



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN SOCIAL SCIENCES & HUMANITIES

An International Open-Access Peer Reviewed Refereed Journal

Impact Factor: 6.064

E-ISSN : 2249 – 4642

P-ISSN: 2454 - 4671

THE LINGUISTIC STUDY OF GRAMMATICAL METAPHOR

Prof. Dr. Abdulkarim Fadhil Jameel

University of Baghdad, College of Education Ibn Rushd

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.37648/ijrssh.v12i02.037>

Paper Received:

27th April 2022

Paper Accepted:

02nd June 2022

Paper Received After Correction:

20th June 2022

Paper Published:

23rd June 2022



How to cite the article: Jameel A.F.(2022). The Linguistic Study of Grammatical Metaphor, *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences & Humanities*, April-June 2022 Vol. 12, Issue 2; 572-582 DOI: <http://doi.org/10.37648/ijrssh.v12i02.037>

INTRODUCTION

There are several philosophers and linguists who use the word "cognition" to describe this area of research. It focuses on the relationship between ideas and the rules that govern their usage that have not yet been widely identified. There are several aspects of cognitive linguistics that deal with the relationship between languages on the one hand, and cognitive units (structures), processes, and structures on the other (Keller, 1998: 69). When it comes to cognition, there are many different disciplines that may help us understand how the mind works.

In cognitive linguistics, conceptual metaphor, or cognitive metaphor, refers to the understanding of one idea, or conceptual domain, in terms of another. An example of this is the understanding of quantity in terms of directionality (e.g. "the price of peace is rising") or the understanding of time in terms of money (e.g. "I spent time at work today").

Aims of the study

This study aims at:

1. Showing the concept of the metaphor and its types in English.
2. Showing the metaphor in English from a grammatical perspective.

Procedures

The procedures that are followed in the study are as follows:

- 1- Collecting enough resources about the topic.
- 2- Dividing the research into three sections. Section one is an introductory section, section two is a theoretical account about the topic.
- 3- The last section presents the main conclusions.

METAPHOR AS A FIELD OF COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS

The field of cognitive linguistics was founded in the 1970s. A scientific approach, it examines language and mental processes, as well as the conceptual frameworks of language. Rosch's pioneering findings on human categorization provided the first motivation for cognitive linguistics. It has enhanced other academic fields, such as psychology, anthropology, philosophy, and literary studies, with its insights. As Janda (2000:2) points out, a lot of what we know about the world is based on how we experience it and how we interpret and understand it.

Cognitive linguistics gives us an opportunity to reconnect the threads of the history of linguistics and heal the gashes that have marked our field in the twentieth century.

There are two major tendencies of cognitive linguistics draw upon semantics, the first one identifies the structure inside the cognitive construction; while the other replaces the idea of two-step models (Keller, 1998: 69).

The theories of cognitive linguistics generally, hold entities of perception, thoughts, feelings, beliefs, intentions; one of these theories suggested by Fauconnier (1985) which involves:

1. Mental spaces
2. Cognitive models that structure those spaces.

A mental space is a medium for conceptualization and thought. Spaces are conceptualized in nature. They are not a kind of thing based on the relationship between symbols and things in the real world, but there is a dynamic integration processes that build up new blended mental spaces (i.e., conceptual blending) (Lakoff, 1987: 281).

THE DEFINITIONS OF METAPHOR

Generally speaking, metaphors are one of the most useful communicative devices a language may have. The basic

purpose of them is referential, i.e., offer a cognitive description of “ a mental process or state, concept, an object, a quality or an action” that is more comprehensive or concise than that offered by literal language. Concomitantly, a pragmatic purpose is performed mainly for aesthetic considerations. Its objective is to appeal to the senses to interest, to clarify (graphically), to please, to delight and to surprise (Newmark, 1988: 104).

Metaphor takes place among the most subtle aspects of the semantics of any natural language by which a figurative comparison holds between a couple of things resulting in an image in the mind's eye. This metaphorical usage involves some shift in meaning distancing the term from its conventional understanding (Carpenter, 1997: 28).

Lakoff and Johnson (2003: 3-4) state that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action (i.e. It is a property of concepts and not words). The idea investigated by cognitive linguistics referring to metaphor is the meaning that the humans recognize in language is primarily based in semantics concepts.

Using Trask's (2008: 98) definition, metaphor is a kind of cognitive semantics, in which one conceptual domain is seen as a way to comprehend another. This mapping between the source and

destination conceptual domains is a common feature of a typical metaphor, and it serves as a useful tool for understanding and organizing the subject matter at hand. Metaphors may be found in every language. Many of these may be found in our own dialect. According to Searle (1985: 89), a "the metaphorical statement and the corresponding similarity statement cannot be equivalent in meaning because they have different truth conditions" Metaphors and parables and proverbs go hand in hand, as shown by the following:

- *A stitch in time saves nine.*

S/he generally means it to apply metaphorically to the situation in hand. Whatever explains the understanding of these sorts of utterances is likely to explain metaphor, and it will not be a semantic theory however constructed (Levinson, 1989:212).

Many emotional experiences are linked to newborns' direct perception of their bodies and of space, and this serves as the basis for metaphorical ideas like WELL-BEING or HAPPINESS. It is common for the youngster to be raised up to get additional care and attention because of their focus on faces and sounds that are up. HAPPY IS ALWAYS UP is progressively taught to the young kid through this method (Tolaas, 1991). In Gibbs (1994:414), he claims that this metaphorical mapping organises many

of the traditional terms we use to describe our emotional experiences. The following are some examples:

-I'm *up*.

-.He is in *high* spirits.

TYPES OF CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR

Cliché metaphors

Metaphors, such as proverbs and idiomatic expressions, are widespread in our language. As far as widespread use goes, they're a happy medium between the old and the new. According to Newmark (1982: 99), there are two types of colloquial expressions: The first branch is simplex metaphor which consists of an adjective that has a figurative meaning; it is called figurative adjective, and a noun that has a literal noun such as:

e.g **Filthy lucre.**

The word 'lucre' is a noun that occurs with its literal meaning. And the word 'filthy' is an adjective that comes with its figurative meaning. It is not intended for this dirty money on the truth, but rather intended to be collecting money to dishonest crooked ways, i.e., illegal gain. The second branch which is called complex metaphor consists of a verb of a figurative meaning i.e., a figurative verb, and a noun of a figurative meaning, i.e., figurative noun such as:

- Explore all avenues.

Complex Metaphor

"Metaphor" refers to a comparison between two or more objects. When it comes to this topic, for example: In this comparison, the light reflects off of something and merges with another metaphor that is the light itself. 'Brightens everything up' A synonym for "light" is to use "light." as an analogy for interpretation or explanation.

(Shipley,onlinewww.Lcc.Gatech.Edu/gallery/rhetoric/terms/metaphor.html).

Dead Metaphors

Fossilized metaphors, frozen metaphors, lexicalized metaphors, and lexically-based metaphors are all terms used to describe these frozen metaphors. Initially, these phrases were used as metaphors, but with time, they became part of the language and lost all of their technical qualities. Eventually, it's almost hard to distinguish between the two. According to Newmark, there are two halves to this metaphor (2891: 91-99). Lifeless metaphors with foreign assets like 'consider' appear in the first section. At its essence, this phrase is a non-native English speaker. the word "consider" is a loan from Latin.

Extended metaphors

President Lyndon Johnson was been described as "the star that is not reached and the harvest that's sleeping in the unplowed ground," which is a metaphorical representation of the United States' "uncrossed desert and unclimbed ridge.".(Sommer,online:www.Lcc.Gatech.Edu/gallery/rhetoric/terms/metaphor.html).

Implicit Metaphors.

Metaphors that have a borrowed name to it which is not authorized, but is understood implicitly, such as:

e.g I am burning.

'passion' is implicitly understood and estimate the speech is:

-“I burn inside me”.

Structural Metaphors

They bring an experience in a structure, or rather in a field of another experience and this is in the form of specific concepts, as in the concept of: - *Argument is war*.

Where we bring 'debate' in the 'war'. The similarity between them that a strong debate occurs between two people in a case, where they differ, and each has a point of view. They, then, end with a victory or defeat, or end with a truce. All of this is a field of war. In the daily debate of the talk, Lakoff and Johnson (2003:14)

refer to the structural metaphor as "cases where one concept is metaphorically structured in terms of another". In this kind of metaphor; Kovecses (2002:3) claims that the source domain provides a relatively rich knowledge structure for the target concept. In other words, the cognitive function of this type is to enable speakers to understand target (A) domain by means of the structure source (B) domain. Knowles and Moon (2006:17) illustrate that the source domains in this type of metaphor supply frame work for target domains and this will determine the ways in which we think and talk about abstract entities and activities which the target domain refer. This process understands as conceptual mappings between elements of (A) and elements of (B). For example, the concept of **Time** is structured according to **Motion**.

-TIMES ARE MOTION.

One can understand the term time as the following element, physical objects, their locations and their motion. Hence the following mapping will take place as following:

-You are wasting my time.

-Times are things.

-The passing of time is motion.

-This gadget will save you hours.

Orientational metaphor

Their semantic notions "directionality" and "specialization" are used metaphorically to arrange metaphors of many ideas, one with the other, in forms that represent the location. Examples of this include: - "Directionality" and "specialization"

- Don't force your meanings into the wrong words.

- Can you extract coherent ideas from that prose?

The words that are used indicate directionality and specialization which are borrowed here in the abstract expressions of the lingual that have nothing to do with the place at all. These words are all included within the conceptual framework:

Ontological metaphor

People often use metaphorical language to make abstract and intangible things like intellectual activity, emotions, and ideas more concrete for the human mind.

- We need to combat inflation and it is imperceptible act, an entity stands-alone, we must combat it. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1989: 11).

Sometimes linguists look at the metaphor in terms of its verb, and sometimes in terms of its circulation, and at other times in terms of the concept indicated by. At the

end, linguists come to one thing which is the metaphor in itself.

IMAGE SCHEMA THEORY

Cognitive semantics has defined an image schema as the most significant topic for studying psychological development of embodied cognitive theory. (Evans and Green ,2006:177). Because the mental image has a powerful connection to reality as a result of person's conscious experiences and recalling for "visual memory," while image schema are more abstract in nature and found in our embodied experiences, the mental image appears when you close your eyes and imagine your father or mother.

MAPPINGS

There are two main roles for the conceptual domains posited in conceptual metaphors:

Source domain: the conceptual domain from which we draw metaphorical expressions (e.g., love is a journey).

Target domain: the conceptual domain that we try to understand (e.g., love is a journey).

A mapping is the method in which a source domain tracks onto and characterizes elements of the destination domain. Mappings represent the conceptual structure of information in

domains, the fundamental process that causes metaphorical usage in language. This conceptualization links closely to image schemas, mental representations employed in reasoning, via the expansion of spatial and physical rules to increasingly complicated contexts.

A major principle of this theory is that metaphors are stuff of mind and not only of language: therefore, the name conceptual metaphor. The metaphor may seem to consist of words or other linguistic expressions that derive from the vocabulary of the more concrete conceptual domain, but conceptual metaphors underlay a system of connected metaphorical expressions that emerge on the language surface. Similarly, the mappings of a conceptual metaphor are themselves inspired by picture schemas which pre-linguistic schemas are addressing space, time, moving, controlling, and other essential features of embodied human experience.

Conceptual metaphors often utilize a more abstract notion as aim and a more real or physical concept as their source. For instance, metaphors such as 'the days [the more abstract or goal term] ahead' or 'giving my time' depend on more concrete conceptions, thereby representing time as a journey into physical space, or as a substance that can be touched and

presented as a gift. Different conceptual metaphors tend to be employed when the speaker is attempting to make a case for a given point of view or course of action. For instance, one would equate "the days ahead" with leadership, but the term "giving my time" conveys more overtones of negotiation. Selection of such metaphors tends to be led by a subconscious or implicit habit in the mind of the individual applying them (Koveses, 2008:168). (Koveses, 2008:168).

GRAMMATICAL METAPHOR

SFL's key contribution to linguistics and education is a concept known as grammatical metaphor (GM), first proposed by Halliday (1985a) as an essential property of academic, bureaucratic, and scientific discourses. There are now two competing theories for explaining gene-driven evolution since the original hypothesis was put out. The occurrence of GM varies greatly depending on which hypothesis is used by researchers. As a result, the purpose of this work is to first examine GM from a theoretical standpoint before turning to practical applications in language development and education research.

The stratal model (Halliday, Halliday 1985a, Halliday 1988, Halliday 1998; Martin, Martin 1992a, Martin 1993b; Halliday & Martin, 1993) and the

semantic model (Halliday & Martin, 1993) have been proposed in SFL theory to explain GM (Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999). According to each model, the concept of stratal tension and semantic junction are used to draw on diverse linguistic configurations that lead to the definition and kinds of GM. Though the stratal and semantic models of GM theorise and define the concept differently, there is a strong connection between both. To be precise, the semantic model is a refinement of the stratal model in this respect. Furthermore, grammatical metaphor may be seen as a consequence of the transfer and/or transcategorization of GM mentioned in the stratal model's semantic model (see Halliday, 1998). As part of the theoretical aspect, we'll look at how the models define and classify GM, followed by research in language development (Christie & Derewianka, 2008) and language education (Byrnes, 2009) that investigate GM. One more extensive research that sought to construct an integrated model to conceptualise GM will be discussed after the discussion of stratal and semantic models in language development and language instruction (Devrim, 2013). An integrated model that incorporates both stratal and semantic models may be useful in the teaching of GM. The study will end with implications

for researchers and educators in genetics and genomics.

TYPES OF GM

The second model that theorizes GM is known as the semantic model, which was suggested by Halliday & Matthiessen (1999). Halliday & Matthiessen (1999), p. 238 account for the congruent and metaphorical realization of semantic categories in grammar:

When a sequence is realized as a clause complex, or a process as a verb, this is congruent: it is the clause complex, and the verb, in the function in which it evolved. When a sequence is realized as something other than a clause complex, or a process as something other than a verb, this is metaphorical. Some other grammatical unit is supplanting them in these functions.

The highest in rank order in semantics is sequence, followed by figure and elements of figures. The elements of figures are participant, process, circumstance and relator. The above explanation states that sequence is realized congruently by clause complex, and process (as a semantic category) is realized congruently by a verb in grammar. Thus, according to the semantic model, if sequence is realized by a clause or if a noun realizes a process in

grammar, then the linguistic structure is called a GM instance.

Based on the congruent and metaphorical realization of semantic categories, Halliday and Matthiessen (1999:244) refer to the notion of semantic junction. Consequently, Halliday and Matthiessen base their categorization of GM in relation to the joining of semantic categories.

CONCLUSIONS

In the context of conceptual metaphors, one notion (or conceptual domain) is seen in terms of another. This kind of metaphor is known as a generative metaphor. It's called a source domain in cognitive linguistics when we pull our metaphorical phrases from a different conceptual domain. The target domain is the conceptual domain that is understood in this manner. As a result, the destination domain of life is often explained in terms of the journey's originating domain.

Conceptual metaphors are part of the common language and conceptual precepts shared by members of a culture. These metaphors are systematic because there is a defined correlation between the structure of the source domain and the structure of the target domain. We generally recognize these things in terms of a common understanding. For example, in our culture, if the source concept is

"death," the common target destination is "leave-taking or departure."

Because conceptual metaphors are drawn from a collective cultural understanding, they've eventually become linguistic conventions. This explains why the definitions for so many words and idiomatic expressions are dependent on understanding accepted conceptual metaphors.

The connections we make are largely unconscious. They're part of an almost automatic thought process. Although sometimes, when the circumstances that bring the metaphor to mind are unexpected or unusual, the metaphor

REFERENCES

1. Lakoff, G. (2881) 'The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor', Metaphor and Thought .Cambridge: Cambridge University press
2. Crystal ,D (2008): A Dictionary of Phonetics and Linguistics ^{6th}ed. Blackwell Press.
3. Halliday, MAK, and JR Martin. 1993. Writing science: Literacy and discursive power. London: The Falmer Press.
4. Halliday, MAK, and R Hasan. 1976. Cohesion in English. London: Longman.
5. Halliday, MAK. 1985. Introduction to functional grammar. London: Arnold.
6. Halliday, MAK. 1988. On the language of physical science. In Registers of written English, ed. M Ghadessy. London: Pinter.
7. Halliday, MAK. 1998. Things and relations: regrammaticising experience as technical knowledge. In Reading science: Critical and functional perspectives on discourse of science, ed. JR Martin and R Veel, 185–235. London: Routledge.
8. Kövecses, Zoltán (2008). "Conceptual metaphor theory: Some criticisms and alternative proposals". Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics.
9. Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1989) Metaphors We live By. Chicago: University of Chicago press.
10. Lesz, B. (2011). To shape the world for the better: an analysis of metaphors in the speeches of Barack Obama. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Norway :University of Tromso.
11. Levinson, Stephen C. (1983). Pragmatics ,Cambridge: CUP
12. Mio, J., Riggio, R., Levin, S. & Reese, R. (2005). Presidential leadership and charisma: The effects of metaphor. The Leadership Quarterly.
13. Newmark, P. (1981) Approaches to Translation, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
14. Nilsen, Helge Normann. "American Women's Literature in the Twentieth Century: A Survey of Some Feminist Trends," American Studies in Scandinavia, Vol. 22, 1990, pp. 27-29; University of Trondheim
15. Reddy, M. (1993) 'The Conduit Metaphor': Metaphor and Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
16. Searle, John R. (1985). Expression and meaning. Cambridge: CUP.
17. Sperber, Dan and Deirdre Willson. (1986). Relevance: Communication and cognition, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Unive
18. Staryk I(2016) Features of Political Discourse and Its Place In The Information Space Of The World. Faculty of Linguistics, 'KPI university Press.

19. Trask R ,L.(2007).An Introduction to Language and Linguistics. Routledge: Avenu New York.
20. Halliday, MAK. 1994. Introduction to Functional Grammar, 2nd edition, London: Edward Arnold.

