iconic interpretations prevailing in the textual form such as syntactic structure, phonological patterns, the parallelism of certain lexical items, or the choice of graphic characters, letters and layouts in writing.

As a prototypical illustration of the complexity of manifestations of the metaphor-icon link, I would like to present an analysis of two short English poems. These poems display both local and global metaphors. Local metaphors are placed in various parts of the poem. They are based on either conceptual mappings in which structured image-schematic concepts are mapped from one domain onto another, such as actions onto events, and a journey onto life (involving diagrammatic iconicity), image mappings (in which locally evoked images are mapped from one onto another, e.g., the colour of objects onto feelings involving iconicity), or a combination of both. The local metaphor may or may not contribute to the formation of a global conceptual metaphor, which is a metaphorical reading of the whole text, i.e., the poem as metaphor.

The poems analysed below differ in the degree to which metaphor and iconicity are manifested in combination. The poems analysed below differ in the degree to which metaphor and iconicity are manifested in combination. The first one is an example of English pattern poetry, which displays an overt iconicity. The second example is a covert manifestation of diagrammatic pattern in a single poetic text where diagrammatic iconicity is achieved through the choice of lexical items and grammatical parallelism. The analysis will demonstrate that in both examples, the metaphor-icon link is at work strongly in the creation and the interpretation of meaning.

In addition, the model of blending will be adduced as a means of clarifying the dynamic mechanism of the metaphor-icon link, because it allows us to see which part of the metaphorical process relates to which type of iconic mapping in the poetic text.

4.1. "Easter Wings"

Text as Icon

"Easter Wings" by George Herbert (1880 [1633]: 34-35) is one of the best-known examples of pattern poetry in the English language. The poem is presented in a silhouette of wings. The visual image mirrors the theme of the poem, which is concisely stated in its title, "Easter Wings". This is a typical example of iconic iconicity, as the relationship of form and meaning is immediate and mimetic. The very shape of the poem—the rising wings of two birds—exhibits the content of the poem in which a human being relates to the actions of a bird (specifically a lark).

Example 1

N.B. The following 'prosnic' presentation of the poem is provided only for clarification of the content of this graphic representation.

Lord, who createdst man in wealth and store,
Though foolishly he lost the same,
Decaying more and more,
Till he became
Most poore:
With thee
O let me rise
As larks, harmoniously,
And sing this day thy victories:
Then shall the fall further the flight in me.

My tender age in sorrow did beginne:
And stifi with sicknesses and shame
Thou didst so punish sinne,
That I became
Most thinne.
With thee
Let me combine
And feel this day thy victories:
For, if I imp my wing on thine,
Affliction shall advance the flight in me.

There are at least two major input spaces created by the reading of the poem as a global metaphor: a bird and a human being. This is done not only by linguistic expressions such as 'let me rise as larks', 'the flight in me', and 'imp my wing on thine', but also in graphic expressions such as the shape of the two sets of wings, and their layout on two facing pages. In the first stanza, a human being (both 'Adam' and all humanity) is (re)presented as a bird which is about to rise on Easter Day. God created Adam ('man') giving him wealth, but he fell and forfeited his paradise. Man's abundance is steadily 'decaying' into poverty. God's only son, Christ ('thee'), enables man to 'rise' again spiritually just as Christ rose from the dead on the Easter Day. In the second stanza, with the inheritance of original sin, humanity begins in 'sorrow', and also decays in sickness. As in the first stanza, it is 'with thee' that provides an uplift for humanity and for the individual. The narrator sees himself as a bird which will 'imp' his wing with feathers from Christ's wings so as to make the 'flight' to heaven, in effect, both the physical flight (or strength to go on with life) and the spiritual uplift are implicated in the poem.

As illustrated in Figure 5, a bird is both the input source space for a global metaphorical mapping onto a human being and the target space for an iconic mapping (from the visual source space of the wings of a bird).

The metaphorical mapping of a bird onto a human being is represented by the four mental spaces on the right-hand side of Figure 5.

In the source input space, we have an image-schema of a bird—a lark with wings, singing, flying, and the movement (expansion and contraction) of the wings. In the target input space, we have an image-schema of a human being—Adam ('man'), a narrator (human being in general), sin and retribution. In the blended space, a fused image-schema of a bird and a human being receives a dynamic structure from cultural background of Christianity. Adam's original sin is related to the punishment, mortality and death of human beings. Man's wealth is shrinking and decaying into poverty. The soul is also in decline. Then, Christ (as represented by 'thee') enables man to rise again spiritually. The victories of Christ on Easter day are celebrated by the song of a lark. The movement of wings, i.e., expansion and contraction, is mapped onto the process of decay and salvation of human beings.

This metaphor-icon link in "Easter Wings"
second page look smaller because the first and the last lines are shorter than those on the previous page. They give the impression that the bird on the second page has taken off or is flying further.

Seen as a global metaphor, the vertical form of the two wings is charged by layers of religious readings provided by Christian tradition and culture. The form embodies the metaphorical meaning of Easter as celebrating Christ's being born again, or rising from death, awakens associations with splendidly winged angels, and image patterns such as fall and rise, decay and advance, loss and victory, list but a few.

Diagrammatic Iconicity by Grammatical Metaphors

The poem, moreover, exhibits structural correspondences between form and meaning navigated by conventional metaphors for linguistic forms as discussed in the previous section. The most narrow lines are given emphasis both by location, i.e., at the centre of each stanza and length, i.e., their brevity. The central position of the wings displays a phrase repeated in both verses of the poem, 'With thee.' If one interprets this poem as a religious declaration against a Christian cultural background, 'with thee' is central to the poem's declaration of belief. The focal significance of 'with thee' is centralised visually or physically in the core of the poem.

In addition, 'with thee' at the joint of the wings suggests a relationship— as if that most poor creature at his most diminished is saved by a hand reached out. The other short lines, one in each stanza, 'most poor' and 'most thin', form a pair. There is an analogical link between the shortness of form and the smallness of the objects ('man' in the first stanza, and 'I' in the second stanza) described\(^{10}\). The third line in the first stanza, 'Decaying more and more,' also corresponds diagrammatically to the decrease in length of the lines of the poem. These correspondences are more subtle and less noticeable than the overall silhouette of the poem; nonetheless, they are as important. These are cases of diagrammatic iconicity.

Imagery Iconicity by Visual Layout

It is clear that the imagery iconicity dominates in this text because, if we put the words of the poem in an ordinary prosaic format or even in a horizontal layout,

\(^{10}\) There are other repetitions in the poem. For example, 'I became most...,' 'let me...,' 'thou didst...,' and 'the flight in me' are repeated in each stanza. These repetitions reinforce the content expressed.

\(^{8}\) Surprisingly, the poem appears in horizontal form in many modern editions (see Herbert 194[1633]: 35, for example).
4.2. Grammatical Parallelism in Shelley’s “Love’s Philosophy”

Text as Metaphor

Love’s Philosophy\textsuperscript{17}

The fountains mingle with the river, 1
And the rivers with the ocean, 2
The winds of heaven mix for ever 3
With a sweet sentiment; 4
Nothing in the world is single, 5
All things by a law divine 6
In one another’s being mingle— 7
Why not I with thine? 8

See the mountains kiss high heaven, 9
And the waves clasp one another, 10
No sister flower would be forgiven 11
If it disdained its brother; 12
And the sunlight clasps the earth, 13
And the moonbeams kiss the sea— 14
What are all these kissings worth, 15
If thou kiss not me? 16

P. B. Shelley’s “Love’s Philosophy” (1904 [1820]: 216) abounds in the use of local metaphors\textsuperscript{18}. Let us see what conventional metaphors are employed in the text and how they are sculpted into the composite metaphorical concept for the given target space, which is hinted at by the title of the poem, “Love’s Philosophy.” The abundant use of metaphorical expressions reflects conventional cognitive metaphors as follows:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsc{a.} \textsc{A natural phenomenon is an entity}
  \item \textsc{b.} \textsc{A natural object is an entity}
  \item \textsc{c.} \textsc{Feeling is an entity}
  \item \textsc{d.} \textsc{Nature is human}
  \item \textsc{e.} \textsc{Opposites form pairs}
  \item \textsc{f.} \textsc{Fusion is mixing}
  \item \textsc{g.} \textsc{Understanding is seeing}
  \item \textsc{h.} \textsc{Contact is touching}
  \item \textsc{i.} \textsc{Requesting is questioning}
  \item \textsc{j.} \textsc{Love is a fusion of opposites}
  \item \textsc{k.} \textsc{Love is contact}
  \item \textsc{l.} \textsc{Love is pairing}
\end{itemize}

The first cognitive metaphors, \textsc{a.} \textsc{A natural phenomenon is an entity}, \textsc{b.} \textsc{A natural object is an entity} and \textsc{c.} \textsc{Feeling is an entity}, are what Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 25-32) call ‘ontological metaphors’ which enable us to conceive continuous events, on-going realities, and unstable or even moving states of things as if they were quantifiable objects, entities or units with which we can refer to, quantify, identify and so on. In this poem, \textsc{natural phenomena} and \textsc{natural objects} such as ‘fountains’, ‘rivers’, ‘winds’, ‘mountains’, ‘heaven’, ‘waves’, ‘sunlight’, ‘earth’, ‘moonbeams’ and ‘sea’ are treated as discrete ENTITIES which have boundaries and shapes. ‘Emotion’ is seen as if it were an ENTITY, which is countable and even modifiable by an adjective of taste, ‘sweet’.

Furthermore, some of these entities are personified by the \textsc{nature is human} metaphor: e.g., the ‘mountains’ that ‘kiss’ high ‘heaven’, the ‘waves’ that ‘clasp’ one another, the ‘sister flower’ that ‘disdained’ its ‘brother flower’, the ‘sunlight’ that clasps the ‘earth’, the ‘moonbeams’ that ‘kiss’ the ‘sea.’ It might be worth pointing out in this connection that some of the metaphors are what Lakoff and Turner (1989) classified as a nonconventional expansion of conventional metaphors. For example, the metaphor of a ‘sister-flower’ disdaining its ‘brother-flower’ in the lines 11 and 12 extends the \textsc{nature is human} metaphor to include not only the male/female distinction but also the particular kinship of brother and sister.

The \textsc{entities} are put into semantic oppositions such as: \textsc{large vs. small} (‘river’ vs. ‘fountain’; ‘ocean’ vs. ‘river’); \textsc{human vs. divine} (‘emotion’ vs. ‘heaven’); \textsc{human vs. nature} (‘emotion’, ‘I’, ‘thou’, ‘me’, ‘mine’, ‘brother’, ‘sister’ vs. ‘fountains’; ‘river’; ‘ocean’, ‘wind’, ‘mountains’,...
On the stanzaic level, too, the first and the second stanza form a PAIR in such a way that each stanza has the same number of elements lexically, syntactically and prosodically, as summarised in Table 3.

Table 3: Stanzacic Pairs in “Love’s Philosophy”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First stanza</th>
<th>Second stanza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lexical items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeatedly used</td>
<td>six the’s, two he’s</td>
<td>six the’s, two he’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four with’s</td>
<td>four kiss’s</td>
<td>four kiss’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjectives</strong></td>
<td>one adjective — sweet</td>
<td>one adjective — high sweet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural nouns</strong></td>
<td>four nouns — fountains, rivers, winds, and things</td>
<td>four nouns — mountains, waves, moonbeams, and kissings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introductory sentence</strong></td>
<td>affirmative</td>
<td>affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concluding sentence</strong></td>
<td>interrogative</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhyme scheme</strong></td>
<td>abab</td>
<td>abab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lexically, the first and the second stanza have the following: six the’s, two he’s (including ‘being’), one lexical item repeated four times (i.e., four with’s in the first stanza and four kiss’s in the second), one adjective (i.e., sweet in the first stanza and high in the second), four plural nouns (i.e., fountains, rivers, winds, and things in the first stanza and mountains, waves, moonbeams, and kissings in the second).

Syntactically, there are five affirmative sentences and one interrogative sentence in each stanza. And prosodically, both stanzas have the same end rhyme scheme, i.e., abab’d ed.

ANO PPOISING FORM IS AN OPPOSING CONTENT

The syntactic features of some elements and the syntactic patterns in the text also reflect the image-schemas of OPPOSITES. Firstly, the OPPOSITION of ‘I’ and ‘thou’ seems to be supported by the presupposed SEPARATION between ‘I’ and ‘thou’, expressed by the final questions of each stanza, which contain a negation: “why not I with thine?” and “what are all these kissings worth, if thou kiss not me?” (Italics mine.) Secondly, the OPPOSITIONS are also embodied in the grammatical differences between the first and the second stanza as shown in Table 4:

Table 4. Syntactic Oppositions in “Love’s Philosophy”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First stanza</th>
<th>Second stanza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbs</strong></td>
<td>all intransitive</td>
<td>all transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of prepositions</strong></td>
<td>one</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first stanza, the verbs are all intransitive, and each line has one preposition, whereas in the second stanza, the verbs are all transitive, and there is no preposition. Hence, the first stanza and the second stanza are grammatically contrastive. In addition, the affirmative introductory sentences and the interrogative concluding sentence form an OPPOSITION within each stanza, though they form a PAIR between the first and the second stanza.

Multi-Layered Metaphor-Icon Link

We have seen so far how this poem manifests a multi-layered metaphor-icon link. There are several conventional conceptual metaphors sculpted into the composite metaphorical conception of LOVE. There are images in local metaphors, too, which enrich the feel of the poem by mapping a mixing act of waters, and of invisible air onto a mingling act of lovers, by mapping a contact of visible natural objects and of fragrant flowers onto the kissing of lovers. The lexical, syntactic and stanzaic form of the poem displays a diagrammatic relationship to the content of the text navigated by the global metaphorical blend as well as conventional grammatical metaphors.

To summarise, “Love’s Philosophy”, describing the longing of a narrator to be one with his separated (or unreachable) lover, displays the theme iconically and metaphorically in its cognitive content, linguistic form and image, particularly achieved by a creative choice of vocabulary and grammatical patterns. Indeed, the poem is a metaphorical icon of ‘love’s philosophy.’ The analysis by the model of blending has demonstrated how and where the organic unity of the
5. Concluding Remarks

This study has shown that the model of blending offers a useful analytical tool to explain the mechanism of iconic and metaphorical mapping in cognitive terms. An original contribution of this paper is the demonstration of the effectiveness of this model for clarifying the complex interrelationship between metaphor and iconicity in the dynamic production of meaning in language in general, and in poetic texts in particular.

It has been demonstrated that a close metaphor-icon link is manifest in two ways: (1) that there are iconic (both imagic and diagrammatic) moments in metaphor; and (2) that a form acquires an iconic meaning by grammatical metaphors. The analysis of the link in ordinary language and poetic texts has illustrated that the model of blending can specify which parts of the metaphorical process – whether the input, generic or blended spaces – relate to the diagrammatic/iconic mapping of form and meaning.

Poems can be varied in their metaphor-icon structure. “The Easter Wings” is dominantly iconic and has a much less rich use of metaphor, while “Love’s Philosophy” is particularly rich and complex in its metaphor with respect to cognitive, image and grammatical aspects. These two poems are believed to be at relatively extreme ends of the spectrum and, to some extent, can be used as measuring standards for other poems to be analysed in future studies. Some poems show the metaphor-icon link in the visual and syntactic modalities as illustrated in the examples in the present paper. Others display such a link in auditory modality. The poetic analysis of this paper has proved that the metaphor-icon link is not a simple one. We need a detailed reading of the texts in their various aspects – visual and auditory forms, structure of meaning, pragmatic and cultural contexts and background information in order to see how the interplay of metaphor and iconicity contributes to the creation and interpretation of meaning.

What remains for future investigation is a qualitative sophistication of the analysis for the purpose of concise and precise explanation, and quantitative, evidential support from different types of material resource such as visual, auditory and formal modalities of language structure and use, in different languages and different genres (cf. D. Freeman 1993, Hiraga 1997, 1998, M. Freeman, in press, among others).
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Further thoughts on delimiting pictorial metaphor

Introduction

Since Ortony’s (1979) Metaphor and Thought and Lakoff and Johnson’s no less influential Metaphors We Live By (1980), the cognitive approach has become the dominant paradigm in metaphor studies. Its basic tenet is that metaphors are not primarily a characteristic of language; they first and foremost belong to the realm of thinking. The cognitivist paradigm presupposes that while most metaphors manifest themselves verbally, it would be a mistake to equate verbal manifestations of metaphor with their cognitive originals. Thus, conceptual metaphors may assume different linguistic guises: “he attacked every weak point in my argument” and “his criticisms were right on target” both derive from the underlying metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 4). Explorations of how conceptual metaphors may appear in language (for two recent studies see Goatley (1997) and Cameron and Low (1999)) and, conversely, how verbal metaphors may be signposts to guide us to their conceptual sources have characterized a substantial part of the study of metaphor over the past two decades, but another entailment of the cognitivist approach has hitherto received short shrift. If metaphor is primarily a cognitive affair, and metaphors on the verbal level are not simply reduplications of metaphors on the cognitive level, then metaphors need not be verbal in nature. The investigation of non-verbal and partly-verbal metaphors is necessary, both for their intrinsic interest and for the further development and testing of the cognitivist paradigm. Given the pervasiveness of visual representations in contemporary society, it is, unsurprisingly, primarily pictorial metaphor that has begun to attract the attention of scholars interested in non-verbal metaphor (e.g., see McNeill (1992) for observations on metaphor in gestures).
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