, but it does not overthrow the whole metaphoric structuring of ideas as tangible and visible objects.

One more sense, with the help of which we are able to recognise ideas, is hearing. In Lithuanian there are a number of metaphors which suggest that ideas can be heard:

(22) niekas nepakartojo kapinio girdėtos minties
išgirdusi tokias mintis salė sužė
mintys skambėjo
girdėti daug ... minčių

Again such data are found only in the Lithuanian corpus. No English examples of similar metaphors have been found either on CD-ROM or in the dictionaries. This leads to a tentative conclusion that the metaphor of ideas as audible objects is not as much recurrent in English as in Lithuanian.

As it has been proved that ideas are tangible, it means that they are perceived with the help of touching. Therefore, they can have certain qualities such as roughness, sharpness and the like. The following phrases illustrate this tendency in Lithuanian:

(23) aštrios šio rašinio mintys
minties aštrumą
smeigė prismeigė į ją mintimis

Similarly, the idea of recognising ideas by touching is expressed in such idioms as 'get/have a rough idea about something', 'give someone a rough idea about something' (AID, p.410). In addition, reified ideas have a feature of being solid,

(24) Susan Taylor had some tough ideas about how we can reduce the number of teenage pregnancies.
We have some strong / very firm ideas ...
in the English phrases ‘in the full/fullest sense of the word’ and ‘in the loosest sense of the word’. In Lithuanian the depth of ideas is very often mentioned as a very frequent phrase ‘gili mintis’ (‘deep idea’) shows.

It also should be noted that word meaning is measured in the lexicographic tradition by numbering different senses of a word in dictionaries. Moreover, even from the grammatical point of view ‘idea’ and ‘mintis’ are treated as objects as the two words are countable nouns in both English and Lithuanian. Lakoff also points out that ‘the metaphor system plays a major role in both the grammar and lexicon of a language’ (Lakoff 1993, p.245).

Thus ideas according to the prevailing metaphorical model can be counted as tangible items. A great variety of quantity words used with the nouns under analysis in both languages prove this. Among twenty most frequent collocates of the word ‘idea’ there are even four quantifiers that are listed here in the order of their frequency:

(27) 
Some
They will be putting some ideas to me soon.

Many
Many of her ideas are mad.

More
More new ideas are coming soon.

Few
He has relatively few ideas.

Some quantifiers are not included in the list but they still can be found in example sentences:

(28) There should be plenty of good ideas from Dean Witter.

What the three different ideas were?

Examples from the Lithuanian corpus show that ‘mintis’ is an object that can be counted, e.g. ‘vienut vienintelė mintis’, ‘pilma/piemoji mintis’, ‘sukosi viena mintis’, ‘visasmintis’.

Furthermore, an idea can be seen as a unit that can be divided into parts as one of the most frequent collocates ‘whole’ suggests. Lakoff observes that we tend to use metaphors based on our bodily experience and the part-whole schema is one of such groups of metaphors (Lakoff 1987, p.273). He notices that we naturally perceive ourselves as whole beings with parts. Therefore, we apply this anatomical perception of ourselves to the surrounding world and abstract notions (Lakoff 1987, p. 273). Thus ideas are understood according to the same schema as the following examples in Lithuanian show:

(29)... minties dalys augte suaugusios
... kompleksinės minties elementai
... minties struktūra
... norėjau panagrinėti mintį

In English we find similar examples, e.g. ‘more complex ideas’ and the numerous set of phrases like ‘the whole idea of something (a paper, protocol, manufacturing, etc.)’. Hence ideas are measurable units that can be whole and have parts just like human bodies.

2.1.3. IDEAS ARE POSSESSIONS

In the chapter about ideas as tangible objects it was mentioned that ideas are made of valuable material such as gold or brilliants. If they are perceived as precious entities, naturally they are possessed and cherished by people. One of the very common verbs that collocate with the noun ‘idea’ is ‘have’ or ‘have got’.

(30) I’ve got no idea.

We have no idea who sent it to us.

The verbs that are among twenty most common collocates of the noun are ‘got’, ‘give’ and ‘get’. It should be noted that in a big number of cases when ‘idea’ collocates with ‘got’ the latter verb is a part of the construction ‘have got’. Nevertheless, all these cases of the verb ‘got’ and the other two collocates show that
ideas can be owned and passed over to other people as properties. Moreover, we find such examples as 'borrowing other people’s ideas' or 'I can get rid of my ideas' that support this notion of possessing ideas. Similarly, in the Lithuanian corpus there are a variety of expressions, which prove that ideas are possessions:

\[(31)\ldots praradęs mintį ir žodį
\ldots savo minčių... šeimininkas
\ldots nenorėjo rankioti svetimų minčių
\ldots neturėk net tokios minties
\ldots atsikratome minties
Šias mintis autorius neabejotinai pasiskolinęs iš A. Maceinos\]

The examples reveal that the same metaphorical model exists in English and Lithuanian because some expressions coincide and can be translated from one language into another word by word, i.e. *pasiskolinti mintį* – to borrow an idea, *atsikratyti minties* – to get rid of an idea.

Very often the noun under analysis is used in both languages with some linguistic expression that refers to the owner of the idea. Such expressions are possessive pronouns (mano/savo/jūsų mintis; my/your ideas) and the possessive case of a noun that refers to the owner (Prezidento / Garry Jacksono / amerikiečių mokslininkų mintis / mintys; Chomsky’s key ideas, the sexpert’s ideas). Besides, the list of the collocates of the plural form ‘ideas’ contains the possessive pronoun ‘own’ that is the fifth most frequent collocate of the word. The importance of this kind of property, i.e. ideas, can be summarised by the following example from the Lithuanian corpus:

\[(32)\] Pavožti svetimas mintis dažnai didesnis nusikalčimas negu pavožti pinigus.

Michel Foucault in his short overview of the concept of discourse The Order of Discourse, which was first published in 1971, emphasises the function of the author or owner of ideas and texts. He notices that in the Middle Ages discourse was ascribed to someone because the author of a statement gave it its value. In the later centuries the authors of the anonymous works that circulated freely among people had to be traced down and determined because the owner of ideas and texts carries the responsibility for it and acts as its unifying force (Foucault 1998, p.19). Thus the notion of possessing ideas and texts has been important throughout centuries and has become especially strong nowadays when plagiarism is treated as a major intellectual crime that involves punishment.

To sum up, we can make the following schema of the way ideas are metaphorised in Lithuanian and English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Ideas are objects</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideas are tangible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas are movable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas are immobile entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas are produced of a valuable material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas are threads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas are seen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas are heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas can be smelled <em>(in Lithuanian)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas can be tasted <em>(in Lithuanian)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas can be measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas have width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas have length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas are counted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas can be divided into parts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus ideas are systematically reified and therefore can be packed as physical objects in containers or words.

### 2.2. Words are objects or containers

The previous part of the article was mainly concentrated on how pervasive is the tendency to talk about abstractions in terms of concrete objects. This part not only deals with this tendency, but also
focuses on container metaphors that are just as natural as ontological metaphors in our understanding. Lakoff points out that container metaphors are motivated by human everyday physical experience: ‘We are physical beings, bounded and set off from the rest of the world by the surface of our skins, and we experience the rest of the world as outside us. Each of us is a container, with a bounding surface and an in-out orientation’ (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, p. 29). The analysis of the Lithuanian noun ‘þodis’ and the English noun ‘word’ has proved the tendency to use container metaphors, as the corpus examples in the following chapters will show.

2.2.1. WORDS ARE OBJECTS

Words are not as abstract as ideas because they have been given a material shape since writing was invented. Besides, they have the sound form. However, in the metaphorical language they are given certain physical qualities that literally could not be ascribed either to a printed or an uttered word. One of such features is that words are produced like ideas, but in a specific way, i.e. they are made of metal. In Lithuanian they are forged,

(33) Šio þodžio kalviu laikymo Jablonskij. 
... verčia skolintis dirbtinai nukalta þodži ‘existere’

In the translation of the second example a problem arises how to translate the word ‘nukalta’. In English words are ‘coined’ and the metaphor not only implies that words are made of metal but also suggests that they are valuable as coins. The latter aspect is not emphasised in Lithuanian. Therefore, the literary translation should be ‘forge’ but the collocational information of the lexeme under analysis allows us to use only the word ‘coin’. Actually, the noun ‘phrase’ is among ten most frequent collocates of the lexeme ‘coin’. Thus the conceptual metaphor coincides in both languages but the two languages use different lexical means to express it and emphasise different aspects. In addition, in Lithuanian the phrase ‘auksiniai/aukso þodžiai’ (‘golden words’) is very common. In both languages this material is associated with something that is precious and excellent. Therefore, exclusively good ideas and words are equalled to some precious material. However, in English ideas and words are brilliant as in ‘they’re just brilliant words’.

Material things are tangible and so are words in both languages. This aspect of words is evident from the verbs that show what can be done with words,

(34) laikytis savo þodžio 
þodžio kišenėje neišsko 
prisilietimas prie seno þodžio 
atsiimti savo þodžį 
rasti þodžį 
ieškoti þodžio

There are similar examples in English as well,

(35) seeking the right word 
found no words 
no time for trimming words

One more very frequent verb that collocates with ‘þodis’ or ‘word’ is ‘vartoti’ or ‘use’. It is interesting to notice that in Lithuanian we differentiate between two equivalents of the verb ‘use’, i.e. ‘vartoti’ and ‘naudoti’. The first one is used to talk about linguistic expressions, whereas the second one is employed to talk about material objects. This shows that although people unconsciously use a great variety of metaphors where words are perceived as objects, they are still aware that they are abstract notions. Some other physical features of words as objects are revealed by the adjectives collocating with the noun, e.g. ‘aðtrus / gruntus / švelnus þodis’ or a rather frequent
phrase in English ‘harsh words’. Besides, such tangible and reified words have shape, e.g. ‘tiesus žodis’, iškreipti / iškraipyti žodžius’. The feature of straightness is expressed in the following sample sentence: the words in such a language are not always straightforward. The verb ‘distort’ has even a separate meaning ‘give a false account of; twist out of the truth’ (OALD, p.251) that is illustrated by the following examples:

(36) Newspaper accounts of international affairs are sometimes distorted.

You have distorted my motives. (OALD, p.251)

Her words were distorted by the stranger’s hand... (CD-ROM)

Furthermore, materialised words can be weighed, e.g. in Lithuanian ‘svarus žodis’, pasverti žodžius’ and in English ‘his every word was valued and weighed’. The measurement of weight is especially emphasised in Lithuanian. There are a number of cases in the corpus where it is suggested to weigh every word before speaking,

(37) kiekvienas žodis turi būti pasvertas

sverkite kiekvieną žodį

kalbėtasi ramiai, pasveriant žodžius

Thus when a word is materialised, it gains shape, becomes tangible and has weight. As it has been mentioned in the analysis of the noun ‘idea’, abstractions metaphorised as physical objects are perceived with the help of our five senses. Similarly, words can be touched, seen, heard and tasted. The sense of touching has been illustrated by the examples above, which present words as objects with such features as harshness or softness. As words can be perceived with the help of sight, they have a certain colour or are visible in some other ways,

(38) žodžio spalvingumas

pajusti žodžio sodrumą

žodžio spalva

kasdienybės nupilkinti žodžiai

bluko jį įvardiję žodžiai

In English the determining words such as ‘colourful’ and ‘colourless’ are used to talk about style if it is expressive or lacks vividness as in colourful style of writing and colourless style (OALD, p.164). The noun ‘language’ is among ten most frequent collocates of the adjective ‘colourful’ which indicates that such language is expressive and emotive as these parallel structures show: ‘colourful and expressive language’, ‘colourful and emotive language’. Besides, language in English can be florid or flowery when it is full of complicated words or expressions. In addition to the sense of touching and sight, words can be heard. Naturally spoken language is heard, but sometimes words produce sounds that are metaphorical. In Lithuanian words can ring,

(39) pernelgy dažnai skamba žodis ‘laisvė šiandien žodis ‘sektą turi kitą skambesį

skambus žodis ‘esmę’

There are a couple of corpus examples where a word has a sound in English: some more ominous-sounding words, the last three words exploded. Finally, words can be tasted and thus can be sweet or bitter, e.g. ‘saldus žodis ‘laisvė’, ‘kartus žodis ‘laisvė’, ‘jausti žodžio skonį’. In English this tendency can be illustrated by the following example: ‘such sweet words may have been comforting’.

The analysis of the way the word ‘idea’ is metaphorised has shown that ideas are perceived as valuable possessions. If ideas are put into words, logically words become valuable possessions as well because of their contents. The sense of ownership is deeply rooted in human nature and even intellectual possessions such as ideas, words or texts are also seen as someone’s property. The corpus samples in both languages give enough evidence to ground this tendency. The first and most striking thing in the
Lithuanian corpus is that the noun ‘word’ reiterates in combination with the possessive case of a noun and most often of a proper noun,

(40) Martyno Mažvydo / Brazausko / moks- lininko / prezidento / veterinario / Redakcijos / tėvų žodžiai

Similar phrases are especially frequently used to introduce citations of someone else’s ideas, e.g. (kieno nors) žodžiais (tariant). Besides, the possessive pronoun ‘own’ is among the twenty most frequent collocates of the plural noun form ‘words’. The pronoun appears in the construction ‘in one’s own words’. Similarly, the Lithuanian phrase ‘papaskotą (ką nors) savais žodžiais’ reveals the importance of using one’s own words, whereas if someone else’s words are used, it must be indicated. The same notion of ownership is inherent in the linguistic terms used to name the words that are taken from a foreign language and adopted, i.e. skolinys – borrowing. The concept of borrowing in English is recurrent in the examples provided for the noun ‘language’ on CD-ROM,

(41) All her spoken language was borrowed, even references …

… likes to borrow words from other languages, and most of its vocabulary …

In addition, there is one more metaphor recurrent in the Lithuanian corpus ‘taupytis žodžiais’ (‘save words’), which implies that words are valuables or money. The value of words is also suggested by the following English examples,

(42) There is no point in wasting words on ill health…

never a word wasted

The value of words is expressed by the previously discussed metaphor ‘words of gold’ or ‘brilliant words’ and in the following group of metaphors in Lithuanian:

(43) brangus žodis ‘Lietuva’
(44) bus atlyginta meiliu žodžiu
(45) žodis Ačiū turi vertę
(46) nupigintas žodis ‘žvaigždė’
(47) visiškai atpigo žodis
(48) devalvavosi žodžiai ‘tauta’, ‘tėvynė’

Examples 46 – 48 indicate that words have lost their value because they are overused. The value of a word can be determined in English as well, e.g. ‘his every word was valued’. Moreover, the fifth most frequent collocate of the adjective ‘valuable’ is the noun ‘information’. However, the notion of such property is best illustrated by the term plagiarism, whose Latin origin again is very informative, i.e. it comes from plagiium meaning ‘kidnapping’ (CCD, p.1020).

Thus the conceptual metaphors from the corpora present words as tangible objects of a certain shape that can be perceived with our physical senses. They are of a certain value and are possessed by someone. The available corpus data show that the same metaphorical framework exists both in English and Lithuanian.

2.2.2. WORDS ARE CONTAINERS

In this section we finally come to a very important part of the conceptual metaphor that treats language as a channel to send the speaker’s meaning through to an addressee. Hence by examining the two nouns ‘idea’ and ‘word’ in English and Lithuanian we shall look at how this mechanism of packaging information into words works.

The information in the corpora shows that words are not simply objects, but they are containers to be filled with some contents. The verb ‘put’ is one of twenty most frequent collocates of the noun ‘word’. The examples below show what a variety of contents can be inserted into words:

(49) Put that story into words.

… put her observations into words.
... signs, groans, and moans put into words. The collapse of the economy is being repackaged in an insidious new language. Language itself is held to be a repository of sexist attitudes. Similarly, in Lithuanian we can find a great number of abstract notions that can be packed in words,

(50) (kieno) žodžiuose (yra) džiaugsmas pavydas ir neapykanta tiesioginė prasmė susirūpinimas, nerimas, noras ieškoti agresyvumo tiesos atpažintum savo praeitį

Besides, words can be filled to a different degree. It is possible to use many words with little contents or to use very few condensed words, e.g. ‘jos vienas žodis atstebėjo kelis pusiaplūsu’, ‘jos vienas žodis man buvo visa knyga’. Sometimes words or other linguistic units can be overfilled, e.g. ‘perkrauti žodžiais dialogai’. Similarly, in English words can have too much contents, e.g. ‘so many words are superfluous’. Although a great variety of abstract notions can be materialised and packed in a word, words and other linguistic expressions can still be empty, e.g. ‘tai tebuvo tuštis žodžiai’, ‘mano sakinys esas per lengvas, neturiš minties’. In English it can be illustrated by the following example: The words of politics will remain empty forever. Thus if a speaker does not put any contents into these metaphorical containers, they seem to have no inherent meaning of their own.

Ideas and other abstractions can be put not only into words but also into the following linguistic ‘containers’ that are in italics,

(51)mintys, randamos minėto romano pusiaplūsuose spaudoje pasirodžiusioms mintims
turi poveikio rašinyje dėstomoms mintims iš keliių knygų paimtai mintis išdėstytai savo mintis ant popieriaus mintis dėstė perioginėje spaudoje reikšti savo mintis ilgais ir sudėtiniais sakiniais knygoje dėstomos mintys

In English ideas are packed in a similar way,

(52) Get your ideas down on paper. He’d brought a letter … which contained some new ideas The report lays out in more detail ideas that have already been put forward This newspaper… is a bundle of ideas We discussed story ideas

In addition, a conversation is seen as a container as one of the most frequent phrases provided on CD-ROM ‘deep in conversation’ suggests. Besides, in both languages the idea of properly arranging ideas in some container is implied by the phrase (iš)dėstytai mintis.

No matter how much content is inherent in words, they still have certain limits as the above examples of overburdened linguistic units suggest. The fact that words have their boundaries set is implied by the terms we use to refer to the act of stating precisely their meaning, i.e. apibrėžti žodį - define a word. Thus words are given certain fixed boundaries that can contain certain notions. However, there are a number of abstractions that cannot be inserted into any words. The cases when words become powerless and too limited can be illustrated by the following samples:

(53) in Lithuanian:
žodžiais neapsakomas / nenusakomas / neišreikštas džiaugmas / vaizdas / gerumas sunkiai žodžiais nusakomas graudulys / jausmas / mintys

(54) in English:
found no words to answer it there were things that couldn’t be explained with words more relieved than words can describe so many emotions have no words It pains me beyond words
Thus many abstractions are too immense to be packed in words and even ideas in the Lithuanian example cannot be put into words although they are materialised and suited for inserting into the metaphorical linguistic packages.

Finally, the conceptual metaphor words are containers is inherent in the lexical means that we use to refer to translating, i.e. ‘versti iš vienos kalbos į kita’ – ‘to translate from one language into another’. The prepositions indicate that two languages are containers and their contents can be moved from one into another. Furthermore, the Lithuanian verb ‘versti’ refers also to the physical action of turning something over. Eventually it implies that in the act of translating one language is turned over as a container and its contents is poured into the other language also seen as a container. Similarly, the word ‘derive’, whose literal meaning is ‘to draw from some source’, suggests that language is a container, e.g. ‘crisis is derived from the Greek word krisis’. Hence, words and language itself are metaphorically perceived as containers that can embrace different abstractions although they have certain limits.

2.3. COMMUNICATION IS SENDING

The conduit metaphor suggests that the act of communication is the act of sending or handing in words with their contents to the hearer. Messages then travel from a source (speaker) in some direction to the goal (hearer). Lakoff refers to this pattern as the source-path-goal schema. He motivates its pervasiveness by our bodily experience: ‘Every time we move anywhere there is a place we start from, a place we wind up at, a sequence of contiguous locations connecting the starting and ending points, and a direction’ (Lakoff 1987, p. 275). Information sent by a speaker moves similarly. Thus this section is an overview of how words and ideas are sent from a source when communication is appropriate and inappropriate. It will also look at how words and ideas are received and decoded or unpacked by the hearer when the messages reach their destination.

Some metaphors contain words directly related to sending by post such as ‘addressing’, ‘sending’ and ‘delivering’ as the following Lithuanian and English examples show:

(55) Kitiems adresuotas jausmas, mintis
Jis [Dievas] atsiunčia jums mintį
Viltis, kad žodis, kuri siunti iš scenos, bus išgirstas
Bloga linkintys žodžiai, pasiūstyti artimu į adresu

(56) He addresses his first words to me
Samaranch delivered the immortal word

The examples show that the model of sending letters by post is applied to speak about utterances produced orally. No matter how paradoxically it may seem, but even God obeys the same mechanism. Thus again people take something from their common physical experience and use it to speak about more abstract phenomena. This metaphor of sending is so pervasive that the verb ‘to post’ has gained a separate meaning ‘to inform the latest news’ (CCD, p.1044). Besides, the noun ‘message’ most frequently collocates with different forms of the verb ‘to send’. The full list of collocates is provided in the Appendix and here we can see the frequency of the verb ‘to send’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Message</th>
<th>16 259 messages</th>
<th>3 706</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) sent</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) send</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) sending</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) sends</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>1 411 Total:</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency of the verb ‘to send’ collocating with the noun ‘message’
The numbers in front of the collocating verb forms show their place in the full list. The frequency number of the noun and the frequency number of the verb show that the verb takes approximately one tenth of all its collocates. Furthermore, if we take into account other verbs referring to the sphere of post, the metaphor of sending becomes even more evident as it is displayed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Message</th>
<th>messages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) get</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) got</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) getting</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) delivered</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) received</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,586</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we count the total frequency number of the collocates that are related to the domain of post, we get rather revealing numbers. In 2,997 out of 16,259 cases the singular form 'message' keeps company with words directly related to post, which makes 18%. 595 examples of the plural form are also related to the same domain, which is 16%. If we count not the frequency number, but the number of collocates, nine out of twenty collocates of the singular form and six out of twenty collocates of the plural form are words that directly refer to post.

However, the act of sending is not always so openly stated in the metaphors of sending. Transmission of utterances can be referred to in other words signifying moving or directing an entity to a person. These are mainly verbs signifying handing something in to someone as in the two sets of English and Lithuanian examples below:

(57) Savo mintis ir pasiūlymus galite pateikti
Kauno inovacijų diegimo centrui
Minties perteikimas

(58) share your ideas with people up there
Clum sets off many interesting ideas.
put forward ideas
the best way to put your ideas across
Tips can be passed on by word of mouth
I must give you another word from my lips

Most of these examples imply direction, movement or the change of position of a word or idea. Thus utterances are movable objects or containers.

The above examples are cases of sending information or ideas in one direction from a speaker to a hearer, but the data from corpora show that sending can also be bidirectional:

(59) Pasikeisti mintimis su kolegomis
Pasitaiko ir blogesniais žodžiais apsikeičia
A few more words exchanged with Harry swapping ideas
Give each other ideas.

This metaphor of bidirectional sending implies that words are things that can be transferred for an equivalent piece of information. Thus again we can see that the value of the interchanged words can be fixed. Therefore, the exchange of ideas can be paralleled to financial transactions or trading when sums of money or goods of equivalent value are interchanged.

Directionality of communication is probably the most important notion in the metaphor of communication as sending. This aspect is reflected not only by the metaphors of sending, but also by other metaphors where words are perceived as moving objects. In Lithuanian such metaphors can be grouped into two main sets WORDS ARE WATER and WORDS TRAVEL:

(60) kad užlietų skaitomi žodžiai
žodžiai liejasi
žodžiai plaukė iš širdies
žodžių jūra
pilasi srautai žodžių
Similarly, in English metaphors words are metaphorised using water imagery:

(61) words tumbled out like a waterfall

We instinctively knew that too many words would drown out the ocean’s music.

In addition, smooth and easy communication is described by the verb ‘to flow’ in English as it can be seen in the definition and example provided in the COBUILD dictionary:

If someone’s words flow, they are spoken smoothly and continuously without hesitation. His words flowed more readily. (COBUILD, p.649)

The perception that messages travel is also reflected in the entry of the headword ‘travel’ in the same dictionary. There is a separate meaning of the verb distinguished as a result of this metaphor:

When news becomes known by people in different places, you can say that it travels to them. News of his work traveled all the way to Asia. Seems like news travels pretty fast around here. (COBUILD, p.1783)

Thus successful communication needs to have direction and steady movement. These two aspects are reflected in the metaphors of sending as well as in other metaphors implying movement of linguistic expressions and their direction.

When inappropriate communication or communication without much effort is referred to, it is no longer perceived as sending. In such cases words are still metaphorically moved, but in a different way. In Lithuanian careless communication is expressed mainly by verbs signifying the act of throwing or falling:

(62) mestelti žodžių
mesteltų bėrų žodžių
šiandien šiuo žodžiu svaidomasi kur reikia ir nereikia
žodžiai brio ant jo kaip kruša

Thus here the direction of words is not as precise as in the metaphors of sending where it is horizontal. The last metaphor of strewing or pouring words in the set of the examples above shows that when communication is not proper, the movement of words can be vertical. It also should be noted that in Lithuanian the act of strewing words as peas is paralleled to easy and quick speech, which does not require much effort, e.g. Moteris kalbėjo sklandžiai, žodžius tiesiog berte bėrė. In the act of throwing some object, in this case a word, the object moves horizontally, but this metaphor suggests that a lot of force is used for sending a message. It also implies carelessness because precious and important objects are usually handled in a gentle way and are not thrown. Similarly, the idea of brutality is inherent in the metaphors below:

(63) atkerta žodžiais
išrežia karčios tiesos žodžius
atrendavo žodžiais

Violence of improper communication becomes especially evident in the word by word translation into English. No similar metaphors of striking or cutting with words have been found in the English source. Therefore, dictionaries were again used as a supplementary source to search for the metaphors describing inappropriate communication. A verb that is used to refer to rude communication is ‘to snap’:

If someone snaps at you, they speak to you in a sharp, unfriendly way. ‘Of course I don’t know her,’ Roger snapped. (COBUILD, p.1577)

The notion of violence is reflected even in the dictionary definition, which describes the effects of such speaking as sharpness. Besides, the association of communication with the sudden act of snapping or cracking implies impulsiveness and carelessness. However, negative effects of words will be expanded upon separately in the part about the sovereignty of language, whereas the present chapter mainly deals with communication as sending. The act of send-
ing does not function if communication is inappropriate or effortless. Nevertheless, it does not mean that communication itself does not function then, only it has negative effects on the receiver.

2.3.1. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF LINEARITY IN COMMUNICATION

Lakoff distinguishes six most important dimensions of conversation structure and one of them is linear sequence (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, p. 78). He points out that participants of a conversation take turns in a linear sequence although some ‘overlapping and lapses may occur’ (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, p. 78). Furthermore, he draws our attention to such a natural phenomenon that in general ‘we speak in linear order; in a sentence, we say some words earlier and others later. Since speaking is correlated with time and time is metaphorically conceptualized in terms of space, it is natural for us to conceptualize language metaphorically in terms of space. Our writing system reinforces this conceptualization’ (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, p. 126). Peter Carleton in his list of perceptual contrasts also distinguishes cycles vs. linearity as one of the numerous contrastive metaphoric pairs that is based on such natural everyday experience as movements back and forth (Carleton http://www.metaself.org/model/glossart.html, p. 7). Thus we send words to an addressee in a particular order if we want positive effects. Therefore, the metaphor of throwing words represents those facts when sequence in communication is despised.

The data from the Lithuanian and English sources support the tendency of linear order in communication. The significance of sequence and linking of words is expressed by the following English examples:

(65) She spoke again, slowly, one word built on another.
spoken words strung together

In the first example words are perceived as building blocks that are put together to form a solid structure. In both samples, however, the main idea is that words as objects are added to each other, one at a time in a certain sequence to form an entity. Similarly, the notion of linear order is reflected in the following examples in Lithuanian:

(66) Kūrėjas įsypso, lėtai deda žodį prie žodžio
Klausės bijodami praleisti žodį
mintis iš minties plaukia
Šneka yra linijinis riškinys – joje žodžiai rikiuojasi vienas paskui kita.

The importance of linearity is best summed up by the last example in the set of corpus samples above. It is also expressed by the fear to miss a word as it could ruin the wholeness of the message. Besides, the idea of putting words in a proper order reiterates in the first and the third examples. Furthermore, the last metaphor belongs to the set of metaphors defined as words are water that has already been discussed. Metaphors that present words as running water emphasise the dimension of continuity, integrity and sequence in communication.

The dimension of linear order is even ritualised in our cognition of communication. The corpus data show that the first and the last words are given a special significance. Especially frequent collocates of the noun ‘žodžiai’ are adjectives ‘pirmi’ or ‘paskutiniai’ as in:

(67) suteiktas paskutinis žodis

We can also find such phrases as ‘bai-giamasis/pabaigos žodis’, ‘ižanginis/įvadinis žodis’. The adjective ‘last’ is the third most frequent collocate of the noun ‘word’ and the collocates ‘first’ and ‘last’ are also in the list of the most frequent
collocates of the plural form of the noun ‘words’. It should be noted that here the noun has a figurative meaning. However, in the cases of polysemy it is not significant what meaning a word has because the focus of the article is the metaphorisation of the word. Thus such common word combinations as ‘last/first word’ can be illustrated by the following samples from the English corpus:

(68) The last word goes to Geoffrey Stern
The right to the last word
His first quietly-spoken words were: ‘Can somebody get me a strong drink’

The importance of the first words is also reflected in such a sentence as ‘TO HEAR your baby’s first words is almost as the day of his birth’. The latter sample sentence partly explains the reason why the first and the last words are significant in human perception. Just as the first words of a child are an event for parents, so are the last words uttered by a person before death. The last words before death used to be like a testament to the person whom they were told. The function of the last word is so much emphasised that the COBUILD dictionary distinguishes a separate meaning on basis of this reiterating collocation:

If someone has the last word or the final word in a discussion, argument, or disagreement, they are the one who wins it or makes the final decision. She does like to have the last word in a discussion. (COBUILD, p.1930)

The order of conversation is also presented as an important factor by Chitra Fernando. The author notices that “people use a lot of expressions to move from one topic to another so that the discourse were ‘knit’” (Fernando 1996, p. 183). Among such expressions there are expressions ‘marking openings (greetings), topic and topic changes, and closures (farewells)’ (Fernando 1996, p. 183). These phrases sometimes make discourse very formulaic, but they perform a very important function of relating and organising separate linguistic units. Such text organisers as ‘not only..but’, ‘moreover’, ‘furthermore’ and a great variety of other idiomatic connectors ‘work globally to make the semantic unity of a discourse explicit’ (Fernando 1996, p.189). Chitra Fernando also points out that epigraphs at the beginning of separate chapters ‘knit portions of a discourse together’ (Fernando 1996, p. 189). Thus different kinds of connectors are abundantly used, especially in writing, to integrate a discourse. The first and the last words function as a unifying frame of the whole discourse in this way delineating its continuous abstraction.

Coherence and sequence in communication are best expressed by the conceptual metaphor TEXT IS A FABRIC. The metaphor of weaving is analysed in Chapter 2.1.1, which presents how ideas are reified. The analysis has revealed that ideas are metaphorically perceived as threads and the process of thinking or expressing ideas is paralleled to weaving or knitting. Texts and books were associated with weaving already in the antique times because of the way threads are arranged in the process of weaving. The way threads are combined reminds of the principle of writing. The metaphor is very suggestive and very much prevailing nowadays as the following set of corpus examples in English show:

(69) You put a spinner of words into an inaccessible place
the themes get tangled
another thread running through the entire book
the thread that ran through Mr. Bush’s speech
Names thread through the narrative
He enjoyed making things up, weaving these things into a story
weaving words around gospel music
well-crafted words – weaving together romance and cynicism
your story may be vague, weaving together scattered bits and pieces.
A gift for weaving together the strands of Bois’ story

The mechanism of weaving is often applied to speak about language in Lithuanian as well. The notions of knitting, tangling and making fibre can be illustrated by the following metaphoric cases:

(70) nesugebėjau normaliai žodžio suregzti personažo spalvingumas, išaustas iš žodžio su tarptautiniais keksmais pynši lietuviški žodžiai
iš tarptautinių žodžių suraizgtas frazes
žodžių pynė
Eglė veldavo žodžius

The metaphor under analysis is inherent in the noun ‘tekstas’ or ‘text’ whose etymology is very informative, i.e. ‘text’ comes from the Latin verb ‘texere’, which means ‘to weave’. Hence a proper discourse is expected to be a continuous and unified artefact, produced in a particular sequence.

Finally, we should cover the cases when the mechanism of sending does not work although communication is expected. In such cases the participant of a conversation who acts as a receiver does not get any message from the silent participant who should act as a sender. Therefore, the receiver forces the sender to produce an utterance or the sender himself makes great efforts to produce it. The factor of force and effort in a conversation that does not flow naturally is emphasised in the following metaphors:

(71) in Lithuanian:
ištraukti tokius žodžius iš jo buvo taip sunku
liudininkas žodžius traukė sunkiai
spauste išspaudžia šius žodžius
žodžiai košiama pro dantis

(72) in English:
she couldn’t make her voice say the words
Claire coaxed few words out of her father
screwing a few words out of her

Thus words flow, penetrate and enter hearers as these Lithuanian metaphors display. In English we can also find some examples referring to the act of passively receiving information:
In addition, Table 2 presents two verbs ‘get’ and ‘receive’ that frequently collocate with the noun ‘message’. Sentence examples of these word combinations suggest no effort of the receiver:

(75) people who suddenly receive unwanted information.
He received whatever messages the politicians were anxious to convey to the greater public.

In the English examples the subjects are people in contrast to the Lithuanian examples, where words are subjects. Nevertheless, the subjects in the English samples show no effort to receive the messages.

Not all the messages, which are received, are transparent and therefore they have to be unpacked and decoded. The latter act needs a special hearer’s effort. In this case words are objects and remain passive, whereas hearers are active subjects as in the following sentence:

(76) Benedict had lifted some of his ideas from the girl’s thesis.

The thesis here is a container where ideas are packed. When it is unpacked, the receiver is able to take them. People follow exactly the same pattern when they receive a parcel by post. In Lithuanian we find some examples which represent words as coded messages:

(77) iššifruti žodžio, raidës prasmę
The act of decoding is important because, as some Lithuanian metaphors suggest, words hide something in them:

(78) realiają padėtį geriausia paslėpti po žodžių apvalkalu
mintis neretai uždengiama žodžiu
žiaurumas neretai uždangstomas gražiais žodžiais

In contrast to the cases when hearers are eager to unpack the received information containers, some Lithuanian examples suggest that hearers can avoid receiving reified messages.

(79) užgaulius žodžius praleisdavo pro ausis
tie žodžiai praslysta pro ausis

In the examples above the words reach their destination, but they are not accepted by the hearer. Therefore, without reversibility communication is broken and has no continuity. The process of ‘weaving’ a discourse is stopped.

Thus the process of communication is perceived as sending, which implies such additional notions as direction, receiving and unpacking. One more important feature of communication is its linearity. Because of the linear order of spoken and especially written language it is associated with the craft of weaving. The latter metaphor implies that appropriate communication and texts are continuous and sequential combinations of linguistic units reminding of texture.

2.4. MINOR MODEL OF COMMUNICATION

At the beginning of the article the minor metaphoric model of communication has been presented. It is less complex than the major model discussed above parts because it has fewer stages. This model consists of a single act of ejecting ideas or words into space without directing them to a particular addressee. The ejected ideas and words may remain in that space as shapeless or reified entities. This is a minor model not only because it is less complex, but also because there are considerably fewer examples belonging to it. Nevertheless, such a model exists in English and Lithuanian and should be briefly dwelt upon.

Words as objects are released into space where they do not have any specific destination or people are not aware of them. This tendency is inherent in the following metaphors:
2.5. SOVEREIGNTY AND POWER OF WORDS

The analysis of the numerous corpus data has revealed one more interesting tendency that is not directly related to the conduit metaphor, but is pervasive especially in Lithuanian. A numerous set of metaphors presents words as independent powerful entities that sometimes gain even supernatural power and are feared. Then linguistic units are very often animated and are independent of people:

- šie žodžiai gyvena savo gyvenimą
- vos prasīšoju, žodžiai patys alysta nuo liežuvio
- nuo liežuvio nusprūsta žodžiai
- žodis sužeidžia skaudžiau nei durklas
- kompensuoja graišnamą, asmeniškai žeidžiančią žodžio galą
- širdžių variantys žodžiai
- skausmingi žodžiai
- užgaulūs žodžiai
- lyg peiliu duria žodžiai
- kaip perkūnas trenkė mane jo žodžiai
- mes save pribalginsim žodžiais

In addition to the negative effects, words are ascribed magic or supernatural power. A very frequent determinant of the noun ‘word’ in Lithuanian is ‘sventies’ as in ‘Motinos žodis buvo sventies’. One more frequent word combination is ‘žodžio galia’. The notion of power is reflected by a paradigm of other words referring to word potency:

- immortal word
- fateful words
- fatal words
- a word can change the whole meaning
- a word which works wonders
- the word power is highly charged for women
- a powerful word
- haunting words

Thus words are not mere linguistic expressions in our cognitive model, but there is uncontrolled power inherent in them. This particular aspect becomes clearly noticeable only when an immense number of corpus examples are analysed and can remain undetected if the languages are observed only intuitively.
3. CONCLUSIONS

The first and the most important generalisation that follows from the comparative analysis of the way two nouns 'idea' and 'word' are metaphorised in Lithuanian and English is that the conduit metaphor is pervasive in both languages when communication is referred to. This conclusion is strongly supported by the numerous data from the computer corpora. The existence of this particular conceptual metaphor in both languages allows us to think that possibly it is a universal metaphoric model. An analysis of different corpora of different languages could prove it or invalidate.

Although this comparative study has revealed that the metaphoric structuring of communication in both languages is very similar, some minor differences have been observed. Ideas and words do not have some aspects in English, but they have them in Lithuanian. However, this does not allow us to claim that the languages do not have the same coherent system of metaphoric expressions because the differences do not affect the whole model. The two languages use different lexical means to talk about the same concepts, e.g. the notion of precious ideas and words is expressed by 'golden ideas / words' in Lithuanian, whereas in English it is expressed by the phrase 'brilliant ideas / words'. Such minor differences become especially evident in the literary translations of Lithuanian examples. Thus such corpus-based analyses could serve to compile metaphoric equivalents in two languages because clearly not autonomous words are translated but the whole multi-word units instead.

There are two distinctive sets of metaphors that are not directly related to the conduit metaphor and are not discussed by the authors who analysed this metaphor. The study has revealed that in the system of metaphorising communication there are two prevailing metaphors LANGUAGE OR COMMUNICATION IS WEAVING and WORDS ARE A SOVEREIGN POWER. The latter metaphor ritualises communication and gives it magic power. All the data can be a starting point for further generalisations about the concept of communication from the point of view of cognitive linguistics.

APPENDICES (ACCORDING TO COLLINS COBUILD ENGLISH COLLOCATIONS ON CD-ROM).

1. Frequency list of the collocates of the noun 'idea'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDEA</th>
<th>42 577</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>3 599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>3 322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any</td>
<td>1 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like</td>
<td>1 047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>got</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whole</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>might</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>think</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>great</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>came</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Frequency list of the collocates of the noun 'ideas'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDEAS</th>
<th>17 883</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>1 356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>many</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>come</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>put</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>got</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>great</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>few</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Frequency list of the collocations of the noun ‘word’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>VOWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>1042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>last</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>every</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>said</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>say</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>another</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mouth</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaning</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sense</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processor</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Frequency list of the collocations of the noun ‘message’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MESSAGE</th>
<th>MESSAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>get</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sent</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>send</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>across</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>got</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leave</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getting</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KANALO METAFORA: KOMPIUTERINIAIS TEKSTYNAIS PAREMTA ANALIZĖ

Santrauka

Metaforų analizė yra vienas iš būdų išsiaiškinti, kaip yra suvokiamas abstraktas ir bendravimas. Metaforizacija yra kognityvinės lingvistikos, kuri pabrėžia kalbos ir mąstymo sąveiką, sritis. Tuo tarpu kompiuteriniai tekstyniai yra patikimiausias empirinių duomenų analizuojant tokius abstraktus. Tad straipsnyje pristatoma vadinamoji ‘kanalo’ metafora lietuvių ir anglų kalbose. Pagal šią metaforą, kurią įvardija G. Lakoff’as ir M. Johnson’as, o plačiau nagrinėja Michaelis Reddy, anglų kalboje vyrauja tokia bendravimo suvokimo schema, kur mintys ar reiškiniai yra daiktai, žodžiai yra indai, kur tarpinamas ar įpakuojamas turinys, o pats bendravimas yra žodžių, kuriuos įpakuoja mintis, siuntimas pašnekovui. Be pagrindinio modelio, dar išskiriama ir kitas, paprastesnis bendravimo modelis, kurį mintys tiesiog patenka į erdvę ir tampa nepriklausomos.

Iš kolokacijų gaunami metaforų gausa rodo, pirmaisiai tokį svarbų žmogų visuomenės reiškinį kaip bendravimus. Tekstyinių dėka dvi kalbos gali būti lyginamos kaip lygiam vertės ne intuityviai įeškant kalbinįjų metaforų abiejose kalbose, bet remiantis gausiais tikros kalbos pavyzdžiais. Be to, remiantis kitų kalbų tekstynais, būtų galima nustatyti tokios metaforos universalumą. Konceptualiosios metavera analizė gali taip ir praktiškai pritaikomu darbu, leidžiančiu sugretinti dvi kalbas įeškoti vertimo atitikmenų ne pavieniems žodžiams, o jų metaforiniam junginiams, kuriuos dažniausiai pažodžiai negalima išversti. Galiausiai tokius tyrimus galima ne tik patvirtinti tam tikrą hipotezę, bet ir užfiksuoti kitus metaforinius modelius, kurių intuicija paremta analizėje gali likti nepastebėti. Pavyzdžiui, tariant šį kognityvinį modelį, išryškėja grupė tokiių metaforinių atvejų, kur pabrėžiamas žodžių suverenumas, t.y. žodžiai atstoja žmones, taip pirmdėm iš į jų atsakomybę, ir tampa nuo jų nepriklausomais.