

Emergentist Metaphorical Creativity: Towards a Model of Analysing Metaphorical Creativity in Interactive Talk

Afef Badri

Abstract—Metaphorical creativity does not constitute a static property of discourse. It is an interactive dynamic process created online. There has been a lack of research concerning online produced metaphorical creativity. This paper intends to account for metaphorical creativity in online talk-in-interaction as a dynamic process that emerges as discourse unfolds. It brings together insights from the emergentist approach to the study of metaphor in verbal interactions and insights from conceptual blending approach as a model for analysing online metaphorical constructions to propose a model for studying metaphorical creativity in interactive talk. The model is based on three focal points. First, metaphorical creativity is a dynamic emergent and open-to-change process that evolves in real time as interlocutors constantly blend and re-blend previous metaphorical contributions. Second, it is not a product of isolated individual minds but a joint achievement that is co-constructed and co-elaborated by interlocutors. The third and most important point is that the emergent process of metaphorical creativity is tightly shaped by contextual variables surrounding talk-in-interaction. It is grounded in the framework of interpretation of interlocutors. It is constrained by preceding contributions in a way that creates textual cohesion of the verbal exchange and it is also a goal-oriented process predefined by the communicative intention of each participant in a way that reveals the ideological coherence/incoherence of the entire conversation.

Keywords—Communicative intention, conceptual blending, contextual variables, the emergentist approach, ideological coherence, metaphorical creativity, textual cohesion

I. INTRODUCTION

METAPHORICAL creativity represents an important aspect of metaphorical conceptualisation. References [1], [2] of metaphorical creativity have focused on the analysis of creative metaphors in written forms of discourse (poetry, newspapers) as products of isolated individual minds and as static features of texts. The analysed examples of creativity were isolated and decontextualised examples. Metaphorical creativity has not been studied as a cognitive phenomenon that may be pervasive especially in interactive talk. The notion of “context-induced creativity” [3] refers to a type of metaphorical creativity that emerges from the immediate context. This kind of creativity “has not so far been systematically explored in the cognitive linguistic literature on metaphor” [2, p. 99]. The discussion of contextual variables [2] inducing this type of creativity overlooked the role of decisive contextual variables in shaping creativity which are

Afef Badri is with the English Department at the University of Sfax, Tunisia (phone: (216) 28 205 294; fax; e-mail: afefbadri@yahoo.com).

the communicative intention and the ideological framework of interpretation. Also, there is an almost lack of research that has focused on creativity in online interactive talk (on the basis of works cited in this paper). Metaphorical creativity in online talk-in-interaction is a dynamic process that is jointly constructed by interlocutors and shaped by variables of the immediate communicative situation. This type of creativity has not received any systematic focus in the works reviewed in this article. This is going to be explored in the rest of this article that seeks to provide a theoretical model to study online interactive metaphorical creativity.

The objective of this paper is to argue that creativity is not an arbitrary cognitive process. On the contrary, it is a goal-oriented and tightly determined by variables of the immediate communicative situation and especially the communicative intention of the speaker. It also operates within an ideological framework of interpretation and it could contribute to the coherence/incoherence of discourse. The paper presents a theoretical model for the analysis of metaphorical creativity in online interactive talk. The model is based on three components. First, metaphorical creativity is a dynamic and emergent process that evolves in real time interactive talk. Second, it is an interactional product that emerges from interlocutors’ constant negotiation of metaphorical conceptualisations. And third, the emergent process of metaphorical creativity is determined by contextual variables surrounding talk-in-interaction. It is facilitated by processes of conceptual integration network and it contributes to varied degrees of discourse cohesion and coherence.

II. DEFINING CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR

Conceptual metaphor is defined as a means that “allows us to understand a relatively abstract or inherently unstructured subject matter in terms of a more concrete, or at least a more highly structured subject matter” [4, p. 40]. Metaphorical mappings are a set of fixed pattern of “ontological and epistemic correspondences” that systematically connect entities and elements from one conceptual domain to counterpart entities and elements in another conceptual domain [4, p. 4]. Conceptual metaphor represents “one of our central intellectual tools. It is the principal instrument of abstract reason, the means by which the inferential structures of concrete domains are employed in abstract domains” [5, p. 141].

Metaphor is a property of thought not a property of language. It is conceptual in nature not linguistic. The example

of LOVE IS A JOURNEY metaphor proves the conceptual nature of metaphorical mappings. Cross-domain mappings in this metaphor support the primacy of metaphorical reasoning over the linguistic realisation [6]. The various linguistic expressions used to describe and communicate emotions of love like “our relationship has hit a dead-end street”, “our relationship is spinning its wheels”, “we’re going in different directions”, and “our relationship is at a cross-road” [5, p. 116] are not considered as different conceptual metaphors. By contrast, they represent different linguistic realisations of the same conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY. Linguistic realisations of metaphor are manifestations and evidence of the existence of metaphorical reasoning [7, pp. 39-40].

III. METAPHORICAL CREATIVITY

The classical view of language establishes a dichotomy between every day ordinary language and poetic language. The province of metaphoric creativity and rhetoric flourish is reserved to poetic language and thus metaphor is defined as a poetic device that consists in a nonconventional use of linguistic expressions. Yet the conceptual view of metaphor maintains that “the locus of metaphor is not in language at all, but in the way we conceptualize one mental domain in terms of another” [4, p. 1]. Literary metaphors represent creative extensions of ordinary conventional metaphors. Metaphor is basic to ordinary natural language semantics not only in poetic and literary creativity [4, p. 1].

Poetic language depends on the metaphoric mechanism available for ordinary people. Creativity is attained via three processes of extension, elaboration and combination or questioning of the available conventional metaphorical mapping [1, pp. 67-68]. First, extending; since metaphorical mapping is necessarily partial in the sense that it does not project every detail feature of the source domain, poets can search for unmapped details or slots to make novel inferences [1, pp. 67-68]. For example, the conventional metaphor DEATH IS SLEEP that involves entailments such as absence of movement and lying in a horizontal position is extended by mapping an element that is not conventionally projected which is dreams in “for in that sleep of death what dreams may come” [1]?

The second process consists in nonconventional elaboration of schemas by filling in the slots in a creative and imaginative manner that adds new conceptual content [1, pp. 67-68]. To illustrate this point, the conceptualisation of death as “the eternal exile of the raft” [1, p. 67-68] represents an elaboration of the manner of travelling as well as the type of journey in the DEATH IS A DEPARTURE metaphor. “Raft” is viewed as an unfamiliar way of travelling because people are forced to go in the journey. This matches the state of exile wherein people are put into it despite their will [1, pp. 67-68].

The third process is questioning. It is illustrated in these verses:

“Suns can set and return again,
But when our brief light goes out,
There's one perpetual night to be slept through” [1, p. 67-68].

The perpetual night refers to death and it consists in a creative metaphor which is LIFETIME IS A DAY.

Finally, composing [1, pp. 70-71] is defined as combining two or more metaphors in a one passage or one sentence such as the metaphorical composite of LIFETIME IS A DAY, DEATH IS NIGHT, LIFE IS A PRECIOUS POSSESSION, EVENTS ARE ACTIONS. Night is conceived as an agent that takes away precious possessions. Light is a substance. It refers to life. Life is a precious possession that is stolen by death. The combination is generated by a set of complex inference patterns that connect the metaphors. This makes the composition conceptual in nature and not a mere joining of expressions together. Complex metaphorical connections yield richer inferences than do single metaphors. For example, the combination of PEOPLE ARE PLANTS with EVENTS ARE ACTIONS produces the personification DEATH IS THE GRIM REAPER. What makes poetic metaphors salient and striking is that they deploy ordinary cognitive resources in a creative and novel manner that defamiliarises conventional mappings [1, pp. 70-71].

The piece of evidence that proves that conventionalised conceptual metaphors remain alive is that they are systematically and unconsciously activated and instantiated in the production and comprehension of novel metaphorical extensions [5, p. 68]. It is claimed that there can be no novel instances of metaphor without the existence of conventional mappings that sustain creative mappings [1]. It is argued that “if those metaphors did not exist at all in our conceptual systems, then we could not understand novel, unconventional poetic language that makes use of them” [1, p. 129].

The aforementioned literature on metaphor creativity discussed isolated and decontextualised examples of creativity overlooking contextual variables that might play a crucial role in shaping and orienting metaphorical creativity. Reference [3, p. 129] presents the notion of “context-induced creativity” that does not depend on pre-existing mapping but it is purely a product of context.

Analysis of creative metaphors in [1] focused on written discourse like examples taken from poetry and newspapers’ articles). Thus, creativity is treated as an individual product of isolated minds and as a static conceptual feature of discourse. As for metaphorical creativity in online talk-in-interaction, it has not received any systematic focus. The paper explains in the following sections how creativity in online verbal interactions is a dynamic process that is jointly constructed by interlocutors and shaped by variables of the immediate communicative situation.

IV. METAPHORICAL CREATIVITY IN FACE-TO-FACE INTERACTION

The focus of the emergentist approach to metaphor [8], [9] has been oriented to the study of metaphor in online spoken discourse. What differentiates research of this approach from the rest of literature that has focused on the analysis of metaphor in written discourse is treating metaphor as a joint and dynamic activity that emerges and develops from online

interactions.

The “dynamic approach” to the study of metaphor stresses the temporal aspect of social and cognitive processes and the role of interaction with the environment, including brain, body, and other persons, in shaping the individual’s behaviour [8]. “Metaphor performance”, in particular, focuses on “talking-and-thinking-in-interaction” to unveil the dynamics of “in-the-moment” spoken discourse [8]. The discourse dynamic framework treats metaphor as “processual”, “emergent”, and “open to change” cognitive phenomenon rather than stable and fixed structures stored in long-term memory. In this dynamic framework, metaphor is viewed as an “activity” that is flexible, dynamic, and open to constant change through time [10, p. 69].

The dynamic approach [11, p. 674] introduced “the metaphoreme” as a metaphoric unit of analysis emerging from the discourse event. The metaphoreme is defined as a lexical and grammatical form that carries conceptual content and affective and pragmatic value. One key feature of a metaphoreme is its “emergent” nature as it emerges from online interactions taking the forms of re-lexicalisation, repetition, explication, and contrast of metaphors along the process of metaphor evolution over the time scale of verbal interaction [11, p. 674]. Some groups of metaphoremes represent elaboration of the same conceptual metaphor in different ways. Some among them may represent creative and innovative extensions of the same metaphor.

The emergent and dynamic nature of the metaphoreme that unfolds as talk proceeds appears to be incompatible with the static and fixed aspect of conventional cross-domain mapping in the two-space model of source-to-target. In fact the two-space model seems incompetent to account for the complexities underlying online creative and open-to-change meaning construction processes [12]. The emergentist approach describes metaphorical exchange as a dynamic temporary activity that unfolds in real time interactions and that is influenced by the context of the real communicative situation but it does not reveal much about the process itself and the underlying internal mechanism motivating and facilitating it.

The online aspect of meaning construction was overlooked in earlier formulation of conceptual metaphor theory [13]. Emphasising the dynamic aspect of online blending creation, [14, p. 201] stresses that frames are not static structures retrieved from long-term memory but they emerge from a partial and dynamic process of building spaces according to contextual information. Speakers are viewed to do more than simply retrieving and instantiating frames from long-term memory, they are constantly and creatively construing and blending cognitive models to produce novel concepts, construals, and activities [14, p. 282]. “The dynamic character of on-line meaning construction thus arises because language users are continuously and creatively building and blending frames rather than merely retrieving and instantiating them” [15, p. 30].

The conceptual integration network is a model directed basically to the analysis of online meaning construction

process [12]. Conceptual integration network is described as a covert and unconscious cognitive process that comprises a range of successive and sometimes simultaneous operations: building mental spaces, establishing connections between them, selective and partial projection from input spaces to the blend, distinguishing common structures, projecting backward from the blended space to the inputs, bringing additional structures to the blend, and running the blend [16, p. 44].

The conceptual integration network is built up from at least four mental spaces (two input spaces but they can be more, a generic space, and a blended space) [16]. Cross-space mapping is defined as a partial process that connects counterpart elements in the input spaces [16]. The generic space produces an abstract scenario that reflects commonalities (frames, schemas, structures) between inputs [16]. The blend “inherits” partial structure from the input spaces and develops its own emergent structure. It develops a richer and more sophisticated scenario and even counterfactual and impossible structures that merge the inputs and the generic [17, p. 24].

Meaning is not construed in any single space neither is it a property of the blended space. Meaning is located and distributed in the entire array of spaces and connections holding between them. Establishing counterpart connections across spaces and achieving integration require much cognitive work such as activating input mental spaces, recruiting structures to establish them, setting generic connections between them, projecting counterpart structures from the inputs to the blended space, recruiting frames from background knowledge to run the blend, backward projection from the blend to the inputs, and so on [13, p. 162].

The conceptual integration network provides a range of cognitive processes that can be applied to account for metaphor transition in verbal interactions. The three processes of composition, completion, and especially elaboration are significantly useful in analysing metaphor transition and evolution. The blend creation is based on three mental operations. First, composition sets connections between counterpart elements of the input spaces. Second, completion recruits additional background knowledge and, cognitive and cultural models to the blend. And finally, elaboration modifies in an imaginative manner elements of the blend which yields an emergent structure [13, p. 14]. The on-line elaboration of blended spaces is named as “running the blend” [13, p. 137]. What is deemed remarkable about the blend is that it can be run indefinitely. Blended spaces can become extremely elaborated [13, p. 147]. This opens infinite possibilities for creative constructions to emerge.

Novel elaborations of the blend depend on other cognitive processes. They depend on completion that recruits novel elements from background knowledge to create new elaborations. This is achieved through packing/unpacking and compression/decompression. Disintegration of network, projecting backward to the input spaces, and reconstruction of the blend are processes as essential for efficient comprehension as blending and integration [16, p. 332-333]. The blend is required to maintain active connection with the

inputs. Integration corresponds to compression and disintegration corresponds to decompression. Both compression and decompression are equally important for the conceptual integration network. Comprehension depends fundamentally on simultaneous activation of the processes of compression and decompression of disintegrated inputs. It is deemed essential for efficient comprehension to keep track of the original inputs via disintegration [16, p. 119].

In a communicative situation of a verbal interaction, integration, disintegration, and reintegration processes are helpful in maintaining coherent interaction. For example, if a speaker initiates a metaphor the following speaker can disintegrate the metaphorical blend by going back to the original inputs. He might select new elements not present in the first metaphor and projects them through the process of completion to the blend and then through elaboration he elaborates the blend in a different way from the original blend. This process can be recursive and each time a participant elaborates the blend in a novel way.

In dialogical interactions blending becomes a joint activity. Different blending operations such as cross-space projection, recruiting structures from background knowledge, and the three operations of composition, completion, and elaboration are determined by the communicative intention of interlocutors and the shared framework of interpretation [18]. The communicative intention determines the elaboration of the emergent structure of the same metaphorical blend in different ways to serve different purposes. The entire blended network is structured and built according to the communicative intention of the conceptualiser. For example, the generic space that contains commonalities between elements in the inputs is subjectively construed as there may be no objective real shared characteristics and properties between inputs. The very choice of mental spaces to build a network is subjective and is motivated by particular purposes. This is an example of how can creativity in online interactions be attained. Once a metaphorical blended network is constructed and introduced by a speaker, the next speaker in order to provide a relevant contribution to what has been previously said and at the same time add new information, he can disintegrate the original network to go back to the original inputs. He can recruit novel elements from background knowledge and project them to elaborate the blend in a novel way since as it has been argued that the imaginative capacities of the mind enable it to elaborate a blended network in indefinite ways. Elaboration is an open-ended process. Following this process a whole conversation can be organised by a single blended network but elaborated differently in each time to serve different communicative purposes. To illustrate this point, two metaphors discussed in [19] are reanalysed. The first metaphor is Blair's expression "I can only go one way. I've not got a reverse gear" [19] in which he conceptualises himself as a "forward looking" politician and his goals as "progressive". This metaphor is a creative instantiation of the conventional metaphors PROGRESS IS MOTION FORWARD and PURPOSEFUL ACTIVITIES ARE JOURNEYS. The creativity manifests in the kind of vehicle used for travelling

(a car without a reverse gear which is something unusual) and the type of motion (exclusively one-direction motion: forward).

The BLAIR'S POLITICAL DECISIONS ARE A JOURNEY OF A CAR WITHOUT A REVERSE GEAR metaphor depends on the selection of frames and elements from the input space (source domain) of a car with no reverse gear moving on a path following a specific direction to conceptualise the input space (target domain) of Blair's political journey. The generic features shared between the two inputs, as suggested by this metaphor, are impossibility of backward motion, one-way direction, and forward progress. In the blended space there is an ever-going forward politician with no possibility of going back in his decisions or attitudes or actions. These characteristics are deemed praise-worthy in Blair's opinion and conceptualisation of himself.

The second metaphor is the BBC evening news anchorman's commenting Blair's metaphorical statement in an ironic way "but when you're on the edge of a cliff it is good to have a reverse gear" [19]. The BBC anchorman profited from Blair's metaphor to create his own metaphor. He disintegrated the conceptual integration network of the original metaphor and he went back to the input spaces to look for elements that enable him to reconstruct the metaphor in a creative way that serves his communicative goal. The element selected by the anchorman is drawn from the physical properties that may characterise the path in a car journey. This element is an edge of a cliff that may appear in a path. He reintegrated the conceptual integration network to produce a blended network of the conceptual metaphor BLAIR'S DECISIONS ARE A JOURNEY OF A CAR WITHOUT REVERSE GEAR FACED BY AN EDGE OF A CLIFF. This metaphor selects frames and elements from the input space of a car with no reverse gear moving on a path following a specific direction and faced by an edge of a cliff in order to conceptualise the input space of Blair's political decisions. What is perceived as common between the input spaces, according to the anchorman, is the necessity or the urgent need for a backward motion and the lethal danger of the inability to move backward. Thus, in the blended space, we find a Politician in a ruinous situation and in need to go back and reconsider his dangerous decisions.

Contrary to creativity in written discourse which is a property of individual minds metaphorical creativity in online interactive talk is an interactional product that emerges as interlocutors negotiate meaning and metaphorical framing of an issue. It is determined and tightly shaped by contextual variables of the immediate communicative situation. This is going to be explained and exemplified in the following section.

V. CONTEXT-INDUCED CREATIVITY

The early version of conceptual metaphor theory has failed to recognise the crucial importance of context in metaphorical conceptualisation [3, p. 664]. The notion of "context-induced metaphor" and "context-induced creativity" explains and illustrates the influence varied contextual variables have over

metaphor production and interpretation. This type of creativity is described as the following:

Based on an informal collection of data from a variety of newspapers, it appears that the context provides a major source of motivation for the use of many novel metaphors. Many of these metaphors are clearly not, in Grady's (1999) classification, either resemblance or correlation based cases. They seem to have a unique status, in that they are grounded in the context in which metaphorical conceptualization is taking place [2, p. 114].

This type of creativity, as it has been suggested, "has not so far been systematically explored in the cognitive linguistic literature on metaphor" [2, p. 99].

Context is divided into two aspects: global context that consists in the general collective knowledge of a community or culture, and local or immediate context that concerns factors specific to every communicative situation and that bear crucial contribution to metaphorical creativity. Local context can be classified into five types: (1) the immediate physical setting, (2) knowledge about the major participants in the discourse, (3) the immediate cultural context, (4) the immediate social setting, and (5) the immediate linguistic context itself [2, p. 97]. Contextual dimensions are classified into four major types:

- "Situational context" related to the physical, social and cultural setting.
- "Discourse context" or the cotext concerns preceding discourse on the same topic.
- "Conceptual-cognitive context" related to the conceptual system.
- "The body context" or the embodiment that concerns universal experience and specific personal aspects [2, p. 186].

This paper is particularly interested in the immediate aspects of context specific to every communicative situation and influence of the "co-text" on creativity. Metaphorical choices may be affected by the immediate linguistic context (the co-text) including the preceding and following discursive units. In fact, speakers can utilise previous discourse on the same topic and a formerly stated metaphorical expression to present a modified version of the metaphor. Metaphors in previous discourse concerning the same topic may be exploited in a variety of ways such as elaborating, extending, questioning, negating, reflecting on, ridiculing, and taking advantage of them [2, p. 54]. Elaborations of the same metaphor may provide an important source of creativity as conceptualisers seek to bring about novel contributions each time by reusing the original metaphor to convey different communicative intentions.

As a case in point on how the immediate linguistic context induces metaphorical creativity, we go back to the example in [19] of the metaphor used by Blair conceptualising himself as a "forward looking" politician and his goals as "progressive" kind of goals by creating a metaphorical expression taken from car domain ("I can only go one way. I've not got a reverse gear" [19]). Blair's expression was exploited by an

anchorman on BBC evening news to turn it against him and to criticise his involvement in the Iraq war by commenting "but when you're on the edge of a cliff it is good to have a reverse gear" [19]. The expression "the edge of a cliff" conceptualises a ruinous and dangerous situation where it would be very convenient to have a car with a reverse gear. The speaker selected a novel element from the domain of journey which is a feature characterising the path (the edge of a cliff) to creatively elaborate the metaphor in a way that also conveys his criticism towards the original metaphor. The BBC anchorman's disagreement with Blair and perhaps negative critical attitude towards him motivates his use of Blair's metaphor to attack him.

In the survey of contextual variables [2], the role of a decisive factor determining metaphorical creativity which is the communicative intention was overlooked and the role of another important factor which is ideology was marginalised. Contextual variables were discussed as having equal influence. This is what is called "the combined effect of factors" [2] where the factors can be conjoined leading the conceptualiser to be coherent with the "multi-aspects" of every communicative situation. However some variables tend to be determined by other variables. For example, effect of the linguistic context (the immediate linguistic context or metaphors used in other discourses or the set of metaphor in the conceptual system) is determined by the communicative intention of the conceptualiser and the communicative intention itself is determined by another key factor which is opinions and attitudes of the conceptualiser towards the conceptualised entity. These opinions and attitudes constitute his evaluative judgment about the situation governed by the worldview that he holds. The discussion of the metaphor turned against Blair is a case in point. The anchorman reused a modified version of Blair's metaphor in a way that is consistent with his critical attitude towards Blair. Within this context, [20, p. 28] suggests that metaphor takes part in forming and expressing the ideology of texts because of the persuasive and rhetorical function it performs. Metaphor has an evaluative dimension related to conveying an attitude towards something and expressing a point of view [20, p. 11]. The evaluative function of metaphor as an ideological tool for conveying and framing worldviews is a crucial factor that shapes and defines the communicative intention of the conceptualiser. Communicative intention is related to a shared goal between interlocutors that they cooperate to achieve [21, p. 8]. Intention is defined as "a plan that an agent is committed to". Joint intention and collaboration are defined as the common goals that a "group of agents" (such as interlocutors in a conversation) collaborate their efforts to achieve. In this case, they also share a plan that clarifies the list of "coordinated actions" that must be followed to achieve the goal [21, p. 13]. Joint intention requires a process of coordination wherein interlocutors recognise that they are jointly collaborating their effort to attain a common goal [21, p. 18].

Metaphor use is always determined by "a specific communicative context" that requires an analysis of the

pragmatic dimension of metaphor in order to complement the cognitive semantic approach [20, p. 9]. The speaker's intention is basic in determining the meaning of a metaphor [20, p. 10]. It is suggested that "in order to understand why one conceptual metaphor is preferred over another we need necessarily to consider the speaker's intentions within specific contexts: metaphors are not a requirement of the semantic system but are matters of speaker choice" [20, p. 9].

Reference [22] also emphasises that meaning is centred around the speaker's communicative intention and is shaped by surrounding context. It introduced an elaborated approach of metaphor analysis in context based on pragmatic considerations. It stress that it is the speaker or "the sense maker" that assigns meaning to metaphorical expressions when he utilises them in a particular context to convey certain intentions and share a mental content in an intersubjective "semiotic exchange" between speaker and addressee.

Creativity is considered as a prominent sign marking online verbal interactions. What differentiates dialogical coherence from monological coherence is "the irreducible unpredictability and novelty of the moves occurring in the ongoing dialogic interaction" [23, p. 98]. The field of online talk-in-interaction is a field wherein metaphorical creativity proliferates. A great deal of conceptual creativity occurs in online interactions where novel and unique metaphors can be produced [12], [15].

The nature of interactive talk that depends on exchange between at least two parties makes metaphor in general and metaphorical creativity in particular a joint achievement. Speakers tend to elaborate on a previously initiated metaphor rather than introduce a different metaphor. This guarantees the cohesion of a conversation. Creativity emerges from the demands of interaction as speakers are constantly required to provide novel contributions. In this context, analysis of the creative process of meaning construction in conversational interactions suggests that the interactional demands of a conversation require from participants to provide relevant contributions that are appropriate to what is previously stated and that also include novel information. One possible way speakers can make their contributions relevant is by relying on conceptual structures available in the inputs utilised by the previous structure to construe the blend. It is possible sometimes that a previous speaker's constructed blend becomes an input for the following speaker's blend in a way that maintains relevant contributions consistent with what is previously stated [24, p. 120]. Speakers' blends are attuned to conceptual structures previously utilised and simultaneously contain novel structures [24]. This applies to metaphorical blends as well wherein an initial metaphor tends to be creatively elaborated in various ways. This creates a conceptual and textual cohesion of a conversation.

In the literature on metaphorical coherence in written discourse, the focus has been chiefly on the role of metaphor in creating textual cohesion. The existence of "moments of stasis" in metaphorical usage, "discourse metaphor networks" [25], systematic metaphors [26], "megametaphors" [27], [28] and a "backbone metaphor" to the text as a whole [19]

guarantees textual and discursive cohesion but it cannot be considered as an indicator of coherence at the level of ideas, attitudes, and representations of reality especially in interactional exchange where there are more than one party.

Reference [29] discussed many examples of a metaphor that functions as a global conceptual structure (the notion of macrostructures [30]) to constrain subsequent metaphorical choices in interviews and politicians talk whether interlocutors share the same perspective or not. In this way metaphor creates dialogical or textual cohesion. But it is the way with which participants exploit available metaphorical entailments to elaborate the original metaphor that creates the ideological coherence of the conversation. Participants' way of reusing the metaphor reveals their stance towards the representation signalled by the metaphor and the degree of agreement between them. This point has been overlooked in the literature mentioned above about metaphorical coherence in written discourse.

The coherence of any piece of discourse especially dialogical interactions is determined by the communicative intention of interlocutors. It is suggested that there is a correlation between coherence relation type and "global discourse intentions" and coherence relations are viewed as "realisations of communicative intentions" [31, p. 1]. Verbal interactions may or may not have a global discourse intention that can be shared among interlocutors as each interlocutor may have his own communicative intention that may not be necessarily congruent with the rest of other interlocutors' communicative intentions. This is defined by the nature of dialogical interactions which is explained as the following: "while monologic, one-speaker, discourses refer to a unique world (the world, or universe, of the speaker), dialogues present as many worlds as there are participants and these worlds can be compatible, as well as incompatible, that is reciprocally contradictory" [32, p. 107]. Creative extensions of a global metaphor are shaped by the degree of compatibility of participants' worlds. Thus, different degrees of coherence or incoherence of a conversation result depending on the degree of agreement among conceptualisers concerning the entity or the issue been conceptualised.

Coherence is considered as a matter of ideology, about how the world is perceived from a subjective point of view [33, p. 278]. Also coherence depends on the social context and the ideological framework that determines how to interpret the world [23, p. 96]. When this is applied to the role of metaphorical creativity in coherence it can be said that the ideological coherence resulting from creative use of metaphor is not a matter of employing the same metaphor, as a global conceptual structure, but the way the metaphor is creatively elaborated and reused to serve the intention the conceptualiser seeks to communicate in each usage.

Analysis of metaphorical scenarios in public discourse [29] illustrates this point. "Cooperative and competitive" reasoning and argumentation through metaphor suggests that there is a process of negotiation across the utilisation of a prominent metaphor in public discourse especially in dialogical interactions. It focused on analysing the reuse of original

metaphors in novel contexts where originally initiated metaphors such as THE EUROPEAN COMMON HOUSE, THE EUROPEAN UNION AS BUILDING, and THE EUROPEAN UNION AS TRAIN JOURNEY, provided common ground for conceptualisers who have utilised these metaphors to serve different argumentative purposes. Every reuse modifies and adjusts the original metaphor to suit a particular purpose, for example, to express strong disagreement towards the argument or the idea expressed by the metaphorical scenario, to convey partial agreement, or to express full agreement. The use of the same metaphor creates cohesion between conceptualisers but it is the way the metaphor is altered, tailored, and reused to suit particular purposes that revealed varied degrees of divergence and lack of coherence at the level of perspectives [29, p. 149]. Thus, metaphorical coherence is not a matter of speakers utilising the same metaphor all over their interaction but a matter of how worldviews determine the way speakers exploit available entailments of the metaphor to serve their vantage points. Novel usages tend to be creative elaboration of the original metaphor because creativity is motivated by the requirement of online interactions to provide novel contributions to the conversation. But novel elaborations are tightly determined by the goals and communicative intentions of the speaker.

The paper reanalyses examples from [29] of the use of metaphors in interviews to explain how creativity emerges and how it is induced by a number of variables. It also explains how creativity contributes to the coherence/incoherence of a conversation. Creativity in metaphorical usage was not the focus of these examples. Their main interest was in how metaphor operates in dialogical argumentation. The examples analyse metaphors in a short dialogue between two politicians [29] wherein both interlocutors utilised the same metaphor EUROPE AS A COMMON HOUSE, yet, despite their attempt to manifest diplomatic agreement their usage of the metaphorical scenario exhibited divergence in points of view. While Gorbachev stressed the independence of each apartment by indicating that “not everyone might like to receive visitors at night”, Weizsäcker emphasised the principle of “reciprocal visiting rights” and pointed out to East–West German border as “a ditch that runs through one communal living room”. The “ditch is ”interpreted as the border between East and West Germany and Weizsäcker’s expression as conveying his view of Germany as one (still divided) apartment. Gorbachev has another view to the concept of “the apartment” that conceives of European states in 1987 as in “need to be secure from visits at night” [29, p. 127].

[R.v.W.: It is an important point of reference that helps us to see *how things should be organized in the common European house, especially as regards the rights of reciprocal visits from one apartment to another.*

- M.G.: You are quite right, but *not everyone might like to receive visitors at night.*
- R.v.W.: We are not particularly happy either that *a big ditch runs right through one communal living-room*] [29, p. 127].

It is suggested that the metaphor created “a common

ground” for the interlocutors and at the same time enabled them to express the divergence in their views [29, pp. 146-147]. The original global metaphor organising this short dialogue is EUROPE AS A COMMON HOUSE metaphor but elaborations are creative. In the first example “*rights of reciprocal visits from one apartment to another*” the speaker looked for an unmapped element or feature from the source domain of living together in a common house to conceptualise the target domain. This is not an arbitrary creative mapping but it is goal-oriented and defined by the speaker intention to promote the stance that Europe should be considered as a one single house encompassing European nations. On this basis, visits among countries should be considered as reciprocal rights and thus should be permitted.

The second speaker is not in agreement with this principle. His expression “*not everyone might like to receive visitors at night*” is a creative elaboration of his addressee’s initial metaphor. He intended to convey his criticism towards the principal of reciprocal visiting. The choice of the particular unmapped element “visits at night” is meant to express harsh criticism but in a tactful and covert manner as night is a time when people are in their private life and hence visits are not something that might be much welcomed.

The first speaker went back to the original metaphor EUROPE AS A COMMON HOUSE to creatively combine two elements “ditch” and “living room” in this metaphorical expression “*a big ditch runs right through one communal living-room*”. Living rooms normally do not contain ditches but this element is creatively selected and mapped to the target in order to express strong disagreement towards the stance signalled by the previous metaphor of night visitors.

In the light of the foregoing analysis, the creative elaborations of the global conceptual metaphor EUROPE AS A COMMON HOUSE made the short conversation cohesive. It is organised by a single global metaphor. But what made the conversation incoherent is the way the global metaphor is creatively elaborated to express incompatible perspectives. At the level of coherence of worldviews, metaphorical creativity unveiled incompatible stances and lack of coherence.

VI. CONCLUSION

The central point that the discussion of this paper tried to provide supportive arguments for is that metaphorical creativity is not at all an arbitrary and fanciful cognitive process. On the contrary, it is deeply grounded in contextual variables surrounding talk-in-interaction. It reveals much about the communicative intentions and ideological framework of interlocutors and it impacts the cohesion and coherence of discourse. Metaphorical creativity can be applied in the analysis of Sufi discourse in order to try to demystify vague and abstract aspects of the Sufi cognition.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Thanks go to the GRAD research unit at the Faculty of Letters and Humanities of Sfax for financial support.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Lakoff, and M. Turner, *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- [2] Z. Kövecses, *Where Metaphors Come from Reconsidering Context in Metaphor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- [3] Z. Kövecses, *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. 2econd ed. Oxford University Press, 2010.
- [4] G. Lakoff, "The contemporary theory of metaphor," in *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- [5] G. Lakoff, and M. Johnson, *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books, 1999.
- [6] G. Lakoff, and M. Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*. New edition with Afterword, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- [7] G. Lakoff, "The Invariance Hypothesis: is abstract reason based on image-schemas?" *Cognitive Linguistics*, vol. 1-1 1990.
- [8] L. Cameron, *Metaphor in educational discourse*. Continuum, 2003.
- [9] L. Cameron, "Patterns of metaphor use in reconciliation talk," *Discourse Society*, vol 18 2nd ed. 2007.
- [10] L. Cameron, R. Maslen, T. Zazie, J. Maule, P. Stratton, and N. Stanley, "The discourse dynamics approach to metaphor and metaphor-led discourse analysis," *Metaphor and Symbol*, vol. 24 2nd ed. 2009.
- [11] L. Cameron, and A. Deignan, "The emergence of metaphor in discourse," *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 27 4th ed. Oxford University Press, 2006.
- [12] J. Grady, T. Oakley, and S. Coulson, "Metaphor and blending," in *Metaphor in cognitive linguistics*, G. Steen, & R. Gibbs, Ed. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1999.
- [13] G. Fauconnier, and M. Turner, "Conceptual integration networks," in *Cognitive Science* vol. 22, 2nd ed. 1998.
- [14] S. Coulson, *Semantic Leaps: Frame-Shifting and Conceptual Blending in Meaning Construction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [15] S. Coulson, "Conceptual blending in thought, rhetoric, and ideology," *Cognitive Linguistics: Current Applications and Future Perspectives*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006.
- [16] G. Fauconnier, and M. Turner, *The Way we Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. Basic Books, 2002.
- [17] G. Fauconnier, and M. Turner, "Conceptual projection and middle spaces," 1994.
- [18] V. Stadelmann, "Language, cognition, interaction. conceptual blending as discursive practice," Unpublished PhD thesis, 2012.
- [19] E. Semino, *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [20] J. Charteris-Black, *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- [21] M. Stone, "Communicative intentions and conversational processes in human-human and human-computer dialogue," in *World Situated Language Use: Psycholinguistic, Linguistic and Computational Perspectives on Bridging the Product and Action Traditions*, J. Trueswell, and M. Tanenhaus, Ed. MIT Press, 2002.
- [22] L. Brandt, and P. Brandt, "Making sense of a blend: a cognitive-semiotic approach to metaphor," *Annual review of cognitive linguistics*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2005.
- [23] A. Rocci, "Are manipulative texts 'coherent'? manipulation, presuppositions and (in-)congruity," In *Manipulation and Ideologies in the Twentieth Century: Discourse, language, mind*, L.de Saussure, and P. Schulz, Ed. 2005.
- [24] S. Coulson, "Extemporaneous blending: conceptual integration in humorous discourse from talk radio," *Style*, vol. 39, 2nd ed. 2005.
- [25] B. Nerlich, and N. Koteyko, "MRSA—portrait of a superbug: a media drama in three acts," In *Metaphor and Discourse*, A. Musolf, and J. Zinken, Ed. Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- [26] R. Gibbs, and L. Cameron, "The social cognitive dynamics of metaphor performance," in *Cognitive Systems Research*, vol. 9, 2008.
- [27] P. Werth, "Extended metaphor—a text-world account," in *Language and literature*, 2nd ed. vol. 3, Longman Group Limited, 1994.
- [28] M. Kimmel, "From metaphor to the "mental sketchpad": literary macrostructure and compound image schemas in heart of darkness," in *Metaphor and symbol*, 3d ed. vol. 20, Lawrence Erlbaum Assocait, Inc. 2005.
- [29] A. Musolff, *Metaphor and Political Discourse: Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- [30] T. Van Dijk, *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. 1980.
- [31] T. Sanders, and W. Spooren, "Communicative intentions and coherence relations," in *coherence in spoken and written discourse: how to create it and how to describe it*, W. Bublitz, U. Lenk, and E. Ventola, Ed. *Pragmatics & Beyond New Series*, vol. 63, 1997.
- [32] H. Clark, *Using language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [33] T. Van Dijk, "Discourse semantics and ideology," in *Discourse & Society*, 2nd ed. vol. 6, SAGE (London, Thousands, Oaks, CA and New Delhi), 1995.