



## Research Article

© 2023 Deda Ndoja et al.  
This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons  
Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License  
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Received: 16 July 2023 / Accepted: 7 October 2023 / Published: 5 November 2023

# The Conceptual Metaphor and the Need to Identify It in the Albanian Literary Corpus

Albana Deda Ndoja<sup>1</sup>

Monika Hasani Hoshafi<sup>2</sup>

Monica Genesin<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Prof. As.,  
Department of Linguistics,  
Faculty of History and Philology,  
University of Tirana, S  
heshi Nënë Tereza 4,  
Tiranë 1010, Albania

<sup>2</sup>Prof. As.,  
Faculty of Human Sciences and Law,  
"Ismail Qemali" University,  
Skelë, Rruga Kosova,  
Vlorë 9401, Albania

<sup>3</sup>Prof. As.,  
Piazza Tancredi, 7, 73100,  
Lecce, Italy

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2023-0158>

## Abstract

*In Albanian pre-university and university literature, a cacophony of viewpoints can be observed regarding the concept of literary figuration in general and the metaphor in particular (especially in the pre-university system, where we encounter some of the strangest definitions). In this paper, we have focused on the concept of metaphor in Albanian tradition studies first, approaching these concepts contrastively. Then we have dealt with the concept of conceptual metaphor, an approach from a psycholinguistic point of view (more precisely neurolinguistic recently), which has taken place even in the most representative manuals of stylistics and which, in our opinion, offers several advantages in the identification of conceptual metaphor in literary text (and not only). The concept of conceptual metaphor and the reflection of the most recent treatments of it will be the main aim of this unit. We intend to do this since there is a lack of treatments related to conceptual metaphors in Albanian literature. Such a fact has created a gap in the prescription of the mental and cohesive identification of primary and conceptual metaphors in everyday life, as well as in literature. We consider the fact that it is a theory that has its origin and the largest number of treatments connected with the metaphor of everyday life, that is, of ordinary discourse, since it is seen as an important part of the conceptual and structural formatting of man. The article will provide examples of the Albanian corpus, specifically of ordinary speech, idioms, and the literary corpus.*

**Keywords:** conceptual metaphor, embodied cognition, figure, trope, primary metaphor, semantic role

## 1. Introduction

There are many studies related to metaphors. Likewise, today the approaches related to it are some which are clearly distinguished from the traditional treatment, however, in Albanian literature these types of approaches are very little known and have been applied very little in the literary and non-literary corpus. For this reason, after consulting most of the studies related to Albanian, we decided to bring the cognitivist concept of conceptual metaphor to this paper. This concept has its origins in the last century but since the publication of the book "Metaphors We Live By" by Lakoff & Johnson (1980), many articles and books have been published in this field, expanding the concept and its application.

The paper will first present a description of the concept of conceptual metaphor and the main authors who have dealt with it. In the following, conceptual frameworks are already identified by different authors and appear in many codes alike, taking the status of universal conceptual maps.

In this context, the paper will also note the normal coincidence of many conceptual maps found both in Albanian and in other communication codes. The construction apparatus of many primary metaphors also appears the same or similar. In addition to the analytical description of the theory, we aim to give it in a comparative way between the conceptual mapping identified for other codes and those found in Albanian.

We judge that the concept of conceptual metaphor is a good way of approaching the identification of the process of human communication in the first place, as it is seen as the mental property of man and is an important part of his daily communication. On the other hand, the identification of conceptual maps creates opportunities for analysis and interpretation of many typologies of human behavior and communication in general and Albanian in particular.

We want to emphasize that this concept has also been applied in literature and has given very good results. We must remember that until recently in Albanian studies, metaphor has been seen as a cohesive ornament, simply being identified in certain lexical categories, without giving precise definitions for how it was constructed and especially for the conceptual domains that had realized it. The application of this approach in this corpus is seen as a necessity by us.

Regarding our study, we will refer to authors such as Justin Rrota (1925), Jakov Xoxa (1965), the Explanatory Dictionary of Literary Terminology (1972), and Xhevat Lloshi (2002).

Regarding foreign studies, we consulted Reddy (1979), Lakoff & Johnson (1980), Lakoff (1992, 2014), Lakoff & Turner (1989), Köveches (2017, 2018, 2020), Gibbs (1994), M. Turnier and G. Fauconier (1998), Rasse, Onysko, and Citron (2020), etc.

## 2. Methodology

As we saw from the presentation above, the main aim of this paper is to present the concept of conceptual metaphor, Embodied Cognitive Theory, and their application in the Albanian corpus. To achieve such a goal, we first used the descriptive method, through which we first clarified the concept of metaphor in the traditional context and then the concept of conceptual metaphor in the cognitive aspect. Throughout this presentation, in addition to the description, we have approached and analyzed different approaches and perspectives regarding the concept of metaphor in various authors found in Albanian literature (Rrota, Xoxa, Lloshi, etc.). We have done the same with the conceptions of different authors regarding the concept of conceptual metaphor. Such a typology of work has allowed the work to be built not simply based on the descriptive method, but also the approach and analytical one. Likewise, the theoretical concepts have all been applied to the Albanian corpus to prove the value of this theory in the Albanian corpus as well.

### 3. The Concept of Metaphor

#### 3.1 The Metaphor in Albanian Tradition Studies

If one consults the literature related to the use of metaphor, as well as all literary devices, it is obvious that the number of studies is relatively small, and generally the latter has been considered in the applicative aspect, i.e., in relation to the concrete use by a specific author of these the figures.

On the other hand, it is noted that generally, the studies regarding the metaphor are in the traditional classical framework (although this statement is to be taken with reservation if one notices the studies that have been performed in the foreign literature).

Thus, it is easily discernible that until recently, with some rare exceptions<sup>1</sup>, the Aristotelian influence has been dominant in the conception of definition regarding the metaphor.

We recall that Aristotle<sup>2</sup> defines the metaphor as: "Metaphor (*metaphora*) consists in giving (*epiphora*) a name (*onomatos*) to something, which belongs to something else (*allogriou*), the transition is either from genus to species (*or tou genous epi in eidos*), or from species to genus (*or tou eidous epi in genos*), or from species to species (*or tou eidous epi in eidos*), or by analogy (*ê kata in analogon*)." (Poetics 1457b6–9). (It is not in the focus of this paper to deal with the various translations of this fragment and the terms found in it, nor with the semantics of the terms or with the debates over their meanings). In this paper we will adhere to the concept of transferring the designation of a unit, or element, of a group to another unit/element, group.).

Let's get back to our study. In this context, some definitions are brought to attention:

- **Justin Rrota:** *Metafora është njai trop, qi trajtohet, tuj përdorë nji fjalë në vënd të njaj tjetre, mjaft qi të pergiten ndo'i fare me vështrim. Kështu thomi: Në rrânxë të malit. Lulja e djelmnis. Mos ther me fjalë. Na e çave kryet. Pjetri është gacë e mbëlueme. Të këndofët zëmra. Dera e Gjomarkajve. Mos e ha fjalën. I vëlon idhnimi. Asht tuj u grë, e tuj zie veti me veti.:(1925).* (Metaphor is a trope, which is treated using one word instead of another, enough to have some similarity. Thus, we say: *In the bottom of the mountain. Youth blossom. Don't kill with words. Don't break my head -you're annoying me. May your heart sing. Gjomarkaj's Door. Don't eat your words. Boiling with rage. He is fighting with himself.*)
- **Jakov Xoxa:** *Metaphor is therefore a type of trope, which carries the characteristics of one phenomenon over another phenomenon, thanks to a comparison that is made in our mind (1965).*
- **Explanatory Dictionary of Literary Terms:** *metaphor-a (Gr. Metaphorá- transfer): "It is one of the main tropes that gives a word the meaning of another word. The expressions "smiling nature", "my heart cries", "bright future", "Will of Steel" are metaphorical expressions because the verbs laugh, cry and the adjectives bright, steel are used with a figurative meaning. The metaphor, just like the simile, is based on comparison relationships, but while in the latter they make a simple comparison ("You are beautiful as the sun"), in the metaphor an identification with the thing itself is created (You are a sun). Thus, in the metaphor, the abstract idea (beauty) is replaced by a concrete figure, more alive and expressive (the sun) that*

---

<sup>1</sup> E. Skenderi, 2019; Steel, 2019; Idrizi & Çeliku: 2022, these authors deal more with the applicative concept in political discourse and to some extent Çeliku idioms.

<sup>2</sup> Metaphor (*metaphora*) consists in giving (*epiphora*) the thing a name (*onomatos*) that belongs to something else (*allogriou*), the transference being either from genus to species (*apo tou genous epi to eidos*), or from species to genus (*apo tou eidous epi to genos*), or from species to species (*apo tou eidous epi to eidos*), or on the grounds of analogy (*ê kata to analogon*). La métaphore (*metaphora*) est le transport (*epiphora*) à une chose d'un nom (*onomatos*) qui en désigne une autre (*allogriou*), transport du genre à l'espèce (*apo tou genous epi to eidos*) ou de l'espèce au genre (*apo tou eidous epi to genos*) ou de l'espèce à l'espèce (*apo tou eidous epi to eidos*) ou d'après le rapport d'analogie (*ê kata to analogon*). Poetics 1457b6–9 D.F.Kenedy, 2010 <https://academic.oup.com/book/34301/chapter/290873576>

leaves it stronger than a simple comparison (1972).

- **Xhevat Lloshi:** Tropes as tools of the author's expression also bring avoidance of direct naming, but they make a strong impression, especially when they are original. Avoidance means a shift against reference, but it can also be a change in the semantics of the word, as well as a combination of both processes (Lloshi, 2002).

It is evident in these definitions the concept of transference is found in the signification of the term metaphor itself (metaphor in Greek transfer/shift) and its Aristotelian definition.

Except for the definition of Justin Rrota, the definition has pragmatic nuances (it has to do with the use and the user: *to use one word instead of another*). In the Dictionary of Literary Terms, he leans more towards the semantic approach (*a trope that gives the meaning of one word to another*).

In Lloshi's definition, we have a more complex explanation, since we not only notice the semantic and structural concept but also the stylistic effect, which is also pointed out by Aristotle (*who makes a strong impression in rhetoric*).

Whereas in Xoxa, the definition appears in wider limits of perception, as it sees this figure as a phenomenon, an occurrence, thus also implying the process, seeing it in the framework of a mental process as well (*thanks to a comparison that is made in our mind*).

Regardless of the interpretation that can be given to the definition as a broader point of view, the treatment of Xoxa, in fact, comes to a further narrowing, since the concept of comparison in Xoxa is not seen as a process of finding closeness, relation, but as a comparison in the framework of the relevant picture, labeling thus the metaphor as a hidden comparison (*We say that a metaphor is created thanks to a comparison that is made in our mind, because without this comparison we cannot have a metaphor... Seen in this light, a metaphor is a short comparison which lacks the conjunction according to Xoxa, 1965:73*)......

Lloshi's construction of the metaphor provides an interesting discussion. Seeing it as an identification process avoided by the logic of the two sides through a common predicate, he tends to explain its construction in a more analytical way, especially on a cohesive formal level (*The principle of identification is avoided by logic, because the identification of phenomena is done according to common predicate, something unacceptable for syllogisms. When identification is made according to similarity, that is, when the predicate marks a common or similar feature for both sides, then a metaphor is born. 1999*).

In this debate, he technically sees the metaphor as the realization of avoidance at a structural level, that is, as a product of a structure (We quote: *The school concept that sees figures in separate words is wrong. Lloshi, 1999:138*). He even uses the example given in the Dictionary of Literary Terminology (1972) to explain that the metaphor "*nature smiles*" is not realized only by the verb but by the deviation in valence of the common complement *man* with another not common complement to him which is *nature*.

In this way, he rejects most of the categorizations, which he usually finds at the pre-university and university level (including Xoxa, 1965: 74-75), which are related to labels such as metaphor, verb, noun, and adjective.

From the review of the above literature, it is noted that Justin Rrota also tries to be more analytical, since he specifies the types of metaphor beyond one unit.

The metaphor is built in four ways: 1 — by giving a human/animal being, a quality or characteristic of another human/animal being: *Mos leh kundra shoqi. Eja more grëth e bānu bletë. Ai āsht nji dhelpe (Do not bark at others. Come, my hornet and be a bee. He is a fox)*; 2. by giving an object, a quality or characteristic of another object: *Hijet e shpeshta të nātës. Kroje t'argjanta (The frequent shadows of the night. Silver fountains)*; 3. — by giving a non-human/animal being, a quality or characteristic of a human/animal being: *Dashtënjia e flakët e atdheut. Leu djelli (The ardent love of the motherland. The sun was born.)*; 4. by giving a human/animal being, a quality or characteristic of a non-human/animal being: *Me armë në dorë, me zjarm në gji. Si të bâhesh urë, gjithë bota të shklet. Trim i çartun. Fëmi i njomë.*(With a gun in hand, with fire in the spirit. If you become a bridge, the whole world steps on you. Mad brave. The fresh child.)

What is more, he uses the verb *to adapt* to describe the process, which in our opinion is semantically more correct and does not create confusion (as usually happens with the comparison as a process and as a figure)

It must be said that in this study the examples have both extinguished metaphors and idioms of ordinary discourse, even though the weight of metaphor in ordinary discourse is not discussed.

In conclusion, we find that in the above samples taken for study, there is a lack of coherence in the treatment. In most cases, the concept is treated within the limits of one word. Even when the definition is given in the framework of a process, when it comes to classifications according to types, it remains the property of a word (excluding Lloshi).

The transference is simply reduced to a simple comparison and, at best, to the identification of one concept with another. Even within the same author, we notice different treatments. There is no precise theoretical line that identifies the process.

### 3.2 Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT)

The concept of conceptual metaphor from the point of view of cognitive theories was first expressed by Michael Reddy and George Lakoff in the 1970s (Of course, the work of many predecessors leading up to Sapir & Wolf's theses was used). It was then elaborated by Lakoff and Johnson in the iconic work *Metaphors We Live By* (1980).

According to these authors, metaphor is first conceptual and then linguistic, gestural, and visual (Lakoff, 2014).

Lakoff explains "*There are metaphorical ideas everywhere and they affect the way we act. Metaphorical thinking and metaphorical understanding of situations arise independently of language.*" According to him, "*This discovery led almost immediately to the hypothesis that common reason understood as 'abstract' (not just about 'concrete' physical objects and actions) uses the embodied metaphorical thought*" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). In this way, the concept of conceptual metaphor was first defined as "*the understanding of one domain of experience (which is usually abstract) in terms of another domain (which is usually concrete)*" [Lakoff & Johnson, 1980]. Regarding this definition, Köveches (2022) distinguishes the fact that the first part of the definition specifies a process, while the second a product.

He further reformulates this definition, specifying that "*Contextual metaphor is a systematic network of connections (experiences) between two domains of experience.*" (Koveches, 2022:2)

The above concept leads to the deduction that language in the traditional concept is the carrier of conceptual frameworks already structured in the human brain, which are formed unaffected by it (language) and are mainly found in the human being.

In this context, Lakoff & Johnson (1980) make this definition of the process:

- Ideas are objects.
- Language is a container for object-ideas.
- Communication is the sending of ideas-objects in the language-container.

Lakoff & Johnson further clarified that the metaphor was created based on a conceptual map, identifying the "**source domain**" which serves to send ideas-objects to the container (with language), and the "**target domain**", which represents the communication of ideas through language.

In this way, the metaphors of everyday life in the first place (not only literary ones) are built from the approach of these two domains. Thus, if it is said "*Policët krehën zonën.*" ("The police combed the area.") the source domain would be ideas-objects related to the context of personal maintenance (combing). It is from this domain that the verb **comb** is taken, which is designed in the contextual framework of the police and its work (as a target domain), to achieve the idea of control of the scene. It is precisely these types of mental conceptual approaches that are realized using the language container.

In this way, the traditional concept that a metaphor is realized by a single word is rejected. Also, it can no longer be conceived as a purely literary description, but as a common mechanism in our

conceptual and daily communicative life.

Likewise, it makes no sense to discuss it simply from the point of view of its concrete linguistic realism, i.e., as the property of the container, as it has been traditionally characterized. It is initially a mental product of ideas - objects (in terms of cognitivism), which is then realized with the elements of language, within the framework of the models that have been defined and continue to be defined in the later stages of the elaboration of this theory.

Thus, Lakoff highlights the fact that Reddy had found over 100 classes of expressions (Examples include: *You finally got around to it. /The meaning is right there in the words. / Put your thoughts into clear language. /Your words are void, etc.*). According to him, the generalization that covers the linguistic metaphors is not in language, but in the metaphorical conception of communication, sending ideas-objects to the containers of language (Lakoff, 2014). Further studies have defined other routes (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, etc.)

This way of communication through what in English are called dead metaphors (dead metaphors, in Albanian *extinguished metaphors*) constitutes a large amount of the human communicative corpus.

Let's see an example of how the two domains are defined. Lakoff & Johnson for the metaphor "*Life is a journey*" distinguish this approach map between two domains:

Source domain - target domain

The beginning of the journey - birth

The end of the journey - death

To reach the destination - to reach the goal.

Crossroads (I'm at a crossroad) – the dilemma, the need for a solution.

Obstacles - difficulties

Fellow travelers- partners (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980)

According to these researchers, this type of perceptual map has the status of universal metaphors, as it is found in different languages. In fact, it must be said that even in the above translation we did not have any difficulties, since the same structures are also used in Albanian. (It should be added that the approach of Lakoff and Johnson, who saw conceptual metaphors as the interaction of two domains, is conceptualized by M. Turner and G. Fauconier as fusion, "fusion/blending" of mental spaces, 1998.).

How is the approach (or fusion) process carried out? Is it individual and indefinable, and therefore also non-generalizable, or can we distinguish mental spaces that can be found even in users of the same code and, more widely, of different codes?

Lakoff (2014) clarifies that these discussions led directly to the Embodied Cognition Theory, ECT, which we will talk about below.

### 3.3 Embodied Cognitive Theory (ECT)

According to Lakoff (2009), the human brain organizes cognition by structuring it into complex hierarchically organized frameworks or schemas. Each **frame/map** uses primitive concepts otherwise called semantic roles<sup>3</sup>. The latter is naturally related to the cognitive recognition of these perceptions in the human brain. Thus, running has semantic roles<sup>4</sup> such as runner, running track or road, running speed, running person or being, etc.

Such elements (semantic roles) are called primitive concepts by Lakoff (2009) "Each metaphorical frame, domain uses such primitive concepts and conceptual metaphors (caught the

<sup>3</sup> Semantic roles are those that, in terms of language, are related to mandatory or optional elements semantically linked to a certain syntagm head, A. Deda, 2017, 2019.

<sup>4</sup> In the generative and descriptive terminology these have certain names, semantic cases, roles. We remember the works of Fillor, Hegeman, Tarvainen, etc. frame-net semantic corpus etc. A Deda, 2017.



rhythm, speed up the feet, etc.) to realize communication."

What should be emphasized is the fact that the user does not use only one conceptual metaphor, but many such within the framework of what are called complex metaphors. In this multitude of uses, researchers have also seen the possibility of generalization or defining a conceptual framework that can unite them. Thus Lakoff (2009) in relation to the metaphor "LIFE IS A JOURNEY" distinguishes these other metaphors or constituent conceptual maps:

- Travelers ==> Lovers
- Vehicle ==> Relationship
- Common destinations ==> Common life goals
- Travel obstacles ==> Relationship difficulties

These metaphorical conceptual maps were further analyzed by Lakoff & Johnson, and it was observed that, in fact, non-metaphorical cognitions could be found in them, which could constitute them, and which were part of human cognitive experience. Thus, they expressed that:

*"There are primitive metaphors that are acquired in everyday life when two basic embodied experiences regularly occur together. For example, goals are understood as destinations. In everyday life, achieving goals often requires reaching a destination. If you want a cold beer, you'll have to go to the fridge. In American culture, people are expected to have goals in life, and a couple in a long-term love relationship is expected to have lives that match those goals. Metaphorically this means having common destinations" (Lakoff and Johnson, 2014: 2).*

So according to them, *to know is to see, or time is movement*. These can be combined with other metaphors and form complex metaphors: *He did not see the truth that was killing him*.

Even from a linguistic point of view (*language as a container*) one can easily distinguish structures with verbs that name destination displacement (or not). Such are found in both English and Albanian: *you are in a relationship, you (cannot) enter and leave a relationship as you please, get stuck in a relationship, continue the connection, the relationship*, etc. Such analysis defined what was later called Embodied Cognitive Theory (ECT).

Such a definition is very important if we consider that until that time, (our studies even now) the concepts were directly connected with the corresponding words, that is, with the Sosyrian terms which in general every signified would have a specific signifier, with whom he had arbitrary relations. In this way, these concepts were directly related to truths in the real world (Lakoff, 2009). According to this logic, such a process was not seen as dependent on the human mind.

The theory drawn up by Lakoff & al, on the contrary, basically invalidates the above concept and the traditional concept of language and communication as social skills.

According to cognitivism, *"The idea that there are primitive conceptual metaphors that arise from regular correlations in embodied experience does not fit the above traditional theory"*. In this context, during the elaboration of the theory, such generalizations were reached with such primary conceptual frameworks as follows [Lakoff & Johnson, 1999, 50-54]:

"CATEGORIES ARE CONTAINERS"  
"KNOWING IS SEEING"  
"UNDERSTANDING IS GRASPING"  
"SEEING IS TOUCHING"  
"EXISTENCE IS BEING LOCATED HERE"  
"ORGANIZATION IS PHYSICAL STRUCTURE"  
"CHANGE IS MOTION"  
"PURPOSES ARE DESIRED OBJECTS"  
"CAUSES ARE PHYSICAL FORCES"  
"AFFECTION IS WARMTH"  
"MORE IS UP"  
"STATES ARE LOCATIONS"  
"PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS"

Naturally, these frameworks are also specified through concrete cases, as in the cases below:

- *Morality is purity, and immorality is putridity.*

Empirical basis: In eating, clean food is associated with well-being, and rotten food with disease (Lakoff, 2008, chapter. 4)

- *Thinking is bodily functioning.*

Special cases: Communication is sending; Thinking is Eating, Nourishing; Understanding is Digesting. Understanding is Perception: special case: Smell (Fragrance).

- *To achieve a goal is to acquire a Desired Object* (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999).

Special Case: Achieving a Goal is Getting Desired Food. One difficulty is getting junk food. Special case: Rotten food.

Within these definitions, were also seen the connections between primary conceptual metaphors in the construction of complex ones, as well as in the construction of different conceptual metaphors with the same source domain. In this way, began the specification and identification of relevant hierarchies (Köveches, 2000, 2010). Thus:

Anger is fire (His eyes bulged out.)

Love is fire (My heart was burning for him.)

Imagination is fire (That moment ignited the imagination.)

Desire is fire (He was eager to read.)

Conflict is fire (The fire of war burned the hope of people.)

Enthusiasm is fire (They burst into cheers.)

We clarify that the examples are in Albanian, noting once again the common correlations between the primary conceptual metaphors and the theory of embodied, embedded cognition (ECT).

## 4. Results and Discussions

### 4.1 Conceptual metaphors at idioms in Albanian

As can be seen in this definition, it is affirmed that the relationship between the meaning they represent and the group of words is arbitrary, since there is no direct connection between them.

Since the beginnings of conceptual metaphor theory, researchers have dealt with idioms (Lakoff, 2014:3). It was precisely the latter that justified in the first place the frequent lack of connection of a signified only with a signifier and, on the other hand, during their concrete analysis was often noticed their construction precisely based on mental approaches to concepts of different domains.

In the Dictionary of the Albanian Language (1980) the concept of the idiom is defined as such:

*Expression with special construction, completely or partially formed, that has been used in a language for a long time with a single meaning (which does not come directly from the sum of meanings of constituent words) and that cannot be translated literally into other languages; phraseological association; phraseological units (e.g. bëj pallë; i ra bretku; i bie më qafë; vret rëndë; e fjeti mendjen; rri mbi gjemba; mori flakë; daulte e shpuar; dushk për gogla; fill e për pe; sy ndër sy; pikë e gjak; për dhjamë geni, etc.).*

Thus, even if we analyze the examples included in the dictionary regarding the definition of the idiom, we can see that most are constructed as conceptual metaphors.

Thus, in the idiom **rri mbi gjemba** (*stay above thorns*), the contextual frame in the framework of the conceptual metaphor is: Embarrassment, annoyance is a *thorn*.

The connection between the two domains is justified by the fact that the thorn is annoying, and piercing. This contextual framework is favorable for the situation, when the being is in embarrassment, in annoyance.

In the other idiom **mori flakë** (to be set on fire), we have that well-defined framework for



English: **Anger is Fire**. In the source domain, **fire** also has **flame** as a semantic role. Let's remember that, just like in English and in Albanian, we have many other idioms that justify this definition (*smoke came out of his head, his eyes popped out, he caught fire immediately*, etc.).

What should be emphasized is the fact that in general the conceptual metaphor is developed, mostly using conceptually and linguistically the elements of the source domain. **The latter tends to be more concrete, while the goal domain is more abstract** (Köveches, 2022).

#### 4.2 The Metaphor in Literature

The meaning of literary metaphors is explored in the book *"More than Cool Reasons"* (Lakoff & Turner, 1989) and *"The Literary Mind"* (Turner, 1996), as well as in many books and articles related to what today is known as cognitive poetics.

According to these authors<sup>5</sup>, the metaphorical creativity in poetry is the result of common mechanisms that poets use in manipulating conceptual metaphors, which they share with ordinary people. This also explains why readers, as suggested by Lakoff and Turner, rely on pre-existing concepts rather than create new metaphorical maps to understand the poetics of the novel (Rasse, Onysko & Citron, 2020)<sup>6</sup>.

Meanwhile, Gibbs (1994) had defined this process, among others, with these elements:

- Imagery is not simply a matter of language, but it provides much of the basis of reason and imagination.
- Figurative language is ubiquitous in everyday discourse.
- Figurative ways of thinking motivate the meanings of many expressions and their interpretation.
- The basis of metaphorical meanings shapes non-metaphorical aspects of our everyday experiences.
- Today, the empirical approach to the study of literary reception that combines methods of cognitive and human sciences is known as cognitive poetics (Cognitive Poetics, Rasse, Onysko & Citron, 2020: 32).

But how can these types of approaches help in the analysis of literary metaphors?

In this context, we have taken as a sample, the first line of the "Poema e Mjerimit" (Poem of Misery), namely:

*"Kafshatë që s'kapërdihet asht or vlla mjerimi."* (A bite that cannot be swallowed is the misery, my brother), (Migjeni, 2017).

We think that the definitions made by Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 50-54) regarding

---

<sup>5</sup> Gibbs (1994: 16-17) tries to specify some features of poetics: • The mind does not internally convert word to word (so words do not match concepts). • Language is not independent of the mind; it is reflecting the experience of perceptual and conceptual understanding. • Imagery is not simply a matter of language, but it provides much of the basis of thought, reason and imagination. • Figurative language is ubiquitous in everyday discourse. • Figurative ways of thinking motivate the meanings of many expressions and their interpretation. • The basis of metaphorical meanings shapes non-metaphorical aspects of our everyday experiences. From these definitions, one can almost distinguish the main features of the conceptual metaphor, already evaluating the role of the literary metaphor as the origin of many primary and complex conceptual metaphors. Such a thing has also been pointed out in traditional studies, but only in the linguistic and not perceptual conceptual aspect, as is the case of extinguished metaphors. Today, the empirical approach to the study of literary reception that combines methods of cognitive and human sciences is known as cognitive poetics (Cognitive Poetics, Rasse, Onysko & Citron, 2020: 32).

<sup>6</sup> According to Lakoff and Turner, the reader in deciphering the literary text uses existing conceptual models rather than deciphering on the basis of the conceptual models of the construction of the text itself, note Lakoff and Turner (Lakoff & Turner, *More than cool reasons*, 1989).

schematizations of primary metaphors help us in the analysis of this metaphorical structure. We say this because from a first perception, we can distinguish the updated scheme:

*MISERY IS FOOD, specific case: rotten food, because it cannot be swallowed.*

In the list of the two authors above you find this definition regarding the primary metaphor, which is related to this conceptual framework:

*THOUGHT IS FOOD. /IDEAS ARE FOOD.*

The semantic roles of this primary metaphor are **taste, preparation, chewing, and swallowing**. Precisely these elements in many cases are the basis of the organization of these complex metaphors: **sweet memory, raw idea, I can't chew this thing, I can't swallow the insult**, etc. which basically relate to **quality, production, absorption/absorption, acceptance** etc. (Ming-Yu Tseng, 2017), all these verbs are present in complex metaphors, which develop based on the primary metaphor.

In our case, we are dealing with the quality of the product, so we have the **product** first and its **quality**, as well as the lack of acceptance, a complex and layered perception (**misery as food realized, tasted, and rejected**).

Ming-Yu Tseng, studying the metaphors used at a food fair in Taiwan (Ming-Yu Tseng, 2017), further specifies the metaphors related to the primary metaphor:

According to him, the following contextual frameworks can be distinguished (A. Deda):

*"EXPERIENCE IS FOOD"; sensory-motor experience predicts vision, taste, smell, sound, touch, muscles, and temperature.*

*"KNOWLEDGE IS FOOD"; sensory-motor experience predicts vision, taste, smell, sound, touch, muscles, and temperature.*

*"CONTRASTS ARE STRIKING PERCEPTUAL DIFFERENCES"; sensory-motor experience predicts sight, taste, smell, and touch.*

*Because of this theoretical basis, we can say that this poem of Migjeni is realized on the basis of a primary metaphor: THOUGHT IS FOOD.*

*The latter is perceived as a specific case: EXPERIENCE IS FOOD.*

In this context, we see that the concept of **misery** is intertwined with metonymic avoidance in conceptualization since we have a hyponymic relationship (in the metonymic framework), that is, misery for poverty/scarcity.

Based on the above framework, we affirm that **misery**, which appears as a **product, quality, and rejection** (specific case), here emerges as an **experience**, precisely in reference to the sensorimotor data, which presents in cohesion (**finished product, quality of enjoyed and acceptance refused**) so in the following framework:

## 5. The Experience is the Dining/Food

According to this perception, this complex metaphor from the beginning appears together with the imposing illocution in reference to the addressee, through a categorical negation (*s'kapërdihet*-which cannot be swallowed).

Furthermore, we can add that this statement is strengthened, if we also consider the second verse " *kafshatë që të mbetë në fyt edhe të zë trishtimi* -a bite that remains in the throat and makes you sorrowful" (Migjeni, 2017), in which the verb of the first verse (*kapërdihet* -to be swallowed) appears semantical superlative related to that of the second verse (*mbetë* -get stuck).

The very unit of the target domain *misery* in this frame creates its own personal frame covered with conceptualization, perception, illocution that will accompany it throughout the poem. It is with

this clothing that it begins and expands into other complex metaphors, framed partly again within the metaphor IDEAS ARE FOOD, and partly in other metaphors as well.

In this context, the analytical process goes through several well-known stages<sup>8</sup> (N. I. Marugina, 2014):

- Mental phase: MISERABILITY IS FOOD (inedible).
- Communicative phase: MISERABILITY IS AN ANIMAL (immobile, blocking).
- Textual phase: Modelling with metonymy (misery for lack, poverty) and synecdoche (bite for the whole part).

The selection of verbs with a semantic superlative at the extremity of the verse, the scaling axis (A. Deda & D. Hasa, 2014), associated with the negation (does not bite), as well as the noun (bite), which is perceived in the context of synecdoche even as a digression in the aggravating extreme.

- Interpretive phase: Misery as a ready organizational, illocutionary, and experiential mini frame in terms of the realization of other complex metaphors found in this poem.

## 6. Conclusions

At the end of this paper and especially the last analysis, we judge that such a theory based on the concept of conceptual metaphor (primary and complex) intertwined with knowledge of other disciplines such as stylistics, text linguistics, pragmatics, etc. offers a very favorable approach in fully identifying the realization of a given literary metaphor.

The analysis not only from the mental and communicative point of view but also from the textual and interpretative one, gives a clear panorama at several levels of the creative process that a recipient distinguishes, starting not only from the direct text but also from primitive collective experiences, part of which he is both receiver and giver, expressed by primitive embodied concepts and primal metaphors.

From the experience at the academic-didactic level, we notice that such analytical cognitions are missing, and students are mostly inclined towards a subjective socio-cultural explanation, which in most cases does not reflect any of the data of the levels we mentioned above.

Of course, the methodological tradition, with which they are equipped at school, is to blame for this. In this context, we see as urgent the application of such methodologies in the framework of national and international projects for the identification of the conceptual metaphors initially of the authors who are part of the program at the pre-university and university levels.

---

<sup>7</sup> We consider: 1. Misery has its ugly stamp. 2. Misery rages in lustful love. 3. Misery under the light of the navel's eye/ trembles like a flame. 4. Misery grows in the shadow of tall houses. 5. Misery makes the child into an adult before it is wasted. 6. Misery works, works day and night. 7. Misery always has polished faces. 8. Misery has a consoling sister, the glass. 9. Misery has no joy, but only pain. 10. Misery needs no mercy. 11. Misery is an indelible stain/ on the forehead of people, it passes through the centuries. For example, 1, 7, and even 11 can be thought to activate this frame further: • Morality is purity, immorality is corruption. Empirical basis: In eating, clean food is associated with well-being, rotten food with disease (Lakoff, 2008, chapter. 4).

<sup>8</sup> • The mental stage is the initial part of the entire text modeling process where the author sets up a suitable and compatible mental space for the readers. The conceptual metaphor "A man is an animal/beast" is chosen from the artist to communicate with his readers. • The communication stage is the second stage of the whole text modeling process where the author introduces some specific semantic spaces to demonstrate the depth and power of the cultural conceptual model "A man is a dog". This metaphor can have extra-linguistic reference and describe real-life situations; can also act as a binder between one part of discourse and another. The framework (Fillmore, 1992) of the concept of being is vital to modeling discourse. • The textual phase is the text modeling process itself. Here we can observe the further development of the conceptual and cultural metaphor, how they intertwine, and how the main textual metaphor is included in the title of the story "born" and models the text. The main textual metaphor "a dog's heart" mediates metaphorical expressions in the text, but it cannot go beyond the scope of the textual frame, it can only work in the environment of a single text. (N. I. Marugina, 2014, 114-117).

## References

- Deda, A. & Hasa, H. (2014), Issues of Gradeability in Albanian Language Traditional Studies, Journal of Educational and Social Research.
- Deda, A. (2019), The necessity to study the semantic valence in the structure of Albanian Language, International Journal of Afro-Eurasian Research (IJAR) / Volume: 4 Issue.
- Explanatory dictionary of literary terms, (1972), Tiranë.
- Gibbs, R.W. (1994), *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Köveches, Z. (2017), *Conceptual metaphor theory*, Eötvös Loránd University.
- Köveches, Z. (2018), *Metaphor in Media Language and Cognition: A Perspective from Conceptual Metaphor Theory, Language yesterday, today, tomorrow, Vol. III. No1, De Gruyter*.
- Köveches, Z. (2020), *Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory*, Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980), University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Turner, M. (1989), *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*, University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lakoff, G. (1992), *The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor*, Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (2014), Mapping the brain's metaphor circuitry: metaphorical thought in everyday reason, Hypothesis and Theory Article, *frontiers in*.
- Lloshi, Xh. (2002), *Stylistics and pragmatics*, Toena.
- Marugina, N. (2014), *Conceptual Metaphor as a Model Generating Literary Discourse*, *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, nr.154.
- Rase, I. & Onysko, A. & Mycron, M. (2020), *Conceptual metaphor in poetry interpretation: a psycholinguistic approach*, Cambridge University Press.
- Reddy, M. J. (1979), The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and Thought* (pp. 284–310). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rrota, J. (2006), *Albanian literature for secondary schools*, Franciscan Publications, Shkodër.
- Simpson, P. (2004), *Stylistics*, Routledge.
- Turner, M. (1990), *Metaphor and the Conceptual Context of Invention*, Duke University Press, 1990).
- Xoxa, J. (1965), *Literary theory and metrics*, Tiranë.
- <https://knowledgecenter.ubt-uni.net/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3148&context=conference>
- [https://aporia.byu.edu/pdfs/driscoll-aristotles\\_apriori\\_metaphor.pdf](https://aporia.byu.edu/pdfs/driscoll-aristotles_apriori_metaphor.pdf)
- <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/metaphor/>
- <https://www.coursehero.com/file/29279479/Lakoff-2014-Mapping-Metaphor-Neurosciencepdf/>
- <http://cogsci.berkeley.edu/lakoff/metaphors/>
- <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00958/full>
- <https://marktturner.org/metmet.html>
- [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271389881\\_The\\_performative\\_potential\\_of\\_metaphor](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271389881_The_performative_potential_of_metaphor)