A Cognitive Analysis of Metaphor and Metonymy in Selected Passages from Oscar Wilde's Short Stories

Suhayla H. Majeed and Lanja A. Dabbagh

Department of English, College of Languages, Salahaddin University,
Hawler

Abstract—M*etaphor* and metonymy are two main motivating aspects for us to perceive ourselves and the abstract outside world. The success of metaphor and metonymy in communication may also be explained by the fact that they are beyond language, as it is to be found primarily in thought and action. In literature, they were used to be thought of as merely figures of speech, but in cognitive linguistics, both of them are important cognitive instruments and way of thinking of human beings. The cognitive linguistics approach to metaphor and metonymy provides an explanatorily elegant framework to account much for the underlying meaning. In this paper, we describe the features and functions of metaphor and metonymy in the selected passages of Oscar Wilde's short stories. There is an attempt to show the importance of language use in the theme of the stories and the aim of the writer through metaphoric and metonymic patterns in the selected texts. Based on the illuminating framework offered by Cognitive Exploration of Language and Linguistics, this paper attempts to analyze these two language phenomena in terms of their constructions, functions, and working mechanisms in the light of semiotics, pointing out that both of them are special signs with the features of multi-hierarchy, ambiguity, and openness and its construction relies on similarity and association.

Index Terms—Constructions, Functions, Metaphoric and metonymic patterns.

I. Introduction

Metaphor plays an important role in literature and language creativity and knowledge representation in particular areas of literature, and its role has been studied by scholars in the field (Rita, 2000; Silvie and Lubin, 2005).

Metaphor and metonymy are treated as two different figures of speech in traditional rhetoric. The famous linguist Jakobson mentioned them in his works in the 1960s as two important principles for language. Cognitive linguistics focuses on the

ubiquity of metaphor and metonymy in language, but in modern theories of metaphor, metonymy is often regarded as a subtype of metaphor and gets a bare mention. Cognitively speaking, metaphor is more useful since people often use metaphors to explain something in a less well-known domain in terms of things from relatively better-known domains. Human interaction generally proves to be much more significant as the foundation for the decoding of the signified. However, metonymy basically involves using a special property of something or its special relationship with some other thing to refer to it; therefore, its major function is to help the hearer to locate or recognize the referent and its special characteristics.

Metonymy, as often treated as a subtype of metaphor by cognitive linguistics, has a different working mechanism; metaphor is based on the perceived similarity between things whereas metonymy on the relationship within things themselves. Cognition and the use of language involve the access and manipulation of mental spaces, which are constructed from human perceptual experience and are extended through imaginative processes, within which metaphor and metonymy are the most significant ones. From the perspectives of construction, poetic, and cognitive function and working mechanism, this paper makes a comprehensive analysis of metaphor and metonymy through comparing and contrasting these two important language phenomena, exploring their similarity and contiguity.

A. Metaphor and Metonymy in Cognitive Linguistics

Cognitive linguists suggest that we use metaphor automatically and unconsciously to understand the mind, emotions, and all other abstract concepts. Such metaphors enable us, as embodied beings, to make sense of a concept such as – mind, which we cannot see with our eyes or grasp with our hands. It allows us to – take a view on the debate and to – get to grips with the subject. Without such conventional metaphors, there would be no abstract thought. It also suggests that metaphors may – privilege some understandings and exclude others. Through field research, George and Mark (2003) have collected large numbers of metaphorical expressions. It is believed that these are derived from a smaller number of conceptual metaphors. Both creative, novel metaphors and dead, conventional metaphors are derived from conceptual metaphors. For George, the

focus of metaphor is not in language at all but in the way we conceptualize one mental domain in terms of another.

Cognitive linguists have paid less attention to metonymy, yet it is also a rampant phenomenon in linguistics. Metonymy is a type of figurative language in which the name of one thing is replaced with another commonly associated with it. The word originally comes from Greek, constituted by two affixes – meta and – onoma which mean – change and – name, respectively. It is present whenever a part of something stands in for the whole item, or an item stands for the whole. In other words, a partial or associative reference maps to the referent itself. A metonymy can also be seen as consisted of three parts tenor, vehicle, and ground. What makes it different is that the – tenor never appears in metonymy and the – vehicle serves as the – ground at the same time. The – tenor and the – vehicle function implicitly, one substituting for the other. This is because the– vehicle represents some characteristics of the – tenor, but the two components in the same metonymy do not share any similarities at all (George and Mark, 1980).

In English, there is another figure of speech called synecdoche that is quite similar to metonymy. Actually it is very difficult to distinguish one from the other since both of them make use of the relationship between things. In a synecdoche, part of a word's basic meaning can be used for the whole, referring to specific objects. Furthermore, there are many other ways to constitute a metonymy. Just as conceptual metaphor restructures a conceptual domain like mountains in terms of another conceptual domain such as the human body, a conceptual metonymy names one aspect or element in a conceptual domain while referring to some other element which is in a contiguity relation with it (Roman, 1985).

As their constructions are concerned, metaphor is consisted of three parts tenor, vehicle, and ground whereas metonymy is only constituted by the substitute and the substituted. Metaphor is to describe one thing in terms of some other thing, the tenor, and the vehicle belonging to two different categories with certain distance between each other; metonymy is to replace the name of one thing with another commonly associated with it, usually a part of it, the substitute and the substituted belonging to the same category. Human interactions generally prove to be much more significant than features that might be available in an objective description of a category. Cognition and the use of language involve the access and manipulation of mental spaces, which are constructed from human perceptual experience and are extended through imaginative processes, within which metaphor and metonymy are the most significant ones. Many linguists including George, Johnson, Roman, and Eco have made magnificent contribution to this field. Their theories provide a bridge between linguistics and our understanding of the body and brain, which has been acknowledged as coherent with other studies in cognitive language. Both metaphor and metonymy merit further research.

B. The Functions of Metaphor and Metonymy

Metaphor and metonymy have six types of functions, including rhetorical function, linguistic function, poetic function, cognitive function, social function, and word-play function (Dingfang, 2000):

1. Rhetorical Function: Metonymy denotes something with its related characteristics, usually the most significant one; it often has strong rhetorical effects. Nicknames humorous by emphasizing some special features of things being mentioned. Puns can also be taken as a special usage of metonymy. These are used to enhance and help to achieve special effects.

2. Linguistic Function: This type refers to the function of filling in lexical gaps. Metaphors use similarities between things to make names; metonymies use things features in certain aspects. Cognitive linguists assume that language develops by metaphorical extension. Body experiences, such as moving in space, seeing people, and handling objects, provide the foundation of language. Metonymy is the most basic form of meaning extension. It is even more important and fundamental than metaphor.

3. Poetic Function: Language is used in building materials for poetry. Innovation in each layer of language can engender poems. In fact, such kind of innovation is a deviation from the original regulations and rules. Layers of language include phonetics, syntax, and lexicology. Metonymy is a kind of deviation that does not involve two domains as metaphor does; thus, it has weaker effects than metaphor does as well. Theoretically speaking, the more it deviates, the more poetic it could be. However, in practice, it is always limited by rules of language itself and people's cognitive ability. If the tenor is too distant in meaning from the vehicle, it would be too obscure to understand.

4. Social Function: Metonymy is an important approach to constitute euphemism, indirect discourse behavior, and argot; the former two expressing politeness during the later one with a sense of privacy. All of them function in strengthening social communications.

5. Cognitive Function: Metonymy is an important component of our conceptual system. People can use a familiar and easy recognized characteristic to represent the whole thing. Therefore, by obtruding their characteristics, metonymy makes it easy to find out and remember the identity and features of things being discussed.

6. Wordplay Function: This function mainly works in nicknames, puns, and two-part common expressions.

Metaphors are used to enrich language or to understand something abstract in more straightforward terms (Hans, 2009, p. 112). Interestingly, many of the expressions that are defined as metaphorical are so conventional and well established that we no longer recognize them as metaphors at all. For example, when we say that we spend time doing something, we may not realize that this is a way to express the metaphor TIME IS MONEY.

C. Metaphor and Metonymy in Literature

Literature is the mirror with which the society is reflected and better perceived; short stories as a genre of literature presents the ideology and activities of actual human experiences through action and performance in societies similar to real ones. Studying of the selected passages from

Oscar Wilde's short stories is suitable for the investigation of metaphor and metonymy. The paper identifies the linguistic means of expressing metaphor and metonymy in the stories.

Metaphor is a topic within linguistics that has been studied in great detail. Two of the leading researchers within this field are George and Mark. Their Conceptual Metaphor Theory (George and Mark, 1980) revolutionized the study of metaphors and has been the foundation for much other research. Most people view metaphor as characteristic of language alone and also as a matter of extraordinary rather than ordinary language. However, the fundamental principle behind the conceptual metaphor theory is that metaphor is part of our everyday life and deeply rooted in our conceptual system. It is not only a matter of language but also of thought and action. The theory argues that our concepts structure the world and how we function in it. By claiming that our conceptual system to a large extent is metaphorical, George and Mark (1980, p. 3) also suggest that metaphor is a major part of our everyday functioning. This, however, does not mean that they deny its role in language. Instead, they view language as a source of evidence for what our conceptual system is like since communication is based on that same system (George and Mark, 1980, p. 3).

Furthermore, they argue that our conceptual system is grounded in the world and our experiences in it, which leads them to claim that metaphors are grounded in our constant interaction with our environment in both physical and cultural terms (George and Mark, 1980, p. 119). Conceptual metaphors function at the level of thought. These conceptual metaphors are repeatedly referred by George and Mark (1980:6) as metaphors. An example of this is HAPPY IS UP. This metaphor is realized in language by what George and Mark (1980, p. 7) call metaphorical (linguistic) expressions. Examples of such expressions are I'm feeling up and My spirits rose (George and Mark, 1980, p. 15). In other words, it is not metaphors (as this word is used within conceptual metaphor theory), but metaphorical expressions, that are most commonly used in written and spoken language. In the metaphor HAPPY IS UP, George and Mark (1980, p. 15) argue for the existence of a conceptual link between the ideas HAPPY and UP. However, we seldom use the exact metaphor HAPPY IS UP when writing or speaking. Instead, we use expressions that reflect this metaphor, such as those mentioned above.

George and Mark (1980) differentiate between three main kinds of metaphors, namely, structural, orientational, and ontological metaphors. Structural metaphors are instances where we metaphorically structure one concept in terms of another (George and Mark, 1980, p. 14). This phenomenon is exemplified with the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR. In this example, the concept of ARGUMENT is metaphorically structured in terms of the concept WAR. This conceptual metaphor is realized in language by expressions such as He shot down all of my arguments. Moreover, George and Mark (1980, p. 4) claim that we do not only talk about arguments in terms of war but the metaphor also partially structures the way we act when we argue. For example, we can actually win or lose an argument, and we see the other person in the argument as an opponent. Orientational metaphors, next, are more extensive than structural ones in that they organize a whole system of concepts with respect to one another (George and Mark, 1980, p. 14). These kinds of metaphor have to do with spatial orientation, such as up-down and in-out, and George and Mark (1980, p. 14) argue that these orientations arise from the fact that our human bodies look and behave the way they do in the physical environment in which we exist. An example of an orientational metaphor is the above-mentioned HAPPY IS UP. Accordingly, there is also a conceptual metaphor with the opposite meaning, namely, SAD IS DOWN (George and Mark, 1980, p. 15).

The third type of metaphor within the conceptual metaphor theory is the ontological metaphor. This is claimed to be the most basic kind when it comes to comprehending and understanding our experience (George and Mark, 1980, p. 219). Ontological metaphors are about understanding our experiences in terms of entities and substances, and alternative names for them are, therefore, entity and substance metaphors. They allow us to treat parts of our experience as uniform entities or substances, which mean that we can refer to them, quantify them, categorize them, and reason about them, in ways otherwise impossible (George and Mark, 1980, p. 25). Understanding our experiences in terms of entities also entails viewing them as containers. These container metaphors are also based on the fact that we view our own bodies as entities or containers. They are realized when we impose boundaries on, for example, woods, which enables us to use expressions such as into the woods (George and Mark, 1980, p. 29). Some experiences and objects around us are easily treated as entities or substances, but we also impose imagined boundaries on things that are not, such as the mind. The ontological metaphor THE MIND IS AN ENTITY is an example of this. This metaphor can be elaborated and provides us with other metaphors such as THE MIND IS A MACHINE and THE MIND IS A BRITTLE OBJECT (George and Mark, 1980, pp. 27-28).

Moreover, George and Mark (1980, p. 33) claim that the most obvious ontological metaphors are cases when we specify a physical object as being a person; when we see something nonhuman as human. This is called personification and covers a wide range of metaphors, each of which focuses on different aspects of, or ways of looking at, a person (George and Mark, 1980, p. 34). Personification is realized by expressions as such. This fact argues against the standard theories (George and Mark, 1980, p. 33). In this expression, we impose a human quality, the ability to argue, on a nonhuman phenomenon, a fact. Although George and Mark distinguish between several different kinds of metaphors, they still have a common definition for the function of all these kinds. They claim that metaphor is about "understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another" (George and Mark, 1980, p. 5). This was also the basis on which the counting of the metaphors in the data of this study was carried out. George and Mark's view of metaphor is not unlike the one presented by Hans (2009, p. 112): "in metaphor, language from one semantic sphere is used to describe something in a different sphere."

Lindquist also states that for a metaphor to work, some aspects of the processes in the two spheres must be similar. Furthermore, Lindquist explicitly describes two different motivations for using a metaphor. These are either to express something common and mundane in a more colorful way, or to explain something complicated or abstract which is hard to understand by means of something more straightforward and concrete (Hans, 2009, p. 112).

Metonymy is, which is, another tool in figurative language is also a topic dealt with in the present paper. Metonymies are cases when we use one entity to refer to another to which it is related (George and Mark, 1980, p. 35), or, as Hans (2009, p. 118) puts it: Metonymy is based on association, whereas metaphor is based on similarity. George and Mark (1980, p. 36) also claim that the primary function of metonymy is referential, in that we use one entity to refer to another. The primary function of metaphor, on the other hand, is understanding – that is, we use one entity to understand another. As with metaphors, George and Mark (1980, p. 37) claim that metonymies are also part of our ordinary, everyday life, and not just a matter of language. Metonymies, as well as metaphors, are grounded in our experiences in the world. We organize our thoughts, actions, attitudes, and language in terms of both metaphor and metonymy (George and Mark, 1980, p. 39). An example of metonymy is: The ham sandwich is waiting for his check, in which the ham sandwich is used to refer to the person ordering the sandwich, rather than to an actual ham sandwich. In this example, it is clear that metonymy is based on association rather than similarity, as mentioned above. In this metonymy, the ham sandwich is associated with, not similar to, the person ordering it. Another example of metonymy is when we use the word bottle instead of water, as in the phrase he drank the whole bottle. In this case, we understand that he drunk the water in the bottle, and not the actual bottle.

Yet other examples are when we use wheels when we refer to car, Sweden when we refer to the Swedish national hockey team, and The White House when we refer to the president of the US (Hans, 2009, p. 118). George and Mark (1980, p. 35) also stress the importance of not confusing metonymies with personifications. With personifications, we impose human qualities on things that are not human, which is not the case with metonymies. In metonymies, such as the one above, the ham sandwich is not ascribed human qualities, but is instead used to refer to an actual person; the person ordering the ham sandwich. Related to metaphor and metonymy is the concept simile. This kind of figurative language is very similar to metaphor, and therefore there is a need to clearly sort out the differences. Hans (2009, p. 114) gives the following examples to illustrate the differences: He is a lion is a metaphor, whereas he is like a lion is a simile. Lindquist also distinguishes between metaphors and similes by stating that metaphors are always untrue. Similes, on the other hand, can be either true or false, and they always contain a word that explicitly shows that there is a comparison, for example, resemble or like, as in the example above. Furthermore, metaphors are considered to be more powerful than similes, since with metaphors you omit the comparison element; it is more powerful to hear that you are something than that you resemble something (Hans, 2009, p. 114).

D. Oscar Wilde and the Short Stories

Oscar Wilde is an author famous during the 19th century. He was born in the year 1854 and died in 1900 as Irish poet. He wrote in different forms in the whole of 1880s, he was to become one of the most popular playwrights at the beginning of 1890s, and therefore it can be said that death robbed the world one of the greatest writers in the world at the beginning of the 20th century. This writer is remembered specifically for the epigrams, the plays as well as the circumstances of the early imprisonment. Some of his work and especially in the 1890s were refined to revolve around supremacy of the art, and more so they were noted to have the themes of decadence, beauty, and duplicity. His writings are of shorter fiction.

Through the analysis of the selected passages in this paper, his linguistic ability is shown clearly in the way he uses metaphor and metonymy when expressing his emphasis. He tried to be the Victorian esthetes and actually tried to write the books or the works that are beautiful both in color and in cadence, and all of his writings are highly fashioned.

E. The Analysis

In cognitive linguistics, there is an emphasis placed on the functional operations of meaning, conceptual processes, and experiences. Metaphor and metonymy are considered conceptual rather than being purely linguistic because "motivation of the metaphor resides at the level of conceptual domains" (Evans and Green 2006, p. 295). Accordingly, metaphor and metonymy are used creatively in the short stories by Oscar Wilde: *Happy Prince, The Selfish Giant, and The Nightingale and the Rose.* Each of the mentioned short stories is analyzed to find metaphor and metonymy, defining their types and functions.

F. Happy Prince

In *Happy Prince,* one conceptual, item is mapped on to, another to make the idea prominent and functional as in:

He flew round and round making silver ripple.

Ripples in the water are not actually silver; only they look like silver; the concept ripples are mapped into silver in that they both have the same appearances. This can be considered structural metaphor.

She (the reed) has no conversation, he (the swallow) said and I'm afraid that she is a coquette, for she is always flittering with the wind

The conversation is a human feature, so this transferred to non-human entity or object that is the reed. Again the "filtering with wind" is a metaphor where the reed as well as the wind are considered humans. Hence, these examples are ontological type where non- human is mapped into human:

The swallow was in love with the most beautiful Reed .... And had been attracted by her slender waist.

Both "in love with" and "slender waist" are basically used for humans but are mapped to the swallow (a bird)

and the reed (a plant). At the same time, "slender waist" is also metonymy for the reed itself since it is an example for part-whole type of metonymy.

> *He was gilded all…. He was very much admired. I am glad there is someone in the world who is quite happy muttered a disappointed man as he gazed at the wonderful statue.*

"He" as a pronoun stands for an animate human referent, but here stands for a statue which is inanimate and not human, that is, the domain of the referent of the statue is mapped onto the human one by metaphor. We can say that there is a hidden metaphor as the statue is a living being and he is also happy. In addition, both "happy" and "dreaming" are concepts used for the statue, that is, the statue is a man, a man, or a prince who is happy. This metaphor is hidden and ontological. The word "someone" is used as metonymy for the statue "happy prince" which is again vague.

> *He looks like an angle.*

Although it is a straightforward simile but can be interpreted as a metaphor. We can say he is an angle. This metaphor conceptually depends on HAPPY IS UP. The statue is high; angles are also high in the sky which is again up. Those who live or are situated in high positions are happy can be considered an example of orientational metaphor.

> *It is winter, answered the swallow, and the chill snow will soon be here.*

"Chill snow" is conceptually metonymy for death because later we see that both the statue and the swallow die.

> *Then the swallow came back to the prince: "you are blind now," he said, so I will always stay with you. I will stay with you always, said the swallow, and he slept at the prince's feet*

The word "blind" is an adjective used for human beings, but it is mapped to non-human area. Hence, it is ontological type of metaphor. Both "always" and "sleep" can be considered as metaphors for death. As indicated by the original metaphor DEATH IS SLEEP and DEATH IS ONE WAY JOURNEY. These are examples of structural metaphor, that is, SLEEP IS AS DEATH.

> *Under the arch way of a bridge two little boys were lying in one another's arms to try to keep themselves warm. "How hungry we are!" they said.*

Both hunger and cold can metaphorically stand for being poor. We can say poor people are cold and hungry; so in a way, it can be considered an example of orientational metaphor in that being cold and hungry is like SAD IS DOWN.

> *I am covered with fine gold … the living always think that gold can make them happy.*

The metaphor GOLD IS HAPPINESS could be in the mind of people at the same time "leaves of gold" is metonymy for richness and it is also metonymy for bread. In both cases, the concrete stands for abstract concept of richness.

> *He is a little better than a beggar.*

There is a hidden metaphor as "he is a beggar" or "the prince is a beggar." How can a statue be a beggar? Again a non-human entity is mapped to human one as an ontological metaphor.

> *"Bring me the two most precious thing in the city," said God.*

The "two most precious things" are metonymy for the heart of the prince and the dead body of the swallow. Similarly, these are metaphors for good charitable people who sacrifice for others and paradise.

> *How wonderful the stars are. How wonderful the power of love.*

Both "love" and "stars" are wonderful since they shine in the sky. There is an example of metaphor which is both structural and orientational. First, love is seen as star and the star is metaphor for love. Hence, star as non-human is taken parallel for love which is human thus, we can say, love is star and can be explained in terms of the metaphor, HAPPY IS UP or BIG IS UP.

> *It is curious, he remarked but I quite warm now, although he is cold. That is because you have done a good action, said the prince.*

A hidden metaphor can arise as good actions make people warm, or good actions make good hearts. This can be an orientational metaphor on the analogy of HAPPY IS UP. We can say people feel happy and warm.

Finally, the clause "I'm going to Egypt" is metaphor for death, for he never goes there but will die as sacrifice and it is based on the metaphor LOVE IS SACRIFICE, as a structural metaphor and the statue of the happy prince also as an agent aiding the departure of the swallow which is travelling on a one way journey based on the structural metaphor DEATH IS ONE WAY JOURNEY (Wilde, 1994).

G. The Selfish Giant

At the beginning, the image of the garden is described:

> *It was a large lovely garden, with soft green grass. Here and there over the grass stand beautiful flowers like stars.*

Here, flowers are mapped into the area of stars, just like stars, flowers are shinning.

> *… and flowers were looking up through the green grass and laughing.*

"Flowers were laughing" is an ontological metaphor where non-human is mapped into human domain and "laughing" is a human activity which is used for flowers. Hence, flowers are used metaphorically as stars and are laughing. Both flowers and stars share the concept of beauty, and as such we can say that flowers are stars.

The garden is a metaphor for "Garden of Eden" which is again a metaphor for "heaven on earth." This can be explained as a complex metaphor as an example of structural metaphor as garden of paradise.

> *My own garden is my own garden.*

This sentence shows that the giant is also a metaphor for selfishness since he takes the garden as his own property alone.

Then when spring came, only in the giant's garden it was still winter:

> *The birds did not care to sing … the trees forgot to blossom …. The beautiful flowers … went to sleep.*

Both the tree and flowers were inactive, so they shared a common feature of inactivity activated by two types of metaphor: Orientational which is SAD IS LOW, and as structural metaphor DEATH IS BROTHER OF SLEEP, and is going to sleep is like death. Hence, here, again we find a complex metaphor. The active agents during the winter are: "the Frost, the Snow, the Hail, and the North wind." The dialogues between the natural phenomena create the

image of coldness of both the weather and the giant's heart. Hence, these natural aspects of winter are metaphors for the giant's heart. Within the description itself, there are examples of ontological metaphor where non-human is mapped onto human using expressions that are used by human beings in:

> The snow covered up the grass with great cloak: the frost painted all the trees silver and the north wind rapped in furs and he roared all day about the garden. The hail was dressed in gray and his breath was like ice.

An example of an ontological metaphor is seen when happiness is mapped onto the natural phenomena through using the word "dance." Hence, the only people who were pleased were the snow, frost, hail, and the north wind since they were dancing in the garden.

Later, the giant's change of heart, his welcome of the children in his garden, mark the alternation of the eternal winter in the garden into spring, when every spring resemble one another, and the same principle can be applied to winter as it is clear in:

> And the giant's heart melted as he looked out ….

Time is conceptualized; each spring marks the birth of plant and animal whereas each winter announces the state of inactivity of both plants and animals (Wilde, 1994, p. 35). This is built on the metaphor LIFE IS SPRING AND DEATH IS WINTER, both of which are examples of structural metaphor.

When the "little boy" reappeared and met the giant for the last time, it is winter except for one spot in the garden (Oscar, 1994, p. 18). The boy's final arrival announces the giant's end since the conceptual metaphor DEATH IS WINTER is applied. The giant and the good boy's departure to the "garden of heaven" is marked with him being covered with white blossoms. White signifies that the good has won. The conceptual metaphors "white is good and black is bad" are functional. Here, both examples of metaphors are of structural type as DEATH IS WINTER and WHITE IS GOOD (Ester, 2011; George and Turner, 1989).

At the end the boy said:

> You let me play in your garden, today, you shall come with me to my garden

The garden is a metaphor for paradise on earth which is also a metaphor for good deeds since people will go to paradise after death. Even death is metaphor for departure and movement to a better place depending on the conceptual metaphors DEATH IS SLEEP, DEATH IS A MOVER, AND MANIPULATOR, DEATH IS WINTER AND LIFE IS SPRING (George and Tunner, 1989, p. 10).

Finally, the "little boy" can be considered a metaphor for the Christ Child who changed the giant to win paradise.

H. The Nightingale and the Rose

From the beginning, we are told that there is no red rose in the student's garden. This (no rose) in the garden can be a metonymy for no place for love in the student's life:

> No red rose in all my garden.

As for metaphor, the student's garden by the basic metaphor EMOTIONS ARE CONTAINERS relate to the student's realm in which there are only books and science. Hence, there is mapping of red rose, love, the garden, and the student's realm. This is complex metaphor where the result is a blend in which the garden devoid of red rose becomes a place that does not give room to sentimental feeling. This metaphor is a type of structural metaphor on EMOTIONS ARE CONTAINERS and LOVE IS A JOURNEY (George and Mark, 2003, 92-96). On another level, the garden, in the end, makes all this function as heterotopia ruled by dispassionateness and dry science (Ester, 2011, p. 253).

There are also metaphors of the ontological type where non-human feature is a mapping to human as in:

> My roses are yellow, … as yellow as the hair of the mermaiden who sits upon an amber throne, and yellower than the daffodil that blooms in the meadow before the mouse comes with a scythe.

Here, the rose is taken as a hair of mermaiden who is made human by sitting on the throne. Love is metaphorically compared to wisdom and power and also taken as birds when colored as flame as in:

> Love is wiser than philosophy, though he is wise, and mightier than power, though he is mighty. Flame-colored as his wings, and colored like flame is his body.

Here, different types of conceptual metaphors are involved. First the structural type of LOVE IS WISE or LOVE IS POWER and depending on EMOTIONS ARE CONTAINERS again is functional. Love has wings and the wings are flame-colored which can be considered as Love is Flame or Love is Fire.

The nightingale sang: (Love that is perfect by death). Again here, there is a structural type of metaphor which is LOVE IS SACRIFICE.

II. Conclusions

1. Metaphor and metonymy are truly presented through linguistic analysis of texts especially literary texts, because they are true representations of natural language.
2. The paper identifies the metaphor and metonymy used by the author as essential linguistic devices for exaggeration or downplays of information and for presentation of salient facts.
3. The three types of conceptual metaphor: Structural, ontological, and orientational are found in the text. Most often they are depending on the general metaphors.
4. Sometimes the metaphors are vague or hidden in the selected texts. Complex metaphor is also used when there is a combination of ontological and structural metaphor or when there is a combination of metaphor and metonymy.
5. Characters conceptualize their love experience in terms of concrete knowledge using source-target domain mapping.
6. The researchers in the analysis coined new metaphors for the short stories LOVE IS SACRIFICE.

References

Dingfang, S. (2000) *Studies in metaphor.* Shanghai: Shanghai Educational Publishing House.

Ester, V. (2011) *Conceptualization of time and space in fairy tales written during the victorian period. California*: University of Rijekcl.

Evans, V. and Green, N. (2006) *Cognitive linguistics: An introduction.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

George, L. and Mark, J. (1980) *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

George, L. and Mark, J. (2003) *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

George, L. and Turner, M. (1989) *More than cool reason. A field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Hans, L. (2009) *Corpus linguistics and the description of english*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Oscar, W. (1994) *Complete works of oscar wilde.* Glasgow: Harper Collin Publisher.

Rita, T. (2000) *Towards new ways of terminology description: The sociocognitive approach*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Roman, J. (1985) *Verbal art verbal sign verbal time.* USA: University of Chicago.

Silvie, V. and Lubin, L. (2005) Approche cognitive de la traduction dans les langues de spécialité: vers une systématisation de la description de la conceptualisation métaphorique. Meta: *Translators' Journal*, 50(2), pp. 415-431.