T. C.

ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY

THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

UNDERSTANDING METAPHOR:
A COGNITIVE APPROACH FOCUSING ON IDENTIFICATION
AND INTERPRETATION OF METAPHORS IN POETRY

Filiz DUR

Supervisor Asist. Prof Dr. Tijen TÜRELİ

MASTER OF ARTS

Adana / 2006

We certify that this thesis is satisfactory for the award of the degree of Master of Arts.

…………………………

Supervisor

Asst. Prof. Dr. Tijen TÜRELİ

………………………….   …………………………

Member of Examining Committee   Member of Examining Committee

Asst. Prof . Dr. Hatice SOFU   Asst. Prof . Dr. Nuran ASLAN.

I certify that this thesis conforms to the formal standarts of the Institute of Social

Sciences.

………………………………

Director of Institute

Prof. Dr. Nihat KÜÇÜKSAVAŞ

Note: The uncited usage of the reports , charts, figures and photographs in this thesis, whether original or quoted from other sources, is subject to the law of Works of Art and Thought No: 5846

Not: Bu tezde kullanılan özgün veya başka kaynaktan yapılmış bildirişlerin, çizelge, şekil ve fotoğrafların kaynak gösterilmeden kullanımı 5846 Sayılı Fikir ve Sanat Eserleri Kanunu'ndaki hükümlere tabidir.

ABSTRACT

UNDERSTANDING METAPHOR: A COGNITIVE APPROACH FOCUSING

ON IDENTIFICATION AND INTERPRETATION OF

METAPHORS IN POETRY

Filiz DUR

Thesis of Master of Arts, English Language Teaching Department

Advisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Tijen TÜRELİ

July, 2006, 134 Pages

This study aims to investigate metaphor in poetry from a cognitive perspective. The presence, interpretation and effect of metaphors in poetry were investigated. Besides, it aimed to find out whether the fourth-year students at the ELT Department of Çukurova University can identify the metaphors in two selected English poems. Additionally, it explored the processes participants went through while they interpreted these metaphors and the linguistic metaphors they built to express the target domains in Turkish. When the data gathered via 'Think and Feel Aloud' and 'Interview' techniques, were analyzed it was seen that participants were affected by some factors such as grammatical structure, degree of conventionality, context and cultural background while interpreting the metaphors. Additionally, the view that 'Blending Theory' is a more advantageous way to understand especially 'original' metaphors in poetry was supported with the results.The results also emphasized that more importance must be given to understanding metaphors since it is of vital importance to understand the meaning of metaphors in order to arrive at a sound interpretation.

Key Words : Metaphor, Cognition, Poetry

ÖZET

EĞRETİLEME'YI ANLAMAK: ŞİİRDE EĞRETİLEME'Yİ
TANIMLAMAK VE ANLAMAK ÜZERİNE
BİLİŞSEL BİR YAKLAŞIM

Filiz DUR

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili ve Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

Danışman: Yrd. Doç.Dr. Tijen TÜRELİ

Temmuz, 2006, 134 Sayfa

Bu çalışma, şiirde eğretilemeyi bilişsel bir yaklaşımla araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Eğretilemenin şiirdeki varlığı, yorumlanması ve etkisi araştırılmıştır. Bunun yanı sıra Çukurova Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümü dördüncü sınıf öğrencilerinin seçilen iki İngilizce şiirdeki eğretilemeleri tanımlayıp tanımlayamadıklarını ortaya çıkarmayı hedefledi. Ayrıca, katılımcıların eğretilemeleri yorumlarken hangi süreçlerden geçtikleri ve seçilen şiirlerdeki eğretilemeleri Türkçede hangi ifadelerle anlattıkları araştırıldı. 'Sesli Düşün ve Hisset' ve 'Görüşme' teknikleriyle elde edilen veriler incelendiğinde, katılımcıların eğretilemeleri yorumlarken dilbilgisi, alışılmışlık derecesi, içerik ve kültürel birikim gibi faktörlerden etkilendikleri saptandı. Bunlara ek olarak, 'Harmanlama Kuramı'nın' özellikle 'alışılmadık ' eğretilemeleri anlamada daha avantajlı olduğu görüşü sonuçlarla desteklendi. Sonuçlar, şiirde anlatılmak isteneni anlamak için eğretilemeyi anlamanın ne denli önemli olduğunu, bu yüzden eğretilemeye daha fazla önem verilmesi gerektiğini vurguladı.

Anahtar Kelimeler : Eğretileme, Biliş, Şiir

List of Abbreviations

CMT	Conceptual Metaphor Theory
BT	Blending Theory
TFA	Think and Feel Aloud
INT	Interview
AI	After Information
PI	Problem Identification
MI	Metaphor Identification
LA	Labeling
FO	Focus Processing
VE	Vehicle Construction
MC	Metaphor Construction
FU	Fuctionalization
CO	Context Construction
RE	Refunctionalization
AP	Appreciation

List of Tables

List of Appendices

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

For many people, metaphor is only an element of figurative language by which one thing is compared to another, as in '*My love is a red rose*' or, as <u>A Dictionary of Literary Terms </u>(1980) describes 'A metaphor is a figure of speech in which one thing is described in terms of another. The basic figure in poetry'. In a metaphor, a first object is described as being or precisely equal to a second object. The traditional view supports   that words are used metaphorically in order to create an artistic or rhetorical effect, to impress people or to express a deep emotion.

Until recent years, metaphor has been studied with a traditional point of view and there has been some accepted features of it. First, metaphor is a property of words. Second, it is used for artistic purposes. Third, it is based on comparing two things. Fourth, metaphor is a conscious use of words used by talented people like great poets. Fifth, it is just a figure of speech that we do not use unless we do not want to decorate our speech. Steen puts quite clearly (1994) that "as a consequence of its alleged odd status, metaphor was not deemed worthy of a place at the core of linguistics "(p.3) .

Research into the forms, structure and functions of metaphor has come along way in the last thirty years. Therefore, the belief that metaphors are 'deviant' 'improper' and 'language which poets and politicians used' was challenged by a radical view. The new view of metaphor challenged the traditional theory in a coherent and systematic way and the last two decades have witnessed a great interest in metaphor as 'a central mechanism' of human cognitive functioning.

The contemporary view launced by Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) revealed that metaphor is not only matter of poetic device but a part of our conceptual world. However, our conceptual system is something that works automatically. Thus, language is an important means to present the way metaphors work and their contribution to meaning. Lakoff stated that ' metaphor is pervasive in everyday life , not just in language but in thought and action…… but our conceptual system is something we are not normally aware of and language is the evidence for what this system is like' (p.5).

Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Honeck and Hoffman (1980) brought a cognitive turn to metaphorology and 'metaphor' became a cognitive mechanism through which people construct a conceptual world. In other words, we can say that the 'ubiquity' and importance of conceptual metaphor is highlightened since 1970s by when it was claimed that metaphors are fundamental to the structuring of thought and language and that we frequently use the concepts and lexis from one semantic area to think and talk about other areas. Lakoff and Johnson (1980 ,p.26) explain metaphor as an integral part of our ordinary, everyday thought and language and call it 'irreplaceable' because it allows us to understand ourselves and our world in ways that no other modes of thought can. Metaphor is so pervasive that every single word of our language may have originated from a metaphor. Piero Scaruffi (2001) points out that some thinkers have even suggested that all language may be metaphorical. Given the importance of language among our mental faculties, some scholars go even beyond and maintain that metaphor is a key element of reasoning and thinking in general. In other words, being able to construct and understand metaphors may be an essential part of being a mind.

The most famous contraversy over metaphor processing has been concerned with the view that metaphor is understood in two stages. As Searle (see Ortony 1978, p, 92) explains, the standard philosophical and linguistic view holds the idea that the literal

meaning of a sentence is computed first, but when it is matched with the context, it is rejected and replaced by a figurative meaning. On the contrary, Steen (1994, p. 90) argues that in this view, decoding is finished first, and then followed by a round of conceptualizatian and communication. In the past 20, years experimental evidence (Dascal 1989, Gibbs 1989, Steen 2004) has suggested that people do not always understand metaphors only in two stages and by a retrieval from linguistic to conceptual metaphor. The identification and interpretation can be affected by contextual, lexical, individual reasons and by the properties of the metaphor under question.

Metaphors are everywhere. They are in our descriptions, our labels and thoughts. And literature is a means through which authors convey their ideas, thoughts and feelings by using metaphors. They also reach and touch the readers' minds and feelings. Poets, particularly, take advantage of this resource and create innumerable pieces of literature. It just comes to show that metaphors are the basic building blocks of language and contribute much to the literary world.

Literary scholars viewed metaphor in literature as an aesthetic function so ignored the importance of understanding process by the reader. Since Aristotle, they have dealt with aesthetic function of the metaphor and the cognitive and affective function of metaphor have not been a matter to work on. However, metaphors have a function of enhancement regarding the literary experience which can be observed empirically in the various kinds of mental representations readers construct for metaphors during literary reception. Steen (1994, p. 241) claims that there is something special about understanding metaphor in literature. Because literature permits maximal subjective involvement to the reader and understanding metaphor in literature can be the epitome kind of reading experience. Its basis in non-literal analogy can trigger fantasies, rich ideas, and pleasure in language which few other literary signs may be able to equal.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Developments in the last decades in cognitive linguistics have shown us how important it is to understand the idea of 'metaphor', to get the meaning from the context and the world we live in. Lakoff (1980, p.13) claims that metaphor is something through which we perceive the world, understand the meaning both in language and thought. Graham Low (1988 / 9) puts forward that metaphor should be given a more important place in language teaching than it has been in the past , for some reasons. Firstly, it is central to the use of language. Secondly, from a structural point of view it pervades large parts of the language system. If we 'live by metaphors' as Lakoff calls, what is the relation between metaphor and literature and what is special about its place in literature? Steen (1994, p.27) states that the relation between metaphor and literature is quite intimate. And it is due to Aristotle's treatment of metaphor in his <u>Poetics</u>. He wrote that 'to be good at metaphor is a sign of natural genius, and it is natural because it 'cannot be learnt from anyone else'.

Lakoff and Turner (1989) have came up with a cognitive turn to this view by arguing that literary metaphors can be traced to two different origins: first, they may involve new linguistic expressions of familiar conceptual metaphors or second, they may reveal newly constructed conceptual metaphors exhibiting the poet's eye at its most original. Furthermore, Gary Smith (2002) emphasizes the importance of metaphor in poems by saying "Unless one has a clear understanding of metaphor, most poems cannot be fully understood". Metaphors can be used to explain ideas in a unique way rather just saying our thoughts in blankly. Just as we use metaphors in speech, so do writers use metaphors in literature. Metaphors in literature are more complicated however to interpret. They require deep thinking, add color to literature and also provide readers with mental pictures and images of what the writer intends to portray. Metaphors take simple ideas

and transform them into unique, distinctive pieces of writings. This is one of the beauties of language. Metaphors are written both deliberately and unintentionally by writers. They are written deliberately by writers to make us think critically and carefully at the meanings of the poem or piece of literature. They are also written unintentionally as they are pervasive in every language. To grab the true definition of a metaphor, most of the time, we as readers need to do some careful analysis of the choice and use of the words in the metaphor.

The speculation on the aesthetic function of metaphor in literature and its role as only a figurative language far from everyday , ordinary thought has now become an idea belonging to 'pre-historic' times. How readers understand metaphors in literature is still an unclear matter. Nevertheless, it is possible to collect evidence from readers' processing of metaphor in literature in order to evaluate how that processing relates to the function of metaphor.

If it is necessary and important to understand the meaning in thought, language and literature; metaphor is the key to open the door of understanding and creating meaning. Identification and interpretation of metaphors both in everyday language and in literary texts, act as necessity and beyond that they have a great role in human thought, understanding and reasoning. Trying to understand metaphor then, means trying to understand a vital part of what kind of world we live in and the poem we read.

1. 3. The Aim of The Study

This study aims to investigate metaphor in poetry from a cognitive perspective. It starts with a focus on metaphor as cognition and moves to metaphor in discourse processing, its presence, processing, and effect on interpreting poems. Besides, the study aims to find out how the fourth year ELT students identify the metaphors in selected

English poems. Additionally, it focuses on the interpretation of the metaphors, metaphor processing and the whole poem via the use of 'Think and Feel Aloud Protocol' and 'Interview' techniques. Last but not the least, it investigates the linguistic variations of the metaphors in the selected poems for participants in Turkish to support the idea that metaphor is a conceptual phenomenon and cognitive mechanism shapes it. By doing all these, the study aims to demonstrate how pervasive metaphor is in language and why it is important to cope with it.

1.4 Research Questions

This study aims at investigating the following research questions:

1. Can the participants identify metaphors in a poem?

2. How does the process of metaphor understanding occur for the participants?

3. Which linguistic metaphors do the participants build to express the target words in two English poems in Turkish?

4. What are the participants' attitudes towards the metaphors in selected English poems?

5. What is the function of metaphor in understanding and interpreting poetry?

1.5 Operational Definitions

The terms used in this research are defined as follows:

Conceptual Metaphor : A set of ordinary metaphoric concept around which we conceptualize the world.

Linguistic Metaphor: A set of linguistic expressions which are the realizations of conceptual metaphor that appear in everyday written and spoken forms.

Source Domain: The conceptual domain from which we draw metaphorical expressions to understand the other conceptual domain.

Target Domain: The conceptual domain that is understood through the 'target domain'.

<u>Mappings</u> : Conceptual correspondences between the source and target domains are mappings.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Metaphor Definition and Development

2.1.1 Classical View

It is possible to define metaphor from different perspectives. One way is , as stated in A Glossary of Rhetorical Terms ' an implied comparison achieved through a figurative use of words; the word is used not in its literal sense'. In the simplest case, this takes the form: The first subject is a second subject. More generally, a metaphor describes a first subject as being or equal to a second subject in some way. Thus, the first subject can be economically described because implicit and explicit attributes from the second subject are used to enhance the description of the first. This device is known for usage in literature, especially in poetry, where with few words, emotions and associations from one context are associated with objects and entities in a different context.

The term metaphor meant in Greek 'carry something across' or 'transfer', which suggests many of the more elaborate definitions. In many dictionaries it is defined as 'a comparison between two things, based on resemblance or similarity, without using 'like' or 'as'. It has a long, stormy history, going back to ancient Greek philosophy. One of the masters of philosophy, Aristotle, who has always been the key figure, the originating source for thinking about the use of language in poetry and prose , viewed metaphor as giving the thing a name that belongs to something else; the transference being either from *genus to species, or from species to genus, or from species to species, on or the ground of analogy* (see Hawkes,1972) . It is worth revisiting Aristotle's thinking on metaphor, because it is the source of most of what has developed since. For Aristotle it is 'the act of giving a thing a name that belongs to something else'. In general, metaphor is

traditionally taken to be the most fundamental form of figurative language used for aesthetic or rhetorical purposes to add beauty, it is also taken as a kind of simile that is based on similarities. Additionally, Diomedes's definition is a typical traditional one. He puts it as 'the transferring of things and words from their proper signification to an improper similitude for the sake of beauty, necessity, polish, or emphasis'. Kenneth Burke's definition is similar to Aristotle's. For him, metaphor is 'a device for seeing something in terms of something else. Joseph Priestly's view shows similarity with that of 'Simile Theory'. That is, a metaphor is 'a simile contracted to its smallest dimensions'. Wallace Stevens sees metaphor as something by which we escape from the clichés of the reality (Kopp, 2001).

According to Aristotle (see Kittay,1987) metaphor is a kind of 'added extra' to language the 'seasoning of the meat' which is used deliberately. The effect of metaphor 'properly' used is created by combining the familiar with the unfamiliar, it adds charm and distinction to clarity. Clarity comes from familiar 'everyday words'. Charm comes from the intellectual pleasure afforded by the new resemblances noted in the metaphor, distinction from the surprising nature of some of the resemblances discerned. When it is used properly, it can act conceptually to produce new understanding. In addition to its rhetorical function, Aristotle seems to recognize the cognitive function that has been dominant in the last decades. In other words, the argument can be made that Aristotle had already pointed out the cognitive importance of metaphor, particularly metaphor based on analogy.

Aristotle described the process of understanding metaphor as finding similarities within differences and suggested that, in order to reach an interpretation, hearers would need to draw on shared cultural understandings. Cameron (2003 , p.13) points out that Aristotle makes a point some later philosophers ignore : that metaphor is not a matter of

semantics or pragmatics, but of both. So, discourse context and background knowledge of discourse contribute to the meaning of metaphor. However, most developments of the Aristotelian tradition have treated metaphor as decoration and comparison. In either case metaphor is dispensible in favor of a plainer expression or an explicit statement of similarity.

2.1.2 Some 16th, 17th and 18th Century Views

Cicero, Quintilian and Horace as J.W.H. Atkins (1934) refers, viewed metaphor as a 'short form of simile', a pleasure giving 'decorum' if it contains similarity, otherwise it is something that is rejected. Its role is to present relations and the recommended uses were for 'vividness, brevity, embellishing, magnifying or minifying'. They seem to reduce metaphor to merely a category of Figures of Speech, distinct from ordinary language that recent philosophers have already rejected.

The middle ages were not notable for the development of literary theory, but showed an interest in the process of formalizing that derived from the classical approach to metaphor, though it had a different end in the view. For a Christian society in the middle ages, a fundamental metaphor was that the world was a book written by God. And like any other book it could and did mean more than it said. Metaphors should be interpreted in the light of some meanings such as 'allegorical', 'anagogical' and 'tropological'. As a result of this attitude, metaphor had a didactic role and was concerned with manifested truths, ideas and values that carried public approval . Its function was to reinforce an established view of the world. The metaphors had little organic relationship with their subjects; they merely decorated it. 18th century metaphors tend to deal with what is generally and universally acceptable. They needed no readers to complete them or join in

with any thought process .They were pre- packaged, finished products of poetry (see

Hawkes ,1972).

The Romantic Period was the time when metaphors were viewed in contrast to

Aristotelian view. Dan Sperber (see David Wellbery,1990 p.140) clearly explains that in

sharp reaction to Aristotelian thinking of the previous century , Romantics tend to

proclaim metaphor's 'organic' relationship to language as a whole, and to lay the stress

on its vital function as an expression of the faculty of imagination. It is in short , not

fanciful 'embroidery' of the facts but a way of experiencing the facts. Metaphor,

'deliberately invoked', intensifies language's characteristic activity , and involves the

creation of 'new' reality. Wordsworth, one of the outstanding poet of this period, tried to

remove the gap between language of poets, prose writers and ordinary men. In The

Norton Anthology, it is explained that Wordsworth subverted the neo-classic principle

that, in many kinds of poem, the language must be elevated over standard speech by a

special diction and by artful figures of speech, in order to match the language to the

height and dignity of a particular genre. This resulted in unelaborated, plainer

expressions closer to ordinary man's and in a way put forward that there is no special

language for poets and linguistic devices are not reserved for poetry, which the modern

view of metaphor holds.

If we move to twentieth century , by passing some more important works in

metaphor such as Rousseau (see Kittay ,1987, pp .5, 87) , Nietzsche (see Cooper, 1986 ,

pp . 261-263) , some influential theories on metaphor is seen, despite the present

dominance of cognitive linguistics, that still hold some value for metaphor researchers.

These theories work with restricted views of metaphor and language, influenced by the

rise of logical positivism in philosophy.

2. 1. 3 20th Century Theories on Metaphor and Metaphor Processing

Simile theory

The Simile Theory is the oldest and until quite recently, the most widely held one, rooting from Aristotle. Aristotle seems to have been the first to claim that metaphors are 'compressed' or 'abbreviated' similes. On any such theory, the meaning of a metaphor is identified with that of the corresponding simile: where 'A is B' is the metaphor (e.g. Life is a journey), its meaning is given by the sentence 'A is like B' (e.g. Life is like a journey). On such a view, the interpretation of a metaphor is a matter of interpreting the corresponding simile, and the truth of the metaphor is thus reduced to that of the simile.

The Simile Theory has been criticized on a number of counts. First, not all metaphors are so readily translatable into similes. William Lycan (1999) makes the point clearly with the Shakespearean metaphor 'When the blood burns, how prodigal the soul/ Lends the tongue vows' . Concerning the simile that this metaphor is claimed to stand for , Lycan (1999) writes: 'A first pass might be: When x, which is like a person's blood, does something that resembles burning, how prodigally y, which is like a person's soul, does something similar to lending some things that are vowlike to z, which resembles a person's tongue'. He then remarks dryly, "We are not much wiser' (p.37).

 Second, the simile analysis appears to represent metaphor as superficial and uninformative. Many philosophers (e.g Davidson 1978 and Searle 1979) have claimed that statements of similarity themselves are trivial, on the grounds that everything is like everything else in some respect or other. Yet, metaphors often appear to be informative and even profound. Third, and perhaps most importantly, the similarities that we most naturally refer in explaining what a metaphor's corresponding simile means are often themselves figurative. Consider the lines of Sylvia Plath's poem "Metaphors": "I am an elephant, a ponderous house". Presumably the protagonist is here describing herself

metaphorically as a house; on the simile theory she thus means that she is like a house. One natural elaboration of what this simile means is that she is a shelter for something, but the key word "shelter" here is itself obviously metaphorical. So, it seems a vicious explanatory circle.

Interaction Theory

Interaction Theory was one of the earliest modern alternatives to the Simile Theory, advocated by the literary theorist I.A. Richards and developed by the philosopher Max Black who built on ideas from Coleridge and later I. A Richards for whom metaphor was a process of imagination fusing images and perspectives into a creative and new whole. It has two central claims: (1) that metaphors have an irreducible 'cognitive content', and (2) that this cognitive content (or meaning) is produced by the 'interaction' of different cognitive systems. Interactionists generally claim that the 'cognitive contents' of metaphors can be true, even though they are not amenable to literal expression (Black, 1979 see Ortony, 1992). In the Interaction view, a mental process linking 'topic' and 'vehicle' generates new and 'irreducible' meanings rather than activating pre-existing similarities as in the Simile Theory. Because for Black, metaphor is the paradigmatic device for pointing out analogies and making comparisons which cross the bounds of our usual concepts.

Black (see Cameron, 2003, p. 17) proposed that a listener or reader would bring to metaphor interpretation a 'system of associated commonplaces' somewhat similar to Aristotle's *endoxa* (commonly held beliefs accepted by the wise and by elder rhetors) and later reworded as an 'implicative complex' of understandings and beliefs. As he puts it , in a metaphor of the form 'A is B,' the "system of associated commonplaces" for B 'interacts with' or 'filters' our thoughts about the 'system' associated with A, thereby generating a metaphorical meaning for the whole sentence. The interaction

theory's central motivation is to account for the fact that metaphors can be such powerful cognitive tools: devices that enable us to better understand the world in which we live.

Black's works brought the cognitive role of metaphor to stage after a long period when metaphor had been reduced to mere linguistic decoration. However, Cameron (2003 p.17) mentions that Black was only concerned to construct theory around novel and strongly active metaphors . According to Gibbs (1994), one of the main limitations of Black's account of metaphor is that it identifies the meaning of the metaphor with the meaning of the frame, thus contradicting the sense of 'interaction'. In fact, since metaphorical projection is unidirectional and the focus is conceived of as a 'filter', only the frame should be altered in this process. Moreover, the fact that Black sees the production of subordinate metaphors as a problem of his account shows that the new implications are intended to be literal assertions, as if such a 'translation' would be a condition for the metaphor's intelligibility. On the contrary, Gibbs argues, very often the new implications can only be understood within the very metaphor and are easily understood by the speakers, who speak and think with a *poetic mind*.

Philosophers (e.g Searle and Davidson) suspicious of the special, irreducible 'cognitive contents' posited by interactionists , have developed several alternatives, the best known of which are Gricean and Noncognitivist Theories.

Gricean Theory

Gricean theories of metaphor are in the first instance theories of metaphorical interpretation. Their central claim is that understanding a metaphor is just understanding what a speaker intends to communicate by means of it, where communication is analyzed in Gricean terms. Roughly, successful communication consists in the hearer's recognizing the speaker's intention to get the hearer to recognize what s/he is trying to

communicate to her / him. Insofar a metaphor can be said to have a meaning, as identified with what the speaker intends to communicate; the sentence uttered has only its literal meaning. A metaphor's truth value is reduced to that of the proposition the speaker intends to communicate. John Searle is the best-known advocate of a broadly Gricean theory of metaphor, Searle (see Ortony,1978) clearly reflects his view by stating that " the problem of explaining how metaphors work is a special case of the general problem of explaining how speaker meaning and sentence or word meaning come apart... Our task in constructing a theory of metaphor is to try to state the principles which relate literal sentence meaning to metaphorical [speaker's] utterance meaning". (p.76)

Furthermore, Searle divides the interpretative process into three stages. First, the hearer must decide whether to look for a non-literal, and specifically for a metaphorical, interpretation. Such a search is typically undertaken because a literal interpretation would render the utterance in some sense defective. Second, once the hearer decides to interpret the utterance metaphorically, s/he employs a set of principles to generate candidate meanings that the speaker might intend by her/ his utterance. Third, having generated a set of possible meanings by these principles, the hearer must identify which element in that set is most likely to be the speaker's intended meaning.

Criticisms of Gricean theories of metaphor are varied. First, on many Gricean accounts, the hearer must first identify the utterance as somehow defective if interpreted literally: only then is the search for an alternative, non-literal interpretation triggered. However, not all utterances used metaphorically are defective. A sentence like 'The murderer is a butcher' exhibits no grammatical deviance; it is literally true and could count as both literally and metaphorically true and informative within a single context of utterance. However, here the speaker may mean that the murderer treated the victim as a butcher cutting meat, may not be talking about his real profession. As there is nothing

defective point here and the sentence is literally meaningful, this means the first step

of Gricean Theory that will start the   interpretation , will not take place.   Second, there

is empirical evidence to suggest that the literal meaning of a sentence used

metaphorically needn't actually be processed in order for the metaphor to be

understood.(see Steen, 1994). Third, Griceans generally assume that metaphorical

meaning, like speaker meaning more generally, is fully propositional in form and fully

capable of literal expression (Searle, 1979).Thus, according to Marga Reimer and

Elisabeth Camp (1996) , The Gricean theory seems doomed to leave out what is most

interesting about metaphor: its complex cognitive and affective "import," which seems to

be inherently inexpressible in literal terms.

Non- cognitivist Theories

   Non- cognitivist theories do not question metaphor's effectiveness, only the means by

which its effects are achieved. The central claim of such theorists is that a sentence used

metaphorically has no distinctive cognitive content aside from its literal content

(G.Lycan).

    Davidson (1978 p. 31) offers what might be termed a "causal theory" of metaphor.

On his view, "a metaphor makes us attend to some likeness, often a novel or surprising

likeness, between two or more things," by making us "see one thing as another." This

view partly resembles the 'Comparative Theory' which argued that metaphors can be

understood through resemblances and in simile forms. He also holds a Gricean view that

metaphors have no special 'metaphorical meaning.' Instead, they only mean what their

words say. Metaphors, unlike 'literal language', are not 'semantic phenomena'. Rather,

metaphors are used, like pointing or photographs, to draw our attention to certain

features of the world that we may or may not have been aware of previously. He argues

that metaphor allows us to arrive at new, and important, cognitive conclusions. He

disagrees strongly that these cognitive conclusions are in any way a part of the metaphor itself as some metaphorical meaning. Instead he argues that "what metaphor adds to the ordinary is an achievement that uses no semantic resources beyond the resources on which the ordinary depends" (p. 35). Thus, metaphors do not `mean' what they show us, or force us to notice. They are more like conversational strategies by which these relations between things, or aspects of the world, are pointed out.

The noncognitivist theory has also been criticized because of some points. Most obviously, for Marga Reimer (1996) the theory seems to conflict with the fact that metaphors are 'cognitively significant' that they can be understood or misunderstood, that they figure in our reasoning and thought, and that they can be true or false. For W. Zachary Wolff, (2001) a more 'compelling' argument against Davidson stems from the problem of 'dead metaphors'. Dead metaphors certainly have a meaning that differs from their literal meaning. In other words, dead metaphors have acquired a new literal meaning that is different from their original literal meaning. Similarly Reimer (1996) pointed out, the noncognitivist view appears to be 'incompatible' with the phenomenon of dead metaphors. Dead metaphors are expressions which have lost their metaphorical import through frequent use and so no longer invite creative interpretation. Their former metaphorical import has 'hardened' into a new literal meaning. She states that

> … the expression "burned up," as in "He was all burned
>
> up about his impending divorce," is a dead metaphor,
>
> whose second literal meaning is just extremely angry. As
>
> Davidson puts it, the expression no longer conjures up "fire
>
> in the eyes or smoke coming out of the ears". This poses a
>
> difficulty for the noncognitivist, because it seems as if dead
>
> metaphors could only acquire their secondary literal

meanings if they were previously used to communicate

those very meanings. And this would seem conflict with the

basic noncognitivist commitment that speakers do not

mean anything by metaphors.

Research into the forms , structure and functions of metaphor has come along way in the last thirty years. All these theories above were challenged by a contemporary one dealing metaphor with a more systematic, cognitive view.

2.2 Metaphor As Cognition : Structural View

In cognitive linguistics, metaphor is often seen as a basic cognitive function, that humans naturally see common traits in subjects which are factually distinct, and such behavior may be required for comprehension and learning, indeed the very nature of language itself relies on metaphor in which essentially artifical, but agreed, symbols (in the form of words) cross map to the experiential sense world of those that share a particular language. Lakoff and Johnson (1980, p.5), known as the generators of cognitive view, define the essence of metaphor as 'understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another'. The shift in the definition of metaphor is a great signal to show its change throughout the history .

As Danaher (2003) puts it " Metaphor, like myth, has long been a puzzle to scholars. Those of a positivist inclination have tended to sweep it under the academic rug, deeming it a linguistic frill that can always be reduced to the kind of literal language with which they are more at home". His next quotation reveals how cognitive theory shaped the new understanding. That is, "Metaphor is one of our cognitive grappling tools; it enables us to see the world in multiple perspectives and to engage with the world

flexibly. Metaphor is much more profoundly a feature of human sense-making than the largely ornamental and redundant poetic trope some have taken it to be".

M. Johnson , one of the pioneers of contemporary theories, views metaphors, or analogies not merely convenient economies for expressing our knowledge; rather, our knowledge and understanding of the particular phenomena in question (see David Danaher, 2003).

The modern and cognitive view took the attraction of a great deal of linguistists and prepared a kind of base for empirical studies. This interest resulted in many researches that aimed at reevaluation of metaphor, giving an end to the classical views and placing metaphor in the center of understanding and thought.

2.2.1Characteristics of Metaphor

At the end of 1970s, Ortony (1978), Honeck and Hoffman (1980)   Lakoff and Johnson (1980) , held the cognitive view of metaphor. Therefore, there appeared a radical departure from the idea that ' metaphor is a figure of speech', to an arrival at 'metaphor is a property of thought'. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) suggested that 'metaphor is a basic mental operation by which we understand the world'. They challenged the traditional view (see Section 1. 1) by claiming:

1. Metaphor is the main mechanism through which we comprehend abstract

   concepts and perform abstract reasoning.

2. Much subject matter, from the most mundane to the most abstruse scientific

   theories can   only be comprehended via metaphor.

3. Metaphor is fundamentally conceptual, not linguistic, in nature.

4. Metaphorical language is a surface manifestation of conceptual metaphor.

5. Though much of our conceptual system is metaphorical, a significant part of it is

nonmetaphorical. Metaphorical understanding is grounded in nonmetaphorical understanding.

6. Metaphor allows us to understand a relatively abstract or inherently unstructured subject matter in terms of a more concrete, or at least a more highly structured subject matter.

7. The system of conventional conceptual metaphor is mostly unconscious, automatic, and is used with no noticeable effort, just like our linguistic system and the rest of our conceptual system.

8. Our system of conventional metaphor is alive in the same sense that our system of grammatical and phonological rules is alive; namely, it is constantly in use, automatically and below the level of consciousness.

9. Our metaphor system is central to our understanding of experience and to the way we act on that understanding.

10. Conventional mappings are static correspondences, and are not, in themselves, algorithmic in nature. However, this by no means rules out the possibility that such static correspondences might be used in language processing that involves sequential steps.

11. Metaphor is mostly based on correspondences in our experiences, rather than on similarity.

12. The metaphor system plays a major role in both the grammar and lexicon of a language.

13. Metaphorical mappings vary in universality; some seem to be universal, others are widespread, and some seem to be culture-specific.

14. Poetic metaphor is, for the most part, an extension of our everyday, conventional system of metaphorical thought.(Lakoff and Johnson, 1980 p. 29)

It is clear that the contemporary theory of metaphor is revolutionary in many respects. In fact , key components to cognitive view were proposed by some philosophers (e.g. Locke and Kant) several centuries ago but it was not a 'comprehensive', 'generalized', 'empirically tested' theory as it is now. As Kovecses (2002 Preface, x) puts it, it is comprehensive because it discusses large number of issues connected with metaphor such as ; the relationship between metaphor and other tropes, the universality and culture – specificness of metaphor, the application of metaphor theory to literature, the teaching of metaphor in foreign language teaching and so on. These issues were also dealt within some theories before but not within the same theory. It is 'generalized' because it tries to connect what we know about the conceptual metaphor with what we know about the working of language, the working of human conceptual system and the working of culture. And finally, it is an empirically tested theory in that researchers have used variety of experiments to test the major claims of the theory. These experiments have revealed that the cognitive view of metaphor has psychological reality, it is a key instrument both in producing new expressions and organizing human thought. Besides, it has useful practical applications in foreign language teaching.

2.2.2 Classification of Metaphor

In practical terms, the theory of cognition and language provides for two levels of metaphor: conceptual metaphor and linguistic metaphor. The former are super-ordinate, epistemic and semantic mappings that take the form of TARGET DOMAIN IS/AS SOURCE DOMAIN. Linguistic metaphors are motivated by conceptual metaphors and are the realizations that appear in everyday written and spoken forms.

The most basic assumption in cognitive metaphor theory is that there is a set of ordinary metaphoric concepts –conceptual metaphors– around which we conceptualize the world. The concepts that our ordinary conceptual system includes structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people. Most of them are metaphorical, and their essence is understanding and experiencing partially one kind of thing or experience in terms of another. In other words , CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN (A) IS CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN (B), which is called a 'conceptual metaphor'. Metaphor in the cognitive linguistic view means primarily 'conceptual metaphor'. The two domains have some special names. The conceptual domain from which we draw metaphorical expressions to understand the other conceptual domain is called 'source domain', the conceptual domain that is understood this way is the 'target domain'. It can be illustrated as follows:

LOVE IS JOURNEY(conceptual metaphor)

LOVE : target domain

JOURNEY: source domain.

The term 'conceptual metaphor' is used to refer to a connection between two semantic areas at the level of thought such as the metaphorical connection between anger and fire for speakers of many languages .

While   conceptual metaphors are referred to in writing with upper case as for example ANGER IS HEAT, 'lingusitic metaphors' are spoken or written realisations of a conceptual metaphor and they are reffered to as sentence structures. In the case of ANGER IS HEAT, some linguistic metaphors are; "I grew hot under the collar "or "She has got a fiery temper". Lakoff and Johnson (1980 , p.51) argue that conceptual metaphors (indicated by capitalization) have become highly conventionalized and they belong to the common knowledge of the user, thus stored as conceptual units in the

mind. So they are not deviant or innovative and they belong to the common knowledge of the speaker or reader because they are already stored as conceptual units in their mind. Furthermore, linguistic metaphor should be derived from or dependent on conceptual metaphors.

   For Lakoff and Johnson, 'metaphors as linguistic expressions are possible, precisely because there are metaphors in a person's conceptual system.
Therefore, whenever we speak of metaphors, such as ARGUMENT IS WAR, it should be understood that metaphor means metaphorical concept' (Lakoff and Johnson 1980,p.6). In this quotation, we can see that they are using the term "metaphor" to refer to both concepts and expressions indistinctly. The different types of metaphoric concepts and their relations with metaphoric expressions can be seen in Table 1.

   Considering the table, three types of metaphoric concepts can be distinguished, marginal metaphoric concepts (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, p.55), conventional metaphoric concepts (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, p.4), and new metaphoric concepts (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, p.145). Metaphoric concepts take public form in metaphoric expressions, also called "metaphors".

Table 1. General Classification of Metaphors

Metaphoric Concepts or Metaphors	Metaphoric Expressions or Metaphors		
Marginal Metaphoric Concepts or Marginal metaphors	Literal Metaphors	Dead Metaphor	Literal dead
Conventional Metaphoric Concepts or Conceptual metaphors		Live Metaphor	Literal live
	Imaginative or Non-Literal Metaphor		Imaginative live (a) Imaginative live (b)
New Metaphoric Concepts or New Metaphors		Novel Metaphor	Imaginative Novel

Among these concepts only conventional metaphoric concepts are systematically called "conceptual metaphors". Conceptual metaphors or conventional metaphoric concepts are normally used when we think and the expressions that represent them in a conventional way are systematically used in the everyday language; they are concepts that we usually and systematically conceptualize in terms of others. An example of conceptual metaphor is the metaphoric concept THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS, where we partially conceptualize THEORIES in terms of BUILDINGS. Marginal metaphoric concepts are 'relatively uninteresting' (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, p.54). They are isolated and unsystematic cases that do not systematically interact with other metaphoric concepts because so little of them is used. An example of these is A MOUNTAIN IS A PERSON (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, p. 55). New metaphoric concepts constitute a new

way of thinking, they have the power to create a new reality, to alter the conceptual system. They are not part of our conceptual system. An example of these concepts is THEORIES ARE PATRIARCHS.

With respect to expressions, they basically make two distinctions (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, p. 53-55): first, they distinguish between literal metaphors, and imaginative or nonliteral metaphors; second, they distinguish among dead metaphors, live metaphors, and novel metaphors. The second distinction among metaphoric expressions parallels the one drawn for metaphoric concepts. Dead metaphors are expressions of marginal metaphoric concepts, live metaphors are expressions that arise from conventional metaphoric concepts, and novel metaphors come from new metaphoric concepts. This parallelism, however, comes to an end when the distinction literal-imaginative comes between these distinctions (see Table 1 above). The result of blending the two distinctions for the metaphoric expressions produces a third one by which Lakoff and Johnson distinguish among literal dead metaphor, literal live metaphor, imaginative live metaphor (subtypes (a) or (b)), and imaginative novel metaphor.

To begin with 'literal' and ' imaginative' metaphors, what they explicitly argue is; both literal and imaginative metaphors can derive from the same general metaphor. As they state " literal expressions ('He has constructed a theory') and imaginative expressions ('His theory is covered with gargoyles') can be instances of the same general metaphor (THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS)" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980 , p .53). While literal expressions are interpreted literally, imaginative ones are interpreted metaphorically since they are non-literal.

One of the sub-categories of both literal and imaginative metaphors is 'live metaphors' and there are two types: literal and imaginative. Literal live metaphors are the used part of a conceptual metaphor, for example,

(1) The *foundations* of my theory are sure.

"foundations" in (1) is one of the parts commonly used of the conceptual metaphor THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, p. 53) and, therefore, it is a case of literal live metaphor. By contrast, imaginative live metaphors are either (a) instances of the unused part of a usual conceptual metaphor as "thousands of little rooms" in (2) :

(2) His theory has *thousands of little rooms*.

which is a case of an unused part of THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS, rooms are parts of a building which are not normally used as part of the concept THEORY, or (b) extensions of the used part of a conceptual metaphor, such as "bricks" in (3) :

(3) These facts are the *bricks* of his theory.

which is an extension of one of the used parts of that metaphoric concept: "the outer shell". This is used to structure the concept of a theory, but that is not the case of the material used to construct the outer shell, the bricks.

Examples (1)-(3) are "metaphorical" because they have some expressions that are metaphorically attributed to what one is talking about, they have metaphoric expressions (in italics) within the conceptual metaphor THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS. This metaphoric concept is conventional. The metaphoric expressions of this metaphoric concept are *foundations* in (1), *thousands of little rooms* in (2), and *bricks* in (3). These metaphoric expressions can be

* literal as in (1)

* imaginative as in (2) or (3).

The latter are interpreted metaphorically while the former is not. Novel metaphors are

nonliteral metaphors that come from new metaphoric concepts; they represent a new way

of thinking. They are not used systematically to restructure part of our conceptual

system. This is the case with the expression in italics in (4):

(4) Classical theories are patriarchs who father many children most of whom fight

incessantly (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, p. 53).

The metaphoric concept called forth in (4), THEORIES ARE PATRIARCHS, is new,

and must be interpreted metaphorically. Lakoff and Johnson characterise "imaginative

novel metaphors" as instances of novel metaphor, that is, a metaphor not used to

structure part of our conceptual system but as a new way of thinking about something.

Lakoff and Johnson changed the traditional senses associated with the terminology

as it is seen in Table 2.

Table 2. The Terminological Shift in Metaphor Theory

Traditional Metaphor Terminology	Cognitive Metaphor Terminology	
Dead Metaphors or Conventional Metaphors	Literal	Dead
		Live
Live Metaphors or Novel Metaphors	Imaginative or Non-literal	Novel

Traditionally (see, Searle 1979; or MacCormac 1985) it is considered that, as far as

expressions are concerned, dead metaphors are opposed to live metaphors. This

distinction is equivalent to the distinction in cognitive metaphor theory between literal

and imaginative metaphors. Traditional live metaphors correspond to Lakoff and

Johnson's imaginative or nonliteral metaphors; traditionally dead metaphors are

lexicalised metaphors and correspond to literal metaphors in cognitive metaphor

theory which means that they are called in most of the occasions "live". Lakoff and

Johnson change the sense in which it is said that a metaphor is "live". From a traditional

point of view, "live" refers to a non-conventional metaphor, an expression which is not

lexicalised. Indeed, this terminological change is clearly appreciated in the quotation

taken from Lakoff and Johnson (1980)

> Expressions like 'wasting time', 'attacking positions',
> 'going our separate ways', etc., are reflections of
> systematic metaphoric concepts that structure our
> actions and thoughts. They are 'alive' in the most
> fundamental sense: they are metaphors we live by. The
> fact that they are conventionally fixed within the
> lexicon of English makes them no less alive. (p.55)

Live metaphoric expressions are, in the traditional terminology, nonliteral or non-

conventional expressions and, in the cognitive terminology, some of them are literal or

conventional expressions that come from metaphoric concepts we live by. From the

perspective of cognitive metaphor theory, live metaphoric expressions give expression to

conventional metaphoric concepts either literally or nonliterally. They distinguish

between dead, live and novel metaphors; but although they use two of the labels

traditionally used to distinguish metaphor, those labels are not used in the traditional

way. In the traditional terminology, there are neither two different types of literal

metaphors as in Lakoff and Johnson (dead and live) nor two types of imaginative

metaphors (live and novel). For authors outside the cognitive frame, there are only dead

(literal) metaphoric expressions or live (imaginative or nonliteral) metaphoric

expressions.

The classification above (Table 1), is not the only way to classify metaphors. it is

also possible to 'classify conceptual' metaphors according to :

a. Cognitive function

b. Nature

c. Levels of generality

It will be necessary to study some of these (a and b) in some more detail since they also

work to understand metaphor and its uses in poetry. According to their functionality

conceptual metaphors are subcategorized into three as 'structural', 'ontological' and

'orientational'. In structural metaphors, the source domain provides a relatively rich

knowledge structure for the target domain. So, they enable the individual to understand

target A by means of source B. This understanding takes place by means of conceptual

mappings. Kovecses (2002, p.33) illustrates TIME IS MOTION conceptual metaphor as

follows:

The basic elements in terms of which we understand time here are: Physical

objects, their locations and their motion.

The background condition applying to this way of understanding is: the present time

is at the same location as a canonical observer.

The mappings are: Times are things

The passing of time is motion

Future times are in front of the observer, past times are behind

Linguistic expressions are: The time will come when…

On the preceding day…

I am looking ahead to Christmas

In the weeks following next Tuesday….

He passed the time happily

As Kovecses (2002, p.34) states ' the mappings not only explain why the particular expressions mean what they do, but they also provide a basic overall structure, hence, understanding for our notion of time'.

Ontological metaphors do not provide as much cognitive structuring for target concepts as structural metaphors. They enable individuals to conceive of their experiences in terms of objects , substances, and containers in general , without specifying the kind. The examples below from Kovecses (2002, p. 34) make it clearer:

Source Domains	Target Domains
PHYSICAL OBJECT	ABSTRACT ENTITIES (e.g. mind)
CONTAINER	STATES (e.g. in love)

Here, we do not really know what the mind is but we think of it as an object.

Orientational metaphors provide the least conceptual structure for the target concepts. They enable the individual to make a set of target concepts 'coherent in our conceptual system. This name is due to their relation with 'basic human spatial orientations such as up- down, in-out'. Kovecses calls this kind of metaphor 'coherence metaphor' because certain target concepts tend to be conceptualized in a 'uniform manner'. For example, the following concepts are characterized by an 'upward' orientation, whereas their opposites by 'downward'one.

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

CONTROL IS UP; LACK OF CONTROL IS DOWN: I am *on top of* the situation. He is really *low* these days.

According to their nature, metaphors can be based on both 'knowledge' and 'image'. While 'knowledge' metaphors are based on our basic knowledge of concepts, 'image' metaphors are rich in imagistic detail and can be found in poetry and other kinds of discourse. This kind of metaphor function to map one conventional mental image onto another. The poem below is a nice example:

> Now women-rivers
>
> belted with silver fish
>
> move unhurried as women in love
>
> at dawn after a night with their lovers

In this example the image of the slow, sinuous walk of a woman is mapped onto the image of the slow, sinuous, shimmering flow of a river. The shimmering of a school of fish is imagined as the shimmering of the belt. 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. But here, the domains are conventional mental images (Merwin & Mason 1981, p. 71) .

2.3 Metaphor as Cognition: Processing view

Language is usually considered to be rule-governed, yet these rules can be broken, and this raises an interesting question of what happens in language processing when someone uses a metaphor and breaks the rules in the process. The rich body of experimental results that has appeared in the psychological literature in recent years (e.g. Cacciari & Glucksberg, 1994; Gibbs, 1994) has changed our understanding of how non-literal statements such as metaphors are comprehended. Previously, the dominant view was that the comprehension of non-literal statements involves two steps: first, it must be recognized that the statement makes no sense if interpreted literally; then its intended,

non-literal meaning is computed by some kind of inference. Now it is known that metaphors can be understood directly, like literal statements.

Good overviews of the many competing theories of metaphor and metaphor processing can be found in Gibbs (1994) and Ortony (1993), but one central issue that needs to be mentioned is the question of whether processing involves one stage or two. Classical metaphor theory would suggest that there are two stages: People need to (1) establish the literal falsehood of a metaphorical statement, and (2) process the statement as a metaphor. However, this theory has been fallen out of favor and empirical findings present more theories on this matter.

Researchers in the tradition of Lakoff and Johnson, argue that there is only one stage. In this view, the human mind is uniquely equipped to process a metaphor directly and this processing does not require a literal detour. Cognitive metaphors are the processing tool used for this. Thus, due to the fact that we conventionally think that ARGUMENT IS WAR, we automatically understand what is meant when someone is described as being 'annihilated by the opponent' in a debate. In this case, most cognitive scientists (e.g.Gentner,1982; Holyoak,1982; Lakoff & Johnson,1980) take understanding metaphors to be guided by principles of analogy. Analogical mapping suggests a kind of projection of structure A on to B. The result of such a mapping is the organization of our view of relevant categories in the target domain, B, in terms of the source domain, A. Cognitive mappings , in other words conceptual correspondences , between conceptual domains form the backbone of the metaphor theory.

In further studies, (e.g. Glucksberg and Keysar, 1990) there appears a shift from 'analogical mapping' towards a 'categorization'. What they claim briefly is, metaphors attempt to create 'ad hoc' categories. This view in fact does not exclude analogy and similarity because there must still be a similarity between the domains to go under the

same category. In addition to that, what Steen (1994, p14) gives importance is that

the concepts can resemble each other one way or the other as they belong to the same

class. 'Analogical processing may have to work *how* they belong to the same class'.

Later in 1990s,(Fauconnier and Turner1995) , 'Blending Theory', focuses on

mappings like 'Conceptual Theory' but also adds a dynamic integration processes which

build up new 'blended' mental spaces. This 'integration' is advantageous over

'Conceptual Theory' since while metaphors with fixed mappings are pervasive in

language, and are ordinarily used unconsciously and automatically in 'Conceptual

Theory', 'blending', is generally 'online' and dynamic.

The most controversial views on understanding is whether the mapping is more like

'analogy' or 'categorization'. Besides, as for the directionality 'direct' and 'indirect'

comprehension have been argued. There is still no easy and direct answer to how

metaphors are processed. And it is a challenging study to show how speakers and hearers

integrate linguistic, conceptual and discourse knowledge to produce and comprehend

metaphorical expressions. Yet, enough is known to claim that different processes and

comprehension procedures is needed due to the nature of language, metaphor and the

individual.

2.3.1 Analogical Mapping and Conceptual Metaphor Theory

When linguists identify and understand metaphor in discourse, they arguably make a

number of steps. In a traditional view of conceptual metaphor, metaphor carries structure

from one conceptual domain a "source" to another a "target" directly. (Lakoff &

Johnson, 1980; Johnson,1987; Turner, 1987; Lakoff & Turner, 1989; Sweetser, 1990;

Turner 1991). In the 'Conceptual Metaphor Theory' (CMT) framework, metaphors are

analyzed as stable and systematic relationships between two conceptual 'domains'.

Lakoff and Turner (1992, see Ortony, Introduction) listed the properties of mappings as follows:

1. Metaphors are mappings across conceptual domains.

2. Such mappings are asymmetric and partial.

3. Each mapping is a fixed set of ontological correspondences between entities in source domain and entities in a target domain.

4. When those fixed correspondences are activated, mappings can project source domain inference patterns onto target domain inference patterns.

5. Metaphorical mappings obey the Invariance Principle that is, the image-schema structure of the source domain is projected onto the target domain in a way that is consistent with inherent target domain structure.

6. Mappings are not arbitrary, but grounded in the body and in everyday experience and knowledge.

7. A conceptual system contains thousands of conventional metaphorical mappings, which form a highly structured subsystem of the conceptual system.

8. There are two types of mappings: conceptual mappings and image-mappings; while conceptual metaphors allow many concepts in the source domain to be mapped onto corresponding concepts in the target domain , image –mappings map only one visual image onto another visual image. Nevertheless, both obey the Invariance Principle.

In a metaphorical expression like

(1) The committee has kept me in the *dark* about this matter.

language and conceptual structure from the 'source' domain of vision is used to depict a situation in the 'target' domain of knowledge and understanding. Particular elements of the source and target domains are picked out through a combination of the source

language used ("in the *dark*") and the relevant conceptual metaphor, a 'mapping'–presumably stored as a knowledge structure in long-term memory–which tells us how elements in the two domains line up with each other. (Grady, Oakley, Coulson, 1999).

In LIFE IS A JOURNEY metaphor, there is a conceptual mapping from the source domain of journeys to the target domain of life. In the mapping, living beings correspond to travellers, life goals correspond to destinations, difficulties encountered in life correspond to impediments to travel, and so forth (Kovecses 2002, pp. 6-7). Our everyday thinking contains thousands of conventional metaphorical mappings of this sort, the processing of which is mainly unconscious and automatic. Each mapping involves a fixed set of correspondences between the respective entities in each domain. Thus, metaphor is treated as a systematic correspondence between a source domain, which serves as the source of vocabulary and conceptual inferences, and a target domain, to which vocabulary and inferences are extended metaphorically. Analogical mapping, thus, a phenomenon that takes place when the language user postulate the existence of a whole range of 'ready made' conceptual metaphors in the mind. (Lakoff and Johnson, 1999).

On this account Cameron (2003, p.60) discusses that the ability to understand linguistic metaphors (when they are first encountered) is likely to rely on the successful identification of a relevant conceptual metaphor. However, the identification of an appropriate conceptual metaphor is not always a conscious process and may not be sufficient to allow a complete understanding of a linguistic metaphor. Additional metaphoric thinking is usually required, which takes into account the context in which the metaphor appears, and the function that it is intended to perform. For example, in order to understand the metaphor *slavery was well on the road to extinction* it is helpful to think in terms of the conceptual metaphor PROGRESS IS FORWARD MOTION;

however, further metaphoric thinking (i.e. more detailed 'mapping' from the source domain to the target domain) is required to understand that considerable progress has already been made and that there is likely to be no turning back. For some other linguistic metaphors such as '*my teacher is a total witch'* the underlying conceptual metaphors are even less apparent, and have very little, if any, explanatory power. It can be concluded that, although conceptual metaphors help us to understand linguistic metaphors, producers and receivers of a language need to operate both linguistically and conceptually.

Similarly, some critical questions were raised by Steen (1994) such as ' do the conceptual metaphors postulated by Lakoff and Johnson really reside in the minds of individual human beings? And do people always understand all metaphors by means of analogical mapping?'. The answer to these questions comes from the limitations of Lakoff's approach by himself. He gives the limitation of his approach by stating

> But do all competent speakers of language have the same
>
> conventionalized metaphors? And how do we know , for any
>
> given   individuals, whether the   love as journey metaphor is
>
> conventionalized for them? The analytic methods devised by
>
> Johnson and myself are not sufficient to answer such
>
> questions. All our methods permit, is an analysis of
>
> conventional metaphors in the conceptual system underlying
>
> the speech of an idealized   native speaker (Lakoff 1986, p.223) .

Steen (1994, p.25) suggests that metaphorical structures may be available to people when they think about texts , but this does not mean that they are 'accessible' and 'actually accessed' during on-line comprehension and not all linguistic metaphors require the retrieval of a conceptual analogical mapping during process by every

individual because an on-line construction of a new analogical mapping can work for every individual. Thus, process of analogizing is triggered when 'information structure' of linguistic metaphor is seen. And analogizing *may* help to 'information structures' in a log-term memory. Interaction between metaphorical textual and knowledge structures occurs *if* there is an 'available', 'accessible' and 'retrieved' conceptual metaphor. With this interaction and using the activated knowledge structures, mapping from one domain to another is processed.

2.3.2 Structure Mapping Theory

'Structure Mapping Theory'(Gentner, 1983) is one of the clearest study of analogical approaches. On this view, metaphors are like analogies involving two stages : 'alignment' and 'projection'. The alignment process works to create a 'maximal structurally consistent match between two representations. As Gentner and Bowdle (2001) point out

> Each element of one representation can be placed in correspondence with at most one element of the other representation, and arguments of aligned relations and other operators are themselves aligned. A further constraint on the alignment process systemacity. Alignments that form deeply interconnected structures in which higher-order relations constrain lower-order relations, are preferred over less systematic sets of commonalities . Once a structurally consistent match between the target and base representations has been found , further elements from the base that are connected

to the   common system can be projected to the target as

candidate inferences (p.223) .

An example can illustrate this view better. Structural mapping theory approaches

understanding 'Socrates was a midwife' metaphor as follows:

First, the receiver matches the identical predicates in the target and source domains: help

and produce. Then, by parallel connectivity, the predicated arguments are placed in

correspondence:

  midwife-→ Socrates, mother -→ student and child-→ idea.

Next, these matches are unified in a global system. And finally, predicates which are

unique to the source but connected to the aligned structure are carried to the target.

Hence, this metaphor can be interpreted like ' Socrates did not simply teach his students

new ideas, but rather helped them realize ideas that had been developing within them all

long'.

2.3.3 Categorization

A growing number of researchers (e.g. Glucksberg and Keysar, 1990;Glucksberg

and McGlone ,1997) have suggested that it is better to treat metaphors as categories

rather than similarities since metaphors establish 'class-inclusion' relations between

ontologically distant concepts. Their main argument is, understanding metaphor is not

something where one category is likened to another but metaphors create 'ad hoc'

categories. This view received much favour as it illuminated the metaphor –simile

relation and reinforced the idea that metaphors are not merely implicit similes. Thus, the

general view 'A is like B' became 'A belongs to the category B'. This theory viewed

metaphor 'beyond similarity' but did not reject analogical comprehension. The example

below illustrates this view more clearly:

In 'Time is a river ' metaphor, 'river' belongs to a category like 'things that flow forward'. So, time belongs to this category. Thus, it can be interpreted that time is something flowing forward, and you cannot take it back.

However, this theory has its drawbacks like many other theories. One difficulty arises when categorization starts from the source without input from the target. In fact in the absence of the target it does not mean much to put the source in a category. What is more the same source may belong to a different category as far as the target is concerned. This is what happens in two metaphors below:

A child is a snowflake→ Child is unique

Youth is snowflake → Youth is ephemeral

Recognizing the problem Gluksberg and MacGlone (1997) proposed a more detailed and enhanced version of categorization view called 'The Interactive Property Attribution Model'. This model suggested that during comprehension the receiver scans the categories concerning the dimensions of applicability. So understanding takes place when appropriate category is comprehended, otherwise the interpretation turns out to be wrong or not appropriate.

According to Walter Kintsch (2000), Glucksberg's discussion fairly summarizes the empirical evidence on metaphor comprehension, but is incomplete in one important way: how do we know what is a superordinate-category level and what is a basic-level property? Thus, Glucksberg's intuitive choice of the right one is unsatisfactory from a computational standpoint. A model of comprehension must select the right features automatically, without having to be told what is relevant and what is not.

The evidence and support comes from a study done by Glucksberg, Newsome, and Goldvarg (2001). What their study has shown is, when people comprehend metaphors, relevant and irrelevant knowledge becomes accessible. Yet, for a meaningful

interpretation within a sentence or context, metaphor irrelevant properties are inhibited not because of a short term working memory but due to information retrieved from long-term semantic memory.

2.3.4 A Unified Theory

It seems only one theory cannot solve the understanding as a whole. Then, it will be better to offer a 'unified' look to metaphor comprehension. The central idea in the unified theory supports whether the mappings are analogies as or categorizations and whether they are computed directly or indirectly are shaped due to conventionality and grammatical structure of metaphors. The result of the experiments done by Gentner and Bowdle (2001) suggest that there is a shift in metaphor comprehension from comparison to categorization as metaphors are conventionalized. That means, participants had a tendency to understand metaphors more directly when they are more conventional.

Parallel to this, what Steen argues is , it is doubtful whether or not many conventional metaphorical expressions in ordinary language require or trigger active analogical mapping. Another evidence comes from Hoffman and Kemper (1987), Gibbs (1994) that people understand such metaphors directly and they are not aware of their non-literal nature. While Lakoff takes this evidence a reason for his idea of postulating conceptual metaphors that are used 'automatically, effortlessly or unconsciously', Langacker (1998, p.127) takes another path by stating ' …people may understand conventional metaphors directly because there is no question of metaphorical mapping during their own language processing. Hence it does not follow from the observed, automatic understanding of conventional metaphors that a category of conceptual metaphors has to be postulated for the individual mind'. Additionally, Kittay (1987, p.108) explains that the metaphorical meaning of some words is seen as directly accessible as their literal meaning and this can

be regarded as instances of 'polysemy' which can be defined as 'one word that have two related meanings or the ambiguity of an individual word or phrase that can be used to express two or more different meanings' (Oxford Dictionary) . Thus, the analogical mapping motivating the figurative connection loses its use in the 'mental lexicon 'of individual users.

Many researchers (e.g. Steen, Deignan, Cameron and Low, Goatly) claim that one of the vague assumptions of cognitive view is putting so much emphasis on conceptual part of metaphor and ignoring the linguistic effect that shapes the understanding. That is why they focus also on 'linguistic metaphor' to present the relation between conceptual and linguistic metaphor which settles a base for understanding. Steen

(1994, p.7-8) argues there are some ways in which the appearance of the conceptual metaphor can be affected by the linguistic expressions. He categorizes these ways as grammar, lexical structure and rhetoric.

One conceptual metaphor may show itself in many grammatical variations. LIFE IS A GAMBLING GAME conceptual metaphor is realized in different grammatical means. 'He is bluffing' evokes the metaphor by a verb while 'he is a real loser' evokes by a noun or there may be some fixed, idiomatic expressions such as 'when chips are down'. Therefore, cognition is 'relatively independent of the way it is expressed grammatically. They may refer to the same conceptual metaphor but by different means such as analytic links (he is a real loser), or by some more abstract procedure in idiomatic ones (when chips are down).(Steen , 1994, p.8)

Different lexical structures can be derived from the same metaphor but their individual meanings still embody distinct lexical realizations. To give the same example above ' a loser' is not as specific an expression as 'playing it close to your vest'. Thus, linguistic structure has an important role during processing. Metaphors are not always

presented in 'A is B' format. They may not be as clear as 'My lawyer is a shark'. The language user can use it in other ways that makes the meaning more complex , forcing the reader or speaker to think more broadly or analytically to get the true meaning. Similarly, Goatly (1997) points out that source domains range from single words and phrases to clauses or sentences or even whole discourses and texts. That means metaphors can be formed on the lexical, sentential and discoursal basis.

In the last area, Rhetoric, 'there is a room for play between metaphorical conceptualization and metaphorical expression' as Steen states. Simile, allegory, dead metaphor are seen related to linguistic metaphor. The conceptual view 'facilitates their treatment as varying verbal manifestations of related or identical underlying conceptual structures'. According to Steen (1994) 'it would be very surprising if there were no functional difference between the expressions of a conceptual metaphor as a simile, a metaphor or analogy'. (p.8) It can be said that in spite of the underlying conceptual unity, there is also a linguistic variety which has to be considered when one studies on metaphor.

For linguists such as, Dascal (1989), Gibbs (1989), Steen (2004), the two-stage model do not always take place in a well ordered way. Because when a reader encounters a linguistic metaphor, there may be some different things as follows:

1.The reader can treat a metaphor as a case of polysemy and the process may be unconscious and automatic, without considering the literal meaning , which is said to take place in two-stage model.

2. The reader can decode and conceptualize a metaphor by referring to some parts of the literal meaning of the vehicle. And an 'implicit metaphor identification' may take place.

3. The reader can identify a metaphor explicitly after the comprehension process.

Also, it is not likely that all implicit identifications will result in explicit ones .

2.3.5 Blending theory

In 1990s it was seen that the cognitive linguistic theory of conceptual metaphor needed to be supplemented by an account of on-line process of human understanding. Fauconnier and Turner (in Kovecses, 2003, p.56) argue that the 'two –domain model of conceptual metaphor should be replaced with a 'network model' which can account for several metaphorical and non-metaphorical aspects of on-line understanding. The model consists of ' input spaces', a 'blended space' and a 'generic space'. While CMT analyses involve mappings between precisely two conceptual structures, Blending Theory (BT) typically makes use of a four-space model. These spaces include two 'input' spaces (which, in a metaphorical case, are associated with the source and target of CMT), plus a 'generic' space, representing conceptual structure that is shared by both inputs, and the 'blend' space, where material from the inputs combines and interacts. CMT's directional view of the relation between source and target –the projection goes from source to target – is replaced by a non-directional view in BT, where the projection goes from any of a number of inputs, minimally two, to the blend.

 To illustrate the theory, a BT account of example

(1) 'The committee has kept me in the *dark* about this matter'

would include the following spaces:

 a . An input space drawing on the domain of vision, in which a person (A) is surrounded by darkness. Another input space, drawing on the domain of intellectual activity, in which a committee has withheld information from an individual (A')

b . A mapping between these spaces, specifying that A and A' are to be taken as one and the same person, that the person's inability to see corresponds to unawareness, and so forth

c . A generic space containing the shared material the two inputs have in common (roughly, 'a person who has no access to a particular stimulus')

d . The blended space, in which a committee is causing an individual to remain in the dark (Fauconnier & Turner,1995) .

There are some basic processes of blending. These are, 'composition', 'completion', and 'elaboration'. 'Composition' is the most straightforward process, and refers to the projection of content from each of the inputs into the blended space. 'Completion' is the filling out of a pattern in the blend, evoked when structure projected from the input spaces matches information in long-term memory. Finally, 'elaboration' is the simulated mental performance of the event in the blend, which we may continue indefinitely.

According to Kovecses (2002, p.233) this model has some distinct advantages since it provides us with a more full account and subtler analyses of literary texts. As a matter of fact literature 'produces a large number of blends. Some authors use the device of creating fantastic blends with great skill and can thus convey subtle messages that can only be fully understood with the help of the kind of analysis like blending'.

Taking all these processing views (Analogical Mapping, Structure Mapping, Categorization and Blending) into consideration it can be concluded that , not all metaphoric expressions require a retrieval, in some cases it is just like understanding polysemous (e.g dead metaphors) expressions, or sometimes an on-line, dynamic metaphorical mapping takes place for individuals. Also, it can be claimed that different people may 'share other parts of the postulated common conceptual apparatus'.

Therefore, understanding metaphors is a research that is still open to research. (Steen,1994).

2.4 Metaphor and Literature: The Use of Metaphors in Poetry

Metaphors are used often in literature, appearing in every genre from poetry to prose and from essays to epics. Utilized by poets and novelists to bring their literary imagery to life, metaphors are an important component of reading closely and appreciating literature.

The close relationship between metaphor and literature goes back to Aristotle once more. Steen (1994 p. 27) states that the relation between metaphor and literature is quite intimate. And it is due to Aristotle's treatment of metaphor in his Poetics. He wrote that 'to be good at metaphor is a sign of natural genius, and it is natural because it 'cannot be learnt from anyone else'. As metaphor was seen having a rhetorical role only, literary scholars viewed metaphor in literature as an aesthetic function so ignored the importance of understanding process or co-construction of it by the reader.

The cognitive turn has some important consequences when one considers metaphor in literary texts. In general it not only revolutionized metaphor and made it an attractive study to understand meaning and human thought but also disciplines such as linguistics and psychology are challenged to redefine their scope, methods and aims. Last but not the least, the clear character of metaphor in literature, its function, identification and interpretation have become empirical rather than theoretical.

It may seem that the cognitive view undermined the close relationship of metaphor and literature for centuries. Thus, poetic or so-called the language used in literature may seem to lose its unique, aesthetic function of creating meaning and adding vividness to literature. Lakoff and Turner (1989) clearly state

It is commonly thought that poetic language is beyond

ordinary language--that it is something essentially

different, special, higher, with extraordinary tools and

techniques like metaphor and metonymy, instruments

beyond the reach of someone who just talks. But great

poets, as master craftsmen, use basically the same tools we

use; what makes them different is their talent using these

tools, and their skill in using them, which they acquire

from sustained attention, study, and practice (preface).

In their view general conceptual metaphors are thus not the unique creation of

individual poets but are rather part of the way members of a culture have of

conceptualizing their experience. Poets, as the members of their cultures, naturally make

use of these basic metaphors to communicate. They have also taken the following

functional view of how writers use in poetry to achieve a special effect.

" poets can appeal to the ordinary metaphors we live by in order to take us beyond

them, to make us more insightful than we would be if we thought only in standard ways"

(p.215).

The quotations stated above reinforces the 'ubiquity' of metaphors, but also shows

that metaphors have still special place and function in literature. Literature is, first of all,

a communication - a thought or message conveyed by the writer to the reader. It is not

only an act of creation, but an act of sharing. It is therefore important to the reader that

s/he understands how the poet uses words, how s/he puts fresh vigor and new meaning

into words. In fact, the special nature of many literary metaphors can be traced to two

different origins. They may include 'new linguistic expressions of familiar conceptual

metaphors' or reveal 'newly constructed ones' showing the poets' eyes at its most original. (Lakoff and Turner,1989).

Kovecses (2002, p.43) argues that the widespread notion among people and scholars that the creative genius of the poet and artist is what creates the most authentic examples of metaphor is partially true. Although everyday knowledge and the everyday conceptual system contribute a great deal to the working of the artistic genius, poets and writers still create new, original metaphors. The following example from Gabriel Garcia Marquez's novel analyzed   by Gibbs (in Kovecses, 2002) is a good example to consider the special place of metaphors in literature:

'Once he tasted some chamomile tea and sent it back, saying only " this stuff tastes of window" . What is tea like tastes like window? This is obviously an unconventional metaphor that was created by the author in order to offer a new and different perspective on an aspect of reality. Original, creative literary metaphors are less clear but richer in meaning than either everyday metaphors or metaphors in science'.

Steen's study (1994) is another good example to claim that literary metaphors are somehow different from others. The result of his study shows that metaphors play a special role in the literary as opposed to journalistic reading. Metaphors are seen as typically literary but not typically journalistic by the participants.

A study done by Boer (2003) reinforces the assumed and claimed difference. In this study, texts were taken at random from recent (1994, early 1995) periodical publications in English (American, British and a few from other varieties), each from a different title with the exception of three fiction fragments. Table 3 shows the mean scores of the relative frequency of metaphors for these genres, separately for types and tokens. According to Table 3 'very original' metaphors are found more in poetry than in other genres.

Table 3   Mean Scores of the Frequency of Metaphors and Their Conventionality

for Genres

1a.Metaphor types per 10.00 words	Genre	Moderately conventional	Moderately original	Very original metaphors
	Poetry	248	192	48
	Fiction	200	72	29
	News	256	84	0
	Science	225	32	0
1b. Metaphor tokens per 10,000 words	Genre	Moderately conventional	Moderately original	Very original metaphors
	Poetry	312	233	71
	Fiction	225	80	58
	News	358	84	0
	Science	468	35	0

For Boer, the results clearly corroborate one of Lakoff and Johnson's less controversial assertations, namely that literature, and poetry in particular, is marked by a great amount, not of metaphors *per se*, but of *unconventional* metaphors. This idea was also confirmed by Steen (1994) in two of his experiments, experts rated metaphorical extracts from fiction and from newspapers on a number of scales; factor analyses indicated that the literary extracts were significantly less conventional in the first experiment and more difficult in the second, compared with the journalistic extracts. It can be inferred that both presentation of the metaphors in literature and understanding of the reader can be parallel to understanding metaphors in general yet there is still a space

that creates a distinctive study like 'analyzing and understanding metaphor in literature' due to the nature of literature.

2.4.1 Function of Metaphors in Literature

One cannot think of poems without thinking of certain elements that are embodied in such as metaphors. Metaphors in literature, especially in poetry have an undeniable effect on creating and interpreting the meaning. Because they make literature exciting and interesting to read. They exemplify a writer's thoughts and they build a common ground for all people of different attitudes, time era and place. Metaphors can be used to explain ideas in a unique way rather than just saying our thoughts in blankly. Just as we use metaphors in speech, so do writers use metaphors in literature. The importance and place of metaphor in literature is listed by Saira Azad (2003) as follows:

1. They also provide readers with mental pictures and images of what the writer intends to portray.

2. Metaphors take simple ideas and transform them into unique pieces of writings. This is one of the beauties of language.

3. Discovering the meaning of metaphors in poetry can open up our minds to the representations of each word in the poem. Thus, our minds' thinking expands. We create sometimes from a short group of words, a powerful and moving novel of thoughts, ideas, and feeling housed in our brain. This is also helpful because often the point in which the poet was trying to make or express can be found with in the metaphors. And if the reader is able to in some way relate emotionally with the words they are reading, then the poets' point will be clear to the reader.

4. Metaphors in literature can be more complicated however to interpret. They

require deep thinking. We might have to read a metaphor numerous times before we grab the true meaning of it. This is what makes literature, with the uses of metaphor, fun to read. They add color to literature hence making it attract to the mind's eye.

5. Metaphors are the bridge for emotions and can lead a reader to understanding. There are many poems that seem quite cumbersome to a reader, yet through a simple metaphor clarity can be found .

Additional to this list, McGrath (2003) puts it as

> If I was ever asked the question "what makes a poem a poem?" the first response to come to my mind would be the use of metaphors. Most poems are dependent on their metaphors because without them they would be open, bland and lacking. The art of poetry is to intrigue the reader and push them to look further, deeper for the unseen meaning. Just imagine reading a poem and all the emotion , truth, and meaning of the poem is being laid out for easy understanding and no real thought is involved in interpretation. Without the metaphors poetry is an open book, while still beautiful, the mystery is gone and with it goes the main factor of why poetry is such a unique art .

Ünsal Özünlü (1999) puts the importance and function of metaphor by stating ' … would the same effect be created if it was said 'plane is landing, swaying' instead of saying ' iron bird' ? In fact this is a question to be answered differently by every reader. However, instead of saying 'plane' every time thus getting away from the ordinary creates what is called richness of expression in language'. In addition to this, Steen

(1994, p. 241) suggests that "There is something special about understanding metaphor in literature. Because, if literature is a kind of discourse which permits maximal subjective involvement, metaphor in literature may be the epitome kind of this reading experience. The basis of metaphor in non-literal anology can trigger fantasies, rich ideas which few other signs may be able to equal".

2.4.2 Metaphor Techniques Utilized By Poets

Metaphors create mystery for the reader and to make them think; to burn images of love, terror, beauty, ugliness, malice, and whatever else in order to produce a response from the reader. Poems are very delicate because of their brevity in description; they depend almost entirely on the metaphorical aspect of the contents. Without the metaphors there is no binding. A poem will feel loose and sort of unfinished. The reader will pretty much have nothing to do with the development of the poem and that is what makes poetry quite interesting and this is raised by metaphors and the way poets use them. Poets can take the reader beyond ordinary and conventional through metaphors.

Turner, Lakoff and Gibbs are the cognitive linguists who have pointed out that poets regularly employ several devices to create novel unconventional language and images from the conventional materials of everyday language and thought. These are extending , elaboration, questioning and combining.

<u>Extending</u>

Poets employ *extending* when they express conventional conceptual metaphor associated with certain conventionalized linguistic expressions by new linguistic means. They introduce a new conceptual element in the source domain. An example of this device used by Robert Frost is seen in Kovecses (2002, p. 47) .

Two reads diverged in a wood, and I__

> I took the one less traveled by.
>
> And that has made all the difference.

Here, LIFE IS A JOURNEY conventional conceptual metaphor is extended. Conventionally, there is one life road for every individual leading the individual to the destination. What can be called 'novel' here is that there are two roads going to the same destination and one can be less traveled.

Elaboration

In *elaboration* an existing element of the source is elaborated in unusual way. The poet uses the source in a more specific and special manner than customary. A good example is provided by Adrienne Rich's poem analyzed by Gibbs (see Kovecses, 2002, p. 48) :

> Fantasies of murder: not enough:
>
> To kill is to cut off from pain
>
> but the killer goes on hurting
>
> not enough. When I dream of meeting
>
> the enemy, this is my dream:
>
> white acetylene
>
> ripples from my body
>
> effortlessly released
>
> perfectly trained
>
> on the true enemy
>
> raking his body down to the thread
>
> of existence
>
> away his lie
>
> leaving him a new

> world; a changed
>
> man.

Here, ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER conventional conceptual metaphor is elaborated. The hot fluid is elaborated as acetylene and it is turned to a dangerous substance.

Questioning

In this device poets call into question the appropriateness of a conceptual conventional metaphor. The following lines from Catallus (see Kovecses, 2002, p.48) is a brief example:

> Suns can set and return again,
>
> but when our brief light goes out,
>
> there is one perpetual night to be slept through.

Here, A LIFETIME IS A DAY AND DEATH IS NIGHT are under question. A consequence of source domains that day becomes life and night becomes day cannot be applied to target domains. Because life becomes death but death does not become life again.

Combining

Combining is considered the most powerful device that goes beyond our conceptual system. It activates several everyday metaphors at the same time. Sylvia Plath's following poem is a very nice example to show how can many conventional conceptual metaphors be combined :

> I am a riddle in nine syllables,
>
> An elephant, a ponderous house
>
> A melon, strolling on two tendrils.

O red fruit, ivory fine timbers!

This loaf is big with its yeasty rising.

Money is new minted in this fat purse

I'm a means, a stage, a cow in calf .

Boarded the train, there's no getting off.

Plath combines many conventional conceptual metaphors such as

PEOPLE ARE PLANTS : A melon strolling on two *tendrils*

PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS : *an elephant , cow in calf*

PEOPLE ARE FRUIT : *red fruit*

LIFE IS A JOURNEY: *Boarded the train, there is no getting off*

It can be said that through the use of these devices literary metaphors become novel, critical and complex. Hence they challenge the minds of the reader, require deep thinking and take the reader beyond the usual and force to look at thought and meaning with a fresh eye. Besides the techniques above, it is also possible to embody metaphors as 'personification' , a metaphorical device commonly used in literature, 'images' and 'extended metaphors'.

Personification involves understanding nonhuman entities or things in terms of human beings and it is regarded as a type of 'ontological metaphor'
(see Section 2.2.1). The following extract from William Wordsworth's ' I Wandered Lonely as a Cloud'

I wandered lonely as a cloud

That floats on high o'er vales and hills,

When all at once I saw a crowd,

A host, of golden daffodils;

> Beside the lake, beneath the trees,
>
> Fluttering and dancing in the breeze.

reveals that the poet personify 'daffodils'. They become the 'host' of place and dance as people. In fact PEOPLE ARE PLANTS conceptual metaphor makes up the basis for this personification.

Poetry includes image-based metaphors that are rich in imagistic detail. The following line taken from Andre Breton's poem is a popular example:

> My wife…. whose waist is an hourglass

In this line the general shape of an hourglass is mapped onto the general shape of a woman's figure. We may reason that if her waist is an hourglass, she has a thin waist in a certain proportion to the rest of her body, the same proportion that the central part of an hourglass keeps with rest of its sections. In fact words in this metaphor do not tell us which part of the hourglass should be mapped onto woman's body. Nevertheless the reader knows exactly which parts these are. And this detail makes image metaphors conceptual.

'Extended metaphors' are 'large scale' metaphors 'behind'a text. They may run through all text without necessarily 'surfacing'. In Steven Spender's poem "Word", Spender uses a simile, a comparison of two unlike things using like or as, to present a "word" as a "fish" and an extended metaphor to compare the activity of writing poetry to fishing.

> The word bites like a fish.
>
> Shall I throw it back free
>
> Arrowing to that sea

Where thoughts lash tail and fin?

Or shall I pull it in

To rhyme upon dish?

2.5 Metaphor and Literature: Processing in Poetry

Much psychological and cognitive science research has been done on the cognitive processes involved in understanding metaphor in the last twenty to thirty years and they provide a good deal of information for the process of understanding. Most of such research has however focused on metaphors like "Surgeons are butchers" where the core of the intended interpretation can be identified rather easily. (See, for example, Malgady & Johnson 1980; Trick and Katz 1986).These valuable pieces of works, however, do not make a distinction between understanding metaphors in literature or outside literature. This can be the result of 'Conceptual Metaphor Theory' which claimed that poets use the same tools as ordinary people. However, this theory also accepts that poetic language is the 'extension' of ordinary language (see Section 2.4). Hence, to think about 'poetic' metaphor may not be the same to think about daily language. The poets can deliberately elaborate, extend, question or combine metaphors (see Section 2.4.2) and make them 'original' and look 'unfamiliar' to the reader which will affect the interpretation.

Additionally, for the 'poetic' language, McRea (2000) argues that 'When words appear in poetry, they do not have just referential meanings but often representational meanings as well'. And these representational meanings ' require negotiation and judgement by its receiver in order to be fully understood'. Consequently, since poems are full of metaphors and metaphors represent other things than themselves, not

understanding the metaphors in poetry results in not understanding the poem really and fully.

In addition to this, Graham Low (personal conversation, June , 10, 2006) argues that poets may use some common and ancient 'motifs' in their culture. Being extended, these common 'motifs' can seem uncommon and this can lead to more complexity in interpretation. At this point, 'cultural' effects also indulge in interpreting metaphors in poetry. Pieces of literature carry the socio-cultural elements of the country it belongs to. What is common in one culture, may not be so common in another one. Therefore, readers' background knowledge on that culture gains importance. To give an example, In Sylvia Plath's poem 'Metaphors' an extension of everyday idiomatic expression 'a bun in the oven' which means being pregnant is given with the following line:

> *This loaf's big with its yeasty rising*

If the reader is familiar with the cultural, daily expressions of that language, it might be easier for them to understand this line.

Steen (1994, pp. 26,90) takes the research on understanding further by claiming metaphors can be identified and interpreted in different ways due to some effects. These effects are 'reader' 'text' and 'context'. The language user may look at the different aspects of the text and for different aspects of knowledge, in order to process metaphors in the contextually appropriate way. According to him, 'discourse context can affect the use of both language structures and knowledge structures during processing. What is more, context may have affected the structure of the text and metaphors it contains during the stage of text production'. Hence, he considers literature as a contextual factor that can affect the understanding process of metaphors.

Similarly, Frank Hakemulder & Willie van Peer (2004) suggest that 'foregrounding' in literature - employing unusual forms of language - breaks up the reader's routine

behavior: commonplace views and perspectives are replaced by new and surprising insights and sensations. 'Authors deviate from rules, maxims, or conventions. These may involve the language, as well as literary traditions or expectations set up by the text itself. Cases of live metaphor, or ungrammatical sentences are clear examples of deviation'.

Metaphors have a function of enhancement regarding the literary experience which can be observed empirically in the various kinds of mental representations readers construct for metaphors during literary reception. Therefore, understanding metaphor in literature requires an interdisciplinary approach more than pure literary criticism. This approach involves attention to psychological, linguistic and literary aspects. Steen (2004, p.137) categorises the process of understanding metaphors in literature as follows:

1. When readers express their difficulty or doubt with processing a metaphorical expression , this is *problem identification*.

2. When readers express their metalingual awareness regarding a metaphor as non-literal comparative or an image, this is *explicit metaphor identification*.

3. When readers connect the topic and vehicle domains of the metaphor with an overt comparative linker such as is or is like, this is *labeling*.

4. When readers process a metaphor in terms of language belonging exclusively to the topic domain, this is *focus processing*.

5. When readers process a metaphor in terms of language belonging exclusively to the vehicle domain, this is *vehicle construction*.

6. When readers interpret a metaphor in terms of language belonging to both the topic and vehicle domain, this is *metaphor construction*.

7. When readers connect the metaphors to other portions of the text or their interpretations thereof, this is *metaphor functionalization*.

8. When readers connect the metaphor to the intentions of the author, this is

metaphor context construction.

9. When readers return to the metaphors interpreted before the current sentence

   this is *metaphor refunctionalization*

10. When readers express their judgement concerning the class or the quality of

   the metaphor, this is *metaphor appreciation.*

These processes were not designed merely for understanding metaphors in literature but the results of the experiments conducted by Steen (1994 , p.142) showed that:

   a. Readers processed the focus of metaphors more often in literary text than in

      journalistic one.

   b. They built contexts in terms of author intentions more often than in the

      journalistic reading.

   c. They identified metaphors explicitly more frequently in literary reading.

   d. They refunctionalized metaphors at later stages of reading process more

      frequently while reading a literary text.

2.6 Difficulties in Understanding

There exists a considerable and convincing body of research in cognitive psychology and cognitive science that indicates that people understand metaphors in much the same way as they understand literal sentences (Cacciari &Glucksberg, 1994; Gibbs,1994 ; Glucksberg & MacGlone, 1997). However some metaphors are more difficult to understand than the others especially for foreign language learners. Studies have been made of the linguistic and cultural difficulties experienced by overseas students attending lectures in a foreign language (Bodycott and Walker 2000, Flowerdew 1994). Littlemore (1998) claims that metaphorical expressions are characteristics of academic discourse that make it particularly difficult for non-native speakers. The vagueness of metaphor leaves a number of gaps in the message which must be filled by inference through the use of background knowledge. As with other types of vague language (see Channell 1994), this is likely to be a problem for overseas students as they lack sufficient background knowledge to draw the necessary inferences. The appropriate ground of metaphorical expressions is often culturally specific (Carter 1997), and will not necessarily be familiar to overseas students. Problems arise when these students inadvertently transfer a different meaning from the vehicle to the topic than that intended by the speaker. For example, Henderson (1982) cites an overseas student who, upon hearing the expression "parent company", interpreted it to mean "supplier" rather than "controller". Both are connotations of the vehicle word "parent", yet only one is used in this particular metaphor. It is not always easy to guess which meaning or connotation is intended. In this example, the student had no difficulties with the lexical aspects of the metaphor, but was confused by its discoursal and pragmatic features.

When faced with an unfamiliar metaphorical expression, native speakers have an advantage over non-native students in that they have access to shared cultural knowledge

and, to a certain extent, shared expectations with the speaker. Often the metaphorical expressions are deliberately based on schemata which represent shared experience and sociocultural values (see, Littlemore, 1998). Without this cultural knowledge, overseas students are likely to misinterpret some metaphorical expressions.

The study done by Gisele Luz Cardoso and Josalba R. Vieria (2003) investigated the steps high school readers go through in making sense of metaphorical expressions they encounter in song lyrics. This metaphor processing was studied through think-aloud protocols. The results showed that metaphor is not immediately understood possibly because of students' proficiency level and differences between metaphor producers and receivers. Literary texts can be subjective and difficult to understand especially because they can contain a high number of metaphorical expressions: "…the higher instances of metaphors present in the literary texts represent one of the greatest difficulties in the interpretation…process" (Zozzoli, Albuquerque, & Santos, 1999). Regarding Foreign Language classes, there may be other problems besides the one of interpretation. They may be related to linguistic constraints. Learners may fail to get the meaning expected by the writer because of their lack of cultural and linguistic knowledge either in their L1 or L2 .

2.7 Universality and Variations of Metaphors

Since the cognitive theory views metaphor existing in language only because it exists in thought, and linguistic metaphors as expressions of metaphorical concepts in conceptual system, they must have a common ground. Kovecses (2005, p.34) puts it " If metaphor is based on the way human body and brain function and we as human beings are alike at the level of functioning, then most metaphors people use must also be fairly similar that is universal, at least on the conceptual level".

Most of the research on metaphor since the introduction of the theory has been based on English, which means that we know relatively little about the role of language-based variation in the structure of metaphorical systems. Nonetheless, the theory addresses the issue of cross-linguistic variability and defines levels of metaphorical mappings as the basis for (or lack thereof) potential language-based variation. As proposed by Grady (1997 p. 177), metaphoric mappings can be "primary" or "complex," with the former being derived from more basic physical and cognitive experiences as compared to the latter. Researchers claim that primary metaphors are learned initially by the correlation of a basic perceptual and a basic cognitive experience that occur in our everyday interactions with the world. Thus, primary metaphors are the natural outcomes of the interaction between the particulars of our physical and cognitive make-up as human beings and our subjective experience in the world, independent of language and culture. And the universality of such embodied experiences renders primary metaphors universally applicable as well. (Grady, 1997 p.186; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999 p. 146). Complex metaphors, on the other hand, are formed by the conceptual blending of primary metaphors and are less directly tied to embodied experiences. Therefore, they are more likely to show crosslinguistic–crosscultural variation than primary metaphors,

which stem from universally applicable embodied experiences (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999 p. 147).

A number of studies have sought out cross-linguistic differences in metaphor use, often focusing on domains thought likely to differ, because of known cultural differences. Through such studies it has been demonstrated that different languages do exhibit different patterns of figurative language use. The differences are of several kinds. In the most extreme case of variation, metaphors which are frequent in one language are rare or non-existent in another, as is the case for some metaphors in English and Spanish (Deignan, Lima and Lòpez-Mora, 1998). In other cases, similar metaphors are used in two languages, but are many times as frequent in one of the languages, as is found for some metaphors shared by English, French and Dutch (Boers and Demecheleer, 1997).

2.8 Differences and Similarities in Turkish and English

The article by Şeyda Özçalışkan (2003) examined the metaphorical structure of the domains of death, life, sickness, body, and time in Turkish. The analysis was conducted within the framework of the conceptual metaphor theory, and it tested the universal applicability of the metaphorical mappings outlined for English in the 'aforementioned' conceptual domains. The data were collected from literary texts, newspapers, news broadcasts, spontaneous speech, and song lyrics in Turkish. The analysis showed a high degree of similarity between English and Turkish in terms of metaphorical mappings for each of the domains, but cross-linguistic variation was also discovered at more detailed aspects of the source domain structure in poetic uses of the Turkish language. The data below show close similarity between English and Turkish in the conventional metaphorical mappings, both in terms of primary and complex metaphors.

Birth	BIRTH IS ARRIVAL
Life	LIFE IS A JOURNEY
	LIFE IS A STRUGGLE
	LIFE IS A PLAY
	LIFE IS A CONTAINER
	A LIFETIME IS A DAY
Death	DEATH IS DEPARTURE
	DEATH IS A FINAL DESTINATION
	DEATH IS REST
Others	BODY IS A CONTAINER
Others	PEOPLE ARE PLANTS
	TIME IS A MOVING ENTITY

The differences and similarities between languages or cultures gain more importance when it comes to understanding metaphors especially by English Language Teaching students. Since metaphors are 'pervasive' in language thus in literature, it is important for ELT learners to have a better understanding of metaphors.

2.9 Metaphor and ELT

Interest in vocabulary acquisition within ELT has increased in recent years, partly as a result of work such as that of Nattinger and DeCarrico (see Deignan 1995), which has

demonstrated the complexity and importance of lexical phenomena such as collocations and fixed expressions. If, as writers such as Lakoff and Johnson argue, a great deal of language is motivated by metaphor, then an examination of metaphors from the learner's point of view might also offer valuable insights into a large and important area of vocabulary. Some implications have been discussed in several articles; Low (1988) discusses the pervasiveness and centrality of metaphor and argues that students need to develop `metaphoric competence': awareness of metaphor and strategies for comprehending and creating metaphors. MacLennan (1994) also advocates explicit classroom attention to metaphor, on the grounds both that it is an integral part of language and should not be ignored, and that learning about common metaphorical patterns can simplify the acquisition of vocabulary and facilitate learning grammar. Lazar (1996) has recently argued for more teaching of figurative language and suggested some activities designed to help students develop strategies for comprehending and generating metaphor.

The notion of a metaphoric competence is discussed by Low (1988) in his paper 'On teaching metaphor'. The focus is on alerting learners (L2) to the presence and effects of conventional metaphor and pedagogical approaches to achieving this in ELT contexts. Therefore, the emphasis is on the 'discoursal and pragmatic aspects of metaphor rather than literary uses'. Graham Low (Ibid) puts forward that metaphor should be given a more important place in language teaching than it has been in the past , for some reasons. Firstly, it is central to the use of language. Secondly, from a structural point of view it pervades large parts of the language system. He identifies a number of functions of metaphor in language use and includes "how things in life are related in systematic ways we can at least partially comprehend through the complex structure of conceptual metaphor"

Experiments done by Frank Boers (1997) revealed that figurative expressions can often be traced back to metaphoric expressions. Hence, metaphoric expressions can facilitate retention of unfamiliar figurative expressions enhancing EFL students vocabulary knowledge. Similarly, Kittay (1987, pp. 210-211) suggested that cognitive linguistic view that the meanings of idioms are not completely predictable, but it suggests that a large part of idiom's meaning is motivated by cognitive mechanisms such as metaphor and conventional language and 'a major practical advantage of cognitive linguistic view is that it facilitates the teaching and learning of idioms in the context of foreign language teaching.

Metaphor is a good way of teaching and learning idiomatic expressions and new words. They are frequently used in poetry through various ways (see Section 2.4.2), and it is already known that ' literature shapes and is shaped by language and it is a great medium when the aim is to teach the English langauge'(see Türeli, 1998). Therefore, it is necessary and important to understand the meaning in thought , language and literature ; metaphor is the key to open the door of understanding and creating meaning. Identification and interpretation of metaphors both in everyday language and in literary texts, act as necessity and beyond that they have a great role in human thought, understanding and reasoning. Trying to understand metaphor then, means trying to understand a vital part of what kind of world we live in and the poem we read. If figurativeness is a natural, expected phenomenon of language, pervasive in everyday interaction, then it should be an important part of EFL curricula. Metaphor should not be excluded or postponed or relegated to special 'ad hoc' exercises, but be integrated into the method and materials of the course from the very beginning.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents information about the research, instruments and procedures: selection of participants and materials, data collection, research procedures and the methods of data analysis.

This study aims to investigate the identification of metaphors in literature specifically in poetry. Another aim is to see the interpretation of metaphors by the participants and their interpretation processes. It also aims to search into the difficulties they have while interpreting. Last but not least, it aims to investigate how participants express two of the target domains in the selected English poems in Turkish. By doing all these, this study aims to focus on the importance of metaphor in understanding the meaning and the message conveyed in poems.

For the purpose of the study descriptive research design was used. The survey conducted had some steps and sessions. In the first step, the fourth-year students in the ELT Department in the 2005-2006 academic year, received the selected English poems to underline 'the most effective/ original/ striking words or phrases'. In the second step, some of the randomly selected participants that attended the first step were taken to a 'Think and Feel Aloud' study which was followed by an interview to have a better insight to their understanding. This session was concluded by the final phase which was held in Turkish.

3.2 Participants of the Study

Since the study aims to search into the present state of identification and interpretation of metaphors in an English poem by the students of ELT Department , for the first step, randomly selected 50 fourth-year students -out of approximately 180 – who are in their forth year at ELT department at Çukurova University participated. The number of the participants to take part in Think Aloud and Interview processes was decreased to 10, 5 males and 5 females. The students had already taken some courses on literature such as:

'Introduction to Literature' (second year)

'Short story' and 'Novel' (third year)

'Drama' and 'Poetry' (fourth year)

Data collection had been completed by March , 2006, before participants took Poetry course in the second semester of the fourth year. Besides, the students were not given any definition or treatment on metaphor not to raise any awareness.

3.3 Selection of the Materials

Two English poems were selected to be used in this study. The reason of selecting poetry as genre is due to the study done by Boer which indicated that poems embody original or very original metaphors more than any other genres (see Section 2.4). The first one was Sylvia Plath's 'Metaphors', the second one was Langston Hughes's 'Dreams' (see Appendix 1) .The title of both poems and names of the poets were not shown to the participants. The reason for selecting these particular poems is due to the metaphors they contain. The table below shows the number of metaphors and their conventionality which is rated for this study by Dr. Jeannette Littlemore who is a

lecturer at University of Birmingham and Graham Low , a lecturer at University of

York at Department of Educational Studies .

Table 4. The Frequency and Conventionality of Metaphors in Both Poems

Degree of Conventionality	a	f	b	f	c	f	d	f
Poem 1 16 metaphors	*means , elephant*	2	*loaf, cow in calf , red fruit , boarded the train there is no getting off,stage*	5	*green apples purse, timbers riddle,ivory*	6	*house,tendrils money,melon*	4
Poem 2 5 metaphors	*hold fast, dreams go*	2	*dreams die,*	1	*life is a broken winged bird*	1	*life is a barren field*	1

a: Conventional

b: Moderately Conventional

c: Original

d: Very Original

While the first poem employs mostly 'original' and ' very original' metaphors, the

second one has fewer metaphors belonging to these categories.

There are some other properties of these poems. The first poem is a riddle poem. A

riddle attempts to use language in such a way as to present common things as unfamiliar

and then asks its readers/listeners to guess what it is. What is central to the tradition is

their use of language: good riddles rely upon creative use of metaphor, simile, and

metonymy, concrete imagery; and imaginative presentation and description of an object

or concept. Another property of this poem is the grammatical structure of the metaphors

it employs. The grammatical structure of metaphors in this poem is as follows:

Single word metaphors: red fruit

Noun with a prepositional phrase: a cow in calf

Sentence: (A is B format)   I am a riddle in nine syllables

Noun with a present participle: a melon strolling on two tendrils

The whole discourse: a journey of a pregnant woman and of a child to be.

Table 5 Conceptual Metaphors and Some Linguistic Expressions in Poem 1

Conceptual Metaphors	Linguistic Expressions
PEOPLE ARE PLANTS (FRUIT)	A *melon* strolling on two *tendrils*
PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS	*Elephant, cow in calf*
INANIMATE OBJECTS ARE PEOPLE	*purse*
TAKING ON RESPONSIBILITES IS EATING	I have *eaten a bag of green apples*
LOVED ONE IS A POSESSION	*money* is new minted in this fat purse
LIFE IS A JOURNEY	*Boarded the train, there is no getting off*

Table 5 reveals some of the conceptual metaphors and their linguistic realizations in

poem 1. The expressions support the view that conventional conceptual metaphors are

not the unique creation of the poets. In other words poets use the basic tools as ordinary

people (see Section 2.4). However, most of the metaphors are combined, elaborated or

extensions of conventional expressions were used by the poet (see Section 2.4.2). Many

metaphors are not in A is B format , and target and source domains are not always

aligned. First poem is a nice example to that sort and embodies more original metaphors

through more complex structure. Thus, it requires more effort , imagination and

creativity on the part of the reader.

The second poem embodies more conventional metaphors through easier

grammatical structures.   The grammatical structure of the metaphors is as follows:

Sentence : (A is B format) Life is a broken winged bird

Life is a barren field

Implicit : Hold fast to dreams

Personification: When dreams die, When dreams go

Table 6 Conceptual Metaphors and Some Linguistic Expressions in Poem 2

Conceptual Metaphors	Linguistic Expressions
LIFE IS A BUILDING	*Life is a barren field*
POSSESING IS HOLDING	*Hold fast* to dreams
CHEERFUL IS SUNNY	Life is a barren field *frozen* with snow

Table 6 shows some of the conceptual metaphors and some of the linguistic expressions in poem 2. As in the case of first poem, while some metaphors are used conventionally, still some other are 'elaborated', 'moderately conventional' or 'original' forms of conventional metaphors and their extensions (see Table 12) .

With this selection it was assumed that participants may have more difficulty in getting or making meaning in the poem containing more novel metaphors with a more complex grammatical structure .Thus, poem 1 was assumed to pose more difficulty as compared to poem 2 in regard to interpretation and understanding.

3.4 Procedure

Before the actual data collection, a pilot study was held with 10 students who are in their fourth year at ELT Department of Çukurova University. The pilot study revealed that the participants needed to be activated during 'Think and Feel Aloud' (TFA) phase. Therefore, they were given some questions prepared by the researcher and asked to comment especially on those questions during TFA .While preparing the questions, great attention was paid not to lead but activate them.

In this study, the participants received two English poems stated above. At first, 50 participants were given the first poem by Plath and asked to underline 'the most effective/ striking / original words or phrases and explain the reason of underlining briefly. They were not given any limitation for the frequency of underlining. For the any unknown words in the poem, every participant was given a glossary giving all

meanings of the words as given in dictionaries. So the participants had to decide on which meaning was appropriate in the context they were given. The primary aim of this step was to see their identification of metaphors when they see them in a poem. Next, randomly selected 10 participants among the 50, took part in TFA phase . The reason for choosing TFA was due to recent trends in literary theory which emphasize the role of a reader's emotions in the process of literary analysis .Additionally, the findings of an experiment conducted by Eva Wood (2002) presented that explicit attention to both feelings and thoughts on the part of the reader may lead to deeper, more complex responses to poetry. Emotions and thoughts can work in a reciprocal relationship to inform literary responses.

In TFA, participants were asked to read the poem once more and tell how they feel and tell whatever comes to their mind while reading, just act as if they were alone in a room, speaking to themselves. While doing this, they also had to answer some questions given by the researcher (see Appendix 2). These questions were designed with great attention not to lead participants but activate their interpretation. The primary aim of this step was uncover the thoughts in their mind and see how they interpreted the poem. Next, they participated in an interview with the researcher. They were asked series of questions, focusing on the poem line by line (see Appendix 3). These questions were designed parallel to Steen's ten step process
 (see Section 2.5). This step was followed by an additional one, only for the first poem, when many of the participants could not find the answer to the riddle, therefore had difficulties in understanding the real meaning. They were provided with the answer to the riddle and asked if they wanted to change any of their interpretations after being informed. As a final step, which was held in Turkish, the participants were asked to

build , the main metaphors throughout the poems, 'pregnant woman' and 'life without dreams' in Turkish by completing the following phrases:

    a.   For the first poem: Hamile bir kadın……

    b.   For the second poem: Hayallerin olmadığı hayat….

The aim of this last step was to see what kind of conceptual domains reside in their minds. After the participants had interpreted both poems, they were asked to reflect their attitudes towards the metaphors in both poems. This procedure was taped and applied to both poems within 2 weeks time.

3.5 Data Analysis

For the analyses of the data, a descriptive research design was used. The frequency and percentages of underlining in both poems were calculated. The data obtained from TFA and Interview recordings were transcribed and categorized according to ten processes (see Section 2.5).The data gathered in Turkish was also categorized according to the Master Metaphor List by Lakoff (see Kittay, p.281).

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

4. 1 Introduction

In this chapter, we will analyze the data obtained from Underlining, TFA, and Interview. The frequency and percentage of underlining for each poem will be calculated and displayed in tables in Section 4.2. The data obtained from TFA and Interview will be analyzed according to certain categories (see Section 2.5) and results will be reported in Section 4.3. Differences between the participants' understanding and the change and progress they showed will be reported in Section 4.4. Additionally, participants' attitudes towards the metaphors and two poems will be reported in Section 4.5. Section 4.6 will report the linguistic metaphors participants built using two target words in the poems.

4.2 Participants' Identification of Metaphors

The main aim of this step was to see if the students can identify metaphors when they are encountered in a poem. Table 7 shows the frequencies and percentages of underlining.

Table 7 Frequencies and Percentages of Underlining

n=50	f	%
Poem 1 nm=16	266	33
Poem 2 nm=5	145	54
nm= total number of metaphors		

The results show that in poem one participants were able to identify 33 % of the total metaphors whereas this percentage increases to 54 % in the second poem. The poems do not contain similar number of metaphors so correlations of the frequencies and percentages above cannot be calculated. However, calculations prove that to get a 54 %

success from underlining in the first poem, the frequency of underlining should have

been around 435 instead of 266. Since the second poem embody more conventional

metaphors with a more aligned structure when compared to the first one (see Section

2.3.2) it can be inferred that participants showed greater success for underlining in the

second poem.

Table 8 The Frequency of Reasons for Underlining in Both Poems

Reasons	Poem 1	Poem 2
metaphor	8	16
deep meaning	13	6
comparison	3	12
create mental picture	9	7
give what is intended	8	7
no response	9	2

The reasons for underlining are categorized in Table 2. There are some main points to

mention according to this table. Firstly, explicit metaphor identification occurs two times

more in the second poem. This can mean that metaphors in the second poem seemed

more flashing to the participants. Secondly, participants evaluated the metaphors as

'comparison' far more in the second poem which can mean that the more conventional

the metaphors are, the more analogical mapping is seen during process (see Section 2.

3.5).

On the other hand, the reason "deep meaning" was seen more frequently in the first

poem. As the metaphors in the first poem are more novel, that is creative, they seem to

force the participants think more deeply and in a more detailed way. They seem to push

the participants think more and harder to get the intended meaning.

The frequency of other reasons such as "create mental picture" and "give what is

intended" show more similarity when compared to other reasons. Participants seem to be

aware of the function of metaphors although they do not name them "metaphors" explicitly.

4.3 Participants' Understanding Processes

'Review of Literature' revealed that understanding metaphors is a vital part of understanding the meaning and thought (see Section 2.2.1). In our study when we analyzed the data from TFA, it was observed that, there was a variety of processes changing from metaphor to metaphor and individual to individual.

4.3.1 Understanding Stages

One of the basic questions on understanding metaphor seemed to be answered by the combination of some theories in our study. The research into the understanding of metaphor showed that metaphors *can* be understood directly like literal sentences (see Section 2.3) . In our study it was seen that while some metaphors in the first poem were understood in one stage by some of the participants , still some others were understood in two stages. In the second poem however, metaphors were understood in one stage only. It will be better to illustrate this assumption with examples from participants' verbal protocols:

Examples for one stage theory for poem 1:

A16: " … elephant stands for the pregnant woman. She is fat and slow, heavy .She thinks she is ugly I think".

B5: " The poem is about a seed. If you plant a seed, it gives lots of things to you. It becomes an elephant , big like an elephant. Then a house, because seeds get older and new seeds live in them".

A15: "Last line gives me the idea of continuity. The person is going somewhere, everybody go somewhere, it is life. Our life journey leads us somewhere, sometimes we do not know where we are going".

Examples for two stage theory for poem 1:

C3: " … a melon strolling on two tendrils. Melon has one tendril but this melon has two, it must be something different but I do not know, may be these are mouths but two mouths is also illogical".

C1: " … someone put apples on the train, oh no, other people force this person do something s/he does not want because it says there is no getting off".

   As it can be seen from the quotations above that the process changes from individual to individual. This variety comes to an end when they comment on the second poem:

C1: " Life is a broken winged bird when you do not have dreams. Dreams are what you make you happy and hopeful. When you do not have them it is like you do not live. You are half".

C7: " Bird is a good way to say life. We are birds . We fly always, but we need our wings , our dreams to help us live happily".

A10: " We need dreams to be happy. Everyone has dreams . I have, too. When I cannot do something I want to, I feel hopeless and unhappy, like this bird".

A 7: " The poem tells what happens when you do not have dreams. This is a bad situation. You do not feel anything, you are frozen. Your life stops when you do not have dreams".

   What can be concluded from all these quotations can go back to conventionality and the grammatical structure that affect the process of understanding. More novel metaphors are likely to show variety in understanding stages. But what is more, although some metaphors are not so novel, this variety can still be seen due to grammatical structure.

4.3.2 Processes of Understanding

TFA and Interview phases provide more information for participants' understanding processes. When the recorded data of these phases were analyzed, certain categories could be made up (see Section 2.5).Table 9 reports the frequency and percentages of processes in both poems in each phase.

Table 9 The Frequencies and Percentages of Processes in Both Poems

Poems	Process	TFA f	%	INT f	%	AI f	%
	PI	13	8.1	43	26.8	3	1.8
Poem 1	MI	4	2.5	52	32.5	90	50.6
	LA	31	19.4	55	34.3	95	59.3
nm= 16	FO	16	10	46	28.7	71	44.3
	VE	29	18.1	60	37.5	68	42.5
n=10	MC	26	16.3	50	31.2	75	46.8
	FU	12	7.5	22	13.7	33	20.6
	CO	14	8.7	19	11.8	30	18.7
	RE	12	7.5	29	18.1	42	26.2
	AP	8	5	41	25.6	84	52.5
	Process	TFA f	%	INT	%	AI	
Poem 2	PI	0	0	0	0		
	MI	27	54	33	66	there was not	
nm=5	LA	29	58	32	64	an AI session	
	FO	21	42	29	58		
n=10	VE	19	38	26	52		
	MC	24	48	37	74		
	FU	3	6	7	14		
	CO	5	10	9	18		
	RE	5	10	14	28		
	AP	4	8	20	40		

PI : Problem Identification, **MI** : Metaphor Identification, **LA** : Labeling. **FO** : Focus Processing, **VE** : Vehicle Construction, **MC** : Metaphor Construction, **FU**: Fuctionalization, **CO** : Context Construction, **RE** : Refunctionalization, **AP** : Appreciation, **INT** : Interview, **AI** : After Information

Table 9 reveals that there is an increase in all processes, except for PI in the second poem, in Interview phase when compared to TFA. It seems that the questions designed by the researcher in order to compile some categories, triggered their interpretations and resulted in more thinking and effort to understand the poems.

To begin with the results of the first poem, first of all, while all processes show an increase in AI, PI decreases to 1.8 %. This natural outcome is due to the progress they showed in understanding. As they found out the right meaning of the metaphors in the poem, they had fewer problems to identify. Secondly, while MI was the least frequent process in TFA, it became the second most frequent one in AI. Besides, while AP was the second least frequent process in TFA, it became the third most frequent one in AI. This increase can reveal that they identified metaphors more frequently as they understood the poem more. Parallel to this, they showed their appreciation of metaphors more frequently.

The results above seem to reveal that, some metaphors in a poem can be problematic to students therefore prevent them from understanding the underlying meaning and appreciation. However, it is possible to activate their thoughts and make them find out the hidden meaning among words.

For the second poem, the most important thing that must be paid attention to is PI process. None of the participants faced this process. This does not mean that all of them understood all the metaphors, yet, it can be inferred that the words or phrases in the second poem seemed more familiar, understandable or less confusing due to the conventionality and grammatical structure of metaphors (see Section 3. 2).

The main difference between the participants' understanding the two poems is the number of phases. In the first poem participants needed an extra phase that we called After Information (AI). It was because of participants' failure in getting the right

meaning from metaphors. That is why they were provided with the answer to the riddle (a pregnant woman) and they were asked if they wanted to change any of their interpretations in previous phases.

Another outstanding difference is the frequencies of some processes. Participants faced no 'Problem Identification' in the second poem, whereas in the first one this process showed an increase in INT and a decrease in AI. The following quotations from TFA clearly show how problematic some phrases and words for the participants:

C1: " Money is new minted in this fat purse? , this is a difficult sentence. What is the relation between money and elephant or house? Houses are expensive, actually".

C3: " At first, I thought it is a turtle when I read 'melon' then I read the rest and I could not understand. I have no schemata for the poem".

A10 : " Unusual thing is there are different topics, but they should take us to one answer, it is difficult. I think noone can understand this poem".

B5 : " A word has been hidden among many words . I felt in a maze looking for the exit. It is not easy to take the right meaning".

For 'metaphor identification', once again two poems differ from each other in TA phase. While the percentage for identification is only 2.5 % in the first poem, this percentage goes up to 54 % in the second. This can show they were more aware of the presence of metaphors in the second poem. There are many reasons for this outcome some of which seem to be grammatical structure of metaphors, their degree of conventionality, techniques utilized by the poets.

For processes such as LA, FO, VE, MC, the frequencies do not show as much difference as MI or PI in TFA. Yet, it should be taken into consideration that the number of metaphors are not the same. Furthermore, although these processes are seen in both poems , not all of these processes are constructed on the correct target and source domains in the first poem. The case is different in the second one. All of the participants who experienced these processes got the meaning right and constructed their thoughts on right source and target domains.

It may not be so realistic and valid to compare INT phases of the poems because almost all of the participants still had problems to understand poem one. But this impossibility, itself,   already seem to support the underlying reasons such as degree of conventionality, grammatical structure, and socio-cultural values that create the difference in understanding.

Table 10 The Range of the Top 5 Processes in Poem 1

Range	1	2	3	4	5
Phase					
TFA	LA f = 31	VE f = 29	MC f = 26	FO f = 16	CO f = 14
INT	VE f = 57	LA f = 55	MI f = 51	MC f = 50	FO f = 46
AI	LA f = 95	MI f = 90	AP f = 84	MC f = 75	FO f = 71

Table 11 The Range of the Top 5 Processes in Poem 2

Range	1	2	3	4	5
Phase					
TFA	LA f =29	MI f=27	MC f= 24	FO f = 21	VE f =19
INT	MC f = 37	MI f = 33	LA f = 32	FO f = 29	VE f = 26

Tables 10 and 11 show the range of top five processes in both poems. LA is the most frequent process in both poems in TFA. Participants seem to experience 'alignment' and then 'projection' (see Section 2.3.2) even though they do not explicitly identify metaphors. Consider the quotations from its Think and Feel Aloud phase for poem 1:

A16: " I think the most effective part is ; 'this loaf is big with its yeasty rising'. This line made me think the poem is about a pregnant woman, here loaf is the woman's stomach [*labeling*] .This shows her stomach is getting bigger because yeasty reminds me of productivity, so she is productive she will have a baby, and she is getting fat. Also bread is a food, we eat and live maybe here, the woman is feeding the baby in her and it will live". The interpretation of A16 supports the 'Blending Theory' (see Section 2.3.4) . S/he makes up 'input' spaces like 'stomach' and 'loaf' then a 'generic space' 'we eat bread' and 'the baby is fed in the mother's womb'. Finally these spaces are blended like 'baby makes the mother's stomach bigger like yeast does to loaf'.

On the contrary, when " labeling" is not experienced by putting correct source and target domains, although other processes such as "focus processing" , "vehicle or metaphor construction" take place, the subject cannot get the right meaning. The quotation taken from B15 is a nice example:

" I think the answer to the riddle is turtle. It says ponderous house, it is the most effective part for me. People say turtles carry their houses on them. The house is turtle's shell [*labeling*].They are slow also, ponderous. Ponderous means slow?, if I am not wrong. This turtle gets into its house when it sees a danger .House is a shelter for it [*metaphor construction*]. But I cannot connect this with red fruit , melon, loaf. Maybe there are red turtles, there must be many types of turtles. I see some similarities between things but I cannot name them. There are a lot of similarities between the words. I mean the poet

uses many language types, styles. I may be surprised at the end. Generally I can make connections but in this poem all ideas are flying in the air. And I could not guess right, here it says 'boarded the train'; an animal cannot get on a train, it must be a person or this train is symbolizing something else. I am lost".

B15's failure in constructing the metaphors reveal that metaphors are not just figure of speech but the main mechanism through which we understand thought and meaning (see section 2.2.1). Since the participant cannot map the source onto right target domain, he cannot figure out the right meaning. Therefore, the participant cannot reach the meaning intended by the poet.

Similarly, C7's wrong labeling affected all the interpretation and this was also accepted by the participant. The following lines show how the participant got stuck with false labeling:

" I think the most effective part is ' I've eaten a bag of green apples'. Because in order to produce armchairs ,trees are being destroyed. Many apple trees were cut for this reason. And they are green, green means something fresh. So these fresh, young trees were cut. Green apples are sofas now [*labeling*]. They are not apples anymore. Also armchair is like an 'elephant', 'melon'. These are metaphors. 'Timbers' are also related with trees and once again says trees are cut. Sofas can be different colours, red , 'ivory', and we sit on the sofas when 'we get on the train' ".

Except for the mislabeling, another thing in common among these interpretations is that; participants had a tendency to build up all their comments based on 'the most effective' parts for them. TFA phase in the first poem also showed that interpretations showed variety because the participants looked at the different parts of the poem for different reasons.

However, when participants commented on the second poem .They all labeled both source and target domains right for the expressions they found metaphorical. In fact, some of the both source and target domains were already aligned for them which can be claimed to make their work easier.

The situation in the third top process (MC) in TFA for both poems is very much alike LA. The frequency of this process is similar in both poems. However, higher frequency for the first poem could have occurred if metaphors and their structures had been similar. Participants' difficulty in getting the meaning is seen again in the first poem. They reconstructed   some words or phrases to make the poem meaningful but these constructions were not correct when one thinks the poem as a whole. Nevertheless, they did well when they constructed the metaphors in the second poem:

B19: " Life is barren field when you lose your dreams. I mean, the field for example, it is dry, it does not give plants, you cannot get benefit. And when you do not have dreams your life is like this field, you cannot produce, it is meaningless to live".

B15: " This line is very true. 'Life is a broken-winged bird'. It means, the bird cannot fly. But birds can fly. I mean, if your dreams leave you or you stop dreaming, you cannot go on, you cannot continue to live".

The interpretations for the first poem are not as clear and right as the ones above:

A15: " … cow in calf, I understand that we are in a society, but at the same time we are individuals. There is a system in this world sometimes we cannot be ourselves because of the rules in the society".

Actually, how A15 interpreted this metaphor could have been true in another context. The subject has its own logic and ideas to comment on the metaphor in question. However, in this context, the 'cow' stands for the pregnant woman and 'calf' for the baby. At this point it will be useful to mention some other reasons for these misinterpretations except for level of conventionality and grammatical structure.

The result of the verbal protocols revealed that FU and RE were not among the top 5 processes. In fact they are two important processes in understanding literary texts .The participants fail to connect metaphors to the poem, in other words when they consider metaphors in lexical level, ignoring the sentential and discourse levels, they have various scenarios all seem disconnected and isolated. These two processes could have helped them to get the meaning more easily if they tended to think the literary text as a whole. Thus, it is not wrong to claim that context factor and nature of literature have enough importance when building ideas. The following quotations from INT show why important these two processes are:

C3: " .. what is the relationship between house and ponderous and elephant? Elephant is slow but house is not. These are not connected, I did not like the poem".

C1: " money and purse are related, we put money in a purse but here they must mean something else, I cannot find it. I did not like. There is no coherence ".

B19: " I could not catch what the poet intends to do in the poem, some lines are related , 'red fruit, green apple'. They are natural things but 'money' ? This is an absurd poem".

When participants fail to connect the lines, they cannot go on commenting. This also seem to affect their emotional response to the poem. But this was not valid for all

the participants. A16 was the only participant who successfully found the answer to the riddle in TFA and constructed thoughts accordingly. Here, A16 was able to connect metaphors such as 'loaf', 'elephant', 'house':

A16: " Her stomach is rising and this is the house for the baby. She is a big house walking slowly and the baby is living in her".

These (FU and RE) are not among the top 5 processes in the second poem either. However, in this poem this situation do not affect their interpretations as it does in the first poem for in the second poem two of the source and target domains of the two main metaphors can bee seen clearly. Moreover, they are not as original as the metaphors in the first poem (see Section 3.2). Therefore, participants can have an overall idea of the poem without these processes.

During the interview phase participants experienced more processes by answering the questions asked by the researcher. These questions were designed to trigger them to think more systematically and uncover the ideas in their minds. All of the participants had more to say and thought in a more detailed way. Not all the answers took them to the correct interpretation but forced them to think more deeply and come up with more alternative interpretations. For the second poem these questions helped them to comment more on the poem but did not change their interpretations. The participants were asked to think about the poem line by line and answer the questions. In this phase, there appeared a change in the top 5 processes. For the first poem the most frequent process became VE and for the second poem MC. Participants started to build up their comments on source domains more in the first poem. The construction of the meaning became more automatic (see Section 2.3) in the second one. That is, participants seemed to first construct the metaphors then focus on target and source domains.

4.3.3 The Effect of Conventionality and Grammatical Structure of Metaphors on Understanding

Many researchers have already suggested that not all metaphors can be understood in the same way since there are some reasons that shape the understanding such as conventionality and grammatical structure (see Section 2.3.5) Table 12 reveals the frequency of LA and MC processes for both poems in TFA phase, degree of conventionality of linguistic expressions which are in 'A is B' format. It is assumed that the presentation of both source and target domains in 'A is B' format can make the metaphors clearer for the reader (see Section 2.3.5). Furthermore, conventionality of metaphors can be an advantageous factor for the reader to understand the metaphors more easily. In the following table degree of conventionality of linguistic expressions , rated by two native lecturers researching on metaphor (see Section 3.3) are shown in small letters a, b, c, and d. These letters stand for:

a: Conventional

b: Moderately conventional

c: Original

d: Very original

Table 12 The 'A IS B' Metaphors in Both Poems, Their Degree of

Conventionality and Frequency of Processes LA and MC in TFA

n =10	Linguistic Expressions	Degree of Conventionality	LA (f)	MC (f)
Poem 1	*I'm a riddle*	c	0	2
	I'm a means ,	a	2	1
	a stage,	b	0	0
	a cow in calf	b	2	2
Poem 2	*Life is broken-winged bird*	c	10	7
	Life is a barren field	d	10	6

   The results revealed that all of the participants processed LA and majority of them

processed MC in the second poem which embodies 'original ' and 'moderately

conventional' metaphors in 'A is B' format. However, only two of the participants

processed LA for a 'conventional' metaphor like 'I am a means' and only one participant

processed MC. Besides, the frequency of processes for a ' moderately conventional'

metaphor, 'cow in calf' are, two. In short, although metaphors have same conventionality

degree, there is still a difference in understanding. This difference can be the result of

both context and the form of verb 'to be'. Due to the fact that the first poem is embodied

with many 'original' metaphors except for the 'conventional' ones in the table above,

those 'original' ones may have affected their whole interpretation. Another point to

mention is that participants seem to be affected by the form of verb 'to be'. In the second

poem 'is' may have seemed a clearer identification than 'am' in the first poem. These

results seem to reflect that conventionality and   grammatical structure are both important

to understand metaphors. Furthermore, even though some metaphors are 'conventional'

and grammatically seem easier to identify, they can still be problematic for the readers

to grasp the real meaning since text ,context and background can affect their understanding (see Sections 2.5 and 2.7) .Another important thing to mention is, the presence of the 'target' domain. In both poems, the participants could see both the 'source' domains in the same line with the target domains. On the other hand, they could see the 'target' domains only in the second poem. The 'I' in the first poem was an unidentified 'target' domain for them. Because of this reason, they seem to fail to map the correct correspondences onto the 'target' domain, which is of vital importance to construct the meaning (see Section 2.4).

In addition to Table 12 it will be better to have a look at the situation for lexical and sentential level of metaphors in the first poem. Table 13 shows sentential and 'A is B' metaphors in the second poem, their degree of conventionality and how participants processed LA and MC.

Table 13 Sentential and 'A is B' Format Metaphors in Poem 2 and Their Degree of Conventionality and Frequency of Processes LA and MC in TFA

n =10	**Sentential Level Metaphors**	Degree of Conventionality	LA (f)	MC (f)
Poem 2	*dreams die*	c	3	3
	dreams go	a	2	4
	Hold fast to dreams	b	4	4
	Sentential Level Metaphors (A is B)	Degree of Conventionality	LA (f)	MC (f)
	Life is a winged bird	c	10	7
	Life is a barren field	d	10	6

According to Table 13 participants seem to be better at understanding 'A is B' metaphors even though they are 'original' and 'very original'. The presence of both 'source' and 'target' domains may have affected the results or expressions like 'go' and

'die' may have seemed so clear (e.g. dead metaphors) that they thought more on

other metaphors. In short, results of both Table 12 and 13 indicated that 'A is B'

metaphors were processed more and understood better. It would be better if we look at

the situation in the first poem for 'A is B' and 'lexical' level metaphors to see if the

form always make the understanding easier or not.

Table 14 Sentential (A is B Format) and Lexical Level Metaphors in Poem 1and

Their Degree of Conventionality and Frequency of Processes LA and MC in TFA

n =10	Sentential Level Metaphors	Degree of Conventionality	LA (f)	MC (f)
Poem 1	*I'm a riddle*	c	0	2
	I'm a means ,	a	2	1
	a stage,	b	0	0
	a cow in calf	b	2	2
	Lexical Level Metaphors	Degree of Conventionality	LA (f)	MC (f)
	red fruit	b	2	0
	loaf	b	2	2
	fine timbers	c	0	0

According to Table 14, the frequencies of LA and MC do not show an extreme

difference as in Table 12.When metaphors with same degree of conventionality (e.g.

stage and loaf) were studied , it was seen that none of the participants processed LA and

MC for 'stage'. However, two of the participants experienced LA and MC for 'loaf'.

These results are in a way contradictory with the ones in Table 12. Besides, participants

failed to process MC for a 'moderately conventional' metaphor like 'red fruit' whereas

two of them processed MC for 'cow in calf'. Therefore, it cannot be inferred participants

are always better at 'A is B' metaphors. The form of verb 'to be', the presence of a 'target' domain seem to be also effective on understanding as well as conventionality , which needs to be researched further .

4.3.4 An Overview

The Sections above indicated some important results therefore, it is better to have an overview . Firstly, results revealed that while participants identified majority of the metaphors in the second poem, they could identify some of them in the first poem. Secondly, the reasons of underlining seem to differ in some points for two poems. The most frequent reason for the second poem is 'comparison', whereas, for the first one it is 'deep meaning'. It seems that the level of conventionality of metaphors, grammatical structures, background knowledge of the participants (see sections 2.6) affected their preferences.

Secondly, for the processing phases, there was an important outcome indicating that participants did not need any extra phase which, we called AI, for the second poem (see Table 9). Furthermore, PI was not processed in the second poem both in TFA and INT. The level of conventionality of metaphors, grammatical structures, background knowledge of the participants were assumed to be the reason for this outcome (see Section 2.6).

Thirdly, the frequencies of processes in each phase (TFA, INT and AI) indicated that, participants had a progress in understanding metaphors even though they could not get the real meaning of many of the metaphors in the first poem. This can take us to a conclusion that trying to discover the meaning of metaphors in poetry can open up our minds to the representations of each word in the poem and expand our thinking, which briefly shows one of the functions of metaphors in poetry (see Section 2.4.1).

Fourthly, for the understanding processes of the participants, the results revealed that, not every participant understood every metaphor the same way, while some participants understood some metaphors in one stage, they understood some others in two stages (see Section 4.3.1). The results support the view that there are some factors shaping the understanding of metaphors such as conventionality, grammatical structure, context and reader (see Sections 2.3.5 and 2. 5). In addition to this 'A is B' format seemed to help participants understand the metaphors in the second poem. However, this was invalid for the first poem. Participants did not show a greater success while interpreting 'A is B' metaphors when compared to lexical ones. The underlying reasons can be conventionality degree, the form of verb 'to be' or the unidentified target domain which need to be researched further.

Fifthly, interpretations of participants indicated that when participants fail to identify the 'target' domain correctly, they have difficulty in finding the correspondences. As a result of this factor, the participants had some problems in mapping the correct elements of 'source' domain onto the 'target' (see Section 2.6) .

Finally , the interpretations of A16 who is the only participant to get the meaning of metaphors in the first poem with more novel metaphors seem to indicate that 'Blending Theory' can work better for on-line and dynamic understanding especially for novel metaphors (see Section 2.3).

4.4 Differences in Understanding Processes

Apart from the general outlook to the processes, it is also important how participants differ from each other when they built their ideas to get the meaning of the poems and how their own interpretations change in each phase . The classified processes (see Section 4. 3) revealed that not every participant reconstructed the metaphors through

mapping same correspondences. Moreover, Tables 15, 16 and 17 show how each

participant developed her/ his understanding through all phases in the first poem. Tables

18 and 19 show these processes for the second poem.

Table 15 The Frequency of Processes for Each Participant For Poem 1 in TFA

Processes	PI	MI	LA	FO	VE	MC	FU	CO	RE	AP
Subjects	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
A7	0	0	4	3	3	5	2	1	2	0
A10	1	0	3	2	4	1	1	3	2	1
A15	0	0	3	1	1	2	1	1	1	2
A16	0	1	5	3	5	5	1	2	0	1
B5	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	1
B16	1	0	5	2	3	3	1	0	1	0
B19	2	0	2	1	3	3	1	1	1	1
C1	4	0	3	3	4	3	1	3	2	0
C3	4	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	1
C7	0	3	3	1	4	3	1	1	2	1

Table 16 The Frequency of Processes for Each Participant For Poem 1 in Interview

Processes	PI	MI	LA	FO	VE	MC	FU	CO	RE	AP
Subjects	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
A7	3	6	5	7	6	6	4	2	6	5
A10	3	6	7	7	5	6	2	3	3	5
A15	7	2	4	3	7	5	1	2	1	3
A16	0	9	9	8	11	9	2	3	4	7
B5	3	3	7	7	9	6	4	3	5	2
B16	8	4	5	3	5	5	1	1	1	4
B19	5	5	4	2	4	3	1	1	3	4
C1	5	6	4	5	4	4	3	3	2	5
C3	5	6	5	3	5	3	3	1	2	4
C7	4	4	5	1	4	3	1	0	2	2

Table 17 The Frequency of Processes for Each Participant For Poem 1 in AI

Processes	PI	MI	LA	FO	VE	MC	FU	CO	RE	AP
Subjects	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
A7	0	10	10	8	7	8	4	3	6	10
A10	0	9	10	7	7	8	3	3	5	10
A15	1	9	9	7	8	8	3	4	3	8
A16	0	11	11	10	9	10	3	4	5	10
B5	0	9	10	7	8	9	4	4	5	8
B16	1	7	11	6	6	6	3	2	4	7
B19	0	8	8	6	5	6	3	2	3	9
C1	0	9	9	7	6	7	4	4	4	8
C3	1	10	9	7	7	7	4	3	4	7
C7	0	8	8	6	5	6	2	1	3	7

Table 18 The Frequency of Processes for Each Participant For Poem 2 in TFA

Processes	PI	MI	LA	FO	VE	MC	FU	CO	RE	AP
Subjects	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
A7	0	3	3	2	2	3	1	1	1	1
A10	0	2	3	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
A15	0	2	2	2	1	2	0	1	0	1
A16	0	4	4	3	2	3	1	1	1	0
B5	0	4	4	2	2	3	0	1	1	1
B16	0	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
B19	0	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
C1	0	3	4	2	2	3	1	1	1	1
C3	0	3	3	2	2	2	0	0	1	0
C7	0	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0

Table 19 The Frequency of Processes for Each Participant For Poem 2 in Interview

Processes	PI	MI	LA	FO	VE	MC	FU	CO	RE	AP
Subjects	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
A7	0	4	4	3	3	4	1	1	2	2
A10	0	3	3	2	3	3	1	1	1	2
A15	0	3	3	3	3	4	0	1	1	2
A16	0	4	4	3	3	4	1	1	2	2
B5	0	4	4	3	3	4	1	1	1	2
B16	0	3	3	3	2	4	1	1	1	2
B19	0	3	3	3	2	3	0	1	1	2
C1	0	3	3	3	3	4	1	1	2	2
C3	0	3	3	3	2	4	1	1	2	2
C7	0	3	2	3	2	3	0	0	1	2

While the interpretations generally sharply differ from each other in the first poem in TFA and INT phases. They show great similarity for each participant in AI phase. On the contrary, the interpretations are so similar in the second poem. This can mean that more original metaphors resulted in variety of interpretations, whereas more conventional ones resulted in similar comments. It will be better to illustrate these differences with some participants' quotations to understand what the metaphorical words or phrases meant to them.

Understanding Process of B5

The first answer of B5 to the answer of the riddle was an animal. The following quotation presents *how* s/he got this idea:

" In my opinion this is an animal. This animal gives harm to fruit and trees,

likes apples, it could be a worm, but I don't think so, because it must be big, it

says 'elephant'. An elephant is big".

In fact B5 without explicit identification, accepts that 'elephant' is a representation of something. However, although s/he takes 'elephant' metaphorically, s/he thinks of other words such as 'apple, red fruit, timbers' literally. Thus, s/he cannot figure out their representational meanings. As s/he misinterpreted the metaphors, s/he cannot reach the answer to the riddle, which in a very good way reinforces the function of metaphors in understanding a poem. As s/he keeps commenting, s/he discovers another thing:

" … this animal looks like a melon. It is… round!"

Here, the participant maps the elements of the 'source' domain onto the 'target' one. (see Section 2. 3.1) . Since metaphors can be image based (see Section 2.), the participant automatically takes the 'shape' of the melon to map.

In Interview phase, when the participant was asked to comment on each line and by answering the questions of the researcher, s/he changes her/his comments:

" … the poem is about maturation. Fruit is red, it is ripe. But apples are green, it

means, they need time to be ripe, also tendrils, one day they will be trees….

elephants do not have ivories when they are young. The poet is trying to tell

growing of something".

B5 seems to go to the answer step by step. S/he started to think more deeply. That is, with processing FU and RE, s/he connected some lines and still trying to map the elements of the source domain onto the unknown target. An interesting thing is that s/he

connects all these interpretations with LIFE IS A STAGE conceptual metaphor when

s/he encounters with the word 'stage'. This shows that this conceptual metaphor appears

both in English and Turkish the same way and supports the idea that some metaphors are

universal (see Section 2.7) Just before the AI phase, B5 connects this conventional

metaphor to another one:

> " Life is a stage, and actors are representatives people, here, calf is the
>
> representative of the cow. It will be cow one day, but now it is only represented
>
> in the cow because it is not mature yet ".

FU seems to help B5 to interpret the poem as a whole thus, comment on the poem more

systematically and think more broadly. After s/ he reconstructed some of the metaphors,

s/he identified 3 of them explicitly which showed that the reader can identify metaphors

once the act of comprehension is finished. (see Section 2.3.5)

In AI the participant was given the answer to the riddle and asked if s/he would like

to change ant of the interpretations. An apparent change was seen after this information:

> " My god!, pregnant really? Oh yes, melon, she is round, I mean fat. Her stomach
>
> is like a melon. And she walks slowly, red fruit is the baby. In fact it is not ripe.
>
> I thought it is red because it is ripe, interesting !. .. purse is the womb of the
>
> woman, and baby is the money. She loves her baby. …"

When the 'target' domain was provided by the researcher, B5 constructed 9 of the

metaphors. The general tendency of the participant was to map the elements of the

source domain and try to find out the correspondences between them (see Section 2.3.1)

According to the results presented in tables 16 and 17 above, the increase in the

phases for B5 is not as much as the increase in the first poem. What is more, B5 did not

change any of his/her comments during INT. S/he just commented more adding a few

details to the comments in TFA. As the participant understand the idea and thought

conveyed through the metaphors and the understanding is completed, variety in the interpretation is not seen. Generally the participant had the same tendency in the first poem to construct the metaphors. That is s/he chose to interpret the correspondences between the domains:

> " Life is a broken-winged bird . Life is compared to a bird. We generally say this 'we are birds' and Turkish there is a saying 'hope is a singing bird in our hearths' like this .Birds are free animals, they are hopeful, or bring hope. They fly wherever they like , our life starts and goes on. And take us from place to place. Our life takes us even if we do not want. This is life, we have to go. And when you don't have dreams you can' t live. You lose an important part of your life . Wings are very important for birds like our dreams".

The quotation reveals that B5 could map the right elements on the 'target' domain which was clearly seen in the same line with the 'source' domain. What is more, s/he uses the background or cultural knowledge which helped her /him to get the right meaning.

Understanding Process of A15

A15 is another participant that could not get the real meaning of metaphors until AI. His /her interpretations in the first poem are totally different from B5 's whereas in the second poem quite similar. The following quotation is from TFA phase and reveals how s/he interpreted the poem:

> " I think the poem is about life and natural chain. I think the poet is a man. These are manly words : 'cow in calf' 'elephant', these are like rude words. A woman does not use them I think. The poet talks about continuity, ongoing process in the world. World is a riddle for us. We try to solve it but we can't, then we die, but

other people try to solve the riddle. I understand these because it says 'boarded

the train, there is no getting off'. It talks about eternity. Our journey in life

finishes, another journey starts for other people. About natural chain, there are

animals and plants and a person on a life journey".

A15 took some words like 'melon, red fruit, apples, elephant, cow in calf'

metaphorically built his/ her comments as s/ he does with literal sentences, that is

directly (see section 2.3). S/he does not explicitly identified metaphors but commented

on their metaphorical meaning automatically (see Section 2.3.5).LIFE IS A

PURPOSEFUL JOURNEY conventional conceptual metaphor makes up the basis of

his/her comments which once more shows the universality of conventional metaphors

(see Section 2.7) . Furthermore it also reveals that some metaphors are not the creation of

poets, the poets as individuals make use of the same conceptual metaphors. However,

they create new metaphors out of them or use some techniques to make them look

unfamiliar (see Section 2.4) Therefore, as the participant may not map the 'source'

domains onto right 'target' domain, his/her interpretation is not correct on discourse

level.

In the INT phase, it becomes more clear that the participant was aware of the

metaphors either with VE or MC but, s/he cannot name or interpret them truly :

" I know there are some words symbolizing something else, but I cannot get their

meaning".

The last quotation reveals the function of metaphor very clearly. That is, metaphor is the

main mechanism through which we conceptualize the world (see Section 2.2.1). In the

INT phase A15 got more confused as the questions asked by the researcher clued

her/him that the interpretations needed to be changed. That is why 7 of the metaphors

seemed problematic to the participant yet s/he explicitly identified 2 of the metaphors but

wrong identification did not take the participant to the intended meaning. As a result,

the participant was provided with the answer to the riddle. That

was when the participant figured out the representational meanings of the words:

> " …pregnant woman? Now everything changes. Let me think…. Mm, she is fat,
>
> of course, she is an elephant, melon, a house. They are interesting. I could not
>
> think like this. Calf is the baby, fine timbers baby. She does not want the baby
>
> I think. She only describes her physical appearance. She is sorry that she is fat.
>
> I would not use 'money' for the baby. Money is something material…".

B5 and A15 are similar to each other since they misinterpreted the metaphors. However,

although they focused on the similar 'source' domains, they came up with different

elements of the domains. This supports the view that individual differences affects the

interpretation of the poems even though analogical   mappings took place. Another

difference between the two participant is that although they interpreted 'money' as child,

B5 considered it as love toward the baby, whereas A15 understood it as an

unwillingness. The psychology and individual feelings of participants seem to affect

her/his comments.

A15's comments on poem two is similar to A7's :

> " Life is a broken field bird. Life finishes when you don't have dreams. You can't
>
> live. Dreams make the life meaningful and colorful. When you don't have
>
> dreams , I have dreams in fact, I want to finish my school, and have a nice life,
>
> you feel hopeless, you cannot live as you like. Like this bird, the birds naturally
>
> fly, but here, its wings are dreams, and if they lose their dreams they cannot live
>
> as they like".

A15 without explicitly identifying the metaphor, as B5, reconstructed the metaphor supporting the view that metaphors can be reconstructed without explicit identification (see Section 2.3.5) and s/he constructed the metaphors as literal sentences.

Understanding Process of C7

C 7 could not get the real meaning of the first poem until AI, either. S/he was an outstanding participant since s/he was aware of three of the metaphors in TFA phase and explicitly identified them:

" 'Elephant' is a metaphor, 'melon' also, 'cow' , these are metaphors. The answer is   sofa. Sofas can be different colours, red , 'ivory'…Sofa is like a cow, and calf is sofa's leg… 'loaf' , 'yeasty rising', there are pillows on the sofa, they are soft and puffy".

Although C 7 identified some of the metaphors, s/he took some others such as 'calf' and 'ivory' literally and build up her/his comments accordingly. The participant like other participants tried to map the elements of 'source' domain onto the 'target'. But as the participant mislabeled the 'target' domain s/he misinterpreted the poem, which once more shows how important it is to process correct labeling.

When the participant was given the answer to the riddle, changes in the interpretation became unavoidable. The participant labeled 8 metaphors and mentioned his/her emotional response to the poem. However, even the answer was provided , s/he could not figure out what 'melon', 'ivory', 'timbers' stand for. This can mean that it may not be enough to know the 'target' domain. More thinking is required to get the right meaning out of the 'target' domain.

In the second poem, however, the participant, like others, built his/ her comments more easily and found out three metaphors in INT phase and interpreted the poem as follows:

> " Life is a barren field. It means, dull. Fields are normally green, or there are vegetables, fruit. In winter they can be empty, but barren is different. If it is barren, it means it can never be fruitful. Life is then meaningless, dull, something misses in your life when you do not have dreams. And what is worse, there is no chance for life to be joyful, because it is frozen. It isn't alive ".

The quotation above is clear enough to show that C7 maps the appropriate elements of 'source' domain. Although there is no explicit metaphor identification before construction, still the participant reconstruct the metaphor. What is more, the interpretation is quite metaphorical which seems to show that reaction to the drawbacks of 'Simile Theory' is quite fair (see Section 2.1.3).

With the help of the questions in INT phase, the participant achieves to find the implicit metaphor 'hold fast to dreams'. In fact this metaphor was among the least identified ones due to its implicitness. This can mean that it is not always easy to find out and interpret metaphors. They may not be as easy as literal expressions. Nevertheless, the reader, with a more systematic look, can handle with the problematic, hidden expressions.

Understanding Process of A16

A 16 was the only participant to find out the answer to the riddle in TFA. Therefore, s/he did not change the outline of her/his comments but built more on them. The success of this particular participant seem to resulted from his/her correct LA and a correct LA seem to be the consequence of her/his focus on the correct elements of 'source' domain.

A16 has the highest frequency of VE process in each phase. Besides, A16 seemed to 'blend' the elements of both domains and form a 'generic' space choosing the coherent elements (see Section 2.3.4). This result can mean that mapping only one image automatically (see Section 2. 2.1) can work for 'conventional' metaphors however, since poetry is full of image metaphors which can be 'very original', fixed , automatic images may not be the intended image. This supports the view that 'Blending Theory' provides a better account for subtler literary texts. The quotation from INT shows how A16 figured out the meaning:

> " … melon is something round, it smells nice, it says 'two tendrils'. First I thought melon is the baby, because tendrils are thin, fragile and fresh. Babies are little and fragile and they are new. Then I gave up this idea because the woman's legs can be like tendrils because her stomach is so big. Her legs look thin and they cant carry that big body so they are tired or she cannot walk , how can I say, they are fragile like they will break easily. Yes, break is better".

It is clear that although A16 thinks about some elements of 'melon' and first map them on 'baby', this image do not seem appropriate when the participant thinks a more round thing than the baby. This can reveal that fixed correspondences may need to be blended for metaphors. When A16 comments on the second poem, the mappings are more automatic, and fixed :

> "Life is a barren field, I think life is not worth living then. Because barren fields give nothing to its owner. So, life gives you nothing. People live for some purposes. If you don't have any aim, dream, life gives nothing, that is the main idea I think".

A16 is also among the participants who identified the implicit metaphor 'hold fast to dreams' and personification 'when dreams die'. In fact the personifications in the second

poem were identified at later stages of INT. The reason for this can be the

participants focusing more on effective, original or interesting parts for them (see Tables

21 and 22).

4. 5 Participants' Attitudes Towards The Metaphors in Both Poems

The processes revealed that participants had to work hard to understand the first poem

and its metaphors. They could not get the meaning implied in the first poem at a glance.

However, this difficulty forced them to think more deeply, try to look at the words or

phrases from different angles and understand the intended idea by the poet. The function

of 'metaphor as a matter of thought' (see Section 2.2.1) was supported by their effort to

understand the underlying thought conveyed through the metaphors. However, metaphor

in literature, especially in poetry, has also other functions (see section 2.4.1). Table 20

shows the participants' attitudes towards the metaphors in both poems.

Table 20 Participants' Attitudes Towards the Metaphors in Both Poems

	More complex	More poetic	Deeper meaning	More enjoyable	More Interesting
Poem 1	10	8	10	9	10
Poem 2	0	2	0	1	0

According to the results of Table 20, first of all, participants found the metaphors in

the first poem more complex. That was why they could not find the real meaning hidden

among the words. However, this complexity was not reflected to their emotional

response to the poem in a negative way. In other words, it can be inferred that although

some metaphors can be hard to interpret, they still appeal to feelings of the reader

and make the reader think more and activate her/his schemata. Thus as well as being a

matter of thought, metaphors are also effective, aesthetic expressions that appeal to

senses.

Secondly, they thought, generally, metaphors in the first poem were more 'poetic'.

This can show that, although metaphors are pervasive in everyday language and thought,

and conceptual metaphors in poetry are not the creations of the poets

 (see Sections 1.1 and 2.4), metaphors in literature are somehow different from

metaphors outside literature (see Section 2.4).

Thirdly, participants thought metaphors in the first poem have deeper meanings. This

can be the result of levels of conventionality of metaphors. Metaphors which are more

original or novel can have more complex meanings than metaphors which are rather

conventional. Thus, more original metaphors led the participants think more deeply to

understand.

Finally, as a result of their 'deeper' meanings, metaphors in the first poem were found

more interesting thus more enjoyable than metaphors in the second poem. These results

show that, metaphors, especially when they are more original and when their

grammatical structure is more complex, become a challenge for participants. However,

they can overcome this challenge by making the metaphors meaningful. While trying to

overcome, they have to activate their schemata, think in a more detailed way, focus on

the language and its usages more which will develop their cognitive and linguistic skills.

Moreover, such cognitive and emotional involvement seem to result in pleasure in

reading.

Table 21 The Range of Top 3 Most Effective Metaphors in Poem 1

Range	1	f	2	f	3	f
n= 10	*Boarded the train there is no getting off*		*a bag of green apples*		*ponderous house*	
		4		3		2

Table 21 displays the frequencies and range of top 3 most effective metaphors in the first poem. The results revealed that four participants found a 'moderately conventional' metaphor (e.g. *Boarded the train there is no getting off*) the most effective. Therefore it can be argued that poets use 'conventional' metaphors in a way that the conventional becomes something effective, and poetic. This supports the idea that 'great poets, as master craftsmen, use basically the same tools we use; what makes them different is their talent using these tools, and their skill in using them, which they acquire from sustained attention, study, and practice' (see Section 2.4).

Table 22 The Range of Top 2 Most Effective Metaphors in Poem 2

Range	1	f	2	f
n= 10	*Life is a broken winged bird*		*Life is a barren field*	
		8		3

Table 22 displays the range of top 2 most effective metaphors in the second poem. According to the table, majority of the participants found '*Life is a broken winged bird'* most effective. In this particular poem, the participants seem to label 'image' metaphors as the most effective. These two metaphors were the ones participants commented on the most. This can be the result of their effectiveness or their grammatical form which made their understanding easier. Actually, participants built their ideas and comments depending on the most effective parts for them (see Section 4.3.2). Therefore, since they mostly focused on these parts and when they misinterpreted them – as in poem one- ,

they could not connect these lines to the other parts of the poem and failed to get the meaning.

4.6 Linguistic Metaphors Built by the Participants

At the end of the INT phase, participants were asked to build linguistic metaphors using two of the target words in the poems used in this study, in Turkish . They completed the given target word in the first poem (see Section 3.3) . Their expressions and underlying conceptual metaphors can be listed as follows:

Hamile bir kadın…..

Conceptual Metaphor	Linguistic expressions
	Armuttur
	Lahanadır
PEOPLE ARE PLANTS (FRUIT)	*Cevizdir*
	Portakaldır
	Meyveli bir ağaçtır
PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS	*Kangurudur*
	Penguendir
BODY IS A CONTAINER	*Valizdir*
INANIMATE OBJECTS ARE PEOPLE	*Toptur*

Anahtarlıktır

Balondur

Additionally, they completed the given target word in the second poem (see Section 3.3) as follows:

Hayallerin olmadığı hayat….

Conceptual metaphor	Linguistic Expressions
LIFE IS A JOURNEY	*Susuz bir yolculuktur*
	Işıksız bir tüneldir
	Rüzgarsız deniz yolculuğudur
A LIFETIME IS A DAY	*Güneşsiz gündür*
LIFE IS A STORY	*Boş bir masaldır*
	Sıkıcı bir hikayedir
LIFE IS A PLAY	*Perdeleri kapalı sahnedir*
LIFE IS A BUILDING	*Mobilyasız evdir*
LIFE IS A STRUGGLE	*Zırhsız bir savaştır*
LIFE IS A GAMBLING GAME	*Kumarda herşeyini yitirmektir*

LIFE IS A JOURNEY metaphor was the most frequent underlying conceptual metaphor for the participants' expressions. However, participants who referred to this metaphor shaped it with different linguistic expressions. One changed the journey to a voyage and the other one to a tunnel on a road. This indicated that understanding metaphors does not only mean to understand underlying concepts. When it came to understanding, the underlying conceptual metaphors were not always retrieved. This can be the result of the linguistic form that were used. Therefore, linguistic expressions should also be taken into consideration while understanding metaphors. The same concepts can be identified with different expressions and affect our understanding. These linguistic expressions supported that conventional conceptual metaphors can be universal (see Section 2.7). The results show parallelism with those of Şeyda Özçalışkan, adding more to her findings (see Section 2.8).

4.7 An Overview

Sections 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 revealed some important results which will be better to have an overview. First of all, it was seen that participants looked at the different parts of the poems and they focused on different elements of 'source' domains which resulted in a variety of interpretations. These interpretations did not take the participants, except for A16, to the right meaning. Furthermore, 'blending' spaces seemed to be a more effective way of understanding metaphors (see Sections 2.3.5 and 4.4) .Besides, by the help of the questions asked by the researcher participants step by step reached the real meaning of metaphors. This indicates that when they are guided and shown how to look at expressions and connect the words or phrases to the poem, they think more deeply and can understand the metaphors and the whole poem which seemed absurd or meaningless at first glance. Secondly, Section 4.5 revealed that although they found the first poem

and metaphors in it more difficult and even meaningless at first, they reported that the first poem was more enjoyable, more interesting and deeper in meaning. It seems that even though these metaphors were more challenging or complex for the participants, they enjoyed being challenged and were forced to think more and understand the poem. This result clearly indicates the function and effect of metaphors in poetry. That is, they create meaning, make the readers think in a more detailed way, and take them beyond the surface meanings with joy. This study once more pointed out that it is of vital importance to understand metaphor in poetry to grasp the idea that the poet wants to convey since metaphor constitutes the essence of poetry as well as its poetic effect. Finally, linguistic metaphors participants built displayed that 'conceptual' metaphors can be universal, can reside in the minds of the readers; Turkish and English have 'conceptual' metaphors in common but these 'conceptual' metaphors are not always accessible or accessed during online comprehension (see Section 2.3.1).

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

This study aimed to investigate metaphor from a cognitive perspective in poetry. It started to focus on metaphor as cognition and moved to metaphor in discourse processing, its presence, processing, and effect on interpreting poems. Besides, the study tried to find out how the fourth- year ELT students identify the metaphors in selected English poems. Additionally, it focused on the interpretation of the metaphors, metaphor processing and the whole poem through the use of Think and Feel Aloud Protocol and Interview. Last but not least, it explored the   linguistic expressions of the metaphors in the selected poems for participants in Turkish to support the idea that metaphor is a conceptual phenomenon and cognitive mechanism shapes it. By doing all these, the study aimed to demonstrate how pervasive metaphor is in language and poetry and why it is important to cope with it.

5.2 Conclusion

In this study, results revealed that not all metaphors are identified and understood in the same way by all participants. While participants identified majority of the metaphors in the second poem, they could identify some of them in the first poem. Participants seemed to find it easier to identify and understand metaphors with an aligned structure where they could see both 'source' and 'target' domains. However, results did not support that it is always easier to understand 'A is B' metaphors due to the fact that conventionality, context and cultural background are among other factors that shape their understanding. Besides, mislabeling target domain seemed to be a burden for the

participants. This could be resulted either because they failed to map the correct elements of the 'source' domain or failed to 'blend' the 'input spaces' appropriately. For the understanding processes of the participants, the results revealed that, not every participant understood every metaphor the same way, while some participants understood some metaphors in one stage, they understood some others in two stages (see Section 4.3.1). The results support the view that there are some effects shaping the understanding of metaphors such as conventionality, grammatical structure, context, and reader (see Sections 2.3.5 and 2. 5).

The interpretations of A16 who is the only participant to get the meaning of metaphors in the first poem with more novel metaphors seem to indicate that 'Blending Theory' can work better for on-line and dynamic understanding especially for novel metaphors (see Section 2.3).

Additionally, it was seen that participants had a tendency to build their ideas on the most effective words or phrases for them. When they failed to interpret these parts appropriately, this misinterpretation affected their whole understanding since they could not connect these parts to the whole poem. This indicated that metaphors in poetry should not be taken only at lexical and sentential level, the context they are embodied in should be taken as a whole.

The linguistic metaphors participants built in Turkish revealed that Turkish and English have common 'conceptual metaphors' and they reside in the minds of the participants. However, this did not always help them to understand the linguistic expressions by postulating their underlying concepts. They may have mapped the elements of domains in a long-term memory but this seemed to be not enough to understand novel metaphors created by the mastery of the poet. In other words an online,

dynamic mapping seemed to be more effective in understanding metaphors (see Section 2.3).

Another important result was that participants were affected by the metaphors in the first poem more. They found that they were challenging but at the same time gave them more pleasure since for participants they had deeper meanings, they were more interesting rather than clichés. This can take us to a conclusion that 'poetic' metaphor or poets' use of conventional metaphor are somehow different from daily metaphoric expressions or conventional metaphors therefore they are found 'poetic'.

The increase in the frequencies of processes in each phase (TFA, INT and AI) indicated that, participants had a progress on understanding metaphors even though they could not get the real meaning of many of the metaphors in the first poem. This can take us to a conclusion that trying to discover the meaning of metaphors in poetry can open up our minds to the representations of each word in the poem and expand our thinking, which briefly shows one of the functions of metaphors in poetry.

5.3 Implications of the Study

The results revealed that more emphasis must be put on metaphors due to the fact that they are the essence of poetry. Students are challenged by the difficulty of metaphors however, this challenge resulted in more effort to understand metaphors therefore they activated their understanding and thought. As teachers we should provide the necessary guidance for the students and let them try to arrive at a sound interpretation themselves instead of giving the exact meaning of metaphors under question.

5.4 Suggestions for Further Research

In this study we had a limitation related to the number of the participants, discourse type and genre. This study was carried out only with the fourth - year students at the ELT Department of Çukurova University. Further, they were only involved in metaphors in poetry. In order to make more reliable generalizations and to see the variations, larger samples and different discourse types and genres are needed. A further research can also explore variations of metaphors between periods and cultures.

REFERENCES

Abrams, M (1993). *The Norton Anthology* (2).(ed). London: Norton Company

Atkins, J (1934) . *Literary Criticism in Antiquity*. Cambridge : CUP.

Azad, Saira (2003). Metaphor Paper . Retrieved Nov, 27 from

    www.caxton.stockton.edu/SAforever/discuss/msg. reader.

Black, M (1979). More About Metaphor. In Ortony (ed) *Metaphor and Thought*

    Cambridge: CUP

Bodycott, P. and Walker, A. (2000) .Teaching Abroad: Lessons Learned About Inter-

    cultural Understanding for Teachers in Higher Education . *Teaching in Higher*

    Education, 5(1), pp. 79-94.

Boer, E (2003). The Frequency of Original Metaphors and Texts. Retrieved March

    10, from www.woordenboer.nl/metafoor/paper.htm.

Boers, F. and M. Demecheleer (1997). A Few Metaphorical Models in (Western)

    Economic Discourse . In Liebert, W-A, G. Redeker and L. Waugh (eds) *Discourse*

    and Perspective in Cognitive Linguistics. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing

    Company.

Cacciari, C. & Glucksberg, S. (1994). Understanding Figurative Language. In M.A.

    Gernsbacher (ed.), *Handbook of Psycholinguistics*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Carter, R. (1997). *Investigating English Discourse* (London, Routledge).

Cardoso, G & Vieira (2003). Metaphor and Song Lyrics . Retrieved June ,10 from

    www.cce.ufsc.br/pgi/academicforumgisele.

Cameron, L (2003). *Metaphor in Educational Discourse*. (pp. 13, 17,60). London:

    Continuum.

Channell, J. (1994). _Vague Language_ . Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Cooper, D.E (1986) . _Metaphor_ . (pp 261-263) . Oxford: Blackwell.

Cuddon, J (1980). _A Dictionary of Literary Terms_. Oxford: Penguin Books.

Danaher, D (2003). Metaphor : Language , Thought , Art . Retrieved Nov, 20 from
     muse.jhu.edu/journals/ poetics_today/v024/24.3danaher.html .

Dascal, M (1989). On the Roles of Context & Literal Meaning in Understanding
     Cognitive Science . _Cognitive Science_ . 13: 253.

Davidson, D (1978) . What Metaphors Mean . _Critical Inquiry_ . 5: 31.

Deignan, A., Lima A and & R. Lòpez- Mora. (1998) . Metaphor, Culture and
     The Classroom. Paper .The 31st IATEFL Conference, University of
     Manchester, England, April 1998.

Fauconnier, G &Turner , M .(1995). The Conceptual Integration and Formal
     Expression. Retrieved Feb,11 from
     www.zakros.ucsd.edu/trohrer/metaphors/turner

Flowerdew, J, Ed. (1994). _Academic Listening: Research Perspectives_ Cambridge:
     Cambridge University Press.

Gentner , D (1982) . Are Scientific Analogies Metaphors? . D.S Miall (ed).
     Brighton: Harvester Press.

Gentner , D (1983) . Structure Mapping: A Theoretical Framework For Analogy .
      Cognitive Science , 7, 155-170.

Gentner, D & Bowdle, B (2001). Convention, Form, Figurative Language
     Processing . _Metaphor and Symbol_ .16.p.223.

Gibbs, R (1989). Understanding and Literal Meaning . _Cognitive Science_ . 13:
     243-51.

Gibbs, R (1994). *The Poetics of Mind. Figurative Thought, Language, and*

   Understanding. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Glucksberg, S , Newsome M, Goldvarg ,Y (2001). Inhibition of the Literal: Filtering

   Metaphor-Irrelevant Information During Metaphor Comprehension . *Metaphor and*

   Symbol . Vol 16, No : 3& 4 . Retrieved on Feb 9,2006 from

   www.catchword.com/erlbaum/10926488/contp1-1.htm.

Glucksberg, S & Keysar , B (1990). Understanding Metaphorical Comparisons .

   Psychological Review . 97 (1) : 3-18.

Glucksberg , S & MacGlone , M (1997). Property Attribution in Metaphor

   Comprehension . *Journal of Memory and Language* .

 Goatly,A (1997). The Language of Metaphors . Retrieved May,2 from

       www.citeseer.ist.psu.edu/449726html.

Grady, J ;Oakley, T ; Coulson, S (1999) . Blending and Metaphor . Retrieved April, 4

       from www.ucla.edu/cogsci/grady_html.

Grady, Joseph. E. (1997). Foundations of Meaning: Primary Metaphors and Primary

   Scenes. *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*. (pp.177,186) University of California,

   Berkeley.

Hakemulder, F & Peer, W (2004) Foregrounding and Novelty. Retrieved April 2 , 2006

       from www.redes.de/foregrounding/projects.htm

Hawkes, T (1972). Metaphor.Britain: Cox& Wyman.

Henderson, W. (1982) . *Metaphor in Economics Talking about Text, Discourse*

       Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press.

 Holyoak, K (1982) .An Analogical Framework For Literary Interpretation. *Poetics* 11.

   Retrieved May 2 from www.jstor.org/journals/03335372.html .

Honeck , R & Hoffman R (1980) *Cognition and Figurative Language* Amsterdam:

John Benjamin

Johnson, M. (1987). *The Body in the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Pres.

Kintsch, W (2000) . Metaphor Comprehension : A Computational Theory . Retrieved

May 5 ,2006 from www.metaphorik.de/aufsaetze/index.htm.

Kittay, E.F (1987). *Metaphor: Its Cognitive Force and Linguistic Structure*. (pp 5,

87,210-11) . Oxford: OUP.

Kopp, Brian (2001). Metaphors in Creative Writing . Retrieved Nov 5,2005 from

www. owl.english.purdue.edu/ handouts/general/gl_metaphor.html.

Kovecses, Z (2002) . *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* .(pp. 33-34, 43, 47-48,56).

New York: OUP.

Kovecses, Z (2005). *Metaphor in Culture* . (p. 34). Cambridge: CUP.

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. (pp. 3-6, 13, 26,29, 51,54-

55,145 , preface)   Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. & Turner, M. (1989). *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic

Metaphor*.(p.215) . Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George and Johnson ,M .(1999) . *Philosophy in the Flesh*. (pp.146-147). New

York: Basic Books.

Langacker , R (1988) . *A Usage Based Model*. (p. 127). Amsterdam John :Benjamins.

Littlemore, J. M. (1998) *Individual Differences in Second Language Learning: Towards

an Identification of The Strategy Preferences and Language Learning Strengths of

L2 Students with Holistic and/or Imager Cognitive Styles*, PhD Dissertation

.London, Thames Valley University .

Low, G (1988). On Teaching Metaphor . *Applied Linguistics* . Vol.9/2.

Lycan, W (1999). *Philosophy of Language : A Contemporary Introduction*. (p.37)

    London & NY: Routledge .

MacCormac, E (1985). *A Cognitive Theory of Metaphor*. Cambridge: MIT.

Malgady, G & Johnson, M (1980) . Measurement of Figurative Language: Semantic

    Feature Models of Comprehension and Appreciation. Retrieved Feb,5 from

    www.lehigh.edu/ interact/2003/papers.

McGrath, M (2003) . Metaphor in Poetry. Retrieved Jan, 207 from

    www.carxton.stockton.edu/ magic/profiles.

McRea, J (2000). Five Skills English . Proceedings of the 1998 International

    Conference on Teaching English in Chinese Context. Beijing . Retrieved February

    20, 2005 from www.nottingham.a.uk/english/nlc/pdf.

Merwin , W & Masson J (1981) .*The Peacock's Egg* . (p.71). SanFranscisco : North

    Point Press.

Ortony, A (1992) . Metaphor and Thought (2nd Ed). Cambridge: CUP.

Özçalışkan, Şeyda (2003). Metaphorical Motion in Crosslinguistic Perpective:

    A Comparison of English and Turkish . *Metaphor in Symbol* . 18 (3) , 18-28 .

Özünlü, Ünsal (1999) . Metafor: Öykü . Retrieved Jan, 5 from www.vision1.

    eee.metu.edu.tr/metaphor/ yazı.htm.

Reimer, M & Camp E (1996). Metaphor : A Tentative Characterization .

    Handbook of Philosophy of Language, ed. E. Lepore and B. Smith . Oxford:

    Oxford University Press .

Scaruffi, P.(2001). Metaphor and Thought .Retrieved , March, 4 from

    www.thymos.com/tat/metaphor

Searle, J (in Ortony 1978). *Metaphor and Thought*. (pp.76, 92). Cambridge:CUP

Smith, G (2002). Poetic Metaphor . Retrieved Jan, 7 from www. beyondintractability.org/ essay.

Sperber, D.(1990). In David Wellbery 1990 (ed). *The Ends of Rhetoric: History, Theory , Practice.* (p.140) Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Steen, G (1994). *Understanding Metaphor in Literature* . (pp. 7-8 ,14, 25-27, 90,137,142, 241) . New York: Longman.

Sweetser, E. (1990) .*From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

 Trick , L & Katz A (1986) .The Domain Interaction Approach to Metaphor Processing: Relating Individual Differences and Metaphor Characteristics. *Metaphor & Symbolic Activity* . 1. (3). 185-213.

Turner, M. (1987) .*Death is the Mother of Beauty: Mind, Metaphor, Criticism* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Turner, M. (1991). *Reading Minds: The Study of English in the Age of Cognitive Science*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Türeli, T (1998). *The Place of Literature in The English Language Teaching Curriculum: A Language Based Approach*. PhD Dissertation. Adana, Çukurova University.

Wolff, Z (2004). Metaphor. Retrieved February 23, 2005 from www.dons.net.au/zach/phil/metaphor/html .

Wood , E (2002). Thinking and Feeling Poetry. Retrieved Feb 6,2006 from www.arts.ualberta.ca/igel/IGEL2002/Eva-Wood.pdf .

Zozzoli, R. D, Albuquerque, M. R, Santos, L. F (1999). The Search for Autonomy: A Challenge for the Student Reader. Retrieved Oct, 22 from www.citeseer.ist.psu.edu /449726html.

Appendix 1 Selected Poems and Underlining

1.READ THE POEM AND UNDERLINE THE WORDS / PHRASES THAT ARE STRIKING/ EFFECTIVE / ORIGINAL

2.EXPLAIN BRIEFLY WHY YOU THOUGHT THAT THEY ARE (BUT NOT THE OTHERS) WERE STRIKING/ EFFECTIVE/ LITERARY.**BE SPECIFIC DON'T SAY " IT IS EFFECTIVE" COMMENT ON WHAT THE EFFECT IS.** 3. THIS IS A RIDDLE POEM. WHAT IS THE ANSWER TO THE RIDDLE?

4. THE POEM IS ABOUT……………………….

5.THE SPEAKER IS………………………………..

I'm a riddle in nine syllables,

An elephant, a ponderous house,

A melon strolling on two tendrils.

O red fruit, ivory, fine timbers!

This loaf's big with its yeasty rising.

Money's new-minted in this fat purse.

I'm a means, a stage, a cow in calf.

 I've eaten a bag of green apples,

Boarded the train there's no getting off

1.READ THE POEM AND UNDERLINE THE WORDS / PHRASES THAT ARE STRIKING/ EFFECTIVE /ORIGINAL .

2.EXPLAIN BRIEFLY WHY YOU THOUGHT THAT THEY ARE (BUT NOT THE OTHERS) WERE STRIKING/ EFFECTIVE/ LITERARY. **BE SPECIFIC DON'T SAY " IT IS EFFECTIVE" COMMENT ON WHAT THE EFFECT IS.** 3. THE POEM IS ABOUT……………………….

4. THE SPEAKER IS…………………………………..

Hold fast to dreams

For if dreams die

Life is a broken-winged bird

That cannot fly.

Hold fast to dreams

For when dreams go

Life is a barren field

Frozen with snow.

Appendix 2 TFA Questions

READ THE POEM ONCE MORE. NOW ,YOU ARE GOING TO INTERPRET THE POEM AS EXPLICITLY AS POSSIBLE. THAT IS **TELL WHATEVER COMES TO YOUR MIND WHILE READING. IT CAN BE A QUESTION, A REMARK ETC. CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS :**

1. WHAT IS THE POEM ABOUT?
2. WHO IS THE SPEAKER? WHAT ARE THE CLUES?

NOW, FOCUS ON THE PARTS YOU HAVE ALREADY UNDERLINED, ONE BY ONE.

1. WHAT IS UNUSUAL/ EFFECTIVE?
2. WHAT DOES THE POET INTEND TO DO?
3. HOW DO YOU FEEL?
4. AMONG THE UNDERLINED PARTS , WHICH IS THE MOST EFFECTIVE FOR YOU , WHY?

Appendix 3 Interview Questions

1. Is this a literary device? What is it called?   *Metaphor Identifiction*

2. What does the poet mean by saying ……?   *Poblem Identification- Context Construction*

3. Who is the speaker? What do we learn about this person?   *Focus Processing*

4. What are the conatations of ……? *Focus Processing – Vehicle Construction*

5. Paraphrase the underlined part in your own words. *Metaphor Construction*

6. If you omit the part you have already underlined , would it change the overall effect/ meaning the poem is about? *Appreciation*

7. What does the poet intend to do in this line? What is the aim? *Context Construction*

8. Which underlined parts are closely related? How? *Functionalization - Refunctionalization*

9. What do you think about the language use/ choice of words / expressions? *Metaphor Identification- Appreciation*

10. Did you like it ? Why?/ why not?

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name and surname: Filiz DUR

Title: Lecturer

Date of birth: 19.06.1978

Place of birth: Antalya

Address: Cemalpaşa Mah. Bahar Cad. Eras Apt /ADANA

Telephone: 0 322 338 66 71

E-mail: filiz_dur@yahoo.com

EDUCATION

2006: Çukurova University, ELT Department, The Institude of Social Sciences, MA

2001: Hacettepe University, English Language and Literature, BA

1996: Antalya Anatolian High School