

# Are metaphorical classes essentially abstract?

Omid Khatin-Zadeh<sup>1</sup>, Zahra Eskandari<sup>2</sup>, Florencia Reali<sup>3</sup>, Hassan Banaruee<sup>4</sup>, & Fernando Marmolejo-Ramos<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, khatinzadeh.omid@yahoo.com <sup>2</sup>Chabahar Maritime University, <sup>3</sup>Universidad de los Andes, <sup>4</sup>University of Bonn, <sup>5</sup>University of South Australia

**Keywords:** abstract concepts, metaphorical classes, semantic associations

This article compares abstract concepts and metaphorical classes in order to emphasize the abstract nature of metaphorical classes. Glucksberg (2003) used the expression “abstract superordinate categories” to refer to metaphorical classes. Drawing on this proposal and Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980) conceptual metaphor theory, this article suggests that metaphorical classes and abstract concepts share three essential features: (1) members of abstract concepts and metaphorical classes are highly diverse and heterogeneous; (2) both metaphorical classes and abstract concepts are highly reliant on situations and culture; (3) both metaphorical classes and abstract concepts are reliant on semantic associations and external concepts rather than intrinsic properties. Therefore, it may be claimed that metaphorical classes are a special group of abstract concepts with a special type of behavior.

## References

- Glucksberg, Sam. 2003. The psycholinguistics of metaphor. *Trend in Cognitive Science*, 7(2), 92-96.  
Lakoff, George., & Johnson, Mark. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.