

WHAT ARE THE DIFFERENT MODELS OF CONCEPTUALIZING METAPHOR AND HOW DO THEY ANALYSE IT?

Marjan Sattaran

Department of Teaching English as a Second Language,

ABSTRACT: *It is believed that metaphoric expressions are not ornamental aspects of speech instead they are assumed to be necessary parts of language. In other word metaphors are not imposed as extra linguistic elements on ordinary language rather they are a necessary part of language they distinguished as the main elements of the texts expanding and elaborating the topic of the texts. In classical theories of language, metaphor was seen as a matter of language not thought. Metaphorical expressions were assumed to be mutually exclusive with the realm of ordinary everyday language. Accordingly, this paper tries to illustrate different model of conceptualizing metaphor.*

KEYWORD: Metaphor, Conceptualizing Metaphor, Linguistic Element

INTRODUCTION

Metaphor has been one of the central issues in cognitive linguistics around 1970. George Lakoff and some of his colleagues introduced metaphor in relation to cognitive linguistics and stated that there is a relation to cognitive linguistics when it is conceivable by practitioners. In cognitive linguistics we focus on features of language which reflect human cognition. According to cognitive linguistics, metaphor refers to patterns of conceptual association.

The main emphasis of cognitive linguistics in relation to metaphor is that metaphor is not inherently a linguistics phenomena rather it is patterns of thought which is expressible on nonverbal ways of understanding meaning as pictures, gestures and diagrams. The starting point in relation to metaphor and cognitive linguistics should refer to the approach of Lakoff and Johnson (1980) of “seminal metaphor we live by”.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The term *metaphor* was introduced as a novel or poetic linguistic expression where one or more words for a concept are used outside of its normal conventional meaning to express a similar concept. In recent years, evolutionary studies in cognitive linguistics and SLA have facilitated foreign language vocabulary acquisition and retention (Lakoff & Johnson 2003). They put more emphasis on how metaphorical awareness can increase the speed and efficiency of vocabulary learning. A large number of studies have done according to the positive influence of the knowledge of conceptual metaphors on EFL learners' ability to learn and acquire words and idiomatic expressions (e.g., Boers 2004, Csabi 2003, Kovescses & Szabo 1996, Herrera & White 2000).

Metaphors are excessively used in everyday communication. Most universal and basic concepts of the world such as time, state and quantity are thoroughly understood through metaphorical mapping. In General, the way of thinking or in other word cognitive processing,

act, perceive and the way in which we view the world are based on our metaphorical concepts. These concepts structure and influence language speech. Therefore, metaphor as an important intellectual element in language use is regarded as a constructive phenomenon in everyday language (Lakoff & Johnson 2003). Metaphor produces an unbelievable power that creates new realities by influencing our thoughts and ideas about the world. Metaphor is a multidimensional tool for explaining, describing and evaluating ideas for having better understanding and communication.

Traditional theory of metaphor which is strongly rejected by Lakoff and Johnson (1999) has some basic tenets. These tenets, or as Lakoff and Johnson called them false tenets are completely opposed and refuted by them (ibid). Some of the basic tenets of traditional theory are as follow: Metaphor is a matter of words, not thought; metaphorical language is not part of ordinary conventional language, and that Metaphorical language is deviant (Lakoff and Johnson, 1999 p: 119). In reaction to this traditional view on metaphor, the conceptual theory has been advanced by Lakoff and his colleagues (McGlone 2007 p: 110).

Moreover Shnitzer and Pedreira (2005) arguing that that there are two approaches toward the study of metaphor: 'Classical' and 'Cognitive'. However they believe that the distinction between the two is "based on whether one is willing to countenance literal meaning (i.e., the classical/figurative distinction), or one rejects the notion of literal meaning in favor of the view that all language is metaphoric" (Schnitzer and Pedreira, 2005, p: 32). Cognitive approach or 'conceptual approach', can be considered as the most influential metaphor theory. This approach, is strongly supported by Lakoff, Johnson, and Turner, and states that "metaphors are not special, but are rather at the core of ordinary language and indeed at the core of human experience" (Schnitzer and Pedreira, 2005, p: 34). This approach mentions that the use of metaphors is important and unavoidable due to strong relation between metaphor, thought and language. Recent metaphor theories put the emphasis on the study of metaphors because it is believed that understanding the way metaphors are used and perceived provides useful knowledge about how brains, minds, and language are connected to each other.

Conceptual Metaphor

Lakoff and Johnson (2003) believe that conceptual metaphors have originally been created and developed in order to reflect the human experiences and they seem identical in different alive languages. According to their paradigm of cognitive semantics (2003), metaphor is a fundamental cognitive ability which allows us to talk and think about abstract concepts and phenomena. Some metaphors are so deeply entranced in human thoughts that they have been called Metaphor We Live By (Lakoff & Johnson 1980) or conceptual metaphors (Lakoff 1987). This kind of approach which highlighted metaphors and also idioms is strongly believed that can facilitate vocabulary learning and long-term retention (Kovecses 2001). Gibbs (1993a, 1994) also argues that people can hardly avoid metaphors in their daily speech because they conceptualize and later internalize most of their abstract thoughts in terms of metaphors, metonymys and idioms. Similarly, Richards and Schmidt (2002) believe that a language learner with such metaphorical awareness can easily identify and produce metaphorical language in various forms of nominal, verbal, or adverbial. The Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) as set forth by Lakoff and Johnson (1980; 2003) provides a very useful tool for analyzing linguistic phenomenon. The main important tenet of this theory is that our conceptual system based on a group of mental metaphorical images that determine our way of thinking and influence our experience of the world.

Lakoff and Johnson see metaphor as a central component in our thought and language. While for most people it is merely "a device of the poetic imagination and rhetorical flourish—a matter of extraordinary rather than ordinary language...as characteristic of language alone, a matter of words rather than thought or action" (2003, p. 4), for Lakoff and Johnson it is prevalent in everyday life and is not merely a linguistic device; it is key to thought and action. Conceptual system plays a key role in defining our everyday realities and our concepts are based on metaphors, hence "what we experience, and what we do every day is very much a matter of metaphor" (p. 4).

One of the most important feature in CMT which is derived from mathematic relation is mapping in which ideas are closely related to each other. Lakoff and Johnson worked on elaborating what it means for a concept to be metaphorical and they illustrated their point by giving many examples. One of these examples is the concept of ARGUMENT and the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR. The metaphor is demonstrated in daily life in such expressions as: your claims are "indefensible"; he "attacked every weak point" in my argument; his criticisms were "right on target; if you use that "strategy", he'll "wipe you out". He "shot down" all of my arguments (2003, P. 4,5). Those examples are not common words used in language; they actually represent fact and truth of life that are witnessed and we can conclude them as 'win or lose arguments', we see the person we are arguing with as —an opponent, we —attack our challenger's —positions and we —defend our own, we —gain and —lose ground, etc. (p. 5).

As Lakoff stated (2003) there are two domains for conceptual metaphors. One is the source domain in which we draw the metaphorical expressions; for example, with the expression LOVE IS JOURNEY, JOURNEY is the source domain, (which is one domain of experience), while LOVE is the target domain that we try to unravel. The process of mapping across those conceptual domains puts the two elements together (LOVE and JOURNEY) so that one can see the common ground, similarities, resemblances and parallels that may exist between the source and the target (P. 56). From this standpoint, metaphor is defined as —a cross-domain mapping in the conceptual system (Lakoff 2003, p. 203).

Another example is illustrated by Fernandez. He explains (2006, p. 101-130), the mapping process that occurs with metaphors such as TO DIE IS TO SLEEP involves mapping our perception of sleep onto our perception of death and fulfils a euphemistic role where the source domain mitigates the target domain. To illustrate this point, it can be said that in the euphemistic mechanism, the euphemistic expression (source) replaces (mapped onto) the taboo expressions (target) and, in the process, the positive aspects of the target domain are highlighted while the negative aspects are hidden (Fan, 2006, p. 72). Lakoff and Johnson admit the possibility of highlighting and hiding, suggesting that metaphors provide a coherent structure, highlighting some things and hiding others.

There are different kinds of conceptualizing metaphor in speaking and writing as mentioned above however euphemism is another one. There is always a bad feeling for talking about harmful and embarrassing words to which society is often sensitive (Crystal, 2003, p. 173); therefore, language has its own ways of avoiding and expressing such taboos. Substituting process with which offensive or unacceptable words are substituted by more appropriate ones has come to be known as 'euphemism'. In other word, euphemism refers to "the use of a vague or periphrastic expression as a substitute for blunt precision or disagreeable use" (Fowler, 1957, quoted in Holder 1987, p. vii). In this view, euphemisms can be seen as —roundabout, toning

down expressions" (Algeo and Pyles, 2004, p. 235), a substitution process which causes replacements such as the following: casket (coffin), fall asleep (die), push up the daisies (be dead), the ultimate sacrifice (be killed), under the weather (ill), and many others.

Euphemism is considered a linguistically universal trait. Almost all languages have euphemistic expressions, particularly employed to avoid vulgarisms (Mashak, 2012, p. 202). However it is a kind of alarm to show which words and expressions should be avoided.

According to Trudgill (1986, p. 30) death and dying are among the most commonly referenced semantic fields in linguistic discussions of euphemism (Hughes, 2000, p. 43-43; Mey, 2001, p. 33-34). Psychologically speaking, there are various reasons why people do not want to talk about the topic of death, most important one is relevance to fear, a deeply seated human instinct; people are afraid for losing their loved ones and its consequences. They are afraid of what would happen after death, mysterious life and hidden destiny, evil spirits, which strikes fear into their hearts (Allan and Burrige, 2006, p. 222). The common strategy that people do is to cope with this fear of death by not mentioning of it or replacing it by other expressions. Although some people do not openly express their fear of death, they try to protect themselves by making some gestures such as a finger-cross or a charm or wood knock (Allan and Burrige, 2006, p. 203), and may try to use euphemistic metaphorical expressions to hide the unpleasant things and to heal their wounds (Fan, 2006).

Turning back to the example of Lakoff (2003), What constitutes the LOVE-AS-JOURNEY metaphor is not any particular word or expression. It is the ontological mapping across conceptual domains, from the source domain of journeys to the target domain of love. The metaphor cannot consider only as a matter of language rather it is thought and reason. The language is secondary. The mapping is primary, in that it sanctions the use of source domain language and inference patterns for target domain concepts (2003, P. 67). The mapping is conventional, in other word it is fixed part of our conceptual system. Mapping tells us precisely how love is being conceptualized as a journey and this unified way of conceptualizing love metaphorically is realized different linguistic expressions. It should be noted that contemporary metaphor theorists commonly use the term metaphor to refer to the conceptual mapping, and the term metaphorical expression to refer to an individual linguistic expression (like dead-end street) that is sanctioned by a mapping. We have adopted this terminology for the following reason:

Metaphor, as a phenomenon, involves both conceptual mappings and individual linguistic expressions. It is important to keep them distinct. Since it is the mappings that are primary and that state the generalizations that are our principal concern, we have reserved the term metaphor for the mappings, rather than for the linguistic expressions. (Lakoff, 1992., P.6)

Basic semantic conceptual metaphors

Understanding emotional concepts like love and anger are very easy for people even by using metaphor. On the other hand realization of most basic concepts like time, quantity, state, change, action, cause, purpose, and category seems easy by using metaphoric expression. These conceptual states are as follows:

Categories

The fact behind the classical categories refers to concept of containers. If X is in container A and container A is in container B, then X is in container B.

If $X \cup A$

$\rightarrow X \cup B$

If $A \cup B$

One of the principal logical properties of classical categories is that the classical syllogism holds for them. The classical syllogism, Artur is a man. All men are mortal. Therefore, Artur is mortal. is of the form: If X is in category A and category A is in category B, then X is in category B., Here there is a generalization in relation to container. The language of containers applies to classical categories and the logic of containers is true of classical categories. A single metaphorical mapping ought to characterize both the linguistic and logical generalizations at once. (Lackoff,1992)

Quantity and linear scales

Quantity in conceptual metaphor consists of two different parts. The first one is famous expression MORE IS UP, LESS IS DOWN which is in very common expressions like Prices, Stocks. The second one is that LINEAR SCALES ARE PATHS in expressions like Anni is far more smarter than Lucy. Anni is way ahead of Lucy in IQ. The metaphor maps the starting point of the path onto the bottom of the scale and maps distance traveled onto quantity in general.(Lackoff, 1992). The main important point in part is logic of paths maps onto the logic of linear scales. Path inference: If you are going from A to C, and you are now at in intermediate point B, then you have been at all points between A and B and not at any points between B and C. (Lackoff, 1992. P,9). If you have exactly 5 cars in your Parking, then you have 4, 3, and so on, but not 6, 7, or any other. These inference's forms are the same. Inference of the path is the result of the cognitive topology of paths. There is a linguistic-and-inferential generalization which should be stated here. The LINEAR SCALES ARE PATHS provides that metaphors in general preserve the cognitive topology (that is, the image-schematic structure) of the source domain. Looking at the inferential structure alone, one might suggest a nonmetaphorical alternative in which both linear scales and paths are instances of a more general abstract schema(Lackoff,1992) .

Time

In English the term time is conceptualized in terms of space. Here are some interesting facts about it. Ontologically speaking: Time is understood in terms of things (i.e., entities and locations) and motion (Lackoff and Jonson, 1980). Background condition: The present time is at the same location as a canonical observer (Lackoff and Jonson, 2003)

Mapping:

☐ ☐ Times are things.

☐ ☐ The passing of time is motion.

☐ ☐ Future times are in front of the observer; past times are behind the observer.

☐ ☐ One thing is moving, the other is stationary; the stationary entity is the deictic center.

Entailment:

-Since motion is continuous and one-dimensional, the passage of time is continuous and one-dimensional.

Special case 1:

-The observer is fixed; times are entities moving with respect to the observer.

Times are oriented with their fronts in their direction of motion.

Entailments:

-If time 2 follows time 1, then time 2 is in the future relative to time 1.

The time passing the observer is the present time.

Time has a velocity relative to the observer.

Special case 2:

Times are fixed locations; the observer is moving with respect to time.

Entailment:

-Time has extension, and can be measured.(Lackoff 1980, P.9)

By looking at the metaphor TIME PASSING IS MOTION, and according to Lackoff (1992) we can realize that this sentence embodies a generalization that accounts for a wide range of cases where a spatial expression can also be used for time. Special case 1, TIME PASSING IS MOTION OF AN OBJECT, accounts for both the linguistic form and the semantic entailments of expressions like: it will be its time when... this time has finished when ... this is the time of acting..... the mentioned time it happens.....tomorrow in preceding day, ... I will see you next year spring is coming up with us. And so many others. However, special case 1 characterizes the general principle behind the temporal use of words like come, will, go, here, follow, precede, pass, stands for not only why they are used for both space and time, but why they mean what it means.

Special case 2, TIME PASSING IS MOTION OVER A LANDSCAPE, accounts for a different range of cases, expressions like:

☐ ☐ There's going to be trouble down the road.

☐ ☐ He stayed there for ten years.

☐ ☐ He stayed there a long time.

☐ ☐ His stay in Russia extended over many years.

- ☐ ☐ He passed the time happily.
- ☐ ☐ He arrived on time.
- ☐ ☐ We're coming up on Christmas.
- ☐ ☐ We're getting close to Christmas.
- ☐ ☐ He'll have his degree within two years
- ☐ ☐ I'll be there in a minute. (Lackoff, 1982)

Special case 2 maps location expressions like down the road, for long time, over, come, close to, within, in, pass, onto corresponding temporal expressions with their corresponding meanings. In special case 2 we can consider general principle relating spatial terms and inference patterns to temporal terms and inference patterns as well. We can also realize that there are some differences in two cases above. These differences in the details of the mappings show that one cannot just say blithely that spatial expressions can be used to speak of time, without specifying details, as though there were only one correspondence between time and space. When we are explicit about stating the mappings, we discover that there are two different-and inconsistent-subcases. The fact that time is understood metaphorically in terms of motion, entities, and locations accords with our biological knowledge. In our visual systems, we have detectors for motion and detectors for objects/locations. We do not have detectors for time (whatever that could mean). Thus, it makes good biological sense that time should be understood in terms of things and motion. (Lackoff, 1989, P.30)

Conceptual metaphor in novel

Image Metaphors

One of the conceptual metaphor in Novel is “image metaphor”, a metaphor that function to map one conventional mental image onto another. Image-metaphors are ‘one-shot’ metaphors: they map only one image onto one other image. Consider, for example, this poem from the Indian tradition:

Now women-rivers
belted with silver fish
move unhurried as women in love
at dawn after a night with their lovers
(Merwin & Masson, 1981, p. 71)

In this poem the image of the slow walking of a woman is mapped onto the image of the slow flow of a river. Metaphoric image mappings work in just the same way as all other metaphoric mappings: by mapping the structure of one domain onto the structure of another.

However there is another form of conceptualizing metaphor in which religious discourse is characterised by its abstractness where the recognition of metaphysical assumptions such as the existence of God, the creation of the universe, the definiteness of our destiny the and reality of death are introduced conventionally by the followers of religion as ideas which transcend

the capabilities of human conventional capacities. Olaf Jäkel in relation to this point maintains that because of the high level of abstraction of the religious domain, it is likely that religious language will be largely (if not completely) dependent on metaphorical conceptualisation when mentioning concepts which are removed from our human sensual experience, such as God, the soul, the hereafter, and the freedom of moral choice (Jäkel 2002, 23). This assumption is one example of using conceptualizing metaphorical works in religious discourse to extend the knowledge of human existence to what is beyond. Charteris-Black asserts that the effectiveness of metaphor within religious discourse is related to the fact that:

[I]t [metaphor] is a primary means by which the unknown can be conceptualised in terms of what is already known [...] metaphors are a natural means for exploring the possible forms that such divinity might take and for expressing religious experiences (Charteris-Black 2004, 173).

CONCLUSION

The Impact of CMT

As it was mentioned above, there are different kinds of conceptualizing metaphor and many other which are not in this work. CMT has lots of impact on humanities and cognitive science. According to Gibbs there are three major impacts which CMT has on cognitive and humanities.

- 1- By introducing new way of thinking about linguistic structure and behaviour and by using language within mind, cognitive linguistic try to make a connection between language and cognition as well as experimental action. CMT try to show in depth something about the content of linguistic meaning and substance of fundamental abstract concept in term of image schemas. According to CMT metaphor offers insight into the overall unity of human conceptual structure, physical experience and communicative function of language. (Gibbs.1994)
- 2- By using CMT, both theoretical framework and empirical method for understanding pervasiveness of metaphorical language and thought across a wide range of cognitive domains and cultural and linguistic domain will illustrate.(Gibbs. 1994). However CMT demonstrates that metaphor is neither a relatively rare, purely linguistic phenomenon nor simply characterized as a pragmatic aspect of language use. Instead it works originating in cognitive linguistics and try to show that metaphor is properly recognized as fundamental scheme of thought(Gibbs. 2008, Kovecses. 2002,2005) serving many cognitive and social/ ideological function(Gibbs.2008).
- 3- CMT try to illustrate new way of thinking about establishing concepts which are abstract and the way in which they influence different domains of human thinking, language use and understanding.

REFERENCE

Algeo, J., & Pyles, T. (2004). *The origins and development of the English language*. Boston: Thomson.

- Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Charteris-Black, J. 2004. *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fan, Z. (2006). *The Mechanism of Euphemism: A cognitive Linguistic Interpretation*. US-China Foreign Language, 4(7), 71-74.
- Fernandez, C. (2006). *The language of Death: Euphemism and Conceptual Metaphorization in Victorian Obituaries*. Sky Journal of Linguistics, 19, 101-130. [Online] Available: <http://www.linguistics.fi/julkaisut/SKY2006/Fernandez.pdf> (May, 2, 2013).
- Gibbs, R. (1994). *The Poetics Of Mind; Figurative Thought, Language and Understanding*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbs, R. (2008). *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hughes, G. (2000). *A History of English Words*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Jäkel, O. 2002. "Hypotheses Revisited: The Cognitive Theory of Metaphor Applied to Religious Texts". *metaphorik.de Journal zu Metapher und Metonymie* (02).
- Kovecses, Z. (2001). *A cognitive linguistics view of learning idioms in an FLT context*. 87-116. M. Putz, M. Nieneir, & R. Dirven, (Eds.). *Applied Linguistics II: Language Pedagogy*. Berlin- New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kovecses, Z. & Szabo, P. (1996). "Idioms: a view of cognitive semantic." *Applied Linguistics*, 17(3), pp.326-55.
- Kovecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kovecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in Culture*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, George and Johnson, Mark. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M (2003). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: The University of Chicago press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226470993.001.0001>.
- Mashak, S. et al. (2012). *A Comparative Study on Basic Emotion Conceptual Metaphors in English and Persian Literary Texts*. *International Education Studies*, 5(1), 200-207. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v5n1p200>
- Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Trudgill, P. (1986). *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.