CHAPTER 2
CMT FROM A COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE

This chapter is dedicated entirely to exploring the concept of conceptual metaphor, a central theme in this study. We will delve into its definition, examine various theories surrounding it, and discuss the methods used for identifying metaphors in both literary and non-literary texts. This comprehensive overview serves as the foundation for our theoretical framework, emphasizing the significance of conceptual metaphors in our analysis.

2.1 DEFENITION OF METAPHOR

Metaphor is a nuanced concept, often described in various ways, such as substituting one word for another with distinctly different meanings, contrasting ideas, or implying a comparison. The Oxford English Dictionary defines it as a figure of speech where a term is applied to an object different from, yet analogous to, its original use. Aristotle saw metaphor as an analogy based on similarities.

Kövecses offers a similar interpretation, stating that a metaphor involves understanding one realm of experience in terms of another. Essentially, a metaphor can be viewed as a simile without the explicit comparison word like 'like' or 'as.' For example, in the phrase 'Achilles is a lion,' the character of Achilles (the target) is compared to a lion (the source) based on shared attributes like ferocity and strength. These shared attributes are often referred to as the 'ground' or 'grounds' of the metaphor.

Kövecses emphasizes that traditionally, metaphors are seen as expressions based on shared characteristics, identifiable and analyzable, and are primarily used for aesthetic or rhetorical effects. A definition that contrasts a target with a source is particularly relevant to metaphors formed with 'to be' or similar verbs. For instance, in "Achilles is a lion," the metaphor ascribes qualities like bravery, commonly associated with lions, to Achilles. Essentially, it's a more colorful way of saying "Achilles is as brave as a lion," capturing the essence of the metaphor. Similarly, calling a tall, thin person a "beanpole" implies the shared attributes of height and slenderness, and this conceptualization seems to encapsulate the intended meaning.

Expanding beyond traditional definitions, Kenneth Burke (1945) described metaphor as "a device for seeing something in terms of something else". Yanow defines metaphor as "the juxtaposition of two superficially unlike elements in a single context, where the separately understood meanings of both interact to create a new perception of each and

especially of the focus of the metaphor." Elena Semino views metaphor as "the phenomenon whereby humans talk and, potentially, think about something in terms of something else." For example, "flammable language" can be seen as a metaphor where the concept of "fire" is used to describe the dynamic nature of passionate language.

These definitions mark a departure from the traditional notion of a simile without 'like,' but they remain somewhat abstract – it's not immediately intuitive to associate 'words' in a speech with 'fire.' These observations don't aim to criticize these definitions but rather to highlight the challenge of defining this complex phenomenon.

Interestingly, linguists often rely on metaphors themselves while trying to define them. The term 'metaphor source' is itself a metaphor, suggesting that a metaphorical word or phrase "carries" a meaning associated with the target. Thus, explaining how "incendiary" is a metaphor inevitably involves the use of other metaphorical language.

In Kenneth Burke's definition of metaphor as "a device for seeing something in terms of something else," the term "device" suggests a tool or mechanism, implying a kind of passivity in the process. "Seeing" refers to the human perception of vision, but in this context, it can also imply understanding, a broader concept than mere visual perception. This understanding of metaphor can extend to other senses, such as hearing, in different contexts. If we modify Burke's phrase to "perceiving something in terms of something else," it becomes evident that perception encompasses the various processes through which we interpret and understand language. The terms "see" and "hear" are often used metaphorically to mean 'understand,' even though they represent different aspects of perception.

Elena Semino's definition shares similarities with Burke's but also has noteworthy differences. Burke focuses on the act of perceiving, highlighting the role of the receiver (listener or reader) of the linguistic expression, while Semino and Zoltán Kövecses emphasize the act of expression, indicating a focus on the creator (speaker or writer) of the linguistic expressions. Burke refers to a "tool or device," suggesting an emphasis on the agency of the perceiver, while Semino describes metaphor as a "phenomenon," placing more emphasis on the metaphor itself as an independent process, neither tied to the speaker nor the listener. Both Burke's and Semino's definitions contrast with Kövecses's, which seems to suggest metaphor as a more vivid way of expression and the analysis it entails.

Semino's addition of "potentially think about something in terms of something else"

expands the definition to include a cognitive perspective on metaphor, suggesting that metaphor may be an inherent aspect of thought processes.

However, a cognitive theory of metaphor has become prominent since 1980, with the publication of the now-classic *Metaphors We Live By* (2003/1980) authored by cognitive linguists and philosophers of language George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. This theory begins by rejecting the assumption in earlier theories that ordinary language is literal, i.e. non-metaphorical. Instead, it claims that the ordinary use of language is pervasively and indispensably metaphorical, because human thought itself is metaphorical in nature. Thus, on this view, the ordinary language expression "Hi Honey!", for instance, is also metaphorical because it involves a kind of comparison between two things, i.e. love and honey. By way of another example from ordinary language, in "She is my latest flame", love is compared with fire. Another example, when English speakers use the term 'warm relationship,' according to Lakoff and Johnson, they are not just making a comparison but experiencing a sensation akin to physical warmth (EMOTION IS TEMPERATURE). Similarly, they perceive the intensity of passionate language as if feeling sensations associated with physical heat (PASSION IS HEAT).

Metaphors can be understood not only by what they are but also by what they are not, especially when compared to literal language. The notion of 'literal' itself, however, is nuanced and multifaceted. Deriving from the same roots as 'letters' and 'literacy,' the term 'literal' originally meant a verbatim interpretation of texts, like religious scriptures, as noted in the unedited Oxford English Dictionary. Interestingly, the term "literal" is frequently employed in a metaphorical manner. For example, in the expression "My mother will literally kill me if I'm not home by midnight," the word "literally" is used to emphasize "kill," which in this context could be seen as either a metaphor or hyperbole.

Traditionally, 'literal' suggests a precise, almost code-like correlation between words and their meanings. Yet, such a clear-cut mapping is uncommon; the meanings that words convey are often deeply affected by their contextual usage. Scholars such as Gibbs (1994) and Wilson and Sperber (2008) emphasize this point, indicating that the context significantly influences our interpretation of words and their meanings.

2.2 THE IMPORTANCE OF METAPHOR

Knowles and Moon explore the vital role of metaphors in language, emphasizing their influence in two primary areas. Firstly, they point out how metaphors are integral to the

development of word meanings. A significant number of words gain their interpretations through metaphorical connections, shaping their connotations and applications. For instance, phrases like "She has published extensively in the field of psychology" or "The failure has hurt him deeply" demonstrate how words like "field" and "hurt" take on metaphorical meanings. Additionally, modern terminology, especially in technology with words like "web," "bug," and "virus," often finds its roots in metaphorical language.

The second key role of metaphor in language lies in its diverse functions during conversations, such as explaining, clarifying, describing, expressing, evaluating, and entertaining. This suggests that the use of metaphors in speech is not out of necessity due to a lack of alternative expressions. Rather, we often employ metaphors to enhance the clarity and intent of our thoughts, to articulate our messages more effectively, and to present our ideas in a more engaging and enjoyable manner.

Moreover, Knowles and Moon demonstrate how metaphors can simplify complex ideas, making them more accessible. Using the metaphor of 'fight and war,' for example, they show how this analogy helps learners understand the intricate process of how the body's cells respond to infection. Such as in the explanation, "Scientists believe stress may suppress the development of T-cells, the white blood cells that 'fight off invading' microorganisms," where the metaphorical language makes the concept of cellular defense mechanisms more relatable and understandable.

In the paper titled, "The Importance of Metaphor on Bush's Speech: An Analysis Using Corpus Linguistics," Mestriner and Martins (2010) delve into the significant impact of metaphors in George Bush's presidential speeches. Their analysis demonstrates how metaphors provide a window into Bush's ideology and offer insights into the implications of his decisions. They embrace the perspective of Lakoff and Johnson, suggesting that metaphors are deeply embedded in our daily lives, influencing not just our language but also our thoughts and actions.

Mestriner and Martins further propose that an individual's use of metaphor is a reflection of their worldview, offering a glimpse into how they perceive and interpret the world around them. Complementing this idea, Al-Bazi highlights that the role of metaphors can vary greatly based on the situation. He notes that different metaphorical functions might emerge in specific speech contexts, going on to identify the most prevalent functions of metaphors in these scenarios:

2.2.1 Metaphor as a decoration

In this context, metaphor serves as an aesthetic tool, employed to enhance the beauty of language. This role aligns with the traditional view of metaphor as an ornamental element. According to this perspective, a metaphor is seen as an embellishment that can be omitted without altering the core message being communicated. This conventional understanding treats metaphor as an additive feature, primarily used for stylistic enrichment rather than essential to the meaning of the expression.

2.2.2 Metaphor as a source of vocabulary

Metaphors play a significant role in introducing novel expressions into language. Over time, many metaphors become so integrated into regular usage that they lose their metaphorical sense and are used in a literal context. This phenomenon is known as a "dead metaphor," which refers to phrases or expressions that originated as metaphors but have since lost their figurative meaning and become commonplace in everyday language. Peter Newmark emphasizes the pervasiveness of this process, stating that "three-quarters of the English language consists of used metaphors" (1988: 111), highlighting how deeply metaphors are woven into the fabric of language.

2.2.3 Metaphor as an intellectual history

Metaphors are often employed to depict and illuminate specific periods in history. Additionally, they hold a critical function in fields such as philosophy and psychology, where they aid in the formation of certain concepts, particularly those related to mental events. This concept underscores the importance of metaphors in shaping and expressing our understanding of complex mental processes and events.

2.2.4 Metaphor as heuristic

Al-Bazi references Gordon's theory (1961) that focuses on creativity and invention, highlighting the pivotal role of metaphorical language. According to this theory, metaphors play a crucial role in shaping and defining our thoughts and perceptions of events. Consequently, this suggests that metaphorical language is integral to creative problem-solving in human cognition. This insight, as detailed by Al-Bazi, emphasizes the deep connection between the use of metaphors and the processes of innovative thinking and problem resolution.

2.2.5 Metaphors can "mislead when used dishonestly."

In the realm of political reporting, metaphors emerge as a particularly notable function, especially in its capacity to mislead readers. As Al-Bazi describes, metaphors can act as a "mask," skillfully manipulating public perception. They are often employed to provoke a specific reaction from the audience, pushing certain ideas to the forefront while sidelining others. This tactic ensures that the audience's response is guided in a predictable manner, highlighting the power of metaphors in shaping public opinion and directing collective attention in political discourse.

2.3 METAPHOR IN COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS

2.3.1 Introducing Conceptual Metaphor Theory

Metaphors are often understood as a distinctive form of expression where one thing is likened to another, exemplified by phrases like "John is a lion." This approach typically aims to create an imaginative and rhetorical impact, as metaphors allow us to communicate powerfully, impress others with eloquent and aesthetically pleasing language, or to convey deep emotions. Five commonly recognized characteristics summarize this traditional view of metaphor:

- Metaphor is primarily a linguistic device.
- It is used for artistic and aesthetic purposes, essentially enhancing or beautifying speech.
- A metaphor relies on a perceived similarity between the two compared entities.
- Crafting a metaphor requires conscious and deliberate word choice, and a special talent is often necessary to use it effectively. Renowned writers and speakers, such as Shakespeare and Barack Obama, are often cited as masterful users of metaphor.
- It's commonly believed that metaphors aren't essential to language, as everyday conversation can occur without metaphors, and they are not seen as fundamentally linked to regular human thought and reasoning.

George Lakoff and Mark Johnson introduced a groundbreaking perspective on metaphor in their 1980 study, "Metaphors We Live By," leading to the development of the cognitive linguistic view of metaphor. This approach challenges traditional notions by proposing that:

- Metaphor is more about conceptual understanding in the mind than just a linguistic

expression.

- The primary function of metaphor is to enhance our comprehension of concepts, going beyond merely serving creative or aesthetic purposes.
- Metaphors don't always rely on similarities between compared entities.
- Metaphors are used naturally by everyday people in regular communication, not just by exceptional writers or speakers.
- Metaphor is not just an ornamental aspect of language; it is an essential process in human thought and cognition.

Lakoff and Johnson convincingly argued that metaphor is a fundamental aspect of both thought and everyday language. Thus, according to Cognitive Linguists, human thought is essentially metaphorical, i.e. the ultimate source or the basis of human thought is our sensuous interaction with the world, so that we can express our abstract thought only on the basis of our bodily or embodied experience. Metaphors thus indispensably pervade ordinary language; it cannot be otherwise.

It's clear that some metaphors in everyday language are more subtle than others. These are often referred to as "dead metaphors." This term suggests that while these metaphors were once vivid and impactful, they have become so commonplace and integrated into our speech that they no longer carry their original metaphorical strength. However, this concept overlooks an important aspect: the most deeply ingrained and unnoticed expressions are often the most active in shaping our thinking.

In contrast, there are what we might call "alive metaphors." These are the metaphors that actively influence our thoughts and perceptions. They are not just figures of speech but fundamental elements of how we understand and interact with the world. These "alive metaphors" are the metaphors we truly "live by."

2.3.2 Linguistic Metaphor

In the realm of cognitive linguistics, as defined by George Lakoff, a metaphor is seen as a way of understanding one area of experience or knowledge (conceptual domain) in terms of another. This approach involves two conceptual spaces: one space is understood in the context of the other. A conceptual space refers to any coherent organization of experiences. This view suggests that metaphors are deeply embedded in our cognitive process, fundamentally shaping our perception and interaction with the world.

In the realm of Conceptual Metaphor Theory, linguistic metaphors play a pivotal role in shaping our understanding and experience of abstract concepts. These metaphors, which consist of words or other semantic expressions, are rooted in the language or phrasing of more concrete conceptual spaces.

To illustrate this concept, let us consider the following example, based on the works of Lakoff and Johnson (1980). When native English speakers discuss an argument, they commonly employ expressions such as:

Your claims are indefensible.
He attacked every weak point in my argument.
His criticisms were right on target.
I demolished his argument.
I've never won an argument with him.
You disagree? Okay, shoot!
If you use that strategy, he'll wipe you out.
He shot down all of my arguments.

In English-speaking cultures, it's commonly perceived that an argument is akin to a battle (AN ARGUMENT IS WAR). This viewpoint is reflected in various linguistic metaphors that draw parallels between arguing and warfare. Such expressions are examples of semantic metaphors. They represent the underlying conceptual analogy prevalent in English thought, where arguments are metaphorically equated to wars. This perspective is further exemplified by the theoretical framework supporting these expressions, reinforcing the notion of AN ARGUMENT IS WAR.

The use of capital letters in a smaller font size indicates that certain terms are not used in their literal sense but rather symbolize underlying concepts in metaphorical expressions. In the study of conceptual metaphors, the two key areas involved are distinctively named. The 'source domain' is the conceptual realm from which we draw metaphorical expressions to make sense of another concept, known as the 'target domain'. For instance, in the metaphor "ARGUMENT is WAR", 'WAR' is the source domain providing the metaphorical framework, while 'ARGUMENT' is the target domain being understood through this framework. Essentially, the target domain is the concept we seek to comprehend through the lens of the source domain.

2.3.3 How is metaphor utilized?

In cognitive linguistics, metaphors are used to understand an abstract concept (referred to

as the "target domain") by relating it to a more concrete, familiar idea (known as the "source domain"). This process of understanding one conceptual space through another is possible due to a set of systematic relationships, or correspondences, between the source and the target domains. These relationships are often called 'mappings' in cognitive linguistics terminology. Essentially, the concept of 'understanding' in the context of cognitive linguistics involves interpreting a more abstract target domain through the lens of a more tangible source domain.

In the metaphor "He attacked every weak point in my argument", the word "attack" suggests a conflict akin to a battle between two opponents (the speaker and 'he'), and "weak point" refers to vulnerabilities like those found on a battlefield. However, in the right context, this phrase is understood to be about an argument. The listener interprets that the speaker has failed to defend their viewpoints effectively. This metaphorical use of combat language to describe an argument is a result of correspondence drawn between the concepts of war and argument. These correspondences, or mappings, between these distinct domains enable the metaphor to be conceptualized in the mind and subsequently expressed in language when discussing arguments in English.

Understanding metaphors involves grasping the systematic connections, or mappings, between a source (the concrete concept) and a target (the abstract idea). However, it's important to recognize that not every element from the source can be directly linked to an element in the target. The metaphorical use of language must align with the established mappings or correspondences that exist between the source and target concepts. This alignment ensures that the metaphor is coherent and meaningful within its context.

2.3.4 Types of Metaphor

Metaphors can be categorized in various ways, depending on the criteria used for their classification. A key approach to classifying metaphors is based on their cognitive function, which leads to three distinct types. This method considers how metaphors are processed and understood mentally, grouping them according to the specific cognitive roles they play.

2.3.4.1 Structural Metaphor

In this type of metaphor, the source domain provides a richly detailed framework to help understand the target concept. Essentially, these metaphors function cognitively by

allowing speakers to comprehend the target domain through the structure of the source domain. This understanding is facilitated through conceptual mappings that link elements of the source domain (A) with elements of the target domain (B).

Consider the way in which concepts of movement and space fundamentally inform our understanding of time. The mappings within this metaphor do more than just elucidate the meanings of certain phrases; they establish an essential framework that shapes our comprehension of time itself. Imagining our concept of time without this metaphorical context is difficult. This is indicative of how structural metaphors typically function - they provide a crucial scaffold that deepens our grasp of the concepts they represent.

2.3.4.2 Ontological Metaphors

Ontology, a branch of philosophy, focuses on the nature of existence. In contrast to structural metaphors, ontological metaphors primarily serve a psychological purpose. They essentially grant a new ontological status to broad categories of abstract target concepts, facilitating the creation of new abstract elements. This implies that we often conceptualize our experiences in terms of objects, substances, and containers, usually without specifying the exact nature of these categories. However, our understanding of objects, substances, and containers is quite general at this level. Consequently, these broad categories offer limited insight into the target domains they are meant to represent.

Nevertheless, assigning a fundamental status to our experiences in terms of objects, substances, etc., remains a crucial psychological task. This is particularly true for experiences that are poorly defined, ambiguous, or abstract. Take the phrase "Life has cheated me" as an example. We may not fully comprehend what 'life' is, but we think of it as an object, allowing us to gain a better understanding. Ontological metaphors help us perceive a more clearly defined structure in areas where it is minimal or absent, enabling us to conceptualize these abstract experiences more concretely.

Personification can be viewed as a form of ontological metaphor, where human characteristics are attributed to non-human entities. This technique is prevalent in literary works, but it's also widely used in everyday language. For example, when we say, 'Life has cheated me', we are ascribing a human action - cheating - to the non-human concept of life. Personification leverages one of the most relatable source domains available to us: our own human experience. By endowing non-human elements with human traits, we can understand them more effectively and relate to them more intimately.

2.3.4.3 Orientational metaphors

Orientational metaphors provide a subtler conceptual framework to target concepts compared to ontological metaphors. Their primary cognitive role is to integrate various target concepts seamlessly into our conceptual system. These metaphors often draw on fundamental human spatial concepts such as 'center-periphery', 'up-down', etc. A term that might more accurately describe these conceptual metaphors is "coherence metaphors." This name better captures their function in imparting psychological clarity and structure to the concepts they depict.

The term "coherence" here simply means that certain target concepts are consistently conceptualized in a similar manner. For example, a group of related ideas might be represented with an "upward" orientation, while their opposing concepts are depicted with a "downward" orientation. This consistent portrayal helps in forming a uniform understanding of these concepts. (based on Kovecses, Z. 2010).

MORE IS UP; LESS IS DOWN: Speak *up*, please. Keep your voice *down*, please.

HEALTHY IS UP; SICK IS DOWN: Lazarus *rose* from the dead. He *fell* ill.

CONSCIOUS IS UP; UNCONSCIOUS IS DOWN: Wake *up*. He *sank* into a coma.

CONTROL IS UP; LACK OF CONTROL IS DOWN: I'm on *top* of the situation. He is *under* my control.

HAPPY IS UP; SAD IS DOWN: I'm feeling *up* today. He's really *low* these days.

The tendency is for upward orientation to align with positive evaluations, while downward orientation often correlates with negative assessments. However, this positive-negative dichotomy isn't limited to the spatial orientation of up and down. It's noted that various spatial image schemas are both bipolar, meaning they have two opposing poles, and bivalent, indicating they carry two kinds of values (positive and negative).

2.3.5   Limitations and Critiques of CMT

While Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) has been foundational in cognitive linguistics, it has also attracted sustained criticism concerning its assumptions, methods, and explanatory scope. The discussion below first outlines alternative approaches that propose

different mechanisms for metaphor comprehension and then summarises internal critiques that target specific theoretical and methodological weaknesses within CMT.

2.3.5.1 Alternative Linguistic Approaches to Metaphor

Expanding beyond mapping-based accounts, several theories treat metaphors as the outcome of general mechanisms of inference, categorisation, conventionalisation, blending, and discourse use.

Relevance-theoretic account

Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995) and Carston (2002, 2010) describe metaphor understanding as pragmatic inference guided by the principle of relevance. Hearers construct ad hoc, context-appropriate concepts rather than retrieving fixed source–target correspondences. Thus "John is a bulldozer" highlights properties such as force and persistence through contextual enrichment, with communicative intention and context carrying the explanatory weight.

Class-inclusion / categorisation account

Glucksberg (2001, 2003, 2008) treats metaphors as category assertions. The vehicle (e.g., "shark") names an ad hoc superordinate (predatory, aggressive entities). The topic ("lawyer") is assigned membership in that class. This view accounts for rapid comprehension and directional asymmetry (e.g., "lawyers are sharks" versus "sharks are lawyers") without appeal to bidomain mappings.

Career of Metaphor

Bowdle and Gentner (2005) propose a shift in processing with conventionalisation. Novel metaphors are processed by comparison (similarity alignment). Conventional metaphors are processed by categorisation (the vehicle functions as a category label). As use accumulates, expressions "change career" from comparison to inclusion, challenging a single, uniform mechanism.

Conceptual blending / integration

Fauconnier and Turner (2002) model metaphor via networks of mental spaces. Selective projection creates a blended space with emergent structure. Expressions such as "computer virus" exhibit properties not reducible to either input alone. Blending thus captures creative cases that exceed fixed correspondences.

Discourse dynamics

Cameron (2003, 2007) situates metaphor in use. Metaphors emerge, shift, and stabilise within interaction. Many "conceptual metaphors" may be analysts' abstractions over fluid practices, varying by genre, activity, and community.

2.3.5.2 Internal Critiques and Theoretical Weaknesses

Alongside these alternatives, scholars within cognitive linguistics identify recurrent problems of definition, method, and evidence.

Methodological clarity

Vervaeke and Kennedy (1996), Haser (2005), and Steen (2007) note limited, replicable procedures for identifying metaphorical expressions and inferring conceptual structures. The Metaphor Identification Procedure (Pragglejaz Group, 2007) improves linguistic reliability, yet the step from surface form to mental representation remains under-specified.

Vagueness in core definitions

Gibbs (2011), Haser (2005), and Glucksberg (2008) point to imprecision in key notions such as "domain," "mapping," "entailment," and "conceptual metaphor." Questions persist about the number of correspondences required, the status of entailments, and the boundary with metonymy. Such vagueness hinders operational testing.

Overgeneralization and limited evidence

Murphy (1996) and McGlone (2007) argue that frequent expressions may be lexicalised conventions rather than evidence of active mappings. Experimental results are mixed on whether comprehenders access domain correspondences in real time. Feature comparison, analogy, or pragmatic enrichment may often suffice.

Neglect of context and discourse variation

Cameron (2003), Semino (2008), and Steen (2011) show that a single vehicle (e.g., "life is a journey") functions differently across genres and purposes. Emphasis on general mappings can obscure deliberate, creative, or ironic uses that manipulate or subvert conventional patterns.

Cultural and cross-linguistic limitations

Yu (2008) and Kövecses (2005, 2015) demonstrate strong cultural shaping in source selection and mapping structure. Early CMT relied heavily on English. Cross-linguistic research reveals notable divergence, which challenges strong universality claims based on embodiment alone.

Underemphasis on emotion and affect

Barcelona (2000) and Gibbs (2017) observe that structural mapping accounts often downplay affective force and felt experience. Expressions such as "broken heart" or "burning love" organise emotional life in ways not fully captured by schematic correspondences.

Static model and creativity

Fauconnier and Turner (2002) and Semino and Demjén (2017) argue that creativity is not well explained by fixed mappings. Novel blends, clashes, and interactions among multiple metaphors align better with dynamic models that allow emergent structure.

Questions of cognitive validity

Glucksberg (2008) and McGlone (2007) report mixed psycholinguistic evidence for CMT-style mappings as independent cognitive entities. Findings from processing time, priming, and neurocognitive studies often support categorisation, analogy, or pragmatic inference as sufficient mechanisms.

2.3.5.3 Working stance adopted

CMT remains a useful heuristic for identifying recurrent patterns of metaphorical expression, provided its limits are recognised. The present analysis proceeds with attention to discourse context and genre, cultural specificity in source selection and mapping, affective and experiential dimensions, and creative meanings that exceed fixed correspondences. Where appropriate, insights from relevance-theoretic pragmatics, categorisation accounts, blending, and discourse-based approaches are incorporated to provide a fuller account of metaphor in Assamese poetry.

2.4 LITERARY AND ORDINARY METAPHORS

A common perception among both layman and academics is that the quintessence of

metaphor is rooted in literary and artistic creations. This perspective attributes the emergence of the most genuine metaphors to the creative ingenuity of writers and artists. Yet, cognitive linguistics offers a more nuanced view, suggesting that this belief is only partly true. It reveals that everyday language and the conceptual frameworks we all share are crucial in nurturing and shaping creative genius. This approach underscores the deep interconnection between daily communication and artistic metaphorical expression.

This isn't to say that artists and scholars never create new and original metaphors. In fact, when they do introduce fresh metaphors, these often stand out prominently in their works. Their uniqueness or unconventional nature usually makes them particularly noteworthy. While innovative artistic metaphors may be less straightforward than every day or scientific metaphors, they are often richer in meaning and depth, offering a wealth of interpretation and significance.

Contrary to what one might assume, common metaphors are not discarded by artists and writers in their creative endeavors. Instead, there is substantial evidence suggesting that these "creative" individuals heavily rely on everyday metaphors, and their originality and inventiveness actually stem from these familiar expressions. Cognitive scholars have noted that literary authors frequently employ various techniques to craft unique, intricate language and "imagery" using the standard materials of everyday speech and thought patterns.

The tools, which are used by literary writers to create effective language, include:

2.4.1 Extending

In extending, a traditional conceptual metaphor, which is associated with certain conventional linguistic expressions, is enhanced by introducing a new linguistic element. This addition aims to bring a fresh conceptual aspect into the source domain, thereby enriching the original metaphor.

As an illustration of this type of metaphor, consider Shakespeare's "Romeo and Juliet." In the play, Shakespeare employs an extended metaphor when he likens Juliet to the sun in the famous lines: "But soft! What light through yonder window breaks? It is the East, and Juliet is the sun! Arise, fair sun, and kill the envious moon" (Act 2, Scene 2: 58). This metaphor beautifully extends throughout the passage, enriching the imagery and deepening the expression of Romeo's admiration for Juliet.

2.4.2 Elaboration

Elaboration differs from extension in that it provides a detailed and often unusual explanation of an existing element in the source domain. Instead of introducing a new element, elaboration focuses on portraying an already existing aspect in a novel and imaginative manner, offering a fresh perspective on a familiar concept.

2.4.3 Questioning

In the literary device of questioning, writers have the ability to challenge the appropriateness or relevance of our everyday, commonplace metaphors. This technique allows them to scrutinize and potentially redefine the way we typically understand and use metaphors in regular discourse.

2.4.4 Combining

Blending is arguably the most potent technique for transcending conventional conceptual boundaries while still utilizing the elements of everyday, traditional thinking. This approach skillfully merges different concepts to create novel interpretations and perspectives.

2.4.5 Personification

As previously noted, personification stands out as a prominent ontological metaphor frequently employed in both everyday and literary language. It's a metaphorical tool that is especially prevalent in literary works. Personification allows us to apply our self-understanding to interpret various aspects of the world. This particular metaphorical technique is extensively used in the Shakespearean tragedies selected for this study, showcasing its significance in literature.

2.5 METAPHOR IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURE (MIP)

2.5.1 MIP in theory

Identifying linguistic metaphors requires a meticulous process to differentiate them from literal (non-metaphorical) language. A collective of researchers, known as the Pragglejaz Group, devised a specific methodology for this purpose, known as the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP). This procedure is outlined as follows:

- Read the entire text or discourse thoroughly to gain a comprehensive understanding

of its overall meaning.

- Identify and analyze the lexical units within the text or discourse.

  a) For each lexical unit identified in the text, determine its meaning within the specific context it is used.

  b) Examine each lexical unit to see if it possesses a more basic, contemporary meaning in contexts different from the one presented in the text.

  c) Assess whether the fundamental meaning of the word differs significantly from its meaning in the given context.

    - If not, label the lexical unit as non-metaphorical in its usage.
    - If yes, then determine whether the contextual meaning of the word bears any similarity to its basic meaning.
        - If yes, then classify the lexical unit as metaphorical in its use.
        - If no, then identify the lexical unit as not being used metaphorically.

2.5.2   MIP in practice

This section will explore the application of the MIP (Metaphor Identification Procedure) to iconic quotes from Shakespeare's 'Romeo and Juliet.' Specifically, we will delve into Romeo's words from Act 2, Scene 2, examining how MIP can enhance our understanding and interpretation of these timeless lines:

It is the east, and Juliet is the sun.

The first step of MIP involves a thorough reading of the entire text. In this instance, the task is more accessible due to the widespread familiarity with Shakespeare's 'Romeo and Juliet,' a renowned play depicting the tragedy of two lovers. The subsequent step of MIP entails identifying distinct lexical units within the text. Typically, a lexical unit is equivalent to a single word, as exemplified in the phrase 'Juliet is the sun.' The focus of this section shifts to Step 3, the core of MIP, where we apply the process to the lexical elements of this specific sentence. This is followed by the concluding action in Step 4, involving a final decision.

- Contextual Meaning: Here, "Juliet" refers specifically to the female protagonist loved by the speaker, Romeo.
- Basic Meaning: The name "Juliet" is commonly given to women in Western cultures.

- Comparison of Contextual and Basic Meanings: In this instance, the contextual meaning of "Juliet" as Romeo's lover represents just one interpretation of the more general usage of the name.
- Metaphorical Usage: Indeed, the name "Juliet" can metaphorically represent any woman who is in love or who is the object of love.

IS (Verb)

The Pragglejaz Group, the founders of MIP, have previously addressed the metaphorical use of 'is' in contexts similar to this one (Pragglejaz Group 2007: 7). In this particular sentence, the contextual meaning aligns with its basic meaning. Therefore, 'is' is not being used metaphorically.

THE (Determiner)

- Contextual Meaning: In this context, 'the' serves the grammatical purpose of indicating that the subsequent noun phrase refers to a specific, unique entity.
- Basic Meaning: The definite article 'the' does not possess a meaning beyond its basic grammatical function.
- Comparison of Contextual and Basic Meanings: The contextual meaning of 'the' is consistent with its basic meaning.
- Metaphorical Usage: No, 'the' is not used metaphorically in this context.

SUN (Noun)

- Contextual Meaning: In this context, 'sun' metaphorically describes a person dearly loved by the speaker, who appears or becomes prominent during the night.
- Basic Meaning: Conventionally, the 'sun' refers to the large, radiant star visible in the sky during daytime, providing light and heat to Earth, as defined by the Cambridge Dictionary Online.
- Comparison of Contextual and Basic Meanings: The contextual meaning sharply contrasts with the basic one. In the contextual sense, 'sun' is a living entity, symbolically representing a person, while in its basic sense, it is an inanimate celestial body. Additionally, while the sun in its basic meaning is visible only during the day, in the contextual interpretation, the 'sun' (person) is also significant during the night.
- Metaphorical Usage: Yes, 'sun' is used metaphorically in this context.

Step 1: Understanding the general context.

Read the entire text/discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.

Understanding the context is paramount when it comes to identifying metaphors. Recognizing metaphorical usage of words within a given context necessitates a thorough familiarity with that context. Words do not operate in isolation; their meanings are often deeply intertwined with the broader content, which is key to unraveling their true interpretative significance.

MIP emphasizes the importance of individual words, which can lead to a certain level of fatigue, especially after extensive exposure to the texts and practice with the method. There's a risk of becoming overly fixated on the specific lexical units and their immediate context, to the detriment of grasping the broader message and nuances of the text. Essentially, it's the classic case of missing the forest for the trees.

Step 2: Lexical units: Determine the lexical units in the text/discourse.

The core principle of the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) is its ability to decompose the process into distinct steps, providing experts with enhanced control and precision in identifying metaphors. This approach significantly improves the reliability of the outcomes. Thus, it's crucial to precisely define the specific unit of analysis incorporated in the operational definition of a metaphor. MIP operates at the level of individual lexical units, as opposed to morphemes, phrases, sentences, etc. Therefore, these lexical units must be clearly delineated in the text being analyzed.

In numerous cases, a lexical unit consists of a single word. Yet, the adage 'every rule has its exception' also holds true for the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP). Here, multiword units like phrasal verbs and compound words are treated as single lexical units. This approach is adopted because their meanings cannot be broken down into smaller, analyzable parts.

Step 3a: Contextual meaning

For each lexical unit within the text, determine its contextual meaning, that is, how it relates to an entity, relationship, or attribute within the scenario depicted by the text. This involves considering both the preceding and following content surrounding the lexical unit.

The MIP doesn't address challenges in establishing the contextual meanings of words; indeed, identifying these meanings is typically straightforward in practice. However, determining the context of specialized terminology not listed in contemporary general English dictionaries can sometimes pose difficulties.

Step 3b: Basic meaning

For each lexical unit, assess whether it possesses a simpler, more fundamental meaning in different contexts compared to the one presented in the given context.

The MIP defines a word's basic meaning as the most concrete, human-centered, and precise meaning listed in the dictionary, within the same word class and grammatical category. This encompasses word classes (like nouns, verbs, prepositions, conjunctions, etc.) and grammatical categories (such as countable/uncountable, transitive/intransitive/copular, etc.). This basic meaning is considered essential to the word's sense in context. This perspective is based on the understanding that language elements are defined by both their semantics and necessary syntax, forming part of the 'cognitive topology' of the source space preserved in metaphor mappings.

According to the MIP, certain classes of lexical units and grammatical categories correspond to specific concepts and referents. Therefore, these should not be altered when determining their basic meaning.

The MIP also asserts that the basic sense of a word should be identified using standard dictionaries of contemporary language, based on the understanding of current users. Emphasizing a synchronic description of the language is crucial to determine if a potentially active metaphorical basis exists for a specific lexical unit identified as a metaphor. Historical dictionaries are generally not recommended in this context, as the diachronic perspective is largely irrelevant to the average language user.

Step 3c: Sufficient distinction

If the lexical unit possesses a simpler, more current meaning in contexts other than the one provided, determine whether its contextual meaning differs from this basic meaning but can still be comprehended in relation to it.

For a metaphorical mapping to occur, there must be a distinction between the contextual and the essential meanings of a word. This distinction is often based on the approach of

Macmillan's dictionary, which follows standard lexicographical practice by listing different senses of a word as separate, numbered entries under the same headword. Occasionally, meanings are grouped together under the same number if they are considered two manifestations of one general meaning, such as human/animal or abstract/concrete. However, this conflation might also result from other factors, such as the need for simplicity, clarity, and brevity.

Therefore, the MIP includes a secondary dictionary, Longman, as a backup resource. If Longman also merges meanings, the broader interpretation is accepted as the primary sense. However, if Longman distinguishes the meanings into separate, numbered entries, they are considered sufficiently distinct. This second dictionary thus serves as a safety net, enabling the identification of more metaphorical expressions than might be possible with just one dictionary.

In summary, dictionaries only provide evidence regarding the distinction in meanings, but it ultimately falls upon the individual researcher to interpret this information. They must judge whether the differentiation between various numbered dictionary entries for a single lexical unit is substantial enough to be considered relevant for metaphor identification.

Step 3d: Relation of comparison

If the lexical unit possesses a simpler, more modern meaning in different contexts than the one currently presented, assess whether its contextual meaning diverges from this basic meaning, yet can still be understood through comparison with it.

When faced with two or more distinct and differing meanings, it's necessary to discern the relationship between them. Metaphorical mappings are indicated by a kind of cross-domain similarity, typically between concrete and abstract meanings. The MIP adopts a broad view of similarity, which can include both pre-existing and newly created resemblances. This encompasses not just literal or external similarities, but also relational or proportional similarities (or analogies).

This quote suggests several insights. Firstly, similarity can be created by the metaphorical mapping itself, rather than reflecting a pre-existing similarity. This explains why seemingly contradictory mappings are possible. For instance, metaphors can depict marriage as a business partnership (implying equality between the spouses) and simultaneously as an asymmetric relationship, akin to that between children and a parent.

Secondly, similarity can be either objectively factual or subjectively perceived. Thirdly, this concept of similarity includes not just an analysis of shared characteristics across different domains but also considers cross-domain relationships. For example, connections may be drawn from recurring scenarios, such as desire often being associated with hunger, due to these sensations frequently occurring together.

Steen (2007: 91) notes that scholars who focus on class-inclusion in metaphor mapping, despite rejecting the role of comparison, could still benefit from considering similarity-based approaches in identifying metaphors. This is for the purpose of selecting phrases for empirical research, to test whether these expressions are indeed processed through categorization rather than comparison.

Beyond metaphorical processing, there are various other relationships that can link meanings; these must be distinguished to ascertain if the connection is metaphorical. Apart from metaphors, the most common types of relationships between specific meanings include generalization, specification, and metonymy.

Another crucial point to note is that one person's metaphor can sometimes be another's metonymy. Take, for instance, the noun 'goal' as defined in the Macmillan dictionary: it has two meanings. The first is 'something that you hope to achieve,' and the second is 'the net or structure that you try to get the ball into in games such as football and basketball.' A metaphorical interpretation might consider the more tangible second meaning as the basic sense, with the first meaning being a figurative extension, possibly under the underlying conceptual metaphor of 'life is a game.' Conversely, the first meaning could be viewed as the fundamental sense, with the second interpreted as a metonymic expansion, representing an 'area for event' metonymy.

Step 4: Final decision: What has really been identified?

If the responses to Steps 3c and 3d are affirmative, the lexical unit should be identified as metaphorical. In essence, the MIP recognizes metaphors only at the level of linguistic expressions, revealing words used metaphorically – these are linguistic metaphors. However, MIP does not identify metaphors at the level of thought, namely conceptual metaphors. Although MIP's approach is grounded in a cognitive linguistic model that acknowledges cross-domain mappings underlying language-level metaphors, it does not specifically identify these mappings.

To label an expression as being used metaphorically, it is sufficient to note the presence of a source and target domain, along with the fundamental connection of actual or perceived similarity.

Moreover, the MIP focuses on identifying metaphors in contemporary, active language use, rather than across the entire historical span of a language. Consequently, it only marks words used metaphorically in the present context, not those lexical units that have evolved metaphorically over time. MIP specifically identifies a singular type of figurative language: the indirect metaphor, characterized by a close distinction between the basic and contextual meanings. Direct metaphors like similes and analogies, as well as anaphoric elements indicating implied metaphors, are not identified through MIP.

2.6 METAPHOR AND COGNITIVE STYLISTICS

This section explores the evolution of metaphor studies within cognitive stylistics, with a particular emphasis on the element of novelty in metaphorical usage in literary writing. A key aspect of cognitive stylistics is its focus on how humans exchange mental constructs, especially how we project one mental image onto another when engaging with literary texts. Experts in stylistics and cognitive poetics have consistently highlighted the process of conceptual transfer in both literary works and everyday conversations. They have identified two principal figurative devices through which this conceptual transfer occurs: metaphor and metonymy.

The concept that a particular metaphor is 'novel' can be understood in several ways. This novelty can refer to the freshness or uniqueness of the conceptual mapping between a source and target domain. Alternatively, it can denote an author's distinctive method of expression used to convey a metaphor.

Expanding on this perspective, it's important to recognize that most figurative mappings are conveyed through everyday, commonly used linguistic expressions. For instance, the metaphor 'IDEAS ARE FOOD' is communicated through a range of standard phrases, such as 'I can't stomach that idea', 'Your theory's half-baked', or 'His story is pretty hard to swallow', among others.

It's intriguing to note that in these metaphors, there's a mapping between a conceptual target domain (IDEAS) and a more tangible source domain (FOOD). This pattern of 'concretization', where we try to grasp the essence of a thought by reframing it in terms of

something more concrete, is replicated in many figurative expressions. It provides significant insight into the workings of the human mind.

The process of concretization highlights how figurative mapping is a natural aspect of human cognition, rather than being alien to our thought processes. As a result, many metaphors have become embedded over time into fixed phrases such as idioms. Idioms are typically defined as groups of words whose meanings cannot be inferred directly from their individual parts. However, it's crucial not to overlook the often metaphorical origins of these idioms.

A clear example of this principle of 'metaphoricity' is found in a slip of the tongue made by a journalist about an overworked sports personality: 'He's burning the midnight oil at both ends' (cited in Simpson, 1992). In this instance, two expressions that represent the same conceptual metaphor have been inadvertently merged. The metaphor invoked here is ENERGY IS A BURNING FUEL, typically conveyed through phrases like 'burn the midnight oil' and 'burning the candle at both ends'.

The commonly used term for such a slip, a 'mixed metaphor,' is somewhat misleading because, as noted, it's a blend of two idioms that draw on the same metaphor. Specifically, this example illustrates the cognitive basis of idioms well by showing how the same conceptual framework can house related sets of stable expressions.

Returning to the topic of novelty, it's in the context of these common figurative mappings that authors strive to not only forge new connections and types of association between target and source domains, but also to diversify and elaborate upon existing metaphors in various ways. Take, for instance, a passage from Craig Raine's poem 'An Enquiry into Two Inches of Ivory': (... the vacuum cleaner grazes over the carpet, lowing). Here, the target domain is a commonplace household appliance, and the source domain is a familiar farm animal. The source domain, as in many metaphorical expressions, is brought to life through verbs that describe actions of the target ('grazes' and 'lowing'), allowing the overarching metaphorical concept to be summarized as: A HOUSEHOLD APPLIANCE IS A FARMED ANIMAL.

Regarding the novelty of the metaphor, it's the 'mental mixture' or 'conceptual blending' of familiar elements that provides a fresh perspective on an otherwise mundane object like the humble vacuum cleaner. Notably, both concepts in this example are physical (one animate, the other inanimate), so the transition between target and source differs from the

process of concretization observed in typical everyday metaphorical mappings.

In light of this discussion, it's important to highlight that novelty in stylistic expression cannot remain novel indefinitely. What initially stands out in a unique context will gradually blend into the background over time. Indeed, many of our common idioms and more unique expressions originated as innovative metaphors in literary works. Phrases like 'cold comfort', 'a tower of strength', 'play fast and loose', 'in my mind's eye', and 'to the manner born' may not seem particularly striking today, but it's notable that they were first used in the plays of William Shakespeare.

2.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter introduced the concept of 'metaphor,' discussing its various definitions and theories. It provided a brief overview of how different theories offer unique perspectives on the meaning of 'metaphor.' Additionally, it introduced the use of 'metaphor' as a stylistic device. The chapter highlighted the academic contributions that paved the way for the contemporary theory of metaphor introduced by George Lakoff and his colleagues. It also delved into the concept of conceptual metaphor and its identification procedure. The next chapter will focus on the analysis of poetry using these theories.