

## **METAPHOR IN POLISH AND GERMAN METALANGUAGE. A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF THESES AND POPULAR SCIENCE WORKS.**

mgr Beata Kupczyk

### **Summary**

A language as the structure ingrained in the conceptual system is a human brain's constitutive factor, therefore a determinant for the understanding of particular phenomena and processes. A significant input in the simplification of the understood content is attributed to metaphor, which allows making abstract concepts comprehensible for people through personification or materialization. Thus, a metaphor not only increases the acquisition of knowledge but also primarily is – metaphorically speaking – a 'carrier' of knowledge, is responsible for its transfer and results in the increase of the knowledge in the recipients.

An area for the functioning of metaphor in this paper is a metalanguage. The coexistence of both phenomena is however not the result of a singular connection, but the relation showing a permanent character, in which the number of language-text concretizations is so frequent that it determines the comprehension of abstract concepts from the scope of linguistics. The combination of these phenomena causes the creation of a new category – metalanguage metaphor – which defining necessitates the clarification of the understanding of the essence of these notions. The theoretical part of this paper was devoted to this purpose.

The first chapter is comprised of the review of selected theories of metaphor throughout history, starting from the assumptions by Aristotle, who is deemed to be a precursor of studies on metaphor, then going through the symbolic interactionism, the reinterpretative concept, the Weinrich's image fields theory, to the contemporary cognitive theory by Lakoff and Johnson, pivotal to this dissertation.

The innovation of the cognitive theory of metaphor lies in the perception of metaphor as the central sense organ, which steers thinking processes. Metaphor acts within the framework of this theory, not as a lexical unit, but the phenomenon of thoughts blended with actions, determining not only highly abstract thinking but also purely prosaic actions determined by the society and the culture. The projection in the Lakoff and Johnson's assumptions is based on the defined domains: *source*, associated with concrete images based on the experience and *target*, equivalent to the difficult, highly abstract and complicated notions. This projection has a unilateral direction solely from the source to the target domain,

thus facilitates the comprehension of abstract phenomena through referring to occurrences familiar to human nature. The systematic blending of these domains has caused the authors to create the notion of a conceptual metaphor, which was divided into three categories: orientational, ontological and structural.

The complexity of the phenomenon of metaphor results in the multiple functions, which metaphor serves. Their function differs fundamentally depending on what kind of metaphor is considered – lexical or conceptual.

Within the scientific discourse's framework understood as an occurrence happening between thinking and speaking, metaphor plays a significant role because it is responsible for the creation, the transfer and the organization of the knowledge in the brain. The cognitive theory of metaphor presents domains as ranges of knowledge. Due to their projection (from source to target domain) a knowledge transfer occurs between recipients with varying levels of knowledge (i.e. internal and external communication). The purpose of this transfer is to diminish the asymmetry in knowledge or to generate an impulse to gain new information while simultaneously assuming the accuracy and veracity of the transmitted content, as well as creating suitable conditions for the knowledge transfer to succeed.

The metalanguage phenomenon derives from logic and was firstly used in linguistics by Hjelmslev, who perceived the metalanguage in a metasemiotic way, equating it to the scientific language. As opposed to the object language, the metalanguage was widely understood as the language encompassing the resource and usage of signs or – in the narrowest sense – as the language of the reverse usage of signs. The differentiation of the object language and the metalanguage is deemed necessary because omitting to do this solution would lead to paradoxes, which is proved by Tarski's theory of truth.

Metalanguage seems to be an occurrence without rigidly defined borders, therefore its range is often classified as other categories, especially metatext. The way of perception of both phenomena – metalanguage and metatext – is not only the component *meta*, often used in linguistics but the clarification of terms – language and text respectively.

The confrontation of metalanguage and metatext results mainly from the formal analogy of terms and prompts looking for other commonalities. Seeing them as phenomena of the same properties has both its proponents as well as opponents.

Defining metalanguage and metatext lies mostly in the exponents emphasizing the relations *meta* within the framework of metalanguage and metatext. Depending on the research subject and functions performed, the nomenclature of indicators is diversified.

Their function is often connected to their placement. They can verbalize the importance, the obviousness of the information and introduce new information of different characters into the text: concretizing (specifying, ordering, clarifying) as well as generalizing (concluding, summarising). The number of tasks they fulfill proves their polyfunctionality.

Although many linguistics papers were devoted to the issue of metaphor and metalanguage, the aspect of the category created as a result of combining these phenomena seems to be neglected or merely touched upon. This subject matter was more deeply analyzed by Piekarczyk (2006, 2007a, 2007b, 2010, 2013), presenting the accumulated meanings, which can be carried by metalanguage metaphor. Its exponents can convey several concept metaphors simultaneously, complementing each other or even coexisting.

The sphere of reference for metaphors occurring within the framework of metalanguage can be the language itself or simply text. All metaphors functioning in metalanguage are classified primarily as metalingual, and those highlighted ones, which play metatext function, are identified in this paper as metatext metaphors. The point of reference for these metaphors is the main criterion to differentiate between them – metalingual refer to the language, encompassing the entirety of cognitive processes. Thus they show an abstract-generalizing character.

Subsequently, the metatext metaphors are the commentary to the created text, therefore they organize the whole text and control its reception, by referring to all cognitive operations made within its area, e.g. localization or transfer.

This paper aims to address similarities and differences in Polish and German metalanguage depending on how 'scientific' researched papers are. Under consideration were Polish and German popular science texts and theses, which were paired up and confronted based on a common style. From all six materials, four present popular science style, therefore the main criterion for differentiation of these papers is the type of recipient.

Firstly, popular science books are juxtaposed, which authors have a philological background: *Mówiąc Inaczej* by Paulina Mikuła and *Der Dativ ist dem Genitiv sein Tod* by Bastian Sick.

The second comparison concerns popular science papers by linguists – *Wszystko zależy od przyimka* by Jerzy Bralczyk, Andrzej Markowski, Jan Miodek and *Deutsch für Kenner* by Wolf Schneider.

The last set is created from theses *Pragmatyka językowa* by Roman Kalisz and *Pragmatik. Eine Einführung* by Jörg Meibauer, which are dedicated to students and future linguists.

Between these pairs, a knowledge transfer occurs between different types of senders and recipients. The paper aims to show similarities and differences of metalanguage metaphors' usage in Polish and German works depending on how 'scientific' they are. The qualitative analysis was mostly conducted, but to underline the discrepancies also a quantitative ratio was included.

To attain the set objectives a cognitive analysis of metaphor was selected, based on the concepts by Lakoff, Johnson, Reddy and Jäkel. Within the target domains LANGUAGE and TEXT, cognitive models of metaphor were found on the metalanguage and metatext level, which resulted in the creation of cognitive metaphors LANGUAGE/TEXT AS PATH and LANGUAGE/TEXT AS MATTER. This paper presents a narrow view of the metalanguage issue, equating with metalanguage metaphors all those metaphors, which refer both to language (communication, translation, discourse) as well as a particular text (metalanguage metaphor functioning as metatext). Due to the high frequency of exponents of set schema, subcategories were created. The schema of path is based mainly on motion, which follows in distinct directions – forward and backward. The issue of motion entails also the stopping of the motion to immobility, which is highlighted by metalanguage metaphors.

On the other hand, the schema of matter presents the elements of language and text as objects of a specific shape, size and structure, which are undergoing various manual operations, personification or are cast as performers of the activity.

Both schemata are determined by temporal and local deictic expressions. The crucial role is also played by prepositions, which create an inseparable relation of both schemata, which will also be undergoing a cognitive analysis of metaphor according to the identified criterion.

The first set of popular science materials (*Mówiąc Inaczej* and *Der Dativ ist dem Genitiv sein Tod*) proved that both texts contain metalanguage metaphors in each of the established categories. Within the framework of the schema of path, more metaphors were noted in Miśka's work, where the vast majority is made of metatext metaphors. In turn, in Sick's book, there are more metalanguage metaphors, but with significantly less prevalence over metatext ones. The schema of matter's metaphors is distinguished by a high

frequency with the advantage of metalanguage metaphors in both works. Metalanguage metaphors dominated also the category of coexistence of both models.

The second pair of popular science papers (*Wszystko zależy od przyimka* and *Deutsch für Kenner*) is characterized by more differences both in terms of quality as well as quantity. In both works prevail metatext metaphors in the schema of path. In the schema of matter, the ratio remains unchanged in Schneider's work, whereas in Sosnowski's paper metalanguage metaphors are at the forefront. The latter dominated also the category of relation in Sosnowski's work, whereas in Schneider's material the result is almost even.

The comparison of theses (*Pragmatyka* and *Pragmatik. Eine Einführung*) shows that Meibauer uses more metaphors. For the first time in the whole analysis, metatext metaphors have such great advantages both in path as well as container schema in Polish and German work. Metalanguage metaphors lead only in the coexistence category of both models with a similarly big advantage.

The juxtaposition of works of various level of 'scientific' advancement is presented by the table nr 3, underlining the domination of metaphors of matter in all of the papers comparing to other models – path and coexistence, which percentage in popular science texts is equal (15,9%) and at the same time higher than the result in theses (13,8% i 8,2%).

The quantitative comparison of popular science works and theses abounds in many similarities but also differences depending on the variables particular to a type of text: the difficulty of the undertaken issue or the presumed recipient.

Beata Kipczyk

