Z E S Z Y T Y N A U K O W E UNIWERSYTETU RZESZOWSKIEGO
SERIA FILOLOGICZNA
ZESZYT 120 / 2025 STUDIA ANGLICA RESOVIENSIA 22

DOI: 10.15584/sar.2025.22.4

Anna DROGOSZ[1]
University of Warmia and Mazury, Poland
anna.drogosz@uwm.edu.pl

METAPHORICAL PROJECTIONS IN PISTOL SHOOTING INSTRUCTIONS

Abstract: Extensive research has been conducted within the cognitive semantics theoretical framework to investigate the metaphorical conceptualisation of abstract domains in terms of concrete ones. This body of research lends support to the embodiment paradigm adopted in cognitive science, which emphasises the role of sensorimotor experience in shaping cognition. Meanwhile, the potential application of cross-domain mappings in the conceptualisation and expression of sensorimotor experience has received little attention. This paper attempts to address this issue through an analysis of the linguistic data contained in tips for inexperienced amateur shooters that have been shared by expert shooters on internet blogs and YouTube videos. The study revealed that instructors intentionally and creatively prompt their listeners to activate familiar domains of physical activity and to make projections onto the physical activity of trigger pull, i.e. the skill they are learning. The paper argues that, in the analysed discourse, metaphorical cross-domain mappings can help instructors overcome the challenge of communicating concrete, physical information that cannot be demonstrated and is largely instructors' internal, private sensorimotor sensation. The paper also compares the cross-domain mappings between concrete domains identified in the data with typical conceptual metaphors, and briefly addresses the question of how such mappings relate to the embodiment paradigm.

Key words: sensorimotor experience, cross-domain projections, embodiment paradigm, shooting instructions

1. Introduction

This paper aims to investigate the use of conceptual metaphors in communicating aspects of the sensorimotor experience. Metaphor, as a cognitive mechanism, has been the focus of cognitive semantics, particularly Conceptual Metaphor Theory,

[1] Apart from being a cognitive linguist, the author is a member of the Polish Sport Shooting Federation and an assistant shooting sports judge.

for the last forty-five years. However, much more attention has been given to the role of metaphors in talking about abstract concepts and (presumably) in abstract thinking, which is a logical consequence of adopting the embodied cognition thesis or paradigm, than to the use of metaphorical projections in contexts, in which both target and source domain are concrete. I believe that that the latter topic deserves more attention. In this paper, I will argue that concrete sensorimotor experience that is private — in the sense that it is not easily visible or directly accessible to listeners — can be made public by means of cross-domain mappings between two different concrete domains. These mappings can be realised linguistically as analogies, comparisons, and metaphors. A communicative situation that could provide data for investigating this topic needs to meet the flowing criterion: the speaker wants to share an experience or a skill that cannot be presented directly by a demonstration, the assumption being that if the skill is physically demonstrable then no additional communicative effort is required. For reasons I explain later, the skill of shooting a pistol and instructions how to do it properly provide ideal context and data.

The paper is structured as follows: First, Section 2 provides a brief presentation of the embodied cognition paradigm, followed by a definition of the conceptual metaphor. Next, Section 3 begins with an explanation why shooting instructions offer unique data for studying the use of conceptual metaphors in communication of sensorimotor experience. Section 4 presents and analyses examples from internet blogs and YouTube videos in which instructors or expert shooters provide tips for inexperienced shooters. The discussion of the observations drawn from this analysis is provided at the end.

2. Theoretical background and methodology

The embodied cognition paradigm adopted in cognitive science assumes that 'sensorimotor interactions with the world shape cognition" (Varela et al., [1991] 2016 p. xxv) or, in other words, "the body plays a constitutive role in cognition, that is, cognition depends directly on the body as a functional whole and not just the brain" (Varela et al., [1991] 2016) p. xxvi). Following this paradigm:

> the concepts we have access to and the nature of the 'reality' we think and talk about are a function of our embodiment: we can only talk about what we can perceive and conceive, and the things that we can perceive and conceive derive from embodied experience. From this point of view, the human mind must bear the imprint of embodied experience. (Evans and Green 2006 p. 46)

The embodied cognition paradigm has been embraced by cognitive semantics as one of the guiding principles from the very beginning (Evans, 2007, p. 66) and it determined its research on figurative language to a large extent. If cognition is embodied, then how we think about abstract concepts must be shaped by sensorimotor experience. As Lakoff (1987, 1990, 1993) and Johnson (1987) have

argued, embodied experience can be systematically extended or projected onto more abstract concepts and conceptual domains, providing them with structure (Evans & Green, 2006, p. 46). In turn, language, that is how we talk about abstract domains, can provide data for empirical research.

The idea of projections between domains lies at the core of the notion of conceptual metaphor, the central construct of cognitive semantic studies. Conceptual metaphor is typically defined as "understanding of one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain", with the conceptual domain being defined as "any coherent organization of experience" (Kövecses, 2002, p. 4), or as "[a] form of conceptual projection involving mappings or correspondences holding between distinct conceptual domains" (Evans, 2007, p. 136). Well-known examples of conceptual metaphors involve THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS, ARGUMENT IS WAR or LOVE IS A JOURNEY[2]. In each of these metaphors, there is a target domain, that is "the domain we try to understand" (Kövecses, 2002, p. 4), and the source domain, which provides structure and linguistic expressions for the target domain (Evans, 2007, p. 200). If we look at the metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY in more detail (cf. Kövecses, 2002, p. 6-7), we can see that the conventional scenario of JOURNEY or TRAVEL is used as a source domain to conceptualize the target domain of LOVE. In this metaphor, the elements of the domain of JOURNEY are mapped onto elements of the domain of LOVE, for example, the tavellers correspond to lovers, obstacles on the way correspond to difficulties experienced in a relationship, the vehicle to the relationship itself, etc.

Conceptual metaphors, which in the first place are the way we think about a certain concept, such as LOVE, can manifest in language as metaphorical linguistic expressions, for instance, *It's been a bumpy road*, refers to difficulties experienced by lovers, and *The relationship is foundering,* means that the relationship is likely to fail. However, metaphors can also have visual, gestural or multimodal manifestations as demonstrated by substantial research (see, for example Forceville 2009; Forceville 2017; Forceville/Urios-Aparisi 2009 for visual and multimodal metaphor studies, and Cienki, 2009; Cienki, 2017; Cienki and Müller, 2008; Mittelberg and Waugh; 2009 for research on gestural metaphors).

An important consequence of conceptualizing one conceptual domain in terms of another is that the rich experiential knowledge we have about the source domain can be used to create inferences or metaphorical entailments about the target domain (cf. Evans, 2007, p. 138-139). Thus, our experience with travelling tells us that journeys are a purposeful activity, that they have a destination that travellers may or may not reach, that longer journeys have stages, etc. When LOVE is conceptualized as a JOURNEY, all knowledge and reasoning that is part of the source domain is available to structure our reasoning about the target domain,

[2] It is a typographical convention in cognitive linguistics to use small capital letters for metaphor labels or concepts.

which is why partners who embrace such a metaphorical conceptualization of their relationship may expect it to have some stages and to develop in a certain direction.

The metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY, used here to illustrate the notions of source and target domain, mappings and entailments, is at the same time an example of embodied cognition, as the domain of LOVE is understood in terms of a more concrete and physically experienced domain of JOURNEY. There is extensive research in support of embodied cognition, and it has been partially realized as studies of how concrete domains can structure abstract thinking and manifest in language. It covers such areas as philosophy (e.g. Lakoff & Johnson, 1999), science (e.g. Brown, 2003; Drogosz, 2019; Fojt, 2009; Zawisławska, 2011), mathematics (e.g. Lakoff & Núñez, 2000), music (e.g. Zbikowski, 2008), politics (e.g. Lakoff, 1991; Lakoff, 1996; Sandikcioglu, 2001), value systems (Krzeszowski, 1997) or emotions (e.g. Fussell, 2002; Kövecses, 1986). On the other hand, investigations into projections between concrete, sensorimotor domains are limited, for example Łozińska (2021), who analyses metaphoricity of names for yoga positions, and Müller & Ladevig (2013), who analyse metaphoric expressions of balance in dance lessons. It is the latter study that explicitly argues for the value of studying how people talk about body movements and the sensorimotor experiences for the study of conceptual metaphor (Müller & Ladevig, 2013, p. 296). This paper hopes to contribute to this line of research.

3. Study rationale and methodology

There are several features which potentially make shooting instructions a unique and valuable material for studying functions of metaphors of concrete, sensorimotor sensations. Firstly, shooting a firearm is undoubtedly a physical activity which demands a skill acquired through practice. What is more, its elements can be reduced to very basic physical activities, for example, holding an object in two hands (i.e. pistol grip) or moving the index finger (i.e. trigger pull). Secondly, the most important aspects of shooting (e.g. the trigger pull) cannot be observed when an expert is performing them and learned by imitation: not only is the movement of the shooter's trigger finger very subtle and quick (3-5 seconds), but also it is significantly obscured by the trigger guard. All this makes shooting a private experience of a shooter. What is more, even though the activities of holding an object and moving a finger are physically simple, there are many aspects of how they should be performed in the context of shooting that are counterintuitive, which is discussed later in detail. This makes shooting difficult to learn through trial and error, as any unguided practice is likely to perpetuate mistakes rather than lead to improvement, as some instructors have pointed out in personal communication. Consequently, shooting instructions are not only indispensable in learning how to shoot accurately, but also provide ideal material for studying how a sensorimotor

experience can be communicated, as the only way the expert shooter can share their experience is by (multimodal) communication. Because direct observation and imitation are almost impossible, the instructors verbally and gesturally prompt the learners to create mental images. Such mental images can serve as models for practice, helping to overcome natural tendencies and form new habits. We can say that while instructors cannot directly influence a learner's body to optimize their performance, they can attempt to influence their minds.

The data for this study were collected from Internet blogs and YouTube videos, but a lot of inspiration came from unrecorded personal communication with expert shooters and instructors, as well as informal observations at a shooting range. The material covered three blogs (7,450 words total length) and sixteen YouTube videos (107.68 minutes in total length), out of which three were selected as a source of examples, as they displayed the greatest number of analogies and metaphorical expressions. The list of sources is provided in the Appendix together with abbreviations used to identify the source of examples in the upcoming analysis. The authors of these blogs and videos are experienced shooters, such as sport shooters, ex-military personnel and professional shooting instructors, all native speakers of American English, who share their expertise with amateur shooters. For the sake of simplicity, I refer to the former as "instructors" and the latter as "learners" or "inexperienced shooters". I decided to draw data from both blogs (written language) and videos (spoken language, gestures and visual aids) to make certain that instructors rely on metaphors irrespective of the medium of communication, and even if gestural demonstrations are possible.

There are lots of tips for amateur shooters on the internet, which is why the data needed careful selection. Firstly, I narrowed it down to instructions for pistol shooting because it is more difficult to achieve aiming accuracy with a pistol than with firearms that have a longer sight radius (the longer the sight radius, the easier it is to align the front and rear sights). Secondly, I focused solely on trigger pull, as this is the factor that usually determines accuracy, and it is also the most difficult aspect to teach and learn. Thirdly, I focused on verbal metaphors, although it should be noted that co-verbal gestures play a significant role in shooting instructions and deserve a separate in-depth study.

In the following section I analyse how instructors intentionally create correspondences between some aspect of the trigger pull (target domain) and a supposedly familiar sensorimotor activity (source domain).

4. Analysis

What an inexperienced shooter feels when pulling the trigger with their index finger (i.e. trigger finger) is little resistance from the trigger at the beginning, more resistance later, and a sudden release when the pistol fires. For many people this

experience is initially overwhelming, especially since it involves an explosion very close to their face, and everything is happening too quickly for a conscious analysis, which is why it is a common practice that instructors break down the process of trigger movement into components. The most popular way to do it is to describe the trigger motion in terms of travel with distinct stages, i.e. via the metaphor TRIGGER MOVEMENT IS TRAVEL WITH STAGES. Let us take a closer look at the names of the stages listed in one of the blogs and consider what they technically stand for and entail as instantiations of the metaphor:

(1) The nine trigger positions of a handgun are identified as: Rest (1), Slack (2), Wall (3), Creep (4), Break (5), Overtravel (6), Pin (7), Reverse Travel (8) and Reset (9). (Tarani)

The first stage is Rest. This is the initial, starting position, during which the shooter puts the finger onto the trigger but does not yet exert any pressure and the trigger does not move. The name suggests, however, that the trigger has already done some work or travel, and this is indeed the case if more shots have been broken. Then this is the position reached by the trigger once the motion has been completed.

The second stage is Slack or Take-up which is explained as "any 'positive' movement of the trigger that does not cause the sear to move and does not engage the mainspring" (Hyve). At this stage, the shooter starts pulling the trigger but feels minimal resistance and from their perspective nothing is happening. The name of this stage draws on the maritime source domain of pulling a rope. The correspondence is made between the minimal effort that is needed to move the trigger at this stage and taking up the slack of a rope before it becomes tight and anything can be pulled. This correspondence highlights the ease of the movement but also the fact that it is not the proper pull yet but just a necessary preparation before the real action is done.

The next stage was called Wall by Rob Leatham, a multi-time world champion and Master level instructor (Tarani). This is the point "where the trigger action first engages the resistance of the sear" (Hyve) and the shooter feels that now far more pressure is needed to keep moving the trigger. Within the travel scenario, the name activates the experience of an encounter with an obstacle that renders movement difficult: the moving entity hits a wall.

The name of the fifth stage (Creep) is attributed to leading competitive shooter Travis McCamish (Tarani). Technically, it is "any 'positive' movement of the trigger that does cause the sear to move and does engage the mainspring" (Hyve). At this stage the shooter continues to pull the trigger trying to overcome its resistance. Calling this stage of trigger movement Creep not only highlights the effort involved in this stage of the pull (creeping demands more effort than walking or even running), but also entails that this movement is slow and careful, as in expectation of something unexpected to happen.

The next stage, Break, is "the point of the trigger action where the sear releases the hammer (or the striker, depending on the type of action)" (Hyve). The shooter

experiences a sudden release of the trigger and the gun fires. This stage of sudden release of the trigger is conceptualized in terms of breaking an object, e.g. a stick. What the name Break highlights is the fact that the release is sudden, giving the effect of surprise or even being startled.

After the Break comes Overtravel, which is "any 'positive' movement of the trigger after the break" (Hyve). This is the movement of the trigger after the resistance is overcome up to the point when it cannot move any further to the rear. The reuse of the word "travel" in the name reinforces the conceptualization of the trigger movement in terms of a structured JOURNEY. Overtravel is followed by Pin, which is not discussed here because this stage, as an enforced stop, is not part of a natural movement of the trigger, and many instructors are even against practicing it.

Finally, there is Reverse travel and Reset, which is "the 'negative' movement […] of the trigger to the point that the trigger re-engages the sear (or the striker, depending on the type of action), and the gun can be fired again" (Hyve). In other words, the trigger moves away from the shooter to assume the position from which another shot is possible.

I want to argue that the conceptualization and description of trigger movement as TRAVEL with stages has important positive consequences for the learner. Firstly, it entails regularity and predictability of the movement, which usually reduces stress. If stages are well defined and always occur in the same sequence, then we know what and when to expect. The whole process of trigger pull becomes more controlled. Secondly, this description lists more stages than an inexperienced shooter is able to identify themselves, which can stimulate their sensitivity to what their index finger can feel while pulling the trigger. Thirdly, some of the names of the stages can function as verbal prompts to create mental images that recreate a familiar sensorimotor experience, such as taking up slack of a rope, hitting a wall, creeping or breaking an object.

The description of trigger movement discussed above appears to be well established among instructors. Some instructors may conflate two or three stages into one, or omit one of the stages, but the general conceptualisation and names remain the same. What is more, in the studied blogs and videos, I found little creativity in the description of this aspect of trigger pull, as the instructions recorded turned out to be rather uniform. This is probably because the characteristics of the trigger movement, including its stages, result from the specifics of mechanical construction of the pistol and are independent of the shooter. However, this is not the case with other aspects of the trigger pull: the direction of the pull, the speed of the movement, and energy involved in the pull. Not only is their optimal execution fully dependent on the shooter, but it is also often counterintuitive and goes against physiological habits. Consequently, this is the area in which novice shooters tend to make many mistakes, and in which instructors encourage them to activate sensorimotor sensations connected with a situation they are familiar with, project these sensations onto an aspect of trigger pull, and thus improve their performance.

The first typical mistake relates to the direction in which pressure is applied to the trigger. Although the trigger itself cannot be pushed to the right or left as it can only move towards or away from the shooter, applying pressure in the wrong direction can cause the entire pistol to move and negatively affect accuracy. Instructors emphasise that the movement must be "straight back", and imagining touching one's own nose can help to establish the correct direction:

(2) So, the second principle of the trigger control is the direction of the press. What's the answer? Straight back. […] How are we going to control that straight back feeling? It's more mental and the best visual analogy, a mental analogy that I will recommend you do, imagine that you want to simply **touch your nose with your finger**. (Pro)

The next group of problems derives from the stages of the trigger pull discussed earlier. The difference in the resistance of the trigger between Pre-travel and Wall requires the shooter to increase the pressure on the trigger to overcome Wall. One common suboptimal reaction is to apply too much pressure. In (3), the instructor uses the analogy of operating a computer mouse or keyboard to evoke the sensation of gently but firmly applying force.

(3) The challenging part is that you need to have a stiff and firm grip, but your trigger manipulations should be gentle – **similar to the effort used to click a mouse or type on a keyboard.** (Hyve)

Another typical mistake is the sudden, instinctive increase in the speed of finger movement, together with increased pressure, which is known as "jerking the trigger". The challenge, then, is to learn how to increase the pressure applied by the finger without speeding up its movement. Instructors draw on domains of experience that can provide a reference model of smooth, constant and consistent movement. On the one hand, they can evoke situations in which the successful use of some device requires a constant speed, such as when PULLING A ZIPPER (4), PRESSING A CAMERA BUTTON (5), or USING A SQUIRT GUN (6). On the other hand, they can make reference to situations involving physical interaction with other people, in which controlled movement is necessary, either because sudden movement can be harmful, such as when picking up a child (7), or because it is socially unacceptable, such as when shaking hands (8).

(4) Constant speed is a must if you want to be successful with rolling–this is why I like to refer to this trigger manipulation as **the zipper pull**, too. When you zip something open or closed, you will typically maintain **the same controlled speed** while doing so. (Hyve)

(5) 'Steady press' is moving through each of the positions with continuous motion akin to that of **using a squirt gun where you maintain continual water pressure**. If you stop anywhere along the way on either path (break or reset) then you increase the probability of altering alignment. (Tarani)

(6) There's a tendency that as soon as the sights are aligned exactly how we want them, we want **to snap that shot** really fast, and in doing so we're **exerting wonky pressures** that are going to misalign the sights. To use the **camera analogy.** It's like you took all this time to get the subject perfectly framed and in focus, and at the last minute **instead of smoothly pressing the button on the camera you smash it really hard**, and it just throws everything out of whack. (ColdBore)

(7) […] let's use the **analogy of picking up a child or a toddler**: if I reach down under the armpits, do I go from zero to a hundred really quick? jerking? giving them whiplash? Or do I start applying pressure and roll into it? So the exact same concept. (Pike)
(8) Another analogy: **is just like a handshake**. Do I come in and grab the hand really hard and try to crush it or do I go to zero percent and apply pressure? (Pike)

In the studied data, instructors also used such source domains as handling of a soft, elastic object, i.e. a rubber ball (Pew), using a car clutch (Pike), the movement of the piston of a car engine (Hyve) or milking a cow (ColdBore). Table 1 summarises the mappings between a familiar domain of experience (source domain) and the target domain of the newly learnt experience, specifying the aspect of the source domain that is projected.

Table 1. Projections of sensorimotor sensations from a source domain to the domain of trigger pull.

The source domain (familiar experience)	**The target domain (new experience)**
the direction of the index finger when one wants to touch their nose	the direction of the index finger pulling the trigger
the speed of movement of the finger or the hand in operating a familiar device (pulling a zipper, pressing a button on a camera, using a squirt gun)	the speed of moving the finger during trigger pull
the speed of movement of the hand or the whole body involved in physical interaction with other people (picking up a child, giving a handshake)	the speed of moving the finger during trigger pull
the controlled movement of handling a delicate, elastic object	the controlled movement of the finger during trigger pull

5. Discussion and conclusions

The aim of this paper was to investigate the potential reliance on conceptual metaphors in communication of sensorimotor experience. Shooting tips on how to improve one's trigger pull were used as a source of data. The analysed examples showed that instructors indeed frequently, creatively and intentionally made correspondences between familiar experiential domains and the less familiar domain of trigger pull to communicate their expertise. It is interesting in itself that cross-domain projections were found in this discourse, and that even a simple physical activity such as bending a finger can be described by activating other experiential domains. At the same time, this observation raises a number of questions.

The first question is whether the analysed examples meet the definition of conceptual metaphor adopted in cognitive semantics. In the case of the description of trigger movement as travel with stages in (1) there is no doubt that it is

metaphorical in this sense. This is an example of a canonical structural metaphor with transparent mappings (e.g. trigger movement corresponds to travel, trigger corresponds to traveller, and obstacles on the way are mapped onto stronger resistance of the sear), which entails predictability. It can be said that the target domain of trigger movement is understood in terms of travel with stages and hence it was labelled TRIGGER MOVEMENT IS TRAVEL WITH STAGES. However, in the case of how instructors describe the private sensorimotor experience of the trigger pull the answer is less obvious. On the one hand, all analysed examples in (2–7) involve a projection of sensorimotor experience associated with a known activity (source domain) onto an aspect of trigger pull, which is an unfamiliar activity to be learned (target domain), so in that respect they meet the definition. On the other hand, the "understanding" component of the metaphor definition is difficult to identify. It should be noted that these projections do not reveal how trigger pull is conceptualised in shooting discourse, or how shooters think about it. In other words, such analogies and comparisons do not feature in the regular discourse of expert shooters. Instead, these projections were created solely for the benefit of learners, to share the sensorimotor experience of instructors and to provide a reference for learners. By activating these projections during training, learners can build optimal muscle activity, but once the skill is acquired, these projections, together with their linguistic representations, are no longer used. Thus, during training, learners are encouraged to conceptualise the motor activity of pulling the trigger in terms of pressing a camera button, for example. However, there is no evidence that this conceptualisation extends beyond the training environment. Therefore, it could be said that, while projections from the source domain constitute the target domain in the case of the metaphorization of abstract domains on both the mental and linguistic levels, in the case of projections between sensorimotor domains, they serve as temporary scaffolding that is removed once the physical skill has been mastered. This observation, however, deserves more attention and studies using more diverse data.

The second question the analysis raises pertains to the function of cross-domain projections in the context of communication of a motor skill. At least in the case of trigger pull instructions, the main reason why instructors intentionally and creatively rely on these projections is to communicate something that cannot be seen or accessed in any other way by a listener. As was explained, technical obstacles make it impossible to observe the actions of an experienced shooter. More importantly, sensorimotor sensations, such as the amount of effort exerted or resistance felt, are private and inaccessible to others. The cross-domain mappings inherent in the conceptual metaphor make it an indispensable means of communicating private states, which has been demonstrated extensively for emotions, and seems equally important for sensorimotor sensations. In the analysed examples, the analogies with familiar activities, frequently reinforced by directions to "imagine" or to "use the analogy", function as prompts to activate memories of sensorimotor sensations

and to project them onto the new, learned experience. In this way, the private sensorimotor sensations required for the successful manipulation of physical objects are made public through reference to the sensorimotor sensations involved in other motor activities. It can be concluded that, in the case of shooting instructions at least, metaphor allows access to mental imagery and thus circumvents the lack of direct observation.

The last issue worth addressing is how the observations drawn from this analysis of communication of concrete experience relate to the embodiment paradigm. Four decades of research in the realm of cognitive semantics (i.e. empirical studies of how people speak and reason about abstract concepts) provided ample evidence that abstract thought is structured by sensorimotor experience. What about projections between two concrete domains? I believe that using the mechanism of creating cross-domain correspondences even for concrete domains also supports the embodiment paradigm although in a different way. While the study of conceptualizations of abstract domains in terms of concrete, bodily domains has revealed the role of the physical experience in shaping mental experience, this study has championed the role of mental imagery to build a sensorimotor sensation and develop a motor skill. Consequently, not only does the body shape cognition, but also cognition can directly participate in shaping physical performance. Although this is common knowledge for any sport psychologist, studying concrete-to-concrete mappings has gained little attention of cognitive linguistics. This paper could make a modest contribution towards filling this gap.

References

Brown, T. L. (2003). *Making truth: Metaphor in science.* University of Illinois Press.

Cienki, A. (2009). "Conceptual Metaphor Theory in light of research on speakers' Gestures" *Cognitive Semiotics, 5*(1–2), 349–366. DOI: 10.1515/cogsem.2013.5.12.349.

Cienki, A. (2017). "Analysing metaphor in gesture: A set of metaphor identification guidelines for gesture (MIGG)". In E. Semino, Z. Demjén (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of metaphor and language* (p. 131–147). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315672953-20

Cienki, A. & Müller, C. (Eds.). (2008). *Metaphor and gesture.* Benjamins.

Drogosz, A. (2019). *A cognitive semantics approach to Darwin's theory of evolution*. AE Academic Publishers.

Evans, V. (2007). *A glossary of cognitive linguistics*. Edinburgh University Press.

Evans, V. & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive linguistics. An introduction*. Edinburgh University Press.

Fojt, T. (2009). *The construction of scientific knowledge through metaphor*. Nicolaus Copernicus University Press.

Forceville, C. (2017). Visual and multimodal metaphor in advertising: cultural perspectives. *Styles of Communication, 9*(2), 26–41.

Forceville, C. (2009). Metaphor in pictures and multimodal representations. In R. Gibbs (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought* (pp. 462–482). Cambridge University Press.

Forceville, C. & Urios-Aparisi E. (Eds.). (2009). *Multimodal Metaphor.* Mouton de Gruyter.

Fussell, S. R. (Ed.). (2002). *The verbal communication of emotions*. *Interdisciplinary perspectives*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. University of Chicago Press.
Kövecses, Z. (1986). *Metaphors of anger, pride, and love*. *A lexical approach to the structure of concepts*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor. A practical introduction*. Oxford University Press.
Krzeszowski, T. (1997). *Angels and devils in hell.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Energeia.
Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things. What categories reveal about the mind*. University of Chicago Press.
Lakoff, G. (1990). The invariance hypothesis: Is abstract reason based on image schemas? *Cognitive Linguistics*, *1*(1), 39–74.
Lakoff, G. (1991). Metaphor and war: The metaphor system used to justify war in the gulf. *Peace Research, 23*(2–3), 25–32. DOI: 10.1515/cogsem.2009.4.2.5.
Lakoff, G. (1993). *The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor*. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 202–251). (2nd ed.) Cambridge University Press.
Lakoff, G. (1996). *Moral politics: How liberals and conservatives think*. University of Chicago Press.
Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought*. Basic Books.
Lakoff, G. & Núñez, R. E. (2000). *Where mathematics comes from: How the embodied mind brings mathematics into being.* Basic Books.
Łozińska, J. (2021). Imagery underlying metaphors: A cognitive study of a multimodal discourse of yoga classes. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *33*(3), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2021.1905486
Mittelberg, I., & Waugh, L. R. (2009). Metonymy first, metaphor second: A cognitive-semiotic approach to multimodal figures of thought in co-speech gesture. In C. Forceville, & E. Urios-Aparisi (Eds.) *Multimodal metaphor* (pp. 329–356). Mouton de Gruyter.
Müller, K., Ladewig (2013). Metaphors for sensorimotor experiences: Gestures as embodied and dynamic conceptualizations of balance in dance lessons. In M. Borkent, B. Dancygier, & J. Hinnell (Eds.), *Language and the creative mind* (pp. 295–324). CSLI Publications.
Sandikcioglu, E. (2000). More metaphorical warfare in the gulf: Orientalist frames in news coverage. In A. Barcelona (Ed.), *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads* (pp. 299–320). Mouton de Gruyter.
Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., Rosch, E. ([1991]2016). *The embodied mind. Cognitive science and human experience* (revised edition). The MIT Press.
Zawisławska, M. (2011). *Metafora w języku nauki: Na przykładzie nauk przyrodniczych*. Wydawnictwa Wydziału Polonistyki UW.
Zbikowski, L. M. (2008). Metaphor and music. In R. Gibbs (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought* (pp. 502–524). Cambridge University Press.

Appendix: Sources of data quoted in the paper

Internet blogs:

(Pew) – PewPewTactical – trigger discipline, pull, and control (beginner's guide) https://www.pewpewtactical.com/trigger-discipline-control-guide/ (1700 words) DOA 16.07.2025
(Hyve) – Hyve – Ultimate guide to trigger discipline and trigger control https://tacticalhyve.com/ultimate-guide-to-trigger-discipline-and-trigger-control/ (4630 words) DOA 19.07.2025

(Tarani) – Trigger Fundamentals. Steve Tarani details handgun trigger-control fundamentals https://www.shootingillustrated.com/content/handgun-trigger-fundamentals/ (1120 words) DOA 03.07.2025

YouTube videos:

(Pike) – FrogMan Tactical. Navy SEAL Training. Handgun Trigger Control. Jason Pike https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0zodCgUHRSk (length 10.55 minutes) 18.07.2025

(Pro) – Tactical Performance Center. Pull the Trigger like a Pro! Master the Skills of Shooting a Handgun. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p6QeVSFLSrU (length 6.52 minutes), DOA 21.07.2025

(ColdBore) – ColdBore Tactical, LLC, TRIGGER CONTROL (Master Class & Training Tips) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4vdck4w0TBc (length 14.03 minutes), DOA 22.07.2025