

Abstract:

Rhetoric is a tool that helps to enhance composition: its aim is to express, to persuade, to inform a personal thought or to entertain the reader. One of its important devices is metaphor which is a figure of speech that makes an implicit, implied or hidden comparison between two things that are unrelated but share some common characteristics.

This research investigates metaphor in English language and its types. It falls into two sections: the first one talks about rhetoric in general, and it introduces a chronological definition of rhetoric, also referring to the uses of rhetoric in our

Rhetoric and Metaphor.

Asst.Prof: Ra'ad

Alnawaas

Dhurgham Mageed

daily life . The second section introduces metaphor in English language and its definitions .It also refers to the relation between the concept and metaphor .This section refers to the most important types of metaphor which are: Live, dead, structural, Orientational, Ontological, complex, extended, also also shows the most important functions of these types.

Introduction to rhetoric

In reading, speaking or writing, rhetoric is a tool that enhances composition, its aim is to express, persuade, inform a personal thought or to entertain the reader (Moliken, 2007: 3).

There are many rhetorical devices, some of them like (Zeugma) are rare so we can hardly hear them or find them within speech or writing, while others like “ metaphor “ and “ hyperbole “ are so common, that it is hard to find an article or hear a speech in which they are not frequently mentioned or used (Ibid).

Some of the rhetorical devices are transitional tools that help us to move from one portion to another, while others help us to present the information or evidence as strongly as possible (Ibid: 5).

Many studies of the rhetorical devices (either collectively or individually) are sprinkled to indicate to their im-

portance certainly, but also indicating to the interlocking nature of rhetoric's pieces (Sloane, 2001: 9).

Rhetoric is behind the design of who is talking with whom and about what and how. It does not ask additional question (like why) because this is considered as part of philosophy . It is found and operates in the everyday world, in all its communicative faces, to present and provide a framework for making, designing and understanding discourse, so once rhetoric is recognized and defined this can lead to the importance of communication (Andrews, 2011: 11)

In some uses, the term (rhetoric) has negative association .It is associated with sophistication, hypocrisy and mask of the truth in persuasive language .This due to the definition of rhetoric as “ art of persuasion “ .Nowadays there are more different views that see rhetoric as the art behind choices in communication of all kind .For example, choosing to write short story to capture issues is a rhetorical choice and the genre of the story helps to identify the writing and its perception by the audience (Andrews, 2001: 11)

Rhetoric operates in speech and writing ,there is a range of modes like the image, the moving image, sound, gesture, movement in addition to verbal acts and these can be used in combination (Ibid)

Rhetoric is a storehouse of techniques .Some are hoary

and state and some are too new to be classified .The history of this art is clearly found in ancient Greece (Parry-Giles and Hoagan, 2010: 4).

One of the most important questions that rhetoricians seek to answer is “ what is rhetoric ? “ The answers are many and varied ranging from Aristrole’s “ the faculty wherein one discovers the available means of persuasion in any case whatsoever “, to Francis and Bacon’s “ the application of reason to the imagination for the better moving of the will “.There is no way to ignore Kenneth Burkner concept of “ identification “, in which she presumes that “ you persuade a man only insofar that you can talk his language by speech, gestures, tonality order, image, attitude, idea identifying your ways with his (Louis and Michele, 1999: 19)

In the twentieth century, the most important definition has been Aristotle’s ; that has adopted rhetoric as practical and pragmatic doctrine .Thomas Farell in his book “ practicing the art of rhetoric: Tradition and invention “ suggests that rhetoric is a higher order practice that entails the entire process of forming, expressing and judging public thought in real – life (Ibid: 21)

In fact the first rhetoricians were the sophists, that Plato developed his conception of Sophestic rhetoric which was reconstructed by Paulakos as “ the art which seeks to capture in opportune moments that which is appropriate and

attempts to suggest that which is possible". According to him the sophists thought of rhetoric as "art" the operated "the word" in order to produce aesthetic pleasure (Ibid)

Such definitions and views were motivated by Plato's attack on rhetoric as "mere cookery" which pushed the scientists to seek what is rhetoric (Sloane, 2001: 10)

Despite differences over purpose, subject matter and critical perspective, scholars do share some common features. They believe that rhetoric is a force in history and that the study of public address can shed light on human condition (Parry – Giles and Hogan, 2001, P: 8).

These shared common features or grounds among scholars distinguish rhetoric scholarship from other academic disciplines yet, they also dictate on interdisciplinary perspective sharing interests with scholars in history, English, media studies, political science, and other disciplines (Ibid)

The scholars of rhetoric aim to make a difference in the largely scholarly conventions. They define rhetoric as a scholarly discipline and identified the most promising and productive areas of research in the field (Parry – Giles and Michelle, 2010: 4)

1. Metaphor

1.1 introduction

One of the great tools of a writer wishing to make impact is metaphor. Metaphor compares two objects. It helps

us to make the claim that objects are not merely like one another, but actually are the same .For example in (He is a snake in the grass) the speaker would be grouping together two objects (He and a snake), with two different qualities: (human and reptile). The implication would be that one of the semantic traits, or qualities of meaning associated with snakes (Behrens and Parker, 2010: 93) .

Different languages have developed different sets of metaphor and the value of comparing two dissimilar objects can be diluted between languages .For example, metaphors can be involved in terms of endearment: a mother might conceivably call her young her daughter “ Pumpkin “. The French literal translation of this metaphor would be “ Citrouille “ or “ Porition “, terms that may leave a French reader baffled and wondering why this child is being called a soup vegetable(Ibid) .

So, metaphor is essentially nonstandard and deviates either semantically or pragmatically from one language to another (Mey, 2009: 568).

Metaphors tend to provoke thoughts and feelings to larger extent than more literal description do, also it evokes in comparison to literal alternative such as “ my mother is grimaced “(Griffiths ,2010: 78).

There are two problems for any account of metaphor.

Firstly: it seems that the supposed readings of metaphor are not sufficient, secondly: many aspects of the force have more to do with (real – world) attributes of the metaphorical focus that with the semantic features that can be claimed to express its meaning. In fact metaphor is the most familiar kind of relationships between meanings where “ a word “ appears to have both “ literal “ meanings and one or more “ transformational “ meanings . Metaphor is haphazard for example: the word “ foot “ is appropriate to mountains or “ eye “ to needles .But, a review to other languages shows that is not. For example in (French), the (needles) does not have any “ eye “ and in many languages, the mountain does not have any “ foot “ (Palmer, 1981: 103) .

Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 486) argue that using sets of metaphors makes us accept one way of seeing that world as the only way .Discourse analysis practitioners usually accept Lakoff and Johnson’s view of metaphor. They argue that when writers use a metaphor they make readers see the world in a particular way. Such a view of metaphor ignores differences between kinds of writings .So it is possible that it means “ one thing in one kind of writing it can mean something else in another language.

1.2 Defining metaphor

Originally metaphor in Greek mean carrying from one

place to another. It is a figure of speech in which one thing is described in terms of another (Peck & Coyle, 1984: 139). This figurative extension of meaning takes place when one or more components of the meaning of a particular term is selected and extended to cover some objects which has not been within the domain of such a word (Nida, 1964: 93).

Metaphor literally meaning to “ carry over “ is in the Aristotelian tradition characteristically defined in terms of movement change, with respect to location. Aristotle applies the word “ metaphor “ to every transition in terms . So we could suppose that a metaphor is a kind of borrowing .That borrowed meaning is supposed to be “ proper “ meaning, that one resorts to metaphor in order to fill a semantic void and that borrowed word takes the place of an absent word where such a place exists (Johnston, 2008: 41).

The word metaphor was defined as a novel or poetic linguistic expression where one or more words for a concept are used outside of it's normal conventional meaning to express a similar concept (Lakoff ,1992: 11) .

The rhetoric of metaphor takes the world as its unit of reference. Metaphor, therefore, is classed among the single – word figures of speech as is defined as a trope of resemblance (Ibid)

Metaphor can be seen in a number of ways .It can be

just a rhetorical device or a figure of speech, a tool in language or a device is a poetic imagination or even a deviant linguistic expression . It can be seen as a matter of words rather than of thought or action (Johnston ,2008: 41).

Metaphors just add meanings, to fill semantic voids, substitute where necessary, but they do not have a creative function. The classical function of metaphor as having merely a substitute function was challenged by modern views which clarify that metaphor does more than just substitute for literal terms . Since a speaker or writer chooses to replace a word with another expression different from posed “ proper “ meaning, while substitution does not introduce new information and has no cognitive function, so metaphor operates by describing phenomenon in terms of another, and allow language to free itself from the function of direct description and to establish a contingent relationship between words and reality. (Johnston, 2008: 52)

Corbett (1971) explains that in metaphor we have “ two entities or objects “ which are “ compared or resembled “ and the comparison is “ implicit “ .Such comparison can be achieved by “ identification “ of one object with the other, or by “ substitution “ of one for the other.

Many theories which assert that metaphorical utterances involve a comparison or similarity between the giv-

en objects, have been criticized by Searle (1979: 85) which considers the elements of comparison as a part of the meaning of the metaphor, and consequently, highlights a sense of similarity. He believes that similarity is not a part of meaning, but has a vital role in production and understanding of metaphor.

1.3 Metaphor & conception

English language is highly metaphorical, since many expressions that have been used in daily contact are metaphorical as “the eye of the needle” or “he drives me insane”. Metaphors are so common that we may not notice them. Many ideas and concepts can not be expressed alone without metaphor. For example, the abstract concept “time”: when we express such a concept we try to refer to it as a physical one that we spend, waste, lose, leave and save.

English language has a good framework for conceptualizing that abstract notion of communication, as the physical transfer of objects as in: “I gave you that idea” or “your ideas came across greatly.”

1.3.1 Conceptual Metaphor Theory:

In “conceptual metaphor theory”, metaphorical expressions are the linguistic manifestations of underlying conceptual knowledge. Traditional approaches have tend-

ed to consider metaphorical uses of words, on a case – by – case basis .Cognitive linguistics points to patterns in the metaphorical uses of meanings as in:

- 1 - The truth is clear.
- 2 - He was blinded by love
- 3 - His writing opaque.
- 4 - I see what you mean.

In these words the literal meaning of the domain of vision is employed metaphorically to characterize the domain of understanding. In such case the real topic of discussion (understanding) is known as the “ topic “ or “ target “ domain while the domain characteristically associated with the vocabulary,(seeing), is known as the “ vehicle “ or “ source “ domain.

In such examples of metaphorical mapping, the relationship between the domain is systematic: if seeing corresponds to understanding, then (not seeing) correspond to “ not understanding “. The systematic nature of the relationship between domains in the metaphor results from mapping cognitive models from one domain onto counterparts in the other (Mey, 1992: 615) .

If we imagine a “ love relationship “ in the following example:

Our relationship has hit a dead- end – street.

Here love is conceptualized as (journey). English language has many expressions that are based on “ conceptualization of love as journey “ for example:

- The relationship isn't going anywhere .
- We can't turn to back now.
- Look how far we're come.

Such examples which are not necessarily about “ love “ can readily be understood about “ love “ even though they are not (poetic) and they are not used for special rhetorical effect. The domain involves understanding one domain of experience and love, in terms of a very different domain of experience and journeys (Lakoff, 1992: 9) .

1.3.2 Conceptual blending theory:

Much of the linguistic data accounted for by conceptual metaphor theory can be also analyzed in terms of conceptual blending theory . The conceptual blending framework (also known as “ conceptual integration and “ blending theory “) assumes many of the same claims as conceptual metaphor theory.To clarify: the idea that metaphor is conceptual as well as linguistic phenomenon and that it involves the systematic projection of language, imagery and inferential structure between domains. However, in contrast to the emphasis on conventional metaphors, in conceptual metaphor theory, conceptual blending theory

is intended to capture spontaneous online processes that can yield short – lived and novel conceptualizations .Further more, blending theory reveals connections between the cognitive under mapping of metaphors and variety of other linguistic phenomenon handled by metal space theory (Mey, J. 2009: 630).

In 1994, Fauconnier and Turner introduced anew analytic framework which treats metaphor as a product of a more general process of human cognition. This operation involves the combination of selected conceptual materials from two or more distinct sources. Like metaphor in conceptual metaphor theory terms, blending is understood as a pervasive phenomenon in human thought, one which shows effect regularly in everyday language (Geeraerts and Guyckens, 2007: 198) .

In this framework, metaphors are treated as subset of conceptual blends characterized by a particular kind of relations holding among various spaces. Fauconnier and Turner present a typology of blends in which metaphors are defined by a symmetry in the degree to which two inputs provide the conceptual frames that structure the blend (Ibid) .

Metaphorical blends involve “ fusion “ of corresponding elements from the two inputs, where a target concept

is excluded from explicit representation in the blend in favor of its counterpart from the source .For example, in the metaphor a (ship – of – state) the notion itself is not represented in the blend, the ship image takes its place (but maintains its conceptual linkage with the state in the target input space). Its “ fusion “ with accommodation leads to the mental experience which Lakoff and Johnson (1980) describe as “ understanding one terms in terms of another “ (Geeraerts and Cuyckens, 2007:199).

1.4 Types of metaphor

1.4.1 Live metaphors:

The reference and ground of comparison become limited between the original meaning of the word or expression and their metaphorical meaning. For example, a fox is “ a person who is cunning “ as apposed to “ an animal which is like a fox in that it has a pointed nose .When the transferred definition loses its analogical feeling, fox is felt to be virtually synonymous with “ a cunning man “, but the feeling of the link between literal and the transferred meaning may continue, so this metaphor is considered a live (Leech, 1981: 227).

1.4.2 Dead metaphor:

Trogný (1997: 89) states that “ dead metaphors “ are old, well known metaphors that have lost their metaphori-

cal meaning by convention and which have become commonly used expressions.

Hogan (2014 ; 86) states that dead metaphor were once real a live metaphors, but they have lost their metaphorical senses and become literal because of repetitive usage. For example the word (crane) (machine for lifting) was derived from (crane) (type of birds), but no connection between them now.

1.4.3 Structural metaphors:

Structural metaphors, are when one thing is understood and experienced in terms of another. Structural metaphors are the most well known metaphors to people, for example ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor is a structural metaphor because it includes the mapping of one kind of experience (ARGUMENT) onto another (WAR) (Finch, 2000: 171 and Li, 2010: 206).

1.4.4 Orientational metaphors:

Feldman (2006: 157) states that orientational metaphors are different from structural metaphors, because orientational metaphors do not structure one concept in terms of another.

Orientational metaphors have to with “ spatial orientations” like up-down, FRONT – BACK, IN-OUT, ON-OFF, DEEP

– SHALLOW, CENTRAL – PERIPHERAL, etc. Orientational metaphors give a concept a spatial orientation for example HAPPY IS UP. The fact that the concept HAPPY which is oriented up leads to English expressions like:

- I am feeling up (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 461).

1.4.5 Ontological metaphors:

Barjes (2007: 33) also refers to AL- Harrasi (2001) who explains that ontological metaphors are concerned with the ways of viewing abstract concepts, such as event, activities, emotions, ideas, etc ,as entities and substances .

Kovescses (2005: 28) states that ontological metaphors can not be understood interms of orientations . An example on ontological metaphor is INFLATION IS AN ENTITY, which deals with the experience of rising prices, for example:

- Inflation is lowering our standards of living.

1.4.6 Complex metaphor

A complex metaphor is where a simple metaphor is based on a secondary metaphoric element.

For example using a metaphor of 'light' for 'understanding' may be complexified by saying 'throwing light' rather than 'shining light'. 'Throwing' is thus an additional metaphor for how light arrives (Ritchie, 2013: 54).

1.4.7 Extended metaphor

It is used when there is a single main subject to which

additional subjects and metaphors are applied.

The extended metaphor may act as a central theme, for example where it is used as the primary idea of a poem and is used repeatedly and in different forms.

Example:

Let me count my loves of you, my rose garden, my heart, my fixed mark, my beginning and my end (Hogan, 2014:9).

1.5 Functions of metaphors:

Metaphor can has different functions:

1- Providing depth

Diane (2000: 68) states that One the most important functions of metaphor that it can provide inner depth to the text.

2 - Adding complexity

Steen (1994: 182) refers Metpahors can be used to add complexity to the text.

3 - Adding aesthetic flavor

A very important fuction of metaphor is to add aesthetic to certain text (Ibid).

4 - Cohesion

Metaphors can be used conciously to structure the development of a text, as the organizing principle which gives the text a lexical cohesion (Goatly, 2000: 163) .

Example:

Above me towered the colossal edifice of society and to my mind the only way out was up. Into this early resolved to climb. Up above, men wore black clothes and boiled shirts, and women dressed in beautiful gowns... (Jack London, What Life Means to Me).

In this example, "society" is compared to "colossal edifice" with "society" as a target and "edifice" as a source. The term "edifice" is repeated and achieves cohesion in this text.

5 - Coherence

Goatly (2000: 172) states that Using different metaphors within certain text helps to make it more coherent.

Example:

All the world's a stage,
And all the men and women merely players.
They have their exits and their entrances;
And one man in his life plays many parts.
His acts being seven ages.
At first, the infant. . .

(William Shakespeare, As You Like It, 2.7)

From this famous passage from Shakespeare's As You

Like It, there is a basic metaphor LIFE IS PLAY with LIFE being a target and PLAY a source. It is well-known that a play consists of many elements, such as, players, costume, stage, audience, directors, roles, exits or entrances of players. In the narrow sense, life held by an individual is conceptualized as a play.

6 - Describing

A very important function of metaphor that it can help in describing entities (Ponterotto, 2003: 83)

Bibliography:

- Al- Harrasi, A . N. K . (2001) . Metaphor in Arabic – to – English translation with specific reference to metaphorical concepts and expressions in political discourse. Birmingham: Aston University. Unpublished University Dissertation.
- Andrews, R. (2011). Theory of contemporary rhetoric. Oxford: Oxford university press.
- Behrens, S ., and Parker, J . (2001) . Language in the real world . Newyork: Routledge.
- Berenike, J . and Berber, T. (2015) . Metaphor in Specialist Discourse. Newyork: Benjamins publishing.
- Corbett, E. (1971) . Classical rhetoric for modern student. Oxford: Oxford university press.
- Diane, P. (2000). The Cohesive Role of Cognitive Meta-

- phor in Discourse and Conversation. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Feldman, J. (2006). From Molecule to Metaphor. London: MIT press.
 - Finch, G . (2000). Linguistics terms and concepts . London: Macmillan press.
 - Goatly, A. (2000). Critical Reading and Writing. London and New York: Routledge.
 - Griffiths, P . (2010) . An introduction to English Semantics and pragmatics . Edinburgh: Edinburgh university press.
 - Hogan, C. (2014) . Metaphor and entertainment. Oxford: Oxford university press.
 - Lakoff, G . (1992) .The contemporary theory of Metaphor. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
 - Lakoff, G ., and Johnston, M . (1980) . Metaphor we live by. Chicago: University of Chicago press.
 - Leech, G . (1981) . Semantics . (2nd edition) . England: Peguin Books.
 - Lakoff, G . and Johnson, M . (2003) . Metaphors we live by with a new afterward . Chicago: the University of Chicago press.
 - Leech, Geoffrey N. (1969). A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry. London: Longman Group Ltd.
 - Louis, J. Michelle, G., and coudill, S. (1999). Contempo-

- rary rhetorical theory . New York: The Guilford press.
- Mey, J . (2009) . Concise encyclopedia of pragmatics. Oxford: Elsevier press.
 - Moliken, P. (2007). Rhetorical Devices . USA: Prestwick house.
 - Palmer, F. R. (1981) . Semantics . Cambridge: cambridge university press.
 - Parry – Giles, S . and Hogan, M. (2010) . The handbook of rhetoric and public address. Oxford: Oxford university press.
 - Ponterotto, D. (2003). The cohesive role of cognitive metaphor in discourse and conversation. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyer.
 - Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik (1985). A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. London: Longman Group Ltd.
 - Ritchie, L. (2013). Metaphor . Cambridge: Cambridge university
 - Sloane, T . (2001). Encyclopedia of rhetoric . Oxford: Oxford university press.
 - Searle, J . (1979) . Expression and meaning: studies in the theory of speech acts .Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
 - Steen,G. (1994) .Understanding Metaphor in Literature. An Empirical Approach. New York: Longman.

البلاغة والمجاز في اللغة الانجليزية الاستاذ المساعد د. رعد النواس ضرغام مجيد

الخلاصة :

البلاغة عباره عن اداة تساهم في تعزيز النص اللغوي، هدفها هو للتعبير والاقناع وايصال الافكار الشخصيه للكاتب من اجل امتاع القارئ. احد واهم ادواتها هو المجاز والذي هو عباره عن اداة مجازيه تقارن بشكل ضمني وغير مرئي بين شيئين مختلفين، ولكن يشتركون في بعض الخصائص العامه.

هذا البحث يتناول البلاغه والمجاز في اللغة الانجليزية، يقع في محبتين حيث يعرض المبحث الاول مقدمه عامه عن البلاغه متطرقا الى مجموعه من التعاريف المتسلسله زمنيا، ويشير ايضا الى استخدامات البلاغه في حياتنا اليوميه . ويعرض المبحث الثاني المجاز في اللغة الانجليزية متطرقا الى تعاريفه، ويشير ايضا الى علاقه بين المفهوم اللغوي والمجاز، ثم يعرض اهم وانواع المجاز ووظائفها في اللغة الانجليزية حيث يقع المجاز في تسعه انواع مهمه وهي المجاز الحي، الميت، التركيبي، التوجهي، الوجودي، المعقد والتمددي ويعرض هذا المبحث ايضا اهم الوظائف اللغويه لهذه الانواع السبعه.