terms of container and physical contact, respectively. Maike Sarah Rein-erth's "Metaphors of the Mind in Film" discusses two types of memory flash-back in early twentieth-century cinema, both of which are based on the metaphor "mind [of a character] as a container" (220), but whereas in one type something that is thought to be inside the mind is projected outside it, in the other the spectators have the experience of traveling inside the character's mind. Sebastian Armbrust's "Coincidence and Causality" deals with plotting principles in serial television drama (both intra- and interepisodic), aiming to integrate CMT with narratology. Once again, a key methodological issue is how essential the use of the metaphorical models really is for the claims made about the topics under discussion. For example, I doubt if Armbrust's anal-ysis of plot structures—which is very interesting in itself—gains much that it would not have achieved otherwise from employing conceptual mappings such as "means are paths," "purposes are goals," or "progress is motion forward" (84) to formulate some of its claims.

Reference

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson
    1980 *Metaphors We Live By* (New York: University of Chicago Press).

Eyal Segal,
Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics,
Tel Aviv University

Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr., ed., *Mixing Metaphor.* **Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2016. xiv + 269 pp.**

This volume, from John Benjamins's Metaphor in Language, Cognition, and Communication series, is devoted to the topic of mixed metaphor. In the introduction, the editor Raymond W. Gibbs notes that mixed metaphors "do not have a good reputation" (vii) and that people are often instructed to avoid them—especially in manuals of writing style and composition, where such metaphors are typically associated with chaotic or unclear thinking and lack of planning. Also, despite being very common in both speech and writing, mixed metaphors have rarely been examined systematically within the fast-growing field of metaphor studies. The present volume, which comprises twelve articles by established metaphor scholars, therefore aims to remedy this situation, both by its very attention to mixed metaphors and by "reha-bilitating" their reputation. Indeed, a common denominator of the first four

articles is their dismissal of claims that mixed metaphors reflect errors in thinking or cause difficulties in understanding (at least of a gratuitous nature). This is done from various perspectives: those of conceptual metaphor theory (Zoltán Kövecses), discourse analysis of spontaneous talk (Lynne Cameron), blending theory (Cornelia Müller), and an empirical study of readers' interpretations (Julia E. Lonergan and Gibbs).

The "mixing" of metaphors clearly involves some clash or incongruity between vehicles (or *source domains*, the term favored by conceptual metaphor theory), but this very general condition still leaves many open questions—for example, how widely or sharply should these source domains differ, or how far apart in the discourse can the relevant metaphorical expressions appear for the "mixing" effect to take place? An article that illustrates such a problem of definition is the one by John A. Barnden (chapter 5), which presents an overview of his computer model ATT-Meta and how it can help handle mixed metaphors. A key feature of this model is its adaptation of a fictionalist/pretense world, in which metaphor users pretend that what is described is literally true. One of the main examples analyzed by Barnden is "the thought of her step-mother's arrival was a dark angry cloud hanging over her mind" (96), in which the "mixing" is supposedly of "the view of . . . mind as a physical terrain . . . with thought-as-cloud" (97). However, many readers would probably not perceive this as a mixed metaphor at all, since the mapping between the domains of ideas and physical space creates a high degree of compatibility between the two metaphorical expressions in question. (Contrast a more obvious example of mixed metaphor mentioned elsewhere in the volume: "The butter mountain has been in the pipeline for some time" [32].)

Two articles that focus on how to define mixed metaphor are those by Gerard J. Steen (chapter 6) and Elena Semino (chapter 10). Steen emphasizes the notion of "deliberateness," claiming that "the experience of mixed metaphor arises when two metaphors conflict that are [both] used deliberately as metaphors" (114); such a "conflict" is created by "a clash between the non-metaphorical meanings of two metaphorical uses of words within one relevant grammatical or discursive frame" (115). Steen goes on to discuss various signals—such as semantic scale, grammatical positioning, and pragmatic properties—that lead to the perception of metaphors as deliberate. He also argues that clashes between a deliberate and a non-deliberate metaphor (and even more so between two non-deliberate metaphors) produce a weaker experience of mixed metaphor, or no such experience at all.

Semino tackles the issue of definition from a different direction, examining the "folk understanding" (203) of the concept by looking at the explicit use (in texts collected from the Oxford English Corpus) of the term *mixed metaphor* as a metalinguistic comment by writers on their own—or others'—use of

metaphor. She concludes that this folk understanding is broader than the technical use of the term in specialist literature, since besides the prototypical case in which the literal meanings of different metaphorical expressions clash in terms of the source domains they evoke, it includes cases in which the literal meanings of two metaphorical expressions involve different scenarios that can be subsumed under a single source domain, and also in which the literal meaning of a single use of metaphor involves a source domain that overlaps in part with the current topic. What all these cases have in common is the possibility of identifying a semantic contrast between entities or actions that leads to the perception of "mixing."

Several articles focus on specific genres or discursive contexts that encourage the mixing of metaphors, or where such mixing is clearly functional. Thus, Fiona MacArthur (chapter 7) considers the mixing of "linguistic and conceptual systems" (133) taking place when speakers of English as a second language use metaphors that are based on literal translations of expressions from their native language. Carita Paradis and Charlotte Hommerberg (chapter 9) study wine reviews, in which mixed metaphors help weave together mixed sensory perceptions (of sight, smell, taste, and touch) that constitute a major part of wine tasting; such metaphors are crucial to the communication of the qualities of the wine in question.

Jonathan Charteris-Black (chapter 8) presents the volume's most directly functional (or purposive) account of mixed metaphors in his discussion of the use of complex metaphors in patients' accounts of chronic pain. He claims that in such a context, mixing metaphors typically occurs "where the speaker's purpose is to emphasize the intensity of embodied experience by representing the pain as *out of control* [thus losing control at the linguistic level as well, so to speak]" (157, emphasis mine). Conversely, a speaker tends to repeat or extend the same basic metaphors rather than "mix" them when discussing aspects of pain that can be controlled.

Charles Forceville (chapter 11) extends the volume's range of media by dealing with pictorial (and multimodal) metaphors. He considers several cases of such metaphors that seem to present qualities equivalent to "mixing" in linguistic metaphors but finally comes to the conclusion that it is better to avoid using the term in the context of visual media, since "language has grammar and conventional ways of combining elements within a single semantic unit . . . that are too radically different from the 'structure' that is its pictorial equivalent" (236).

The volume's remaining article, by Anita Naciscione (chapter 12) on extended metaphors, is notably the only one that deals with a corpus of literary texts (ranging historically from Old to Modern English). While interesting in itself, the relevance of Naciscione's discussion to the volume's general topic

is questionable, since she focuses on a series of metaphors that emphatically use the *same* source domain and thereby produce an effect of continuity rather than a clash or incongruity.

Eyal Segal,
Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics,
Tel Aviv University