2.2 Review of Literature

In order to compare this writing with the previous theses and international journals, there are four theses and two articles of journal used as review of literature for this writing. All of the theses and articles of journal have similarities and also differences with this writing.

The thesis entitled *The Analysis of Figurative Language Employed in William Wordsworth’s The World is Too Much With us* is written by Setianingsih (2006). Theory of Knickerbockers and Reninger (1963) is used as main theory for this thesis. It is analyzing figurative language in a poem. The similarity with this writing is, Setianingsih (2006) writing is analyzing about metaphor descriptively. The differences are that his thesis focuses on figurative languages and the data source is poetry.

The thesis written by Papadoudi (2010) is entitled *Conceptual Metaphor in English Popular Technology and Greek Translation*. This thesis uses theory Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Pragglejaz Group (2007) and Chateris-Black (2004). The analysis of the English data identifies 14 main metaphors and 29 sub metaphors which contribute to the structure of the target domain of technology. It distinguishes between conventional and novel metaphors. The similarity of Papadoudi (2010) thesis in this writing is, both use Lakoff and
Johnson (1980) theory and Pragglejaz Method (2007). The difference in this writing is, this writing analyses a novel but Papadoudi’s Thesis analyzed Greek languages and culture.

*Conceptual Metaphors and Figurative Language Interpretation: Food for Thought?* written by Mc Glone (1996). This thesis uses Lakoff (1993) and Glucksberg (1991) Theory. Figurative expressions are interpreted as instantiations of deep conceptual metaphors, such as *ideas are food*. In contrast, Glucksberg (1991) has proposed that metaphors are interpreted as assertions of the topic's membership (e.g., *lecture*) in an attributive category exemplified by the vehicle (e.g., *three-course meal*). The similarity in Matthew S. McGlone’s thesis with this writing is the thesis used Conceptual metaphor as the theory. The difference is this thesis compares Lakoff theory and Glucksberg theory.

Arya (2011) Thesis is entitled *Figurative Language and Their Translation in Hemingway’s Novel Entitled “The Old Man and The Sea”*. This thesis is using figurative language theory proposed by Larson (1998). This thesis is analyzing figurative languages which are categorized into seven types there are metonymy, synecdoche hyperbole, metaphor, idiom and simile. The similarity is this thesis analyzes metaphors in novel and figuring the meaning of metaphor in a discourse. The difference is this thesis is analyzed figurative language which has broader scopes.

The article was written by Rachel Giora in 2006. This article is entitled *Anything negatives can do affirmatives can do just as well, except for some metaphors*. The aim of this article is to analyze some of the functions
people believe are specific to negation vis-à-vis affirmation in order to question the asymmetry between the two, which is the received view prevalent among many formal linguists, pragmatists, and psycholinguist. The similarity of this article with this writing is finding the relevance of the figurative meaning of the word. The difference is this article covers pragmatic scope of study.

The article of journal entitled *Metaphor used in the Entrepreneurial Process* was written by Gaddefors (2007). This article was written in 1995 and it is critically investigates the use of metaphors in the entrepreneurial process. The similarity of this article with this writing is investigating about how metaphor is used and the difference is the objects that become the source of data.

2.2 Concept

The concept in this study is explaining about metaphor, conceptual metaphor and its types which are structural metaphor, ontological metaphor and a method for identifying metaphor by Pragglejaz Group.

2.2.1 Metaphor

Metaphor is kind of figure of speech which makes an implicit, implied or hidden comparison between two things that are unrelated but share some common characteristics. In other words, a resemblance of two contradictory or different objects is made based on a single or some common characteristics. Metaphor is for most people a device of the poetic imagination and the rhetorical flourish a matter of extraordinary rather than ordinary language. Metaphor is often
viewed as a characteristics as the language alone (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). Metaphor is often used in daily to explaining something that is complex and hard to be explained by comparing something that has similar characteristics.

2.2.2 Conceptual Metaphor

In cognitive linguistics, conceptual metaphor, or cognitive metaphor, refers to the understanding of one idea, or conceptual domain, in terms of another. Conceptual system is fundamentally metaphorical in system, it contains metaphorical as well non-metaphorical concept, and the metaphorical concept is highly complex. Non-metaphorical concepts are those that appeared directly in experience and defined in its own terms. Metaphorical concept is that can be understood without proper structure of the phrase or word. (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980) Conceptual Metaphor involved conceptualizing one kind of object or experience in terms of a different kind of object or experience.

There are three types of metaphorical concepts, which are explained by linguistic expression (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). But there are only two types of metaphor that are indentified in this study. They are:

2.2.2.1 Ontological Metaphor

Ontological metaphor is the type of conceptual metaphor. It is giving a status as an entity or substance to something that does not have the status inherently. Understanding experiences in terms of entity and substances allows someone to pick out parts of their experience and treat them as discrete entities or substances of a uniform kind. There are various purposes and kinds of ontological
metaphor that are reflecting the kinds of purposes served. Putting some metaphorical words as an entity make it easier to be referred, quantified, identified their a particular aspect of it, seen as a cause, acted with respect to, even believed that it can be understood (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). Ontological metaphor is attempting to deal with personal experience. Ontological metaphor serves limited range of purposes-referring, quantifying, etc. it barely viewing a nonphysical thing as an entity or substance that does not imply to comprehend very much about it.

2.2.2.2 Structural Metaphor

Structural metaphor allows someone to comprehend one aspect of a concept in terms one another. It will hide other aspect of concept and it makes the reader focuses on one aspect of concept. A metaphorical concept can keep someone from focusing on other aspects of the concept that are inconsistent with that metaphor. (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980) For example, in the middle of an argument, there are people who intent on attacking the opponent's position and defending their own, they may lose sight of the cooperative aspects of arguing and focuses on battling aspect.

2.2.3 Pragglejaz Method

The method for identifying metaphorically used word in a discourse was written by a group of scholars called Pragglejaz. The first approach in the identification process concerns for finding metaphorically used words, which involves the canonical case of metaphor identification in cognitive linguistics. The second approach concerns one way in which it is possible to go from words
identified as metaphorically used to their related underlying conceptual structures, by means of a five-step procedure. And the third approach focuses on other linguistic forms of expression of metaphor as an underlying cross-domain mapping in conceptual structure, such as simile and analogy (Steen 2007). This method has five steps in identifying metaphor and it can also be used to identify the conceptual metaphor found in this novel.

2.3. Theoretical Framework

Theory and method were applied in this study. These are Conceptual Metaphor Theory proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Pragglejaz Method of Identifying Metaphor in a Discourse proposed by Pragglejaz Group (Steen 2007).

2.3.1 Types of Conceptual Metaphor by Lakoff and Johnson

Metaphor is for most people a device of the poetic imagination and the rhetorical flourish a matter of extraordinary rather than ordinary language. Moreover, metaphor is typically viewed as characteristics of language alone, a matter of words rather than thought or action (Lakoff, Johnson 1980) there are three types of metaphor, but only two types of conceptual metaphor that are applied in this study in order to make the analysis more focus, the type of Conceptual Metaphor that are analyzed are Structural Metaphor and Ontological Metaphor.
2.3.1.1 Ontological Metaphor

This type of metaphor involves the projection of entity or substance status on something that does not have that status inherently or pick out parts of experience and treat them as discrete entities or substances of a uniform kind. For example:

Inflation is an entity

The above metaphorical concept is reflected in the following sentences:

- Inflation is lowering our standard of living.
- If there's much more inflation, we'll never survive.
- We need to combat inflation.
- Inflation is hacking us into a corner.
- Inflation is taking its toll at the checkout counter and the gas pump.
- Buying land is the best way of dealing with inflation.
- Inflation makes me sick.

The range of ontological metaphors that is used for such purposes is enormous. The list gives some idea of the kinds of purposes, along with representative examples of ontological metaphors that serve them.

2.3.1.1.1 Quantifying

- It will take a lot of patience to finish this book.
- There is so much hatred in the world.
- DuPont has a lot of political power in Delaware.
- You've got too much hostility in you.
As seen in the above examples. The defined words or phrases (*patience, hatred, political power, hostility*) which are the sub type of ontological metaphor are given a status as an entity or substance by quantifying a concept which is discrete or is not bounded (not having physical form). The given status of such words or phrases is indicated by the words in collocation with the quantifier words such as *a lot of, or so/too much.*

2.3.1.1.2 Referring

- My *fear of insects* is driving my wife crazy.
- That was a beautiful *catch*.
- We are working toward *peace*.
- The middle class is powerful *silent force* in American politics.
- The *honor of our country* is at stake in this war.

As seen in the above examples. The defined words or phrases (*Fear, catch, peace, force, honor*) which are the sub type of ontological metaphor are given a status as an entity or substance by referring a concept which is discrete or is not bounded (not having physical form). The given status of such words or phrases is indicated by the words in collocation with words referrer such as, my, *beautiful, toward, Powerful silent, of our country*

2.3.1.1.3 Container Metaphor

In-out orientation is projected onto other physical objects that are bounded by surfaces. Thus someone also views them as containers with an inside and an outside. Rooms and houses are obvious containers. Moving from room to room is
moving from one container to another, moving out of one room and into another. They even gives solid objects this orientation, as when someone break a rock open to see what's inside it. They impose this orientation on their natural environment as well.

The visual field as a container and what someone see as being inside it are conceptualized. Even the terms "visual field" suggests this. The metaphor is a natural one that emerges from the fact that, when looking at some territory (land, floor space, etc.), A boundary of the territory, namely, the part that can be seen are defined by field of vision. Given that a bounded physical space is a container and that the field of vision correlates with that bounded physical space, the metaphorical concept of visual field as a container emerges naturally. For example:

- The ship is coming into view.
- I have him in sight.
- I can't see him—the tree is in the way.
- He's out of sight now.
- I can't get all of the ships in sight at once.
- That's in the center of my field of vision.
- There's nothing in sight.

2.3.1.4 Personification

Perhaps the most obvious ontological metaphors are those where the physical object is further specified as being a person. A wide variety of
experiences with nonhuman entities in terms of human motivations, characteristics, and activities are allowed to be comprehended by it. Here are some examples:

- His theory explained to me the behavior of chickens raised in factories.
- This fact argues against the standard theories.
- Life has cheated me.
- Inflation is eating up our profits.
- His religion tells him that he cannot drink fine French wines.
- The Michelson-Morley experiment gave birth to a new physical theory.
- Cancer finally caught up with him.

Something nonhuman as human is seen in each of these cases. But personification is not a single unified general process. Each personification differs in terms of the aspects of people that are picked out. Consider these examples.

- Inflation has attacked the foundation of our economy.
- Inflation has pinned us to the wall.
- Our biggest enemy right now is inflation.
- The dollar has been destroyed by inflation.
- Inflation has robbed me of my savings.
- Inflation has outwitted the best economic minds in the country.
- Inflation has given birth to a money-minded generation.

2.3.1.2. Structural Metaphor

This type of metaphor involves the structuring of one kind of experience or activity in terms of another kind of experience or activity. For examples:

A) Argument Is War

The above metaphorical concept is reflected in the following sentence:

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

It is important that people in some countries do not just talk about argument in terms of war where people can actually lose or win the argument. The person that they are arguing with is seen as their opponent, strategy is used in their argument. A lot of things people do in arguing are structured by concept of war, even though there is no physical battle, only verbal battle. The structure of arguments such as attack, defense, counterattack, etc, reflects the concepts of war. It is in this sense that the argument is war structures the actions that performed in arguing.
It can be imagined that a culture where arguments are not viewed in terms of war, where no one wins or loses, where there is no sense of attacking or defending, gaining or losing ground.

B) Time Is Money

The above metaphorical concept is reflected in the following sentences:

- You're *wasting* my time.
- This gadget will *save you* hours.
- I don't *have* the time to *give you*.
- How do you *spend* your time these days?
- That flat tire *cost me* an hour.
- I've *invested* a lot of time in her.
- I don't *have enough* time to *spare* for that.
- You're *running out of* time.
- You need to *budget* your time.
- *Put aside* some time for ping pong.
- Is that *worth your while*?
- Do you *have* much time *left*?
- He's living on *borrowed* time.
- You don't *use* your time *profitably*.
- I *lost* a lot of time when I got sick.
- *Thank you for* your time.
In some cultures, time is a limited resource that people used to accomplish their goal. Because of the way that concept work developed in Western culture and because work is typically associated with time it takes and time is precisely quantified, it has customary to pay people by the hour, weeks, or year. Thus people understand and experience time as the kind of thing that can be spent, wasted, budgeted, invested wisely or poorly, saved, or squandered.

“Time is money”, “Time is a limited resource” and “Time is a valuable commodity” are all metaphorical concepts. They are all metaphorical since people are using their everyday experience with money which is limited resource and valuable.

Highlighting and hiding in structural metaphor is necessary. The very systematicity that allows us to comprehend one aspect of a concept in terms of another (e.g., comprehending an aspect of arguing in terms of battle) will necessarily hide other aspects of the concept. (Lakoff and Johnson 2003). It allows people to be focused on one aspect of a concept (for example, the battling aspect of arguing). A metaphorical concept can keep someone for seeing on other aspects of the concept that are inconsistent with that metaphor. For example, in a heated argument, people often see the people that do argument are defending their argument and launch their attack with strategy, it is similar to war. But, there are also cooperative aspects in argument, for example, someone who is arguing can be viewed as giving his time, a valuable commodity, in an effort at mutual understanding. People may lose sight in cooperative aspects of argument and see argument in battling aspect.
Highlighting and Hiding

The expressions we use for talking about language. Here are some examples:

The Conduit Metaphor

- It's hard to get that idea across to him.
- I gave you that idea.
- Your reasons came through to us.
- It's difficult to put my ideas into words.
- When you have a good idea, try to capture it immediately in words.
- Try to pack more thought into fewer words.
- You can't simply stuff ideas into a sentence any old way. The meaning is right there in the words.
- Don't force your meanings into the wrong words. His words carry little meaning.
- The introduction has a great deal of thought content. Your words seem hollow.
- The sentence is without meaning.
- The idea is buried in terribly dense paragraphs

2.3.1.3 Metaphor and Cultural Coherence

Each country has their culture. It may be different from one another. Therefore, different point of view from each culture when translating the meaning of the metaphor cannot be evaded. It is important to consider some cultural values
in societies that are coherent with our up-down specialization metaphors and whose opposites would not be.

"More is better" is coherent with “more is up” and “good is up”. "Less is better" is not coherent with them.

"Bigger is better" is coherent with “more is up” and “good is up”. "Smaller is better" is not coherent with them.

The future will be better" is coherent with “the future is up” and “good is up”. The future will be worse” is not.

"There will be more in the future" is coherent with “more is up” and “the future is up”.

"Your status should be higher in the future" is coherent with “high status is up” and “the future is up”.

Not all cultures give the priorities to up-down orientation. There are cultures where balance or centrality plays a much more important role than it does in some cultures. Or consider the non spatial orientation active-passive. Active is up and passive is down in most matters for some cultures. But there are cultures where passivity is valued more than activity. In general the major orientations up-down, in-out, central-peripheral, active-passive, etc., seem to cut across all cultures, but which concepts are oriented which way and which orientations are most important vary from culture to culture.
2.3.2 Construction of Metaphor by Pragglejaz Method

The Pragglejaz Group is an international collective of metaphor researchers who joined forces to examine whether it was possible to devise an explicit and precise method for canonical metaphor identification in discourse. Their name has been derived from the initial letters of their first names:

Peter Crisp, Chinese University Hong Kong, China
Ray Gibbs, University of California, Santa Cruz, USA
Alan Cienki, VU University (Amsterdam) Netherlands
Graham Low, University of York, UK
Gerard Steen, VU University (Amsterdam) Netherlands
Lynne Cameron, Open University (Milton Keynes), UK
Elena Semino, Lancaster University, UK
Joe Grady, Cultural Logic LLC (Washington DC), USA
Alice Deignan, University of Leeds, UK
Zoltán Kövecses, Eötvös Loránd University (Budapest), Hungary

2.3.2.1 The Five Step Method of Pragglejaz

The cognitive linguistic approach to metaphor assumes that metaphors in language use are expressions of underlying cross-domain mappings which are part of the conceptual structure of language and discourse. The question that arises for the analyst of discourse, therefore, is how someone can get from the linguistic expressions of metaphor in discourse as for instance uncovered by the Pragglejaz method to the presumed underlying conceptual structures. It have been suggested that getting from the linguistic form of metaphor to its conceptual structure is a fundamental methodological problem and this group proposed a five-step framework for addressing the issues involved (Steen, 1999, in press; cf. Semino,
et al., 2004). Finding metaphor in discourse is not just a matter of identifying metaphorically used words but also of identifying their related conceptual structures. Steen’s attempt at an explicit procedure for the conceptual analysis of metaphor includes the following five steps:

1. Find the metaphorical focus
2. Find the metaphorical proposition
3. Find the metaphorical comparison
4. Find the metaphorical analogy
5. Find the metaphorical mapping

### Table 1

*Analysis of “Now sleeps the crimson petal”*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step no</th>
<th>Process of Metaphor Analysis</th>
<th>Result of Metaphor Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identification of metaphor-related words</td>
<td>Sleeps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identification of proposition</td>
<td>P1 (SLEEPs PETALt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P2 (MOD P1 NOWt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P3 (MOD PETALtCRIMSONt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Identification of open comparison</td>
<td>SIM {\sum_{\alpha} \Sigma F \Sigma a }</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[F (Crimson Petal)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Sleeps (\alpha)]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first step concerns the identification of the metaphorically used words in the text. Even though the complete first utterance is the linguistic expression of a cross-domain mapping, or a metaphor, there is only one word that is metaphorically used, and that is sleep. In traditional terminology, it is the focus (Black, 1962) or vehicle (Richards, 1936) of the metaphor.

When step 1 identifies metaphorically used words, it identifies terms which express the focus, vehicle, or source domain of the metaphor. It does so by finding those words which are somehow indirect or incongruous in context (e.g., Cameron, 2003; Charteris-Black, 2004). Such words, like sleep, therefore form a potential threat to the coherence of the text (Steen, 2002b). However, when it seems possible to integrate them into the overall discourse by some form of comparison or similarity which resolves the incongruity, the words are somehow metaphorical, or related to metaphor. Step 1 is hence explicitly based on the idea that metaphor is a form of indirect meaning that is based on correspondence or similarity.
Step 2 involves the transformation of the linguistic expressions of the text into conceptual structures in the form of a series of propositions. It makes explicit the assumption that metaphor is a matter of thought, not language. This type of conceptual structure for discourse is usually referred to as a text base, which has a linear as well as hierarchical quality (e.g. Kintsch, 1998). In order to indicate its conceptual instead of linguistic status, small capitals are used for its technical representation.

The third step transforms the single proposition with concepts from two distinct domains derived in step 2 into an open comparison between two incomplete propositions which each pertain to another conceptual domain. This can be done because some form of cross-domain mapping between the two conceptual domains framing the two sets of concepts distinguished in steps 1 and 2. Step 3 makes this explicit is assumed. It states that, for some activities \( F \) in the target domain and some entity \( a \) in the source domain, there is some similarities between the activity of the \textit{crimson petal} on the one hand and the sleeping of some entity on the other hand. Moreover, labeling these two domains as target and source, respectively, suggests that the similarity has to be projected from the sleeping of the entity towards the activity of the \textit{petal}. These assumptions lie at the basis of most metaphor analyses in the literature.

Several issues are implied by step 3. One involves the formal and conceptual separation of the two domains or spaces already involved in step 2. Another concerns the explication of the idea that was there from step 1, that we are indeed working on the assumption that there is some sort of similarities or
correspondences between the two sets of concepts: hence the addition of the operator SIM. In addition, step 3 also postulates that corresponding elements on both sides of the equation, to the effect that there is some activity or state needed for the petal in the target domain, and some agent for the activity of sleeping in the source domain will be needed; hence the addition of the open function and argument variables. These are natural additions if someone wants to align the two domains in order to reconstruct the correspondences between them. They are, moreover, minimal assumptions, in that no new conceptual elements are added to the comparison except the ones that are implied by the original proposition.

Step 4 turns the open comparison proposed by step 3 into a closed comparison which has the formal structure of an analogy (but in fact does not always need analogical interpretation). The open values indicated by F and a in step 3 have now been interpreted by the analyst. Step 4 thus makes explicit that analysts sometimes have to add new conceptual substance to the mapping between the two domains in order to make the mapping complete. This is often the crucial step of the analysis. For this particular example, the fourth step also happens to be the least constrained of all steps. Thus, on the side of the source domain, there is one option to fill in the logically most encompassing candidate for the agent of sleeping, which would be “animal”; and there is another option to fill in the most obvious candidate from the perspective of human experience, which is “human”. Since the rest of the poem also exploits personification and not animation, the example analysis has opted for the latter.
However, this is just for expository purposes. If the analysis aims to capture the meaning of the text as it might function for a reader, then the first line might have to be interpreted in the broadest fashion possible, because readers do not know yet what the rest of the poem will do, and then the notion of “animal” might be preferable.

Step 5 can also add further correspondences which have remained in the background of the analogy until now. Implicit elements of the sleeping schema may be projected onto implicit elements of the crimson petal schema, such as the goal or function of sleeping (rest) which may be projected from source to target to infer that the petal is tired. Or the typical time of sleeping, night, may be projected from source to target to infer something about the time of the real action of the poem. These are examples of inferences which add minimal assumptions about the cross-domain mapping and, if they are accepted, enrich the information that may be derived from it for the meaning of the text.

With step 5 we have completed our sketch of the five-step method. We have moved from the identification of its linguistic form (step 1) through its propositionalization (step 2) to its transformation into an open comparison (step 3), which was then interpreted as an analogical structure (step 4) and fleshed out into a cross-domain mapping (step 5). This procedure explicates various aspects of what analysts do when they say that particular linguistic expressions in discourse are related to metaphorical mappings.