

Metaphor and Framing in Cognition and Practice: Take Metaphors for AIDS as Examples

CHEN Ying^{[a],*}; ZHOU Junzi^[a]

^[a]School of Humanities and Foreign Languages, Xi'an University of Technology, Xi'an, Shaanxi, China.

^[b]School of Foreign Language, Zhejiang University of Finance & Economics, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China.

* Corresponding author.

Received 2 October 2019; accepted 14 November 2019
Published online 26 June 2020

Abstract

The notion of “framing” as an important function of metaphor can be applied to the related perspective: cognitive and practice-based. We analyze these perspectives by applying it to a corpus-based study according to Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) and English Web 2015 (enTenTen15) Corpus¹ in Sketch Engine² of illness-related for AIDS concordances and collocations and demonstrate its value to both theory and practice. By analyzing the data which includes violence-related metaphors for AIDS and through the application of this framework, we can find that there are merits in applying the notion of framing at different levels of generality in metaphor analysis (conceptual metaphors and linguistic metaphors), so that we can have a deeper understanding of cognition and framing in AIDS. Metaphor has characteristics of salience and mutual reactions, therefore, this article tries to study metaphor

¹ The English Web Corpus (enTenTen) is an English corpus made up of texts collected from the Internet. The corpus belongs to the TenTen corpus family which is a set of web corpora built using the same method with a target size 10+ billion words. Sketch Engine currently provides access to TenTen corpora in more than 30 languages. (<https://www.sketchengine.eu/#blue>)

² Sketch Engine is the ultimate tool to explore how language works. Its algorithms analyze authentic texts of billions of words (text corpora) to identify instantly what is typical in language and what is rare, unusual or emerging usage. It is also designed for text analysis or text mining applications. Sketch Engine contains 500 ready-to-use corpora in 90+ languages, each having a size of up to 30 billion words to provide a truly representative sample of language. (<https://www.sketchengine.eu/ententen-english-corpus/>)

from the perspective of frame theory so that it can provide a new angle for researching metaphor. According to theoretical and practical advantages of taking two levels into account when considering the use of metaphor for communicating about sensitive topics such as AIDS and people's positive, negative or neutral attitudes towards AIDS. We emphasize that there is a need for “rich” definition of framing when evaluating, comprehending and commenting.

Key words: AIDS; Framing theory; Conceptual metaphor; Illness as metaphor

Chen, Y., & Zhou, J. Z. (2020). Metaphor and Framing in Cognition and Practice: Take Metaphors for AIDS as Examples. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 20(3), 99-108. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/sll/article/view/11785>
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/11785>

1. INTRODUCTION

More and more scholars agree that metaphor is not only a rhetorical device, but also a fundamental in thinking. Metaphors are important in communication and cognition, using metaphors can better demonstrate, reflect, and reinforce different ways of making sense of particular aspects of our lives. Even the subtlest expression of a metaphor, via a single word, can have a powerful influence on how people understand the information, thus metaphors have profound influences on how we conceptualize in thought and reasoning. The central function of metaphor is itself often referred to metaphorically as “framing” (Lakoff, 2001; Semino, 2008; Cameron, et al, 2010; Ritchie, 2013). Many of our metaphors used to understand AIDS are basically based on ordinary embodied experiences, for example, people refer to many war-related frames, death-related frames and healthy body in trying to understand AIDS even when

their own bodies have been severely disrupted. The use of metaphors displays the vivid characteristics of language, and also reflect the relation between language and thought in regard to human illness. For example, people who are infected with HIV can be described as a “fight”, “killer”, as the example is shown below from COCA:

The governmental commitment into the AIDS³ fight is crucial now. It should be the government owning, leading and taking on, because the international aid is not unlimited.

So, I think as a broad statement he knows that yes, HIV³ can kill. Mrs. Brooks: We have talked to him that we hope that he will be one of the people that can maintain this disease.

These two metaphors typically suggest different framings of the situation of AIDS and experiencing HIV. In the “fight” metaphor, the disease is regarded as a kind of enemy or aggressor, patients should pay much attention to this fight to the AIDS enemy or aggressor, and the government must also play a right role in this long fight. In comparison, the “kill” metaphor in the second extract above implies HIV can be a killer once a person was inflected with it, he or she may be killed, and people around them also hope that they can overcome this virus. These two framings imply different relationships between various subjects and diseases, may thus reflect and reinforce different ways of experiencing the illness, with a potentially influential factors on the individual’s sense of self.

In this article, there are two main interrelated perspectives on metaphor considering these framing effects: cognitive (e.g. Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) and practice-based (e.g. Reisfield & Wilson, 2004). All two perspectives are concerned with the implications of the existence and the use of different metaphors, though, each has its own specific scopes. From a cognitive perspective, many scholars have shown that metaphors are concerned with thought and embodied experiences (Gibbs, 2002). We show how metaphors in thought and embodied experiences certify the central role of metaphor in conceptual structures and processes. From a practice perspective, the focus point is on how metaphors can help or hinder communication in particular settings (e.g. healthcare or diagnoses). Patients’ war-related, kill-related and other some relevant metaphors can express and reinforce complex feelings on individuals, such as positive, negative or neutral; people around them may bring effects to society even some extreme behaviors included. What is worthy to mentioned is that AIDS

³ There is a subtle difference between AIDS and HIV. HIV is a human immune system virus that destroys human CD4 cells and disables the human immune system. AIDS is an acquired immune system syndrome. Because the immune system is destroyed, patients are easily infected by bacteria or viruses and various diseases occur frequently. AIDS is a symptom of late HIV infection. (<https://zhidao.baidu.com/question/13126015.html>)

is different from cancer, it is a kind of infectious and chronic disease for lifelong, and our goal is to make recommendations for policy makers or charity campaigns about which metaphors should be adopted and which should be avoided. The notion of “framing” is defined in different ways as a central to two perspectives, thus, it is difficult to define a clear consensus on how framing works and how best to analyze it, therefore, it may will be more clearer and there are merits in applying the notion of framing at levels of generality in metaphor analysis (conceptual metaphors and linguistic metaphors), one is responsible to pay more attention to what expressions can and cannot be drawn at each level. We display the theoretical and practical advantages of taking two levels into account when considering the use of metaphor for communicating about sensitive topics such as AIDS. The importance of a systematic analysis of actual metaphor used by members of specific communities and a “rich” definition of framing is needed when evaluating, comprehending and commenting. In a word, this article aims to arise people’s attention to using metaphorical expressions and provide a blueprint of good practice in framing analysis of illness metaphors.

2. FRAMING AND METAPHOR

As mentioned before, “framing” itself is metaphorically often referred as the central function of metaphor. To introduce the notions of “frame” and “framing”, it can be shown that framing theory shows exactly how frames become embedded within and make themselves manifest in a text, or how framing influences thinking. Metaphors shape and structure thought (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), the metaphorically framing AIDS affects people’s understanding of diseases in various nuance ways. We consider how the framing power of metaphor has been unfolded in previous work from the perspectives of cognition and healthcare practice.

2.1 Frames and Framing

The definitions of “frame” and “framing” have been used in a range of different fields. Bateson (1955) is the first one who puts forward the notion of frame in psychology; American sociologist Goffman (1967), who has made classic studies in sociology and he emphasizes that his concern is the experience structure that individuals have at any moment in social life; American artificial intelligence expert Minsky (1975) firstly puts forward frame theory, he thinks the framework is the representation of our knowledge of the world and then applies it to computer psychology; Fillmore (1975, 1985) introduces Frame theory to semantics and makes a big influence on the later study on cognitive structures based on human experiences. Under such circumstances, Lakoff (2004) applies the notion frame in cognitive science and sociology to the fields of politics. Frame choice is

a dynamic process, it is a conceptual representation of experience and provide a solid or flexible structure that enables us to comprehend the partial meaning in the whole part. There are many inevitable differences between different fields, for example, in analyzing the cognitive metaphors and linguistic metaphors, the nuanced framings and meanings are different. According to Entman (1993), who provides an overarching definition of “framing” that aims to reconcile the different uses of the term in different disciplines in relation to communication:

a. Framing essentially involves *selection* and *salience*. To frame is to *select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, casual interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation* for the item described. (Entman, 1993, p.52; italics in original)

b. Frames, then, *defines problems*-determine what a casual agent is doing with what costs and benefits, usually measured in terms of common cultural values; *diagnose causes*-identify the forces creating the problem; *make moral judgments*-evaluate causal agents and their effects; and *suggest remedies*-offer and justify treatments for the problems and predict their likely effects. A single sentence may perform more than one of these four framing functions, although many sentences in a text may perform none of them. And a frame in any particular text may not necessarily include all four functions. (Entman, 1993, p.52; italics in original)

Entman suggests that frames, broadly speaking, can be classified “at least four locations in the communication process: the communicator, the text, the receiver and the culture” (Entman, 1993, p.52). Although these four locations have a close relevance with each other, our analysis on framing can’t include the whole four parts, this article mainly focuses on the communicator and culture aspects. Framing in all four locations includes similar functions: selection and highlighting, and use of the highlighted elements to construct an argument about problems and their causation, evaluation, and/or solution. (Entman, 1993, p.52)

Therefore, in terms of an understanding personally, there exists a nuanced difference between frame and framing in the process of recognizing a metaphorical expression at different levels. Frame is a kind of relatively fixed, static model in the given text which in order to understand and display the contents. It determines and influences the framing process and audiences’ understanding of information. By contrast, framing is a dynamic process that emphasizes the creation and operation of a still frame model, that is, the constriction of the relevant discourse. The main function of framing is to highlight goals in the discourse and achieve purposes.

2.2 Frames and Metaphor in Cognition

In 1980, Lakoff and Johnson proposed conceptual

metaphor theory, metaphor firstly defined as mappings (or sets of correspondences) onto different domains in conceptual system. Lakoff and Johnson’s notion of conceptual domains owes much to Fillmore’s concept of frames in semantics, which also has a big influence in cognitive linguistics. The development of Fillmore’s concept of frames has undergone roughly from Case Grammar, scenes-and-frames paradigm to Frame Semantics, which show the frame is no longer a language structure, but a cognitive conceptual structure derived from human life experience and a cognitive construction method. Frame theory expands and extends the concept of conceptual metaphor, it points out that people think in terms of frames and metaphors, and the mapping onto different frameworks is a metaphor.

Furthermore, the mapping from source domain to target domain is partial and selective, but not arbitrary and blind, target domain will display restrictions for mapping contents. For example, in the conceptual metaphor TIME IS MONEY, this conceptual metaphor involves the mapping aspects of the source domain of MONEY onto aspects of the target domain of TIME, however, not all frameworks about money are projected onto the concept of time. Money is endless, if we lose money, we can earn it again as much as possible, but time is limited. Once time is lost, it will never come back. Therefore, when we use the source domain to express the target domain, it always highlights similar features and hide the irrelevant features. And as for what are the kind of relevant features that need to be highlighted, and which are irrelevant features that need to be hidden, they are constrained by the subject and specific context. Just as conceptual metaphors, they can highlight similar features and hide irrelevant features, frames also call attention to some aspects of reality while obscuring other elements, which might lead receivers to have different reactions.

A conceptual system is formed by mapping over from source domain to target domain, conceptual metaphor can be regarded as a relatively fixed association pattern formed by mapping relationships onto different concepts established by human beings according to their own experiences, and this is the formation of frame. When this mapping is needed, the cognitive framework can be activated to form a metaphor. Information about the physical experience stored in the brain in the past, people can form a frame in the brain. For example, LIFE IS A JOURNEY⁴, once people mentioned the word “life”, each node in the framework of the word “JOURNEY” will be activated, such as LOCATIONS, MOTIONS AND PATHS and other relevant words, forming metaphors through mapping. More details are as follows:

a. STATES ARE LOCATIONS

He is at a crossroads in his life.

⁴ In Conceptual Metaphor Theory, people use small capitals for conceptual domains and the formulation of conceptual metaphors.

b. CHANGE IS MOTION

He went from his forties to his fifties without a hint of mid-life crisis.

c. MEANS ARE PATHS

He followed an unconditional course during his life.

d. DIFFICULTIES ARE IMPEDIMENTS TO MOTION

Throughout his working life problematic professional relationships had somehow always got in his way.

e. PURPOSEFUL ACTIVITIES ARE JOURNEYS

His life had been a rather strange journey.

In everyday life, the composition of this cognitive framework is not arbitrary. People often refer to their familiar experience, touchable and specific concept based on their own embodied experience to conceptualize, experience and set up abstract conceptions.

In the original version of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (short for CMT), Lakoff and Johnson (1980) use the term domain to refer to the conceptual structure involved in metaphorical mappings. Nevertheless, there are some problems in the later development of the theory, which have explicitly shown both the choice of level of conceptual structure involved in mappings and the process of labelling both conceptual structures and conceptual metaphors (e.g. Croft & Cruse 2004, pp.7-29; Sullivan, 2013; Dancygier & Sweetser, 2014). As a result, many different terms have been used to describe more specific structures involving representations of particular situations and the notion of frames (e.g. Sullivan, 2013) is defined in contrast with that of domain, which is used to capture a sub-domain structure, that is to say, a domain can be integrated with multiple frames, for example, the BODY domain includes frames such as EXERCISE, INGESTION, DIGESTION and many others (Sullivan, 2013).

Metaphor and Frame are both important theories in the field of cognitive linguistics. Metaphor is a conceptual system formed the source domain mapping onto the target domain. This kind of conceptual system is built on a relatively fixed mode, that is, frame. When we need this mapping relationship, we can activate cognitive framework to form metaphor. However, the formation of framework is not causal, even for the same thing, because of the different cognitive perspectives, the activated modes are not identical. Metaphor is not just a feature of language, but a kind of thought, it is one cognitive domain (generally an abstract, experiential domain) understood or mapped onto in terms of another specific domain (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Conceptual metaphor is fundamental to how speakers illustrate their thoughts, and with metaphor we express how we conceive of the world and our roles in it. We can say the triggering of frames in one metaphor or different metaphors can adequately produce more detailed understandings and come into being a multi-dimension model in accounting for figurative languages.

2.3 Framing and Metaphor in Healthcare Practice

The framing power of metaphor is exuberantly relevant in areas such as health-care. The choice for different descriptions of illness can have positive, neutral and negative meanings varied from each individual, and some negative effects may make patients or well-being of people fall into a vulnerable situation. Such diverse framings from individuals display the positive, negative or neutral attitudes and produce the potential consequences, which should be emphasized not only from personal talking, but also to a higher level, such as the whole society. The main goal is trying to set up guidelines or suggestions for patients, doctors and policymakers on what kinds of language should or should not be applied.

In Sontag's (1979) *Illness as Metaphor*, AIDS is described as: an invasion, and it is invoked the reminiscent of syphilis: pollution. And in media articles and academic papers that are concerned with practices and training in healthcare communication (e.g. Miller, 2010). The following positive example shows the positive attitude though Saviano had battled AIDS for years, words "fighter" and "battled" seem to be a tough process for years, but he had much courage after hearing what the doctor's saying.

• She also knew Saviano was a fighter: He had battled AIDS for years, and doctors said he had a good chance of living if he found a kidney match. "I'm giving my kidney to a good place," Pavlak, of St. Paul, remembered thinking when she decided she would undergo the tests and surgery.

Therefore, people should give an increasing awareness and pay close attention to the relationship among healthcare professionals and individuals talking of the potential negative consequences of war-related and death-related metaphors for AIDS, such negative words should be avoided especially for patients. People describe different forms of metaphors for AIDS when they talk to patients or friends, so metaphors do not work in the same way for everyone, different labels are used to refer different general metaphors. Metaphors do not work in the same way for everyone, and different metaphors can be motivated for various angles (Reisfield & Wilson, 2004; Semino *et al.*, 2015).

Most studies on HIV/AIDS mostly focus on the positive or negative collocations simply based on subjective judgment, or to analyze it from aspects of illness singly, however, many scholars seldom combine the two with other aspects, such as framing theory in cognitive linguistics and corpus linguistics, and the study of discourse analysis with cognitive linguistics theories is rarely, especially those sensitive topics about illness. Therefore, in the rest of this article, we will explicitly and systematically use a multi-dimension way of analyzing metaphors and framings, and recommendations will be displayed for communications about AIDS/HIV based on the study evidence.

3. A STUDY ON THE TYPES OF METAPHOR IN AIDS: A CORPUS-BASED STUDY

By collecting data from Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) and English Web 2015 (enTenTen15) Corpus in Sketch Engine, the online corpus was used to extend the analysis. Overall, the analysis shows that patients represented in the two corpora use a variety of metaphors to talk about different aspects of their experiences, and to find frequent patterns when other people talking about AIDS/HIV and their collocations.

By typing words “AIDS” and “HIV” in COCA, on the one hand, Table 1-a and Table 1-b below will show the frequency, MI (mutual information) and collocations about two words. According to MI, if this value is higher than three, the significance of the match is high, to make a further inference, the higher the value, the stronger the significance. On the other hand, based on the tables and according to the emotional tendency in some sentences, we analyze the roles of framings played. Similarly, typing two words separately and Table 2-a⁵ and Table 2-b⁶ also shows the same items of two words, though, different from the former, the next standard of classification is based on the parts of speech and the typicality score (LogDice), indicating how strong the collocation is. A low score means that these words in the collocation also frequently combine with many other words. There are also some sentences analysis given below. There is a contrast between COCA and (enTenTen15) Corpus in Sketch Engine, by analyzing collocations in example sentences from these two corpora, our purpose is to testify whether the function of such metaphoric framings in these expressions are consistent in two corpora. The aim of this part is to give a fully describe on different kinds of metaphoric framing about AIDS/HIV.

3.1 Metaphors in Talk of Illness

In recent years, a great deal of studies on the ways people use metaphor in talking about their experiences of illness. The topic from academic disciplines to other scales is very sophisticated and large. Studies have shown that patients routinely employ a wide range of metaphorical expressions as they talk about illness and their subjective experiences of illness.

The interest of the disease metaphor happens to be that it refers to a disease that carries too much mystery and is filled with too many fateful illusions. Therefore, the viewpoints attached to the disease itself and the rhetorical

metaphors imposed on the disease reflect to a certain extent the great defects of the culture of our times. It also reflects the gloomy attitude of humans to disease and even death. Patients are largely influenced by the types of explanations provided for them by medical caregivers, and it is obvious that what is happening to each individual varies from person to person. Therefore, metaphors appear to have both a representational and determinative function for individuals.

To take an example, Semino *et al.* (2018) gave an integrated approach to metaphors for cancer from the perspective of cognition, discourse and practice, showing the theoretical and practical advantages of taking into account when talking about the sensitive topics such as cancer. The analysis of metaphors shows the “battle”, “violence” and the “war” metaphors in relation to cancer during the patients as fighters for their illnesses. These metaphors in different ways, at different times, allowed individuals define their illness experience in metaphorical ways that sometimes differ from the metaphors used by physicians. The “battle”, “violence” and the “war” metaphors in relation to cancer between physical body and the disease may not only a battle or a war, but also from their struggle between psychological self and illness. In addition, one question is that whether the metaphors talked by patients who are ill or recovering from illness are different from those people in healthy condition talking about their healthy experiences. There may exist a big gap in describing illness between patients and people in healthy condition. That is to say, the particularly AIDS and cancer, are not different from those primarily used by people in good health, but it does not disturb the fundamental way that people metaphorically make sense of their lives.

3.2 Conceptual Metaphor Based on Cognitive Research

We have identified the main metaphorical words (capital letters in tables) from COCA which can be seen in Table 1-a and Table 1-b, as we can see, there are variously referred to as “FIGHT”, “KILL”, “WAR”, and “DEATH” metaphors. Negative emotional tendency is the most apparent in both tables, it can be seen that the theme words with high frequency are respectively DEATH words, WAR words and ADVENTURE words. Therefore, it can be concluded that AIDS is the metaphor of “DEATH”, “ADVENTURE” respectively. These metaphors take on different forms under the framework of these general metaphors. And in Section 4.1, more specific analyses and examples will be given. In addition, the MI score of these collocations are remarkable, which to some extent, we can say these collocations are related with the patients’ experiences.

⁵ Three sub-tables are included as a whole part of AIDS collocations from the perspective of parts of speech.

⁶ Three sub-tables are included as a whole part of HIV collocations from the perspective of parts of speech.

Table 1-a
COCA (P: Positive N0: Neutral N: Negative)

AIDS	Frequency	MI	Emotional tendency
Died	468	5.28	N
Fight	263	4.71	P
Dying	222	6.07	N
Combat	48	3.08	P
Deadly	30	3.06	N
Killers	7	3.40	N

Table 1-b

HIV	Frequency	MI	Emotional tendency
Risk	804	6.84	N
Living	277	4.84	P
Antibody	70	9.20	N
Lifetime	17	3.79	N0
Deadly	12	3.70	N
Kills	5	3.51	N
Empowerment	4	3.93	P

3.3 Linguistic Metaphor Based on Discourse Research

As we have mentioned, the conceptual domains of CMT tend to be postulated at a very high level of generality. Some linguistic metaphors show distinctive tendencies in terms of how they are used to frame the patient's experiences. The same word may show a nuanced difference in different sentences. In this part, we will display the data from Sketch Engine (Table 2-a and Table 2-b) and follow a number of previous studies in considering conceptual strictures at the sub-domain level to account for the framing implications of specific patterns in our data that are not enough to account for in terms of general conceptual metaphors (e.g. Sullivan, 2013). In addition to the "DEATH" and "WAR" metaphors mentioned above, there are also "PAIN", "DISASTER" and "CHALLENGE" metaphors. Thus, framing is relevant with some kind of specific settings, which includes: entities/participants, roles and relationships, attitudes and emotions. It is a process that involves the use of metaphorical expressions to reflect and facilitate particular understanding and evaluations of topics or situations (Semino *et al.*, 2018). And in Section 4.2, more examples and their corresponding analyses will be displayed.

Table 2-a
2015 Corpus

AIDS (N.)	Frequency	Log dice
Killer	34	7.23
Crime	69	6.85
Stigma	417	5.75
Death	1,084	5.44
Scourge	203	4.84

AIDS (V.)	Frequency	Log dice
Fight	1,837	6.6
Combat	500	6.1
Kill	279	4.67
Battle	75	4.62
Afflict	33	4.56

Table 2-b

HIV (N.)	Frequency	Log dice
Sentence	136	9.7
Stigma	1,014	6.6
Punishment	12	6.28
Killer	11	5.67
Challenge	40	4.14

HIV (V.)	Frequency	Log Dice
Combat	2,044	7.83
Fight	2,241	6.77
Eradicate	343	6.27
Battle	329	6.12
Ravage	98	5.7

4. A STUDY ON THE ROLE OF AIDS METAPHOR BASED ON FRAMING THEORY

The framing implications of metaphors for AIDS are a useful and meaningful case study and there is evidence that metaphor can have an important and potentially beneficial, role in the experience of people with diseases (e.g. Gibbs & Franks, 2002). The problem with the research on metaphor relating to illness is that researchers have primarily much focused their attention on highly personal, idiosyncratic metaphors and downplayed the importance of conventional metaphorical expressions. Conventional metaphors are typically viewed as "dead" metaphors or merely clichés (Gibbs, 1994). But conversely, conventional metaphors reflect the conceptual thought, which is more vivid and alive in the minds of speakers and listeners. Unfortunately, there are less studies on such kind of selected metaphors and do not systematically provide a complete analysis of framings for all the metaphors. We focus on metaphors and propose an account of their framing implications according to their specific usages in the following analysis and examples. In Section 4.1 we discuss mappings between the source domains and target domains of CMT, and point out some limitations of this approach. In Section 4.2 we discuss some examples from the perspective of metaphoremes which can be accounted for the use of specific linguistic expressions by specific groups in specific communities under specific contexts of communication. In Section 4.3 we discuss the implications of the two levels of analysis in the healthcare of communication.

4.1 Conceptual Metaphors in the Cognitive Approach to Metaphor

Taking these sentences as examples below, though there is a nuanced difference of AIDS and HIV, some words of the degree may various, there are some similar degree words,

for example, FIGHT, KILL and WAR etc. Therefore, we display some sentences according to the types of metaphor. According to the data, it can be roughly classified into three types.

The first one is “WAR” metaphor framework, for example (the relevant expressions are underlined):

a. It’s like being in a war when you have to make sacrifices, give parts of your life up and do so many things differently. You feel you are under constant attack by an invisible enemy.

b. The defeat of most infectious disease is likely to be but temporary, or a victory in a skirmish rather than a final triumph in a war.

c. Unite for children. Unite against AIDS.

d. Uniting the world against the AIDS.

e. Keep it safe, fighting HIV.

f. Now it is time for you to step up and protect yourselves. There is a salient war raging. It is the war on HIV.

g. The above image is freely available for any and all bloggers and webmasters who wish to express their stance against the AIDS War and its tragic consequences.

The use of “war” in examples a, b, f and g has clear military associations, it is for patients who are infected with AIDS or in people describing the disease. In the example g, the word “tragic” may suggest that such disease may have a high frequency with negative adjectives. The other expressions may do not suggest such associations, they are propaganda, that is to say, making a connection between AIDS and war, to fight, to win this battle, people may connect with patients to resist together this disease, or people in good condition pay attention to their surroundings. The two domains belong to different conceptual areas, but they all aim to resist the invasion of the other part. There are strengths and weaknesses, there are experiences of pain and even death, they all have a beginning, the process of development to the end, etc. AIDS prevention is a metaphor for war is a mapping from the source domain to the target domain. The conceptual system of people is to link the knowledge of AIDS prevention with the feelings of war. Using this known, specific knowledge to understand the concept of expressing an unknown abstract notion.

The second one is DEATH metaphor framework, for example (the relevant expressions are underlined):

h. Using it won’t kill you, Not using it might. Help stop AIDS. Use a condom.

i. ADIS is a mass murderer.

j. Nevertheless, they may be killed because their presence aids murder.

k. With the moisture of love, they will have more courage to fight the killer.

l. With They are afraid of illness, more terrible indifference.

m. Their vehement repudiation of standard public

health and disease control measures has guaranteed that thousands more of them will die the horrible death AIDS confers on its victims.

n. Now given that AIDS kills T-cells, but a regenerated thymus makes more and better T-cells, that’s a really good thing.

The words “kill”, “murderer” and “killer” in the examples h, i, j, k and n make an obvious statement, AIDS is the target domain, and death is the source domain. AIDS as an incurable disease remains mysterious and deadly, when talking AIDS, people who are inflected are painful and abnormal. Whether the disease is murderous or sick, it is mysterious and indifferent, it can kill people, people are afraid of them, the victims are painful, that is the word “indifference” used in the example l, this psychological feeling may even more serious than kill people directly.

The third one is DEVIL metaphor framework, for example (the relevant expressions are underlined):

o. AIDS is sin, is evil, is plague.

Following Lakoff and Johnson (1980), expressions such as these should be interpreted as realization of conceptual metaphors involving “devil” as the source domain, a conventional conceptual metaphor that can be activated DISEASE IS MONSTER. Isolation, discrimination, and expulsion are almost the ways in human history to treat the incurable so called demonic diseases.

At a general level, therefore, the pattern exemplified above can be seen as the realization of a conventional conceptual metaphor that can be labelled BEING ILL WITH AIDS/HIV IS A BIG CHALLENGE WITH THE DISEASE. This conceptual metaphor can also in turn be seen as a more general metaphor BEING ILL IS A BIG CHALLENGE WITH DISEASE, which could also capture expressions such as “fighting” cancer and other diseases, and so on. What’s more, an even more general level, these metaphors can be illustrated in terms of a more basic level metaphor DIFFICULTIES ARE OPPONENTS, which in Grady’s (1997) terms, can be seen as the “primary” metaphor arising from an experiential correlation between difficulties and aggressors.

And now let us consider how these three different frameworks account for the framing implications. Generally speaking, all of the examples suggest a consistent framing of the experiences of illness. The patient is defined different roles in the disease, such as fighter, and the disease itself is placed in the role of aggressor or enemy; If being cured or living longer, patients are construed as winners in the fight, while not recovering or dying correspond to be killed or losing the fight. More generally, these expressions take the “experiential viewpoint” of the patients and people in good condition, suggesting difficulty, danger, and the need both patients and healthy people for bravery (Dancygier & Sweetser 2014, p.46). In other words, it is both possible

and meaningful to group them together under one conceptual metaphor resulting in one particular framing of the illness experience (Semino *et al.*, 2018). Overall, framing varies in terms of the specific framings from the individuals involved. In addition, there are also differences among the former examples, particularly in terms of the relationship between the person and the disease, thus it could result in different framings. The former examples may show the failure and negative attitudes of the fighters, the patient's own agency and determination in difficult circumstances collapsed in a moment. The empowerment position may suggest a sense of pride in one's own efforts and much courage to confront the disease, and disempowerment position can be displayed from negative emotions and places of patients. Such differences should prevent hasty conclusions about whether the conceptual metaphor is good or bad.

To make a short summary. First, a conceptual metaphor can account for a wide variety of expressions according to different positions and angles. Secondly, it can be clearly related to a more basic primary metaphor that explains its motivation in experience alongside similar metaphors with different target domains (Semino *et al.*, 2018). Thirdly, to compare within and across languages and cultures: the metaphorical construction of illnesses may not same for different illnesses within the same language, for example, cancer can be collocated with journey, but AIDS can't, it may because the different characteristics and nature (cancer isn't epidemic and stable relatively in the whole life; in contrast AIDS is infectious and very painful in the late period), what's more, the same illness in different languages and cultures also vary from each other. Importantly, at this level of analysis, the notion of framing captures the implications for thought and experiences relatively and map onto a very general correspondences between domains in conceptual structure. Therefore, a general source domain such as BIG CHALLENGE allows some useful generalizations, but it does not account for variations in terms of some important aspects of framing which are related with potential consequences. We need to analyze the potential factors in a more detailed angle.

4.2 Linguistic Metaphors in Discourse-Based Approach to Metaphor

As is shown above, there are some common words both collocating with AIDS and HIV, however, linguistic metaphors show the nuanced differences when we recognizing what kind of metaphors they belong to.

a. Instead, disease offered the most efficient and fastest way to kill the billions that must soon die if the population crisis is to be solved. AIDS is not an efficient killer because it is too slow.

b. AIDS is a human-species killer. It is the first infection we know, which has the capability of making the human species extinct.

c. It likely won't surprise you to know that many

members of the public believe that that AIDS is no longer a killer since the advent of protease inhibitors and the "cocktails," but they could not be more wrong.

When referring the word "kill", we usually have negative attitudes in sentence b, but as it displays in sentence a, other diseases may have a violent influences on bodies, but AIDS have a chronic impact on bodies, thus, it will not kill patients immediately, such expressions have shown four times in the data, therefore, patients need more courage and find themselves in adverse circumstances, they need to have an optimistic and active attitudes. In sentence c, "AIDS might no longer be a killer", but when considering the whole context, it still a great threat for people.

The particular use of "kill/killer" will produce converse meanings under different circumstances. In Cameron and Deignan's (2006) terms, "kill/killer" can therefore be seen as an example of a metaphoreme, as it has very specific semantics, affective, and pragmatic qualities that do not apply in the same way to other apparently similar expressions, such as "deadly" or "death", or to non-metaphorical uses of the noun. The general language-wide metaphoreme is employed in a specific sense and for specific purposes by the community of speakers talking AIDS/HIV or patients with it, who use it to frame people who are ill in an empowered or disempowered way (Gibbs and Cameron, 2008).

d. Jewel affirms that until she can no longer do so, she will fight the good fight of faith by encouraging others to love and protect themselves and to believe in themselves because HIV is not a death sentence but it is a life sentence and with education, a proactive take on treatment, great moral support and a strong spiritual foundation, one can keep their eyes fixed upward in love, joy, happiness and peace with H.

e. Funeka helped me accept my status and deal with it," Tinzi said. "But most importantly, she taught me that HIV is not a death sentence, for me or my child."

f. This was my future, this was my destiny, a coffin. I was going to die. They say HIV is not a death sentence anymore. What they don't tell you is that HIV is a death sentence for prosperity especially for HIV-positive women. HIV is often a lifelong sentence of poverty for women.

In the paragraphs d, e and f, the word "sentence" shows the different meanings, the original meaning of "sentence" is a kind of judgement, a kind of neutral word, but with kinds of metaphoremes of the same word "sentence", it also has positive and negative meanings. In paragraphs d and e, "sentence" is used by patients to present themselves and others as active, determined, and optimistic people who never give up, regardless of finding themselves in adverse circumstances, especially in d, it tends to involve courage for oneself or others, and encourage others. These various forms of a certain word are consistently used to express a particular topic, that

is, the roles, identities, and mutual relationships of that metaphor subset of contributors to the linear structure. The framing implications or potential consequences are varied from individual patients and metaphorical patterns, which can only be accounted where the foundation is firmly grounded in the specific context of communication. At this level, framing is therefore linked to specific expressions as they are used metaphorically by the members of a particular discourse community using a particular channel of communication (Semino *et al.* 2018).

4.3 Implications for Practice in Communication About AIDS

HIV is spread primarily by unprotected sex, contaminated blood transfusions, hypodermic needles, and from mother to child during pregnancy, delivery, or breastfeeding (Rom WN, Markowitz SB, 2007). The infection rate of the latter two has been controlled, but the ratio of first factor rises at a high speed. The word “dirty” is often used for describing AIDS related with patients, things and objects, because the route of infection is paralyzed and the infected person is dirty, the body is not clean, the virus is in need of being washed. As a result, AIDS has brought about a metaphorical framework of pollution and metamorphism. The pollution is the process by which the virus erodes the body. It is also the way in which the virus is transmitted between people. It is also the corrupt symbol of the morality and ignorance of sexual attitudes to social life. It is undeniable that some infected people do have some individual responsibilities, and AIDS can indeed play a so-called “regulatory” effect on society. However, such metaphorical framing is a kind of stigmatization of patients: on the one hand, they endure the great suffering caused by the illness in the later period, although this pain can be temporarily controlled by drugs; on the other hand, it is the most terrible enemy that bears the accusation of public opinions. Based on this circumstance, analyze the deep metaphorical framework and find out how people frame when they express.

The analysis in the level of conceptual metaphors additionally shows that there is no single War, Death and Devil metaphor for AIDS, patients use violence-related metaphors to talk about a variety of aspects of their experiences of illness. These findings potentially highlight a need to avoid negative metaphors or some other intersectional disempowerment metaphors. It is also vital to highlight future courage and supports for patients, and a more sensitive communication approach. The analysis at the level of specific linguistic expressions shows that it is vital to pay close attention to specific word choices in specific contexts. A healthcare professional may select alternative expressions and framings instead of using “kill” or “sentence” to indicate their disease will get better and better. And specific expressions are highlighted that healthcare professional would be well advised to actively question in interaction with patients and their remedies.

When considered in combination, the two levels of analysis can be used to develop a nuanced, evidence-based approach to communication in healthcare, which distinguish between what is appropriate when communicating with the public or patients from what may be appropriate when interacting with small groups or individuals (Semino *et al.*, 2018).

CONCLUSIONS

In this article we have focused on the “framing” function of metaphor as a phenomenon which is relevant from the perspective of cognition and practice. Using a corpus-based study, we account for the potential framing effects in using through collocations and contexts with AIDS/HIV.

Results are almost consistent from two data, though the analysis of the level of cognition of based on emotional tendency and the level of linguistic metaphors is based on parts of speech, the potential framing effects playing a vital role of both. These two levels of analysis are complementary. The analysis at the conceptual metaphors makes it possible to use a wide range of metaphorical framings of the same illness across different languages, or of different illnesses within the same language. For example, “journey” collocated with cancer, “dirty” accompanied with AIDS, and both “war” and “enemy” collocated with cancer and AIDS. When the two levels of analysis are combined, we can arrive at a more comprehensive stage of metaphor as a cognitive and discourse phenomenon: firstly, a general conceptual metaphor is grounded with our experiences; secondly, the particular effect and pragmatic associations of specific metaphores emerge from the experiences and communications of people with AIDS or talking about HIV.

In addition, we need to change attitudes towards AIDS patients. There are some suggestions for policy makers, they should try their best to avoid these sensitive words in files and public talks, and it is better to choose more positive and neutral expressions for some charity campaigns, in order to give more courage to patients. It is our responsibility to take more consideration on our language usage in detailed context. People under different culture may shape different framing on the same illness, the theoretical and practical advantages of being aware of sensitive topics such as AIDS when communicating, a “rich” definition of framing will improve the understanding between patients and other people related with them.

REFERENCES

- Bateson, G. (1987). A theory of play and fantasy. In G. Bateson (Ed.). *Steps to an ecology of mind* (pp.183-198). London: Jason Aronson Inc.

- Croft, W., & Cruse, D. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, L., & Deignan, A. (2006). The emergence of metaphor in discourse. *Applied Linguistics*, (4), 671-690.
- Cameron, L., Low, G., & Maslen, R. (2010). Finding systematicity in metaphor use. In L. Cameron, & R. Maslen (Eds.), *Metaphor analysis: Research practice in applied linguistics, social sciences and the humanities* (pp.116-146). Equinox.
- Dancygier, B., & Sweetser, E. (2014). *Figurative language*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Entman, R. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, (4), 51-58.
- Fillmore, C. (1975). *An alternative to checklist theories of meaning*. In C. H. Cogen, G. Thurgood Thompson, K. Whistler, & J. Wright (Eds.), *Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (pp.123-131). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fillmore, C. (1985). Frames and the semantics of understanding. *Quaderni di Semantica*, (6), 222-254.
- Gibbs, R. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbs, R., & Cameron, L. (2008). The social-cognitive dynamics of metaphor performance. *Journal of Cognitive Systems Research*, (9), 64-75.
- Gibbs, R., & Franks, H. (2002). Embodied metaphor in women's narratives about their experiences with cancer. *Health Communication*, (2), 139-165.
- Goffmann, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays in face-to face behavior*. Aldine Publishing Company.
- Grady, J. (1997). *Foundations of meaning: Primary metaphors and primary scenes*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of California.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (2001). *Metaphorik.de, 11 September 2001*. Available at <http://www.metaphorik.de/aufsaeetze/lakoff-september11.htm>. Accessed May 2016.
- Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant! Know your values and frame the debate*. Hartford: Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Miller, R. S. (2010). Speak up: 8 words and phrases to ban in oncology. *Oncology Times*, (12), 20.
- Minsky, M. A. (1975). *A Framework for Representing Knowledge*. In *The Psychology of Computer Vision* (P. H. Winston, Ed.). New York: McGraw- Hill.
- Reisfield, G., & Wilson, G.. (2004). Use of metaphor in the discourse on cancer. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*.
- Ritchie, L. D. (2013). *Metaphor*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rom WN, Markowitz SB. (2007). *Environmental and occupational medicine* (4th ed.). Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge University Press.
- Semino, E. Z., Demjén, J. D., Koller, V., Payne, S., Hardie, H., & Rayson, P. (2017). The online use of violence and journey metaphors by patients with cancer, as compared with health professionals: a mixed methods study. *BMJ Supportive and Palliative Care*, (1), 60-66.
- Semino, E., Demjén, Z., & Demmen, J. (2018). An integrated approach to metaphor and framing in cognition, discourse, and practice, with an application to metaphors for cancer. *Applied Linguistics*, (5), 628-631.
- Sontag, S. (1979). *Illness as metaphor*. New York, Doubleday.
- Sullivan, K. (2013). *Frames and constructions in metaphoric language*. John Benjamins.