

The semantic dimensions of metaphor within the framework of interactionist theory: an applied analytical study

Nada Sami Naser^{1*}

¹ Department of Arabic Language, College of Education, Sawa University, Almuthana, Iraq. Email: dr.nada@sawauniversity.edu.iq

Corresponding Author:

Nada Sami Naser^{1*}
Email: dr.nada@sawauniversity.edu.iq

Abstract: Metaphor has long been a preoccupation for thinkers, rhetoricians, and critics. It has been an attractive field due to its role in conveying the text's meaning as a fundamental pillar of discourse. Therefore, the studies aimed to uncover its essence and understand its mechanisms of operation. Despite the differences in viewpoints and starting points, the foundations that traditionally governed the view of metaphor remained constant. Thus, it became associated in our minds as the domain of rhetoricians and writers, and as a linguistic phenomenon in which one word is used in place of another based on the similarity between its two parts. However, the new rhetorical perspective has made metaphor play a communicative role. We live, communicate, and interact with metaphors daily, even if we are unaware of it. Metaphor organizes our knowledge and behaviors, and reveals forms of interaction within society, allowing us to understand its structure and system. To achieve this, most researchers based their approach on the initial acknowledgment that interest in metaphor is, above all, an interest in the human self, as it encompasses the social, ideological, and cultural practices of the self. It reflects his thinking and gives him a framework for understanding things and how they work, because the matter here is deeper than being limited to mere verbal embellishment or a free means, as long as the metaphor is not only related to the verbal or linguistic aspect but is associated with the mind and with the intellectual and speculative relationships that each of the recipient or listener makes. Perhaps one of the most important aspects of interaction is the cognitive theorizing of metaphor, specifically the sum of human physical and environmental interactions with their world. Therefore, he resorts to it to achieve his goals. This aspect remained hidden for a period of time and did not crystallize until the emergence of interactionist theory, which was developed by "Georg Lakoff" and "Mark Johnson". "Especially with the publication of their joint book "Metaphors We Live By," which revolutionized the view of metaphor, its mechanisms, and its essential role in many aspects of our lives, as it made the system that controls us metaphorical by nature. Therefore, this research examines the dimensions of the language of metaphor within cognitive theory. Based on an approach that believes that metaphor is not a property of literature, but rather something that we communicate and live by, and that it is something that can be embodied through our actions and behaviors, we tried to demonstrate this by observing metaphors in interactionist theory, where the general principles of metaphor require going beyond the substitutional approach, so we considered it central to human life. It enables us to understand reality, to form concepts, and to adopt consistent, coherent paths for accomplishing actions, such as promising, threatening, reinforcing, and legitimizing. (1) Therefore, cognitive studies opened new doors for approaching literary texts and infused the study of metaphor with a new spirit that reveals the depth of literary craftsmanship and uncovers the worlds of scholarly writing and its aims. The study of metaphor has transcended its traditional rhetorical aspect and expanded, and is no longer a linguistic phenomenon resulting from a process of substitution or deviation from a literal meaning to a metaphorical sense." Rather, it is a cognitive process inherent in the mind that establishes our conceptual systems and governs our life experience," as Muhammad al-Salih Bu'amrani put it in his book "Theoretical and Applied Studies in Cognitive Semantics" (2), which researchers in this field consider one of the most essential Arabic references in this area. Metaphor is no longer about a word, attribute, or scene; it has become a kind of blending of two worlds and the projection of one onto the other. Meaning is not conveyed through its lexicon and standard tools, but rather through another language, things, meaning, or image of the poetic or prose text, which is based on a metaphorical structure distributed throughout its various parts. From this standpoint, in this research, I examined the manifestations of figurative metaphor in cognitive studies, aiming to clarify its connotations and meanings within the framework of cognitive theory. Therefore, in this research, I will present a framework surrounding the cognitive approach, detailing its internal theoretical variations in addressing metaphorical competence. Consequently, I will study this approach within the framework of George Lakoff's theory and his view of metaphor with his colleague Johnson Mark, as they viewed metaphor differently from what came before, since they assumed the existence of an objective reality that is clearly available;

hence, they proceeded from the notion that the faithful representation of things existing in this reality is the cornerstone of meaning. They concluded that addressing many of these cognitive trends leads us to the conclusion that reality appears so unusual and rich that we cannot represent it completely and in detail by simple means; therefore, our mental frameworks impose limits on the subjects of the world that must be studied and approached within what has been studied and what will be studied. (3). In the last section, I focused on the most prominent researchers who applied this theory within the limits of the perceptions of George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, or slightly beyond them. I concluded the study with a summary of the most important results, hoping that I had succeeded and that success comes from God.

Finally, I cannot claim to have done this research justice. In this scholarly context, I can only quote the words of Imad al-Isfahani: "I have observed that no one writes a book in a single day without saying the next day, 'If only this had been changed, it would have been better,' or 'If only such and such had been added, it would have been more pleasing.'" If he had done this, it would have been better. If he had left it, it would have been more beautiful. This is one of the greatest lessons.

Keywords: metaphor, interactionist theory, rhetoricians, critics

Introduction

The development that modern rhetorical studies have witnessed in the field of understanding metaphor, its mechanisms, and how it is produced and accepted was not a limited scientific leap or an internal, self-generated development made by the science of rhetoric in its old sense, especially in its concern with the beauty of expression. Instead, in the opinion of most researchers, it was the product of a fruitful interaction between the various linguistic sciences. Especially pragmatic linguistics, or what is commonly known among specialists as discourse linguistics (4), or utterance or text linguistics, and other fields of human knowledge, such as constructivist education and cognitive psychology. This development was the fruit of a fruitful intellectual shift from focusing on the beauty of expression in literary discourse—a narrow field that had long burdened rhetorical studies and isolated them from the reality of communicative discourse in general—to focusing on the effectiveness of expression within its broad, living rhetorical contexts and on the paths of its mental construction or its cognitive architecture. From a rhetorical (with a fatha on the kha) and textual perspective, linguistics (5) has reintroduced the epistemological relationship that connects it to rhetoric after its scope expanded and it broke the constraints of the old grammatical study and its alliance with logic. Linguistics has begun to liberate rhetoric from the shackles of the reductionist conception that limits rhetorical study to describing images and metaphors, isolating them from their social, contextual, and discursive dimensions. In recent decades, communication scholars' interest in journalism and audiovisual media has grown.

The publicizing of rhetorical devices had a profound impact on the development of rhetorical studies in its broadest sense—that is, studies that contribute to the production of knowledge. Therefore, the methodology for studying metaphor has undergone two interpretive theories:

- a) The traditional theory
- b) The contemporary theory

The first theory starts from that famous duality (6) that contrasts (truth) and (metaphor), and therefore it depends, according to George Lakoff, on the following pillars: (7)

1. All everyday language is literal, not metaphorical.
2. Every subject can be understood literally, without metaphor.
3. Only literal language can be judged as true or false.
4. All definitions given in a dictionary are literal, not metaphorical.
5. All concepts used in grammar are literal, not metaphorical.

The second theory is the conceptual metaphor theory, as presented in Lakoff's 1993 work, a development within cognitive linguistics that constitutes an approach to organizing and constructing concepts. It is based on refuting these five pillars, starting from the point of moving the phenomenon of metaphorical expression from the area of studying (performance). That is, from viewing it as a linguistic phenomenon, merely a stylistic choice, to viewing it as a cognitive phenomenon related to

how the human mind works in creating its conceptual systems and encoding its cognitive structures and models. Therefore, for Lakoff, metaphor is a mental process inherent in the mind, which establishes our conceptual systems and governs our life experience. This means that metaphor is essentially conceptual in nature, contrary to the belief of many who regard metaphor as a linguistic property that focuses on words rather than on thinking or activity. (8)

We will discuss this in detail in the following sections.

Section One

Firstly/ Contemporary Metaphor Theory of (Laykoff, George, and Johnson, Mark)

The essence of metaphor, according to Laykoff, George and Johnson, lies in its ability to allow understanding (experiencing or suffering) something based on something else (9) It is a mental process that is linked to the essence of the work of thought, as it is related to our activities, our work and our thinking, as it goes beyond the field of language to the field of thought, and through it we perceive the world around us and conduct our experiences in it. As long as our conceptual framework is metaphorical, metaphor remains integral to our daily lives and is not rhetorical, poetic, or aesthetic. We often do not pay attention to it and are almost unaware of it because our conceptual framework is not ordinarily conscious. Therefore, it is not possible to talk about metaphorical language deviating from ordinary language, but rather the norm is metaphor and nothing else. George Lakoff's use of metaphor is not primarily concerned with its ordinary linguistic meaning but with a richer, more complex meaning. It refers to metaphorical frameworks and models; a symbolic model is a way in which our knowledge of a target field is constructed. As a result of transferring its concepts, perceptions, and relationships from another familiar field to us, the source field, metaphor remains a mechanism that operates on the idea of the world, and we perceive the world according to major metaphorical conceptual patterns from which our speech is derived. We use it automatically and spontaneously in our daily lives. Metaphor ultimately becomes a matter of a conceptual system that is always present, whether in the process of production or interpretation. Within this system, metaphor is defined as a product of the interactive process between the individual and his environment, on the one hand, and between the interpreter (the recipient) and the environment of reception, on the other. (10) These two writers are among the most prominent who embodied the interactive experimental tendency in metaphor clearly, as they were able to reveal the dimensions of thematic epistemology, and specifically Aristotelian epistemology, in their joint work entitled "Metaphors We Live By. With this book, they achieved a qualitative leap and a shift at the level of the linguistic and cognitive sciences. The essence of this shift lies in the revolution we declared against the objective tendency based on the idea of correspondence between linguistic symbols and elements of the external world. And so the separation of the body from the environment, only to meet again in a book entitled "Philosophy in the Body: The Challenge of the Body-Mind to Western Philosophy," in which he called for a re-reading of Western thought in its entirety, and the experimental dimension of both includes the kinetic, sensory, emotional, and social dimensions. In addition to these, innate abilities play a central role in organizing the world. The experimental dimension holds that human experience interacts with the elements of the external world; the body is not independent of the mind, and this refutes the positivist view that the meanings of words exist a priori (11). In summary, metaphor, under the interactive empiricism of both George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, can be understood as follows:

Metaphor combines imagination and reason. Among the requirements and necessities of reason are categorical formulation, inference, implication, and deduction. Imagination, in turn, calls for viewing one kind of thing through another, a different kind, which is called metaphorical thought.

Most of our everyday thinking is metaphorical in nature, and metaphorical inferences and implications are inherent in our daily thought processes, making metaphor primarily a mental construct. (12) For both George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, metaphors can either give us life or kill us, and they illustrate this with the following:

A- Metaphors are what we live by:

After metaphor acquired marginal status, was excluded from the study of meaning, and was considered merely an embellishment and an additional power of language, it became the object of disdain and contempt among many thinkers.

For example, Hobbes poured his contempt on metaphor because it carries emotional and sentimental charges that lead to error and slips. He also considered them forms of amusement and frivolity, mere illusions, because they contradict reason. On this basis, he rejected all rhetorical forms as being contrary to reason. John Locke, for his part, considered figurative language, and metaphor in particular, to be enemies of truth and reality. (13) George Lakoff and Mark Johnson stand in opposition to this disdain for metaphor, asserting that we live by metaphor because "language is essentially metaphorical, that is, it changes. Metaphor is an integral part of our normal thought system, and it is the principle that is always present in language." The daily use of metaphor is particularly evident in what is termed "forced metaphor" among children. Metaphor has been considered an essential component of human cognition, as it serves as a mediating bridge that connects children to learning. Although forced metaphor reflects a poor cognitive situation, its regularity among children refutes what is prevalent in Western and Arabic rhetoric, that is, it refutes the idea that the child learns first the real meanings and then learns the metaphorical meanings. Instead, the opposite is true: he assigns metaphorical names to situations and subjects and then learns their literal names. (4) The daily use of metaphor is not limited to children; instead, we use it in our activities, behaviors, and perceptions regularly and spontaneously, as if the matter were not related at all to metaphors. The conceptual framework that governs our lives and thinking is metaphorical. (14) B- Metaphors can kill:

Just as metaphor is of paramount importance in our ordinary intellectual activities, penetrating our existence, giving meaning to our experiences, shaping our perceptions, and even giving us life, It is also capable of killing us, and this is what George Lakoff embodied in his book "The Gulf War or Metaphors That Kill" (Metaphor can kill when it is resorted to and used as an inferential construct to justify war and to explain the attack on humans, Metaphor can kill when it hides the ugly face of war, when it tampers with people's destinies and makes no sense of their suffering (15). There is no better evidence of this than George Lakoff's approach to the study of metaphor in political discourse. Based on the fairy tale characteristics of hero, villain, victim, rescue, defeat and victory, he applied them to three articles: "Bush Sr.'s invasion of Iraq," "The terrorist operations related to the bombing of the Twin Towers in New York," and "Bush Jr.'s second invasion of Iraq and the overthrow of Saddam Hussein's regime." It is well known that politicians work to direct metaphors in ways that serve their goals and to ensure that they provide justifications for their decisions and viewpoints. They are merely extraneous and means to justify various historical scandals, and political texts are usually based on metaphors. Its goal is to distort facts, mislead public awareness, and conceal crimes. This is what makes metaphor a cold-blooded killer. It kills under the guise and cover of metaphorical expressions that transform destruction into construction, and building and killing into liberation. Therefore, metaphor is no longer merely a mechanism by which humans live and interact, but has become a means of war and killing, and of bringing about change on the world map. The approach to the concept of metaphor in George Lakoff's book, "The Gulf War or Metaphors That Kill," is not grounded in perspective or higher theoretical conception, but rather in bringing the concept down to the concrete, immediate, tangible reality. C/ Elements and parties of metaphor according to Lakoff, George, and Johnson, Mark

The experimental interactionist theory of Lakoff, George, and Johnson, Mark, acknowledges the presence of both parties in the metaphor (the source and the target), in contrast to the traditional classical theory, which, with its Aristotelian tendency, posited the presence of one party and the absence of the other.

Metaphor in the interactive perspective arises from the interaction of two active thoughts brought together by a single word or compound. The interaction begins with the observation of common traits at the level of the two active thoughts. A unit is formed by their interaction, which brings them together; this is not based on the idea of transfer. The unity resulting from the interaction is not merely the simple addition of the two parties to each other, but rather a mental one, in which both the

different and the similar are considered. The whole then becomes what forms the unity. Based on this foundation, unusual phenomena are viewed through the lens of the usual, and we can also examine the normal with a new perspective.

Metaphor, under the interactive empirical approach, does not rely on a priori similarity that exists independently of an individual's experience with their environment, as in the Aristotelian positivist approach. Lakoff and Johnson refute this idea, arguing that similarity is creative, driven by an innate human ability that can provide forms and images for data about the external world. This is because humans do not come into existence as blank slates; instead, experience organizes and shapes them. For them, metaphor does not rely on similarity as much as on linking, which is the process of establishing cross-domain connections between two domains, one the target and the other the source.

D/ Contrast and adjacency in metaphor

Metaphor is not limited to similarity; according to Lakoff and Johnson, contrast and adjacency also play roles in it. We should not view similarity techniques merely as stylistic embellishments or linguistic luxury, but rather as spontaneous and instinctive expressive methods that reflect the essence of human beings. Children often resort to similarity to overcome communicative blocks; this tendency is evident in the language of ordinary people, whose spontaneous, continuous, and instinctive use of similes and metaphors reflects it. Based on the above, we identify dead metaphors, which are metaphors whose origins have been forgotten. We also find forced metaphors in children, reflecting a desire for economy, as well as radical metaphors that we often do not notice as metaphorical. Consequently, researchers in this field argue that humans are inherently metaphorical beings. The uniqueness of the creative individual is evident in their ability to fully exploit the principle of similarity through condensation, intentional connection, and the combination of disparate and distant elements. The cognitive perspective views linguistic similarity as a projection of conceptual similarity, whereby we notice metaphors in structures that do not appear to relate to metaphorical concepts at first glance. This is clearly embodied in George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's account of the situational, directional, ontological, and structural metaphor. 19)

Secondly, the types of metaphors according to George and Mark

Lakoff, George, and Johnson, Mark divide metaphor into two categories:

Situational metaphor

Metaphor of the creative type

And each of these two sections branches into other types within them, and we will explain the types of each section as follows:

The situational metaphor

According to Lakoff and Johnson, this type of metaphor lies in the metaphorical nature of language and in human conceptual structure. It is the foundation of any metaphorical process, as it is intertwined with our daily lives, where it is often not perceived but rather treated as mere direct descriptions of mental phenomena.

In addition, they belong to a commonly accepted cognitive framework, meaning they are viewed within that framework as they operate within the space of a known and circulated cognitive system. This led Lakoff and Johnson to refer to them as conventional or established metaphors. They include several types, such as directional, ontological, and structural metaphors, and are treated as facts within the conceptual framework. Their definition is as follows:

-Directional metaphors:

The researchers call this type of metaphor directional because most of them involve spatial directions (up, down, out, in, front, behind, etc.). These spatial directions derive from the human body's position and its operation within the physical environment. This type of metaphor gives a spatial orientation to our conceptual framework, as evident from some well-known and common expressions,

such as saying:

That (happiness is above).

In this phrase, the concept of happiness is directed upward, and this may be justified by expressions such as "I feel like I'm on top of the world today." We find that the directional metaphor is grounded in our physical and cultural experiences of being above. To clarify how these metaphors work, the researchers presented concepts such as:

Happiness is above, misery is below, more is above, and less is below. And the representation of that is as follows:

Happiness is above, misery is below, which means:

(I am on top of the world - He lifted my spirits. - My spirits fell. - Thinking about it throws me into an abyss. - I feel like I'm falling. - He is at rock bottom these days.) I am devastated - I have fallen into an undesirable situation. He is sinking into misery.

These phrases indicate that the concept of misery in the physical realm is associated with the word "below." In contrast, the idea of happiness in the physical realm is related to the term "above." This is because the position of falling is associated with misery and collapse, whereas the position of standing is associated with a positive emotional state.

And from other conceptual phrases, the words (more above and less below) are represented as follows:

The number of printed books has not stopped increasing every year - my earnings rose last year, the volume of artistic activities in this state has decreased - the number of mistakes made is very low - his profits have dropped this year - if you feel hot, lower the heating power, and other phrases that subject humans to the experience of spatial directions physically, which lie in the spatial orientations that directly emerge with our internal and external environment.

Directional metaphors, also called preferential metaphors, are metaphorical uses of words directly related to direction. Most of them are associated with spatial directions: high, low, inside, outside, front, back, above, below, deep, shallow, central, and peripheral. These spatial directions stem from the fact that our bodies possess them; thus, they give perceptions a spatial form based on a physical nature that varies from one culture to another, in terms of thought and the intended meanings derived from the words used in a particular society or nation. 20)

In summary, drawing on the aforementioned examples that represent metaphorical concepts from a direct (up-down) perspective, along with their corresponding linguistic expressions, as presented by Lakoff and Johnson, most, if not all, of our thoughts and experiences are primarily metaphorical. Accordingly, the phrase "I am on top" denotes "I am happy," a figurative expression with an upward spatial orientation that conveys optimism, relief, and joy. This idea has a counterpart in the negative aspects of the downward spatial domain, which means "below," such as "I feel like I am falling," which can mean "I am sad," and these concepts derive from sorrow and grief. (21)

Some researchers have noted that these perceptions may contain errors because directions in other cultures may have different meanings. For instance, "up" might express the opposite of happiness, as stated in the verse:

﴿So whoever Allah wills to guide, He expands his breast to Islam; and whoever He wills to misguide, He makes his breast constricted, as tho he was climbing into the sky. Thus, Allah places defilement upon those who do not believe. {Al-An'am, verse 10

Through the interpretation of this noble verse, it becomes clear that it is not necessarily the case that the higher or upper always indicates a positive matter; it may express the opposite. This is what the interpreters said: this is a metaphor struck by God for the heart of this disbeliever, in its extreme constriction in receiving faith. His example of refusing to accept faith, and his constriction at its arrival, are like his refusal to ascend to the sky and his inability to do so. 22)

The statement suggests that the directional metaphor (up-down) proposed by Lakoff and Johnson may not hold in certain respects across cultures, including Islamic cultures.

- Structural metaphors

It lies in constructing less clear conceptual frameworks from clearer ones, such as our construction of the language system, which is less clear, based on the housing system, which is clearer. Its goal is to organize our conceptual framework by highlighting aspects of experience that align with that metaphor and concealing others that could align with it in different cultures. The researchers refer to this pattern as a structural metaphor.

From here, the authors argue that structural metaphor is the construction of our metaphors based on another conceptual framework. For example, we constructed the debate framework using the war metaphor (debate is war), placing debate on the same level as war. The similarity is that the discussion intensifies between two people on a particular issue, at which point each defends their own position. Thus, the outcome is either victory, defeat, or a truce. This is what the authors expressed in many phrases commonly used among people in their daily lives, such as:

The argument is free - you can't defend your claims - his criticisms hit the mark - I have never won an argument against him.

Lakoff and Johnson conceptualized argument as a form of war. They borrowed war terminology for discussions because, in an argument about a particular topic, the person with whom we are arguing can either defeat us or we can defeat them. Thus, we are compelled to defend ourselves with a counterattack, and in this way, a verbal battle becomes an argument or discussion in the language of war.

War phrases include: "So-and-so attacked us" and "His ideas are easy to defeat." Lakoff sees

We discuss argumentation only in terms of war, and we may win or lose. The person we argue with is considered an adversary; we attack their positions and defend our own, winning and losing positions.

We devise strategies and implement them. A large part of what we do during an argument is built on the concept of war. If we don't find a real physical battle, we find a verbal one. The structure of the argument reflects this, and thus, the metaphor of argument as war in our culture, which we live by, shapes the activities we engage in when we argue. (24)

-Ontological metaphors

It lies in the construction of abstract systems and subjects derived from physical systems or tangible objects. In this, abstract subjects or things not directly perceived, such as philosophy and wisdom, or emotions like love and anger, are treated as tangible material things. They are constantly present in our thinking to the extent that we deal with them as mere assumptions and axioms, which we can judge as true or false. The researchers refer to this type as an ontological metaphor.

As is the case with the metaphor "love is a journey" and "time is money," through the metaphorical expressions present and linked in our daily lives, which represent a systematic way that contributes to the study of the nature of metaphorical concepts, such as their saying in "time and money" metaphorical expressions as follows:

You are wasting my time.

This process will make you gain hours and hours.

I don't have time to give you.

How do you manage your time balance?

It took me a whole hour to fix this wheel (26)

.An example of such a metaphor is their saying (love is a journey), represented as follows:

Love as a journey - the lovers resemble travelers - the love relationship resembles the vehicle - the common goals of the lovers resemble the common stops on their journey - the difficulties in the relationship resemble travel obstacles (27).

This means that the writers' metaphor helps us understand several ambiguous and widely discussed concepts in everyday life.

- Creative non-positional metaphors

These are metaphors that lie outside our standard conceptual framework. They are based primarily on creating new relationships between subjects and include every metaphor with an aesthetic, artistic character. And creatively, whether at the level of poetic, philosophical, prose, political, and other discourses, non-positional metaphors are based on investing the faculty of similarity to enter new worlds and work on building virgin and new unprecedented relationships between subjects, by going beyond ready-made and mummified rhetorical patterns. Any going beyond the regurgitation of previously available metaphorical stock, and creating infinitely new semantic combinations between the consumed metaphors, as long as the metaphor for authors is based on an interactive relationship, the environmental, ideological, and cultural environment plays a vital role in creating new metaphors that are based on unprecedented relationships and connections between subjects and situations. Where are similarities found between different and disparate subjects, and that is what allows for the emergence of a new understanding that sheds light on the phenomenon of semantic creativity (28)

The most prominent figures who applied the conceptual metaphor theory and its applications in modern linguistics.

Metaphor has been studied in modern linguistics within various theories, and the most important of these theories is the interactive cognitive theory. This theory, proposed by new rhetoricians, is considered an alternative to traditional studies for studying meaning and overcomes their shortcomings. The origins of this theory can be traced back to Richards.

Who laid its framework (Richards)

The general framework is in his book "Philosophy of Rhetoric." This theory found wide resonance among rhetoricians.

Who is considered one of the most famous, who expanded on it, such as Max Black

(George Lakoff) and Paul Ricoeur

(Umberto Eco) and Umberto Eco (Mark Johnson) and Mark Johnson

Especially since this theory offers new ideas about the interactive construction of meaning, and it relies on two main elements (30).

First: on the ideas of cognitive psychology, which studies how memory retains information and uses it when needed.

Secondly, drawing on the ideas of Gestalt psychology, a psychological school that focuses on perception and behavior based on humans' responses to units or a complete image, taking into account the alignment of psychological and physiological events. Rhetoricians argue that the semantic perspective introduced by Richards is essential for moving beyond the "nominal definition" that prevailed in the traditional rhetorical perspective to the "realistic definition," which explains how metaphorical meaning is produced and received. 32)

Max Black is widely regarded as one of the most prominent advocates of the interactionist theory of metaphor. He discussed it in his book "Models and Metaphors," preferring it to other theories and raising a series of questions concerning the concept and nature of metaphor. He distinguished at the level of metaphor between what he called the word:

That is, the rest of the sentence (frame) and what he called the focus word (focus), the focal word.

The semantic dimensions of metaphor within the
framework of interactionist theory: an applied
analytical study

He confirmed that the focal word relinquishes specific characteristics to acquire others, and the frame, in turn, loses certain traits and develops others as a result of the interaction between the focus and the frame. When we say "Zaid is a lion," the lion loses some of its animal characteristics to acquire human traits, and Zaid likewise loses some of his human traits to acquire animal characteristics. The interaction arises from common traits between the two active thoughts, after which a unity emerges that encompasses both, born of that interaction. In this unity, both the similar and the different are taken into account, and the idea that results from the interaction is not merely the addition of one side to another, but relatively a new and generative concept.

Max Black provided an example that lies in: "The president exploded during the discussion," where he acknowledged that the word used metaphorically is "exploded," which is the focal word. In contrast, the rest of the sentence, at least, appears as "the president during the discussion," which represents the frame. He pointed out that the previous metaphor can be translated into other languages without losing its metaphorical meaning, because the metaphor is sensory and relates to meaning rather than to phonetic, spelling, grammatical, or syntactic aspects. From this perspective, it gains its legitimacy(34).

Max Black focused on the issue of metaphorical overlap and favored it over the concept of the substitution theory, starting from the idea that when we use a particular metaphor, we are dealing with two dynamic and different ideas at the same time, both based on a single word, and their meanings arise from their overlap. The focal word acquires a new meaning that differs from its original, and the new context (the metaphorical frame) expands its meaning. He also pointed out that the success of the metaphor depends on the reader's awareness of the word's extension and expansion. The reader is compelled to acknowledge both the old and new meanings simultaneously and connect them (the two ideas) with each other. The secret of the metaphor lies in the connection between these two meanings. 35)

Ivor Armstrong Richards (I.A. Richards) is considered.

The author of "The Philosophy of Rhetoric" represents a pivotal moment in the history of rhetorical thought in general, and metaphor in particular. He announced a break with traditional rhetorical approaches, aiming to dismantle the myth of fixed and intended meaning, in which a word has a stable, unchanging meaning regardless of use or context, thereby positing a single, definitive meaning for a term. Richards' work is considered pioneering among linguists because he recognized the weaknesses in the traditional problematic.

Richards asserts that metaphor is constant in language and that any ordinary conversation cannot be devoid of metaphor. Even in the field of dry sciences, it cannot be dispensed with, and its use increases in the realm of philosophy. The deeper we delve into abstraction, the more we rely on metaphor. And if metaphor, under the Aristotelian positivist tendency, is a verbal matter or a matter of transfer and substitution, then according to him, it is relationships and metaphors between ideas. It is an exchange process between texts, as that has a metaphorical nature, and according to this. The basis from which metaphors emerge in language.

Richards introduced two terms to distinguish the two sides of the metaphor: the tenor and the vehicle. Although he initially viewed the metaphor as ornamentation, with the tenor as the primary focus, he emphasized two points: first, meaning arises from the interaction between the tenor and the vehicle.

The second: The vehicle should not be considered merely an ornament for the tenor, as the cooperation and conjunction of both the tenor and the vehicle

The second: The carrier should not be considered merely an ornament for the content, as the cooperation and union of both the content and the carrier generate a meaning with multiple powers that cannot be attributed to either of them separately. And the bearer gives birth to a meaning with various powers that cannot be attributed to either of them separately.

Richards asserts that, at the level of metaphor, we can discern similarity either easily or with difficulty. He divided metaphors, in his view, into two categories:

- The first type is based on a nearly direct relationship between the two sides of the metaphor: He provided an example in "table legs," which he considers a dead metaphor. The difference between the previous phrase and the phrase "horse legs" lies in the fact that table legs possess some characteristics of horse legs, but table legs hold and do not walk on them. The common characteristics in this context are called the ground or basis.

- The second type is based on the existence of a shared stance taken toward the two parties forming the metaphor, and the example

The example provided by Richards, in this regard, lies in: "the girl is a duck," as it seems futile to search for the fundamental similarity between the girl and the duck, since the girl cannot be called a duck because she does not have a beak or legs like a duck. Moreover, as much as metaphor is based on similarity, it is also based on contrast and difference. The more distant the elements of the metaphor are, the stronger the association becomes (36).

Among the supporters of this theory is Paul Ricoeur.

Paul acknowledged that metaphor pertains to the science of sentence semantics and does not relate to the science of word semantics. It is a phenomenon of attribution, not of naming, as it only acquires meaning within discourse. When we say "the shroud of sorrows" or "blue prayer," we encounter two words that are in tension, and their combination constitutes the metaphor. Thus, for Paul Ricoeur, metaphor becomes the result of the tension that unites two words in a metaphorical statement. The tension we find in the statement or metaphorical utterance does not stop at the two words; it extends to the tension linking the two opposing interpretations of the statement, which nourishes the metaphor. He acknowledged that the revelation of the disparity only occurs after interpreting the statement literally. Sadness is not a cover if we consider a cover to be a piece of fabric, nor can prayer be considered blue if blue is regarded as a color. Thus, metaphor does not exist in itself but rather exists in interpretation and through it

Paul Ricoeur affirmed that metaphor does not rely on similarity, but rather fundamentally involves a compression of the shock generated by the collision of two contradictory ideas. He also noted that metaphors establish new, unprecedented semantic relationships that did not previously exist. For instance, when Shakespeare writes, "Time is a beggar," he invites us to regard time as a beggar. The degree of tension between the two parties is very vast, and the work of similarity lies in the meeting of these two distant parties.

Paul Ricoeur reached a conclusion indicating that two opposing cases should be accepted regarding

The relationship between metaphors and symbols is as follows:

A- In metaphor more than in symbol: Metaphor enriches language with an implicit semiotic science for symbols, and the mixed matters in the symbol are clarified in light of the tension of the metaphorical utterance.

B- In the symbol more than in the metaphor: The metaphor is nothing but a strange form of attribution, merely a linguistic procedure, containing within it a symbolic power. The symbol remains a two-dimensional phenomenon, where the semantic aspect refers to the non-semantic aspect. The emblem is constrained while the metaphor is unconstrained. Moreover, symbols have roots that lead us into mysterious experiences of power, while metaphors are merely linguistic surfaces of symbols. In its strength, the metaphor establishes a connection between the semantic surfaces and the pre-semantic surfaces in the depths of human experience through the symbol's two-dimensional structure. In summary, according to Paul Ricoeur, metaphor has greater emotional value and also provides new information.

New, thereby enhancing its status within the framework of interactionist theory. 37)

In conclusion of this research, after we provided a definition of conceptual metaphor according to the interactive cognitive theory, and then detailed the founders of this theory, and highlighted those who established, applied, and advocated for it, we found that metaphor, according to this conception,

is not only related to language or words but that human thought processes are largely metaphorical. This is what is meant by saying that the human conceptual system is metaphorically structured and defined.

To determine the metaphorical structure governing this system, metaphors were classified into ontological, structural, and directional categories to facilitate the identification and observation of figurative aspects of words or actions. Specifically, recent studies have shown that metaphor has an extraordinary ability to connect two conceptual systems that are usually unrelated. This connection is based on a similarity that may exist between the two conceptual systems; if it does not, the conceptual metaphor creates it and imposes it.

- 1- See: The Metaphorical Concept of Path Structure in the Arabic Language, p. 128
- 2- See: Theoretical and Applied Studies in Cognitive Semantics, p. 126
- 3- See: The Metaphors We Live By, p. 22
- 4- See: The Cognitive Theory and Its Impact on Rhetorical Studies. p. 815 and see: Theoretical and Applied Studies in the Science of Mystical Semantics, p. 237
- 5- The Arts and Sciences of the Text, 174
- 6- See: Al-Balagha Al-Wadihah, p. 75
- 7- See "Metaphor in the Light of the Interactionist Theory," pp. 31-34; a reading of the book "Metaphors We Live By," pp. 197-200, and the book "Metaphors We Live By," pp. 10-11.
- 8- The same sources, and see: The Metaphorical Concept of Path Structure in Arabic (pp. 128-129)
- 9- See: The Metaphors We Live By, p. 23
- 10- See: the same source
- 11- See: Lakoff, George, and Johnson, Mark, Metaphors We Live By, pp. 10-11, and a reading of the book (Metaphors We Live By), p. 197, and Metaphors and Modern Arabic Poetry, p. 20, quoted from Metaphor in the Light of Interaction Theory / 32
- 12- See: The Gulf War or the Metaphors That Kill, quoted from the article "From the Gulf War to September 11... Metaphors That Kill," Al-Sharq Al-Awsat newspaper. Killer metaphors, Al-Sharq Al-Awsat newspaper <https://archive.aawsat.com/details.asp?article=358940&issueno=10004#.XfXqA4NvbIU>
- 13- See: The Metaphors We Live By, pp. 184-185, and a review of the book The Metaphors We Live By and Beyond, pp. 200 and beyond.
- 14- The same source, p. 65
- 15- The Gulf War or Metaphors That Kill, p. 5, quoted in Metaphor Under Interactionist Theory, p. 34
- 16- See: Structures of Similarity in the Arabic Language, p. 63, and Metaphors that Kill, p. 13, and the Interactional Theory, p. 40.
- 17- See: Metaphors that Kill, p. 75, and Interactionism, p. 41.
- 18- See: Structures of Similarity in the Arabic Language, p. 64, quoted from Metaphor in Interactive Theory, p. 41
- 19- See "The Metaphors We Live By," pp. 8-9-22
- 20- The same source, pages 34-37

21- See: Ibn Kathir's Tafsir 2/159 and see: The Concept of Metaphor by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, p. 21

22- See: The Metaphors We Live By, p. 121

23- The same source

24- The same source, p. 48

25- The same source, p. 25

26- The same source

27- See: Structures of Similarity in the Arabic Language, p. 64

28- The other theories that studied metaphor within modern linguistics are four theories (substitutive, interactive, contextual, and intuitive).

29- See: Structures of Similarity in the Arabic Language, p. 87

30- Gestalt: A form or image of integrated natural, physical, biological, or psychological phenomena, such that the functional unit (i.e., the perceived object) possesses characteristics that cannot be derived from its parts merely by combining them. "See: George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, Metaphors We Live By, p. 88."

31- See: Rhetoric of Discourse and Text Science, p. 139

32- See: Metaphor in Modern Literary Criticism, pp. 129-130

33- See: the same source

34- See: Concepts of Text Linguistics and Discourse Analysis in the Miraculous Signs by Abdul Qahir Al-Jurjani (116-149) and the Proceedings of the Symposium on Abdul Qahir Al-Jurjani, Publications of the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Dr. D., Dar Muhammad Al-Hami for Publishing, University of Sfax, Tunisia, 1998, p. 108

35- See: The Philosophy of Rhetoric, pp. 90-91, 100-101

36- See: The Theory of Interpretation and Excess Meaning, pp. (94-102)

References

- The Metaphors We Live By, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, translated by Abdul Majid Juhfa, 1st edition 1996 and 2nd edition 2009, Toubkal Publishing House
- Metaphor in Modern Literary Criticism, Dr. Youssef Abu Al-Adous, Al-Ahlia Publications, Amman, 1997, 1st edition
- Clear Rhetoric, Ali Al-Jarim and Mustafa Amin, Dar Al-Ma'arif, 1999
- Rhetoric of Discourse and Text Science, Dr. Salah Fadl, Knowledge World, 1992
- Structures of Similarity in Arabic (A Cognitive Approach), Saleem Abdul Ilah, Toubkal Publishing House, Casablanca - Morocco, 1st edition – 2001
- Tafsir Ibn Kathir, 1st edition, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyyah, Beirut-Lebanon (n.d.)
- Theoretical and Applied Studies in Gnostic Semantics, Mohamed Saleh Bou Omrani, 1st edition 2009, Aladdin Library – Sfax
- The Philosophy of Rhetoric, Ivor. Armstrong Richards, translated by Said Al-Ghanimi, Ph.D. Nasser Halawi, Africa East - Morocco 2002
- The Arts and Sciences of Text, François Rastier, translated by Idriss Elkhatab, Toubkal Publishing House, Casablanca, 1st edition, 2010
- A reading of the book "Metaphors We Live By" by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, Omar Ben Dahman, University of Tizi-Ouzou
- The Theory of Interpretation: Discourse and Surplus Meaning, Paul Ricoeur, translated by Said Elghami, Arab

The semantic dimensions of metaphor within the
framework of interactionist theory: an applied
analytical study

Cultural Center – Casablanca – Morocco, 2nd edition 2006

- The Cognitive Theory and Its Impact on Rhetorical Studies (Metaphor as a Model)

Prof. Dr. Saleh bin Al-Hadi Ramadan, Symposium on Rhetorical Studies – Reality and Aspiration 1422 AH

Theses

- Metaphor in the Light of Interactionist Theory (Why Did You Leave the Horse Alone) by Mahmoud Darwish as a Model – Master's Thesis – by researcher Jamila Retous – Faculty of Arts – Arabic Language – Mouloud Mammeri University, Tizi Ouzou

- The Rhetoric of Discourse and the Science of Text by Salah Fadl, a Study in Criticism of Criticism, prepared by the student Wahiba Ben Qati, 2015-2016, Master's Thesis – Arab Ben Mehidi University – Oum El Bouaghi

- Concepts of Text Linguistics and Discourse Analysis in "The Miraculous Signs" by Abdul Qahir Al-Jurjani (A Study in the Light of Terminology Science) - Master's Thesis - 2010-2011, Faculty of Arts - University of Badji Mokhtar, Algeria - by the student Soumia Abrir

- The concept of metaphor according to George Lakoff and Mark Johnson thru their book "Metaphors We Live By" as a model

- Master's thesis – prepared by students Saida Zekraoui and Bahia Bouzleha – Faculty of Arts – Akli Mohand Oulhadj University, Algeria

Journals

- The Imagination of Abd al-Qahir al-Jurjani, Proceedings of the Abd al-Qahir al-Jurjani Symposium – Faculty of Arts and Humanities in Sfax – Tunisia – Mahyeddine Hamdi - 1998 – Sfax – Conference Proceedings

- The Metaphorical Concept of Path Structure in the Arabic Language – Abdul Ali Al-Amri – Journal of Arabic Linguistics – Issue 2, March 2016, Jumada al-Thani 1437 AH