1. ARGUMENT

Is metaphor just a matter of poetics and style? Cognitive Linguistics claims that we "live by metaphors"[1], that metaphorical, and, closely related, metonymic processes are a major device of human conceptualisation. Largely unnoticed, these processes are pervasively and systematically at work in everyday language: clocks have *hands*, a marriage may be *dead*, in *as time goes by* and *Christmas is coming*, TIME is viewed as an OBJECT which moves through space, in *the baby arrived*, *I went through some hard years* and *the old man passed away*, LIFE is seen as a JOURNEY, etc.

The underlying objective of the present thesis argues against the prevailing assumption that metaphor is a figure of speech typical of literary works by investigating non-literary texts with special reference to political and economic texts. The decision to focus on the use of metaphor in the political and economic fields is based on the findings and claims that these fields are pervaded with metaphor and other tropes such as metonymy, synecdoche, hyperbole, etc.

Formal linguistics has treated metaphor as a device of the poetic imagination, "as a sort of happy extra trick with words, an opportunity to exploit the accidents of their versality, something in place occasionally but requiring unusual skill and caution. In brief, a grace or ornament or added power of language, not its constructive form,"[2] found mainly in "high" literature, but hardly present in everyday language. However, there was an exception to this rule, one important theory, known as **Interaction Theory** which did not regard it as a simple use of words but according to Richards as "two thoughts of different things active together and supported by a single word or phrase, whose meaning is a resultant of their interaction."[3] For quite a long time, concerns with metaphor have been obsessively decorative and taxonomic. This should come as no surprise for anyone acquainted with the time when a metaphor has been evaluated only to the extent that it contributes to "preventing the diction from being ordinary and mean."[4] The stylistic tradition of metaphor is a purely ornamental device whose function is to set beauty on style, and to please or seduce readers. This place assigned to metaphor is quite slim, for Aristotle himself has in the *Rhetoric* acknowledged metaphor's cognitive value:

> "Accordingly, it is metaphor that is in the highest degree instructive (...) It follows, then, for style and reasoning [enthymemes], that in order to be lively (...), they must give us rapid information. Consequently, we are not highly gratified by enthymemes that are obvious - and 'obvious' means absolutely plain to everyone, not

---

[1] George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1980

[2] I.A. Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric (1936)* , Oxford University Press, New York and London, 1969, p. 90

[3] *Idem,* p. 94

[4] Aristotle, *Poetics,* Section 3, *The Internet Classics Archive*, Massachussetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA Available: http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/poetics.3.3.html

> demanding a bit of mental inquiry - nor by those which, when stated, we do not understand. What we like are those that convey information as fast as they are stated - so long as we did not have knowledge in advance - or that our minds lag only a little behind. With the latter two kinds there is some process of learning. "[5]

"There is some process of learning" is the key sentence that acknowledges a pedagogical status for metaphor.

Aristotle regards metaphor as "the transference of a name from the object to which it has a natural application, this transference can take place from genus to species or species to genus or from species to species or by analogy."[6] Aristotle's definition is taxonomic in that it grades metaphor as highest on the scale of figurativeness, with what we nowadays know under the names of metonymy and synecdoche as falling within the first category of his definition. Since Aristotle's time, a constant search for the definition of metaphor has been undertaken. It would be of little benefit for our purposes to review all the definitions offered by the many students of metaphor; this sounds like an impossible enterprise because of the huge amount of works devoted to the subject of metaphor.

Studies of metaphor, however, have almost exclusively focused on literary texts, and especially poetry, at the expense of other text-types such as scientific texts or social science texts. This is because the language of literary texts has long been held to be the most accessible area for metaphor analysts. Yet, in ignoring non-literary texts, such analyses have contributed indirectly to distorting the reality of the language of fields such as economics and politics, which found themselves condemned to linguistic sterility.

Over the past two decades, linguists' view of metaphor has changed fundamentally. Modern metaphor has changed fundamentally. Modern metaphor theory refutes the idea that metaphors are merely poetic devices rather than part of everyday speech, characteristic to human thought processes, enabling us to make sense of the world and deal with our experiences on it.

With the recent renewed concern with the subject of metaphor, kindled mainly by philosophers of language, linguists, discourse analysts and psychologists, analyses of discourse have started to take into account metaphor in non-literary texts. It seems that this tenacious concern with metaphor in discourse analysis is not without motivations; its pervasiveness has been so compelling. Indeed, it is so omnipresent in everyday speech, science, psychology, philosophy, economics, politics, etc., that it can no longer be ignored in these text-types, nor be thought of only as a poetic figure.

The present study is grounded in mainstream cognitive linguistics as developed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and their claim that "our conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature."[7]

Metaphor theory has drawn attention to two crucial and previously underestimated aspects of metaphor, namely that:

---

[5] Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, Book III, par. 14-25, *The Internet Classics Archive*
[6] *Idem,* par. 37
[7] G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, *op. cit.,* p. 3

(i)   Metaphor is pervasive in language, i.e. metaphorical linguistic expressions occur frequently and systematically in all kinds of discourse, from informal conversation to poetry.

(ii) Metaphor is a matter of both language and thought. More precisely, the patterning of everyday metaphorical in language (e.g. "We can't afford to lose this argument" and "She attacked every point I made") point to existence of conceptual metaphors (e.g. **ARGUMENT IS WAR**), which are a fundamental part of the way in which we ordinarily conceive of ourselves and the world.

Cognitive metaphor theory, in other words, makes an important distinction between **linguistic metaphorical expressions** on the one hand and **conceptual metaphors** on the other. The latter are conventionally represented in SMALL CAPITALS and expressed in the form A IS B, where A is the **target domain** of the metaphor (e.g. **ARGUMENT** above), and B is the **source domain** (e.g. **WAR** above). Another crucial distinction is between conventionality and creativity, both at the linguistic and at the conceptual level. Conceptual metaphors may be conventional (e.g. **LOVE IS A JOURNEY**) or novel (e.g. **LOVE IS A COLLABORATIVE WORK OF ART**), or, more accurately, they may fall at different points in a cline of conventionality. As far as language is concerned, a conventional conceptual metaphor may receive a conventional or a creative linguistic realisation (e.g. 'Our relationship is off the track.' vs. 'We are travelling in the fast lane on the freeway of love' as realisations of **LOVE IS A JOURNEY**. Novel conceptual metaphors, on the other hand, are by definition always realised linguistically by creative metaphorical expressions.

Accordingly, the data adduced to defend the cognitive status of metaphor are political and economic fields. My choice of politics and economics draws on my conviction that (i) of all the social sciences, politics and economics are the most sensitive and determinative in the life of the individual and the society; (ii) the fields of economics and politics are inextricably linked in practice, having in view the impact of political decision making on economics and vice verso and (iii) judging from the importance of these disciplines, metaphors have been comparatively both understudied and underestimated.

Studies of economic and political texts have been mainly polemical and ideological, i.e., exclusively made with the intent of showing the superiority of a given economic or political theory while denigrating another. The approach to metaphor in these text-types, however, transcends this ideological perspective, and affords an objective analysis of linguistic phenomena (here, metaphor and related tropes such as metonymy, synecdoche, simile, oxymoron, hyperbole, etc.) in view of a better understanding of economic and political texts. The present paper shows the extent to which metaphor and related figures assist understanding, contribute to interpersonal interaction, and further social control within communities.

It is also the main assumption of this paper that metaphor and related tropes pervade these types of texts that have been thought to be devoid of any emotive features. I will argue that, though political and economic texts tend to emphasize objectivity and concreteness, their status is similar to literary texts in showing stylistic variation.

Indeed, both in political theory and political speeches and in economic theory and economic analyses, metaphor functions as a (i) language necessity (in economics) as a (ii) cognitive tool (in economics and politics) and as a (iii) means of social control (in politics).

(i) The existence of metaphors in the language of economics stands for the foundation of theories. They starts as "gap-fillers" in economics theory and have come to be considered as part of the theory to which they belong. Their overuse does not entail their obsolescence. They constitute most of the root metaphors in economics (i.e. *bogus company, bear market, bull market, cash flow, soft loan, liquid assets, price freeze, laundered money, orphan stock, wildcat enterprise, windfall profit,* etc) which are indispensable in economics.

(ii) Metaphor as a cognitive tool enables us to draw on our world of experience with people, objects and events, by conceptualising the most abstract phenomena in terms of the most intelligible. Cognitive linguistics calls this transfer "mapping" from a source cognitive domain to a target domain, which means that metaphor operates between domains. Having made a collage from different EuroNews broadcastings, I have come to the following: the financial situation in Asia these days, for instance, was presented as serious and the OPEC members meeting in Vancouver were reported to be working on a plan to stabilise *Asia's ailing economics*. Japan was said to be thinking of *injecting money* into its financial sector. The most affected countries are Thailand, whose economy was referred to as the *ailing Thai economy*, and South Korea, whose *shattered economy* was described as *the worst hit by the turmoil*. *The financial rescue package* to the crisis put forward by the IMF constitutes a *painful IMF* reform, but the only *medicine* the affected countries can take. The situation is structurated according to the conceptual metaphor **AN ECONOMIC CRISIS IS A DISEASE** which brings about a host of entailments from the DISEASE domain. The economy is, therefore, the sick patient, the IMF, the doctor or rescuer and the IMF reforms, the medicine.

(iii) The political game is certainly one of the most figurative ever invented and played by men, as Ştefan Avădanei states in his book on metaphor.[8] Famous politicians and writers of political texts use metaphors in order to stir emotions, arouse imagination and persuade the audience. All political theorists from Plato to Machiavelli, Hobbes, J.S. Mill and "politics makers" of contemporary governments make use of metaphors in order to establish dominant paradigms that could have influence on the reader / hearer thus paving the way for political or social decisions to be made. Let's not forget that behind all these political metaphors there are wars, conspiracies, plots, assassinations, crimes and genocides.

This analysis of metaphor in this work will rely on **stylistics** and **pragmatics** as two key disciplines providing a framework within which economic and political texts will be dealt with. The motivation for this choice is that both stylistics and pragmatics are disciplines concerned with language in use. While stylistics will study the linguistic choices made by the user of language among the linguistic resources available, pragmatics will concern itself with determining the **illocutionary** force - what the metaphor does.

---

[8] Cf. Ştefan Avădanei, *La început a fost metafora*, Ed. Virginia, Iaşi, 1997

Pragmatic theory has, as it were, forced out metaphor from the rather taxonomic considerations towards more practical ones, i.e., it does not regard metaphors as poetic, embellishing devices; they are **cognitive** tools. This has revived the old debate of the effects of metaphors on an audience, and what we can do with them or make them do for us.

From stylistics, I will borrow the terminology of **tenor**, **vehicle** and **ground** or what cognitive linguistics later called **target domain** and **source domain** to explain the meaning transfer or **mapping**, that is the active way of forming metaphor. Further, I will draw on Hulban[9] for notional classes of metaphor, namely, the **concretive** (body part, food, animal, plant**,** physical world metaphors, etc.)**, anthropomorphic, synaesthetic, spatial, relational, technical, etc.** metaphors. These semantic classes derive from the notion of collocation. Moreover, I believe that a categorisation of metaphors in terms of syntactic complexity, where applicable, is helpful to determining the amount of implicitness in the metaphors. A search for the source of metaphors will further determine the liveness / deadness of the metaphor.

The view of stylistics I will adopt here contradicts the notion of style as a phenomenon typically characterising literature. I assume that stylistic features, though exemplifying a difference in frequency occurrence, are found both in literary and non-literary texts, and that, therefore, stylistic studies could apply to all discourse types without exception, and should concern themselves with the socio-political dimension of texts. Fowler calls this "linguistic criticism" as against "literary criticism."[10] He argues for the necessity of analysing what he calls "public, official language" which includes, among other things, "the statements of governments," because of the impact they have "in shaping attitudes and meanings within a community, and the passive way in which ordinary people necessarily consume them."[11]

The stylistic study of metaphor in economic and political texts will consist in identifying the syntactic structures chosen. It will be assumed that the style of a metaphorical utterance, i.e. the form it assumes, should afford enough clues for the reader as to how to interpret it in a pertinent way with a minimum amount of wasted energy. Not only does syntax play a major role in minimizing / maximising efforts for readers in their attempts at establishing relevance, but also the form a metaphor takes reveals, like with some other utterances, "assumptions about the hearer's contextual resources and processing abilities."[12] Some of these contextual resources are extralinguistic, including "such factors as consciousness of who is speaking and who is listening at any point in discourse, consciousness of the social relationships obtaining between these participants, and consciousness of the temporal and spatial co-ordinates of the discourse."[13] The more

---

[9] Horia Hulban, *Syntheses in English Lexicology and Semantics*, Ed. Spanda, Iasi, 2001; *Style in Language*, *Discourses and Literature*, Ed. Spanda, Iasi, 2003;

[10] Roger Fowler, *Linguistic Criticism*, Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York, 1986

[11] *Idem*, p. 36

[12] Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson, *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1995, p. 218

[13] *Idem*, p. 123

information is presupposed or built in the syntax of a metaphorical utterance, the more inferring the reader needs to do.

As speakers of a language, we have expectations as to what should follow what in discourse. Our simplest intuition about the structure of the English language is the unmarked NP/VP sequencing. I would like to suggest, following Sperber and Wilson, that the reader constructs "anticipatory syntactic hypotheses", i.e., he does not only "identify each word and tentatively assign it to a syntactic category, but [uses] his knowledge of its lexical properties and syntactic co-occurrence restrictions to predict the syntactic categories of following words or phrases."[14] If the expectations of syntactic co-occurrence restrictions obtain, then the way to relevance should be made straightforward; but if these expectations are disappointed, the search for relevance requires more efforts for inferring. Riffaterre suggests that "unpredictability will compel attention," and that the "stylistic context is a linguistic pattern suddenly broken by an element which was unpredictable, and the contrast resulting from this interference is the stylistic stimulus."[15] This notion of "unpredictability" as a stylistic feature is of much relevance to a theory of metaphor. Following Sperber and Wilson, I hope to demonstrate that with regard to metaphor "stylistic differences are just differences in the way relevance is achieved."[16] To show this link between linguistic form and pragmatic interpretation, I need to grade metaphorical utterances in terms of degrees of syntactic compactness.

Since the social world is governed by the pragmatic principles an application of such principles to political and economic discourse seems very beneficial as not everything that is said, is meant; especially politicians and journalists may employ different styles and different registers; they use metaphors as indirect speech acts, their utteremces are based on presuppositions. The distinction between **explicatures** and **implicatures** is a clear case in this sense. According to Driven,[17] implicatures are enabled by the processes of correlation and resemblance, which is a case of metaphor while explicatures of an utterance are the result of a number of cognitive operations like expansion, whereby, due metonymy, the utterance meaning can be associated with "more" meaning.

As to the pragmatic component of this study of metaphor, I will draw on a conception of pragmatics "much concerned precisely with such mechanisms whereby a speaker can mean more than, or something quite different from, what he actually says, by inventively exploiting communicative conventions."[18] Seen in this way, pragmatics fulfils some of the basic functions of rhetoric, namely, the study of effective communication, and is not so much concerned with how beautiful metaphors are as with what they do and how readers react to them. No one can impose a concept by way of metaphor on the minds of passive recipients. Therefore, it is important to consider the pragmatics of the discourse process as well as cognitive structures. For example, political discourse quite often involves conflict and contestation. Discourse is a way of action in which power is wielded

---

[14] *Idem,* p. 205

[15] Michael Riffaterre, "Criteria for Style Analysis", *Word,* 15(1) 1959, 154-174

[16] D. Sperber and D. Wilson, *op. cit.,* p. 224

[17] Cf. René Dirven, "Major Strands in Cognitive Linguisitics", *LAUD,* No. 634, The University of Duisburg-Essen, 2004

[18] Stephen C. Levinson, *Pragmatics*, Cambridge University Press, London:, 1983, pp. 26-27