

Cross Metaphorical Coherence in Gichuka Social Discourse

Emise Kageni Miriti¹
Chuka University

Dr. Humphrey Kirimi Ileri²
Chuka University

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes metaphorical coherence in Gichuka social discourse. The purpose of the study is to investigate how coherence is defined in Gichuka social through discourse the use of various metaphors. Metaphor is an important tool that partially structures concepts in discourse to make them more understandable. The overlap of metaphors in discourse makes the various aspects of a concept clear and creates both metaphorical and textual coherence. This study is guided by Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) by Lakoff and Johnson. The study employs purposive sampling of eleven main Gichuka speech events. Metaphors were identified using Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP). The study finds that the JOURNEY metaphor overlaps with most metaphors to achieve both textual and cross metaphorical coherence. This study is useful in demonstrating how metaphor variously structures concepts hence creating coherence within discourse which is very important for meaning making. The study gives life to Gichuka language and contributes to the linguistic theory by demonstrating the extent to which Gichuka conforms to the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT).

Key words: Coherence, Metaphor, Overlap, Social Discourse, Up-down Spatialization,

Date of Submission: 14-06-2022

Date of Acceptance: 29-06-2022

I. Background of the Study

Metaphor is used to figure out an abstract conceptual domain in terms of a concrete domain, using knowledge structures of that concrete aspect of experience to reason about the abstract aspect of experience (Kovecses, 2002). The study of metaphorical linguistic expressions can be used to understand the nature of the activities of a people because metaphorical concepts are tied to metaphorical expressions in any particular language in a systematic way (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Conceptual metaphors are inferred through a careful study and analysis of the metaphorical expressions that are used to talk about them. Coherence in metaphors can be realized through internal or external systematicity of metaphorical entailments (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Internal systematicity results in coherence within a metaphor depicted through the various instances of the same metaphor, while external systematicity results in cross-metaphorical coherence where various metaphorical entailments overlap to structure a single concept, 'Where there is an overlapping of purposes, there is an overlapping of metaphors, and hence, a coherence between them' (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 96). In this way, the different aspects of a concept are highlighted through the various structuring of metaphors. Coherence comes about when different conceptual metaphors are used at the same time to realize a particular effect (Karnedi, 2015).

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) refer to the use of different metaphorical expression as metaphorical coherence: "a cognitive relation among conceptual mappings, which aim to enhance and strengthen meanings, or a set of arguments for a concept (p 104). Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argue that the manifold ways in which metaphors structure a concept serve different purposes by revealing the different aspects of a concept. They further posit that where the functions of metaphors intersect the metaphors also intersect and hence there is coherence between them. "Permissible mixed metaphors fall into this overlap" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p.96). Coherence across metaphors comes about when one concept is described using other concepts that are themselves metaphorical. For instance, the concept ARGUMENT can be conceptualized in various ways using JOURNEY, CONTAINER and BUILDING metaphors (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

Previous Literature

Previous research on metaphors include studies on conceptual metaphors in Western commercial advertisements (Zhang, 2009); metaphors that underlie political discourse (Cienki, 2005; Berberovic, & Delibegovic, 2021); figurative language use in Kikamba dowry negotiation (Kangutu, 2014); metaphors of love in Gikuyu (Gathigia, 2010), metaphorical euphemisms of sexual intercourse (Gathigia, 2010); euphemisms used in Dholuo HIV discourse (Jaoko, 2016) and marriage metaphors Gachara, (2012) among others. However, few of these studies investigate coherence especially with reference to social discourse. Metaphorical coherence in Gichuka social discourse has not yet been studied. The present study, therefore, investigates metaphor use in Gichuka social discourse with specific focus on cross metaphorical coherence

II. Methodology

This study is qualitative in nature. Naturally occurring discourse in Gichuka social activities was analyzed for metaphorical expressions and the concepts they represent. The study employed purposive sampling of Gichuka speech events. A sample corpus of eleven audial recordings of Gichuka social activities was analyzed for this study. To arrive at the data to be used, the researcher listened to the recorded Gichuka discourses and transcribed them. The transcribed audial recordings realized eleven long extracts in Gichuka which the researcher read through and highlighted expressions which might have contained metaphorically used segments (what could not be semantically decomposed into constituent parts) of the spoken discourse. The linguistic metaphorical expressions were identified using Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIPVU) (PRAGGLEJAZZ, 2007; Steen, Dorst, Hermarrmann, Kaal, Krennmayr, & Pasma 2010). The metaphorical expressions so identified were translated into English using free translation and literal translation where it was not possible to get the across the meaning, feeling and the emotion behind the metaphor using free translation.

III. Results

Thirty six extracts that cut across the four metaphor types were analyzed for metaphorical coherence. The ontological or orientational metaphors overlapped with the structural metaphors to create sense in what the speaker was saying.

1 *Nĩtwenda ũtongoria ũrĩa mũtheru ũthiĩ na mbere ũria ũthiĩte kũraca na ũgatũkinya thayĩ*
We want clean leadership to continue, leadership that is going far and that will get us peacefully to our destination.

Leadership is structured by JOURNEY, CONTAINER and VEHICLE metaphors in 1 These are the source domains from which the abstract concept leadership is understood. Each of these metaphors partially structure (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980) the concept leadership. Each of them elaborate on the different attributes of leadership that makes comprehension clear. *Mũtheru* refer to a container that is clean, uncontaminated and utilizable. The metaphorical entailment transferred to leadership, is one that is incorruptible. This is the kind of leadership that the journey further elaborates on by *ũthiĩte kũraca* to mean that it is the one that will go far. The metaphorical sense is the type of leadership that will last. This type of leadership that the speaker metaphorically describes, is finally conceptualized as a vehicle that will get the people concerned to their destination. Metaphorically speaking, it is the leadership is capable of sustaining the people and fulfilling its mandate to the people: leadership that is satisfactory. JOURNEY, CONTAINER and VEHICLE metaphors coherently define the nature of the leadership that is desirable to the people. The fact that the three can jointly describe the various aspect of leadership, means that they are coherent, and that each of those metaphors elaborate on a different aspect, thus making the whole hence we can say: LEADERSHIP IS A CONTAINER
LEADERSHIP IS A JOURNEY
LEADERSHIP IS A VEHICLE

2 *Rĩu rĩgũkinya bangĩ thĩnĩ wa nyambura ĩno.*

Now we have gotten to another stage in this ceremony

In 2 an activity is conceptualized through JOURNEY and CONTAINER metaphors simultaneously. The preposition *in* is indicative of a container. A journey like a container has a surface. The path of a journey is its surface. Similarly, a container has a bounding surface. The metaphorical entailment created is that the more of the ground covered in an activity the more surface it covers and the more the depth. Therefore, like a journey, the more the surface it creates, the more the path and thus, the content. The activity is also seen in terms of container metaphor. The more of the activity, the deeper it gets into the container. The deeper the container, the more the content (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). The path of a journey that defines its content are used together with the depth of a container to structure an activity. The point of intersection, is both journey and container have a depth defining component which is used to understand how an activity progresses thus:

ACTIVITY IS A JOURNEY
ACTIVITY IS A CONTAINER

3 *Tūbota kwīthīrwa tūkīaragia mūgambo ūmwe, tūkīgendaga njīra īmwe*

So that we are able to speak the same voice and walk the same path.

In 3 unity or agreement in a community is conceptualized both as a voice and also as a journey. The speaker usually does this for emphasis. Common notions of different metaphors are used to enhance understanding. The non-metaphorical entailments about voice and a road in this instance is found in their utility. A voice that can be heard by all is singular, clear and audible. For a road to get people to their common purpose, there should be singularity of direction as well as clarity. The notions of singularity and clarity are transferrable to unity, and it is the one that defines coherence between the two metaphorical source domains, voice and road, so that they are able to simultaneously structure the abstract concept unity thus:

UNITY IS A VOICE
UNITY IS A ROAD

4 *Twīna mwanya wa gwaka ītūūra rīrī rībue, na nīkenda rībote kūthīl wega, na ūtūūro wetūūbua*

We have an opportunity to develop this village to make it better so that it can go on well, and our lives can become better.

The abstract target domain: social economic progress is doubly conceptualized through BUILDING and JOURNEY metaphors as source domains. *Gwakaof* building and *kūthīl* of a journey imply increasing in size. The more you increase the path of a journey, the longer it becomes. Similarly, the more you construct a building, the taller, or the bigger it becomes. The two images have a surface that is capable of increasing and it is the one that is metaphorically transferrable to the abstract target domain, progress. Their content defining surface is the one that make the two metaphors coherent and capable of conceptualizing the social economic progress that people envisage. Both metaphors fit together to make the comprehension of the abstract concept better. Thus:

SOCIAL ECONOMIC PROGRESS IS A BUILDING
SOCIAL ECONOMIC PROGRESS IS A JOURNEY

5 *Ciasa, nīkīo gīntū gī kinene mūno na rīrīa ūnenewathīl njarani irīa ifīcio na njarani irīa ndūku...*

Politics is the greatest thing we have and when leadership goes into the wrong hands and bad people...

In 5 the metaphorical theme is politics. Politics is described variously through CONTAINER, HANDS, and JOURNEY metaphors. The fact that the three target domains can be jointly used to address the abstract concept, politics implies that their senses overlap. Leadership is thus conceptualized as a magnificent thing, (container), mobile (Journey) and transferrable into the wrong and bad people (hands). The metaphorical concept, hands, also carries a metaphorical notion of having a bounded surface (container) that is implied by the preposition *into*. The three metaphors carry a pragmatic coherence in that they are used to sensibly dissuade the populace to watch out on the kind of leadership to put in place. We can thus say:

POLITICAL LEADERSHIP IS A CONTAINER
POLITICAL FIGURES ARE HANDS
POLITICS IS A JOURNEY
HANDS ARE CONTAINERS

6 *Twīna cibitarī tūkwambīrīria na process nī nthīū mūno īri bakubī kūrīka*

We have a hospital that we are starting and the process has gone very far it is almost complete

In 6 JOURNEY and BUILDING metaphors are used as source domains to conceptualize the abstract concept, development. The two metaphors are used together because they overlap. The comparable notion of a journey being capable of gaining some milestones and the building gaining height are used compares with the process of development. Hence, the development process is seen to have *gone far* (journey) and almost coming to *completion* (building). Thus:

DEVELOPMENT IS A JOURNEY
DEVELOPMENT IS A BUILDING

7 *Mwīandīkithie kīamani kū kenda kībota kūthīl wega*

You should register yourselves in that party so that it can progress well

In 7 the CONTAINER and JOURNEY metaphor overlap to structure the more abstract concept: politics. A political party is seen as a container into which people get register) or a vehicle which they board and get a ticket. The parties, like vehicles or containers, are destination bound. The two metaphors make the concept of registering in a political party in order to vote in a desired pattern coherent. The same way people get into a vessel because they are on a designated journey, so it is with political parties and politics. Thus:

A POLITICAL PARTY IS A CONTAINER (VESSEL/VEHICLE)

POLITICAL PROGRESS IS A JOURNEY

8 *Antũ makĩendaga kũthĩ na mbere makĩendaga maisha mao maitia ĩgũrũ maũntũ mabua*

People want to move forward and desire that their lives go up so that things are better

In 8 JOURNEY and UP-DOWN metaphor overlap to structure the more abstract concept: social economic progress. To grow socially and economically is moving(journey)upwards (up-down). The two metaphors make the speaker's discourse coherent. The metaphor describes both what social-economic progress is. They elaborate that it is an upward movement. The two metaphors are able to simultaneously structure this concept because there is an overlap of their purposes, hence coherence between them. Thus we can say that:

SOCIAL ECONOMIC PROGRESS IS A JOURNEY

SOCIAL ECONOMIC PROGRESS IS UP

9 *Na kĩrĩgĩrĩro, nĩ gĩntũ kĩa bata mũno antũ ma ngai, ĩndĩ kĩrĩgĩrĩro nĩkĩagaga, ĩndĩonakegua family yakuĩgĩkinyagia mwisho, ũtigate kĩrĩgĩrĩro*

Hope is a valuable thing people of God, but hope can lack but even if your family comes to an end, do not lose hope

The abstract concept: hope has been structured by VALUABLE RESOURCE and JOURNEY metaphors in 9. As a valuable resource, hope can be lost if it is not secured. It is seen as a resource that people can bank on whenever things do not turn up. *Gũkinyamwisho* literally seen as the end of the lane, is metaphorically used to conceptualize the situation one is bound to get into if they let go hope. The JOURNEY and VALUABLE RESOURCE metaphor overlap to depict hope as an important factor (resource) that is important to keep people going (journey). Inversely, loss of hope, is coming to the end of the journey. Thus:

HOPE IS A VALUABLE RESOURCE

HOPE IS A JOURNEY

10 *Tiga gũtinda ũgĩkua nkoro kwabota kwĩgua kana kau ũkwona bau nĩko gagakũgĩa methorimontha na no kũgarũrũke na maũntũ makathĩ wega*

Do not lose heart, may be the child that you have might be the one to wipe your tears, and the situation can change and turn around for better.

In 10 BRITTLE OBJECT, JOURNEY and TEARS are used as the source domains through which different abstract concepts, hope, and difficulties are conceptualized. The three different metaphors are coherent in that they are sensibly able to take home the message. *Gũkuaandnkoro* are both used metaphorically. They carry the non-metaphorical entailment that the heart is a brittle object that can easily break. Metaphorically this implies losing hope. Therefore, hope is a brittle object, it can be shattered to pieces by difficult situations (methori) but the speaker says that, that does not have to happen, circumstances can happen and things go well (journey), which means something good showing up that brings back hope. The three metaphors though, they are conceptualizing different things create discourse coherence because their purposes overlap (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Thus:

HOPE IS A BRITTLE OBJECT

HOPE IS A JOURNEY

DIFFICULTIES ARE TEARS

11 *Kandĩkieni na kuuga atĩrĩ gĩani na kĩrĩgĩrĩro thĩini wa ngai*

Let me finish by telling you to have hope in God

11 is an instance where two different source domains, JOURNEY and CONTAINER overlap in a statement to structure two separate concepts. The target domains, a speech and God are conceptualized through JOURNEY and CONTAINER metaphors respectively. This is very common in any coherent and unplanned discourse (Shen & Balaban, 1999). The speaker is making his concluding remarks. *Kandĩkieni* (journey) which metaphorically entails that making a speech is a journey that has a start and a finish, is coupled with a statement that gives hope

to the bereaved: to find solace in God (container). Generally, in the religious discourse, God is usually conceptualized metaphorically as many things: rock, strong tower, refuge etcetera, all of which imply protection. The images are meant to make comprehension of him vivid and to enable people to believe and put their trust in him. The two metaphors make complete sense and bring coherence to what is being talked about.

Thus:

A SPEECH IS A JOURNEY

GOD IS A CONTAINER

12 *Nīakūmonia būria magīre gwīkarathīnī wa ūthamaki nīkenda maūntū mathīī wega*

He is instructing them on how they ought to stay inside the kingdom so that everything can go well with them. In 12, to conceptualize the abstract concept of spirituality, the speaker uses the source domains CONTAINER and JOURNEY. A spiritual life is metaphorically referred to as *the kingdom*. A person living a spiritual life is perceived to be *inside* the kingdom (container). *Kūthīī wega (going well)* (journey) metaphorically entails a successful spiritual life. The overlap of these two metaphors make coherent the concept of spirituality or the walk of faith. Thus:

SPIRITUALITY (KINGDOM) IS A CONTAINER

SPIRITUALITY IS A JOURNEY

13 *Mekarangwatanīroni īnu, maūntū monthe makathīī wega*

If they stay in that fellowship it shall go well with them

CONTAINER and JOURNEY metaphors overlap in 13 to make coherent the abstract concept, relationship. The use of preposition *in* gives the concept of a relationship a bounded surface, which entails protection safety and abode. Therefore, the audience is being encouraged to seek to abide in that relationship with their creator. In that state, the speaker says that things are bound to go on well (journey). This metaphorical overlap alludes to other statements like, a walk in the Lord” or “a journey in the Lord.” Thus:

A RELATIONSHIP IS A CONTAINER

A RELATIONSHIP IS A JOURNEY

14 *Tūkoragwa tūrī o bantū ta bau, rīrīa ūmwe wetū atūtiga nīūntu twīgucaga tūrī thīnī wa ūntūūnu*

We are at times awkwardly found to be in such a position when one of us leaves us because we are usually deep inside that situation

Various metaphors are used in 14 to make coherent the effect of death in people’s lives. Death is perceived as departing (journey) which impacts people by plunging them into depression (container). One that is mourning is thus conceptualized as being deep inside the container. The metaphors used in this instance make coherent the concepts of dying and mourning. It metaphorically implies that the bereaved are left behind (journey) in deep sorrow (container). The more, they stay in that situation, the deeper they get into depression (deep container). But if they get over mourning, they are able to surface out of the container. Thus:

DEPRESSION IS A CONTAINER

DEATH IS DEPARTURE

MOURNING IS BEING INSIDE

15 *Mabotithagie gūtūūra ūtūūro mwīcūru, mabotithagie kūthīī na mbele mūno*

Help them to live lives that are full, help them to move forward

In 15 both the CONTAINER and JOURNEY metaphors overlap to conceptualize life. Container and journey are the source domains while life is the target domain whose comprehension is sought. Full life (container) is life that is moving forward ever (journey). The content defining surface of both journey and container defines their coherence and simultaneously they are able to conceptualize life. Hence

LIFE IS A CONTAINER

LIFE IS A JOURNEY

16 *Rīrīa wamenya ūrī mūgendi, tigana na nteto cia mbindu. Ma magūca gūkūruta wegani wa ngai, tigananamo, rūngama wega na ūthīī na mbele tontūtūwī gīntū kīmwe thīnī wa rūgendo rūrīa tūthīite*

When you get to know that you are a sojourner, you should stop all issues of darkness, and leave all those that come to pull you out of the grace of God, stand firm and move on because I can see we are one thing in this journey.

Excerpt 16 is a typical example of the metaphors that make coherent the conceptual metaphor SALVATION IS A JOURNEY. A saved person is one that is on a journey (sojourner). The quality of salvation (journey) is conceptualized through light and darkness images as people can choose to either journey by day or by night. These metaphorical expressions create internal systematicity within the metaphor SALVATION IS A JOURNEY. There is also external systematicity where the same concept (salvation) is conceptualized in terms of CONTAINER and JOURNEY metaphors. A truly saved and consistent person is one that is firmly standing (building) and in that case, he or she is perceived to be in salvation(container). There is the overlap of these metaphors that is able to make coherent the concept of salvation. Thus: SALVATION IS A JOURNEY

A SAVED PERSON IS SOJOURNER

SALVATION IS A JOURNEY IN THE LIGHT

LACK OF SALVATION IS A JOURNEY IN THE DARK

SALVATION IS CONTAINER

SALVATION IS BUILDING

17 *Nokatwinthe marĩa tūtigarĩte, tūbatũ nĩ kũboya ĩtu rĩrĩ rĩrĩku rĩa antũ gwĩtwa mũno rĩebererue*

All those who are left should pray for the current cloud that is there of people being called enmass to be lifted

In 17 departure, cloud and summon are used as the source domains through which the abstract target domain, death is conceptualized. The three metaphors overlap to make coherent the concept death. Though the three metaphors do not share a notion, we term them as coherent as they are able to simultaneously structure the discourse of the day. Thus:

DEATH IS DEPARTURE/ A JOURNEY

DEATH IS A CLOUD

DEATH IS A SUMMON

18 *Nĩnkwona twĩ gĩntũ kĩmwe thĩnĩ wa rũgendo rũrĩa tũthĩte. Ũyũũtũtigĩte, aratigerie mĩaka ĩrĩ kana ĩthatũ aringa rĩcũrĩĩ, na gũkinyia ĩgana rĩcũrĩĩ tĩ mathe. Īndĩ nĩmenda mũmenye ma magendaga, maĩkoragwa na thĩna, marĩa matigĩtwe tatwiũnĩmo makoragwa marĩ thĩnani*

I can see we are one in this journey. The deceased had only two to three years to go to hit a hundred full years' mark and to fill a hundred years is not a joke. But I want you to know that those that go have no problem, those that are left like us are the ones in trouble

In 18 JOURNEY, CONTAINER and DEPARTURE make coherent the metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY. Death (departure) is perceived as the aspect of exiting the journey (life) while leaving the rest of the sojourners (the living) continuing with the journey(living). The CONTAINER metaphor overlaps with the JOURNEY metaphor to make the concept of life coherent. A long and a fulfilled life (a long journey) which is the envy of the speaker in this context, is compared to a full container. The content defining surfaces of both the container and the journey act as the intersection that makes the two metaphors coherent. Thus:

LIFE IS A JOURNEY

LIFE IS A CONTAINER

DEATH IS DEPARTURE

19 *Wauma nthĩno, antu ma ngai nĩmo macaga magakũnogokia magagũkinyia ba ũthĩte. No antũ mau mangĩ nau nja, ona ũgakinya mũico kamaũraga. Twaboya wega wa ngai mũtũrĩreni wetu. Ona rũgĩkinyia mami wetu, nĩtũmũkinyie ngoro cietũ cĩna thayũ wa ngai*

When you leave this earth, the people of God help you to rest and to arrive to the place where you are going but those others outside, even when you come to the end, they get lost. We pray for the grace of God in your lives, even as we escort our mum, we pray the peace of God to take abode in our hearts

The metaphors JOURNEY, REST and ESCORTING in 19 are used together to make coherent the concept of death, burial and the role of the church. The speaker refers to death as taking leave from earth (journey). This statement carries the metaphorical entailment that one goes on a journey in the next world. The importance of belonging to a church is emphasized, because they are seen to play the role of conducting one's burial(escorting). Metaphorically speaking, this is the final journey to rest (burial). The three metaphors overlap to make the message coherent. Thus:

DEATH IS A JOURNEY

BURYING IS PUTTING TO REST

BURYING IS ESCORTING

20 *Nĩ tontũũboru ũnu ka ũthĩcaga ũgĩkagĩrwa binya*

Because that word continues to be reinforced

The abstract target domain faith in 20 is conceptualized by JOURNEY and BUILDING metaphors at the same time. Faith is capable of progressing or moving forward (journey) that is to mean growing or increasing. The more one grows in faith, the stronger or firmer they become (building). The two metaphors overlap in their content defining surface to make coherent the concept, faith. Thus:

FAITH IS A JOURNEY

FAITH IS A BUILDING

21 *Augire, “Nĩnkũmenya akariũka rĩngi thĩni wa ũriũkio ũria wa mũico ũrĩa twetererete nkinya ũmũnthĩ na tĩ mũkinyu*

She said, “I know he will rise again in the final resurrection we are waiting for and has not yet come.”

Resurrection in 21 is conceptualized both as a container and a journey. As a container, people have put their hope in it (container) which means that even if their loved ones die, they bank on resurrection: that they will see them again. It is this resurrection that people await which has not yet come (journey). The path of the journey, and the depth of the container define the coherence between the two metaphors and make it possible to simultaneously structure the concept resurrection. Thus: RESURRECTION IS A CONTAINER/VESSEL

RESURRECTION IS JOURNEY

22 *Nũntũũno nĩ nyomba ĩrĩa ng’endaga ndĩ thĩni wayo*

Because this is a house in which I travel

In 22 two concepts, body and life are simultaneously conceptualized using two different metaphors, BUILDING and JOURNEY metaphors. Like a building, the body is perceived to house the person’s spirit that walks the life’s journey (lives), so that when the journey is over or cut short, the spirit, leaves (dying) and so the journey (living) stops or continues in the next world as some believe. The overlap of these two metaphors make coherent the metaphor, LIFE IS A JOURNEY. Hence

THE BODY IS A HOUSE/ CONTAINER

LIFE IS A JOURNEY

23 *Gũkũ nthĩ, gũtĩ na ba gwĩkara, ona gũtĩ na bantũ ba kũnogoka nũntũ noka rũthĩte. O bũrĩa ntukũ irathĩ, nwabu ũrakubĩbĩria ntukũ ya kuuma thĩni wa nyomba yaku*

Here on earth there is no place to stay or to rest because we are on transit. As days progress, then the more one approaches the day of getting out of their house

In 23 the concepts of life and death are understood through the overlap of the more delineated concepts: journey, building, in, and out. The metaphorical entailment here is that as long as one is alive (in) they are forever moving (journey). The journey (life) has no rest or stop-overs, until it is over or one reaches their final destination (death) where they alight from their vessels (get out of the body). The simultaneous use the CONTAINER and JOURNEY as source domains makes the concept of life and death more vivid and coherent. Hence

LIFE IS A CONTINUOUS JOURNEY

THE BODY IS A BUILDING

LIVING IS IN

DYING IS OUT

24 *Muntũ athĩ kiumiani egua kiugo kĩa ngai, ona ũrĩa aticĩ kũthoma, gĩkamwĩkaria nkinya kiumia kũ kĩngĩ*

When one goes into a service, even if they do not know how to read, the word keeps them up to the following week

The metaphorical theme pursued in 24 is Christian life. Journey, container and food are used as the source domains through which this concept is elaborated. People are encouraged to regularly go into a church service (container) so that they can be fed on the word of God which gives them nourishment (food) to go the extra mile (journey) until the following week when they would attend church again and the journey continues. Thus we can say that:

A CHURCH SERVICE IS A CONTAINER

CHRISTIAN LIFE IS A JOURNEY

THE WORD OF GOD IS FOOD/LIFE

25 *Ūnu rīu tūkathiĩ nawe biti ciĩgana ūyũũkũremwa nĩ ngurubu?*
How many feet will we go with such a person, one who cannot manage a group?

25 is an instance where two different metaphors together structure two different concepts. The speaker is wondering whether they can move any distance (unite/agree) with a colleague who is unable to manage a group. The two metaphors create the impression that a group is a heavy container whose management requires a person that is agreeable. Thus:

A SOCIAL WELFARE GROUP IS HEAVY CONTAINER
UNITY IS A JOURNEY

26 *Rīu tūkathũngĩra bau bangĩ twathiĩ wega na tũkĩnabinga*
Now, if we get into the next session, we shall move on well and then we close

A social activity is simultaneously structured by JOURNEY and CONTAINER metaphors. The progress in the activity is perceived as getting from one session into another (container). It is also conceptualized as going on well (journey) towards the end (journey) or the point where it is closed (container). The overlap of the JOURNEY and CONTAINER metaphors makes the concept of a social activity more comprehensible. The path of a journey and the depth of a container are the notions of the two source domains that make overlap possible, hence defining coherence between them. Hence

A SOCIAL ACTIVITY IS A JOURNEY
A SOCIAL ACTIVITY IS A CONTAINER

27 *Nabũukwarirue nĩkwathiĩre wega noka bũkwenda bwĩkĩrĩrwe itugĩ kenda bwongererwe bwĩcũre bururu. Bau mwakinyirie nĩbo tũthũite gũtirũra, kana nĩ rĩria ikũrũ tũkũmincĩra? Kwĩna ba twatigĩrĩre bafĩbecũru, nĩbo tũthũite gwakĩrĩra. Rũrayio rũthũicaga na mbele na kũrauwa nkinya rũkathira bunka rũrĩrwambĩre mũsingi mũng' iinyu ma.*

Whatever was said went on well, but it only requires some reinforcement for it be conclusive. Shall we take up from where you left or it is the old agreement that we shall build upon? We shall build upon what was left incomplete; dowry continues to be paid until it is paid in full as long as it has a strong foundation.

The concept of dowry negotiation is elaborated upon metaphorically in 27. JOURNEY, BUILDING, CONTAINER, VEHICLE are the source domains through which the abstract target domains of dowry, dowry negotiation and dowry payment are understood. The earlier negotiation is said to have gone well (journey) but only requires to be reinforced with ideas (building) to be made conclusive (building). To carry on in the current session, the speaker says that they will *push* (vehicle) from where they left (journey). The speaker proposes that they would renegotiate instead of building upon the old agreement (building) which is referred to as *kũmincĩra rĩria ikũrũ* (to plant on the old seed bed) because those that negotiated previously are absent. They agree to continue with the wedding plans on the promise that the dowry would be paid in full (container) as long as there is an agreement that is binding referred to by the use *strong foundation*-(building). The use of these metaphors together make the aspect of dowry coherent. Thus:

DOWRY NEGOTIATION IS A JOURNEY
DOWRY NEGOTIATION IS A BUILDING
DOWRY NEGOTIATION IS A CONTAINER
DOWRY NEGOTIATION IS A VEHICLE
DOWRY NEGOTIATION IS PLANTING
PAYING DOWRY IS A JOURNEY
PAYING DOWRY IS PUTTING UP A BUILDING

28 *Nĩmendaga kwaria na ũkubĩ mbuge togu mĩario yathiĩ, rwaria ruũ ni rũrikĩru ma na twithe tũgatetheka*
I wanted to talk briefly and say as the way the talk has proceeded, it has been deep and all of us will benefit

In 28 a speech or a conversation is structured by JOURNEY and BUILDING metaphors together. The speaker says he would be brief (journey). Reiterating the earlier conversation, he says it has gone well (journey) and it is deep and firm (building). The overlap of JOURNEY and BUILDING metaphors make the concept of a conversation or a speech coherent and more comprehensible. Thus we can say that:

A SPEECH/CONVERSATION IS A JOURNEY
A SPEECH IS A BUILDING

29 *Nĩkũmenya nũũ kanyani kau, ũrarĩ auge gaũntũ kanini. Nĩ ayũkie kaanya na agatũmĩre wega*

I do not know who on behalf of this family, was to say something small. Take that chance and utilize it well

In 29 CONTAINER and VALUABLE RESOURCE metaphors simultaneously structure the abstract target domain opportunity. *Kanyaniis* used to make reference to that opportunity given to say something on behalf of the others. The preposition *in*, makes reference to the container that opportunity is perceived to be. The speaker hands over the opportunity (container) and requests him to utilize it carefully. The entailment made is that opportunity is precious and limited (valuable resource). The two metaphors: CONTAINER and VALUABLE RESOURCE are coherent in structuring the abstract concept opportunity. The container provides the surface upon which the precious commodity opportunity, is held. Hence

OPPORTUNITY IS A CONTAINER

OPPORTUNITY IS A VALUABLE RESOURCE

30 *Kanyanika family ĩno, kambuge ĩno nĩ family ĩcuriĩ na ni ĩ rathiĩ wega.*

On behalf of this family, let me say it is a complete family and it is progressing on well

The speaker in 30 uses CONTAINER, VEHICLE and JOURNEY metaphors at the same time to conceptualize the concept of the progress in the family. He has been accorded the opportunity(container) and he observes that the family is full(container), to mean that all have attended the function without fail, or to mean that the family is well up. *Going well* features the progress of the family in terms of a journey, and the family itself is perceived as a vehicle. The three metaphors: CONTAINER, VEHICLE and JOURNEY overlap to make coherent the concept of progress in the family and opportunity in the same instance. Thus:

OPPORTUNITY IS A CONTAINER

A FAMILY IS A CONTAINER

A FAMILY IS A VEHICLE/VESSEL

FAMILY PROGRESS IS A JOURNEY

31 *Rĩ rĩ a mũntũ arĩ mutige nĩ mwendwa wawe nĩ egucaga maisha marĩ maũmu mũno*

When one is left by their loved one, life becomes very difficult.

31 is an instance where two different source domains: DEPARTURE and CONTAINER are used to conceptualize two different target domains (death and life) in the same instance. The overlap of the two metaphors serves to make the subject matter coherent. Thus we can say that:

DEATH IS DEPARTURE

LIFE IS A CONTAINER

32 *Nĩ kenda tũbota kwambũrĩ ria kĩ aho, na tũbota gũtonya bau bangĩ, twambe tũũrie ngai rũũtha nĩ tontũ maũntũ monthe twambagĩ rĩ ria na mwathani, Nĩ kenda tũthiĩ kiugoni. Nĩ kenda twarĩ kia tũbecane kaanya tũkethue na kuuma bau, tũkĩ nathũngĩ ra kĩ athoni wa rĩ mwe*

So that we can start this occasion, and be able to move to the next step, first let us ask God for permission because we always start all things with prayers. After that, we shall get into the word, so that when we finish we grant time for greetings, and from there, we enter into the occasion straight.

In 32 the program of events in the activity is systematically conceptualized through the overlap of JOURNEY, CONTAINER and VALUABLE RESOURCE metaphors. The activity is said to start and move into the next step (journey and container). The speaker says that all things (activity) usually start(journey) with prayers. From there (journey) they will grant time for greetings (valuable resource) and from there, they will enter into the activity (container). Like a container, people get into it, and start moving from the start to the end(journey). Time acts as the facilitator or incentive (valuable resource) for the occasion to set sail and move smoothly (container and journey). Thus:

AN ACTIVITY IS A JOURNEY

THE WORD IS A CONTAINER

TIME IS A VALUABLE RESOURCE

33 *Rĩ rĩ a antũ matigwa nĩ megucaga marĩ atabũkĩ re mũno, na marĩ athire nĩ binya na marĩ abinyĩ rĩ rĩ ku sana*

When people are left, they feel drained, empty and depressed.

In 33 there is an overlap of DEPARTURE, PHYSICAL FORCE and CONTAINER metaphors to conceptualize coherently the abstract psycho social effects of death. *Gũtabũkĩ rwa* metaphorically implies a container whose

contents have been drained off. This CONTAINER metaphor used to link how people feel when a loved one dies(departs). It is also closely linked to the depressive mood people find themselves in that is oppressive (physical force and forces them into(container) extreme sadness. Thus we can say that:

DEATH IS DEPARTURE
SADNESS IS PHYSICAL FORCE
SADNESS IS A CONTAINER

34 *Tũrĩ nthĩ ĩ rĩ a ĩ cũrũte maũntũ mengĩ, wĩ ĩ mwĩ ngĩ mũno ũrĩ a wĩ cũrĩ te nthĩ na maũntũ matĩ thiĩ wega gwikiri ũgu.*

We are in a world which is full of many evil things and things cannot go on well when it is like that

In 34 CONTAINER and JOURNEY metaphors overlap to conceptualize the current state of affairs in the world. Like a container, the world is said to be *full* of many evil things thus, people cannot experience any social or economic growth(journey). The path of a journey and the content of the container are the shared surfaces that make it possible for the two metaphors to simultaneously structure the non-progressive state of affairs in the world. The two metaphors, though conceptualizing two different things, find coherence in their shared notions. Thus we can say:

THE WORLD IS A CONTAINER
SOCIAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IS A JOURNEY

35 *Tũbotē gũtoria mũtũrĩ reni*

So that we can overcome in life

The metaphorical theme in 35 is life. *Gũtoria* which means to win has a metaphorical entailment that living is being involved in a battle or war(container). *Mũtũrĩ reni* which means in life, has a metaphorical entailment that living is like being in a bounded surface (container). The depth defining surface creates the coherence that makes life to be perceived both as a container and a battle. Hence

LIFE IS A BATTLE
LIFE IS A CONTAINER

36 *Na ũkathiĩ na mbere kũmũboria bururu thiĩ ini wa riĩ twa rĩ a Jesu*

And you will continue on to heal her in Jesus name

In 36 both JOURNEY and CONTAINER metaphors overlap to bring the message home. The progress in the journey is used to conceptualize how healing takes place- it begins at some point and continues to the end like a journey, when the person is finally said to have fully recovered. The two find coherence in that the healing(journey) is perceived to take place in nowhere else, but in the name of Jesus (container). Both journey and container share a content defining surface that makes both name and healing coherent. Thus:

HEALING IS A JOURNEY
THE NAME OF JESUS IS A CONTAINER

Table 1: Summary of the Patterns of Metaphorical Overlap in Gichuka Social

Metaphors	Frequency	Percentage
Journey and Container	12	33.33
Journey container and others	7	19.44
Journey and others	5	13.89
Journey and building	4	11.11
Container and others	4	11.11
Others only	2	5.56
Journey, building and others	1	2.78
Journey container building and others	1	2.78
Total	36	100

Table one (1) shows a summary of how the metaphors overlapped in Gichuka social discourse. Thirty-six (36) instantiations of multiple use of metaphors were analyzed from across the eleven spechevents. Eight categories of metaphorical overlap were arrived at in Gichuka social discourse. The first category is where JOURNEY and CONTAINER metaphors overlap. This is the most predominant category. There are twelve instantiations, which account for 33.33% of the total instantiations. The next category is where JOURNEY, CONTAINER and OTHERS overlapped. There are seven (7) of such combinations. This category accounts for

19.44% of the total overlaps. The third category is the overlap of JOURNEY metaphor and OTHERS. These are five (5) out of the thirty-six instantiations. This accounts for 13.89%. The fourth category is that of the overlap between JOURNEY and BUILDING metaphors. The instantiations are four out of the possible thirty-six. The fifth category is that of the overlap of CONTAINER metaphor and OTHERS. They are also four instances. The fourth and the fifth category each accounts for 11.11% of the total overlaps. The sixth category is that of the OTHERS. This is the overlap between the not so common metaphors that were found to feature in Gichuka social discourse. These are the novel metaphors as compared to the ordinary (conventional) ones JOURNEY, CONTAINER, and BUILDING. This category has two instances of such. This forms 5.56% of the total overlaps. Category seven is that of the overlap of JOURNEY, BUILDING and OTHERS. There is only one of such instance. The eighth category is the overlap of JOURNEY, CONTAINER, BUILDING and OTHERS. There is only one (1) instance of such overlap. Category seven (7) and eight (8) each accounts for 2.78% of all the overlaps.

IV. Conclusion

The findings in this paper show how metaphor enables Gichuka speakers to shape their meanings and communicate their attitudes coherently. The findings reveal that metaphorical overlap does exist in Gichuka social discourse. Metaphor overlap in Gichuka social discourse is realized by the overlap of the conventional metaphors, JOURNEY, CONTAINER, BUILDING and OTHERS. The JOURNEY metaphor was found to overlap with most metaphors. The conventional metaphors (JOURNEY, CONTAINER and BUILDING) were seldom found to cluster together and share the same root metaphor. For instance, from the data analyzed, Gichuka social discourse did not realize an overlap of JOURNEY, CONTAINER and BUILDING metaphor. Rather, both conventional and novel metaphors were found to be scattered in Gichuka social discourse. Ontological and structural metaphors, were found to overlap in Gichuka social discourse. This contrasts with Shen and Balaban (1999) in their analysis of coherence in discourse. They argue that coherence can only occur in structural metaphors and not ontological metaphors because ontological metaphors are highly abstract and not tightly connected with their examples.

There were both coherent and incoherent metaphors in Gichuka social discourse. These metaphors create coherence either at the metaphor level or at the discourse level. Firstly, there are coherent metaphors which co-occur to structure the same concept. This results in external systematicity or cross-metaphorical coherence (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). This is the most predominant type of coherence realized in Gichuka social discourse. Out of the thirty-six (36) instances of overlap analyzed, there were twenty one (21) instantiations which account for 58.33% (percent) of the overlaps. Secondly, there are incoherent metaphors where instances of different metaphors were used simultaneously with different concepts to produce creativity and create coherence within the social discourse. This is a very likely phenomenon in any discourse that is not pre-organised. There were fifteen (15) of such instances, which account for 41.67% (percent) of the total overlaps. These findings compare favourably with Berberovic and Delibegovic (2021) where they find figurative creativity to produce both intratextual as well intertextual coherence within political discourse. These findings also compare with the results of McCarthy (2019) in the study of coherence and incoherence in NASA instructional materials. The study establishes that NASA instructional materials made use of both coherent and incoherent metaphors. The coherent metaphors were used to arrest the imagination of the readers, while the incoherent ones were used to excite the audience.

Coherence within metaphors or internal systematicity was minimal. The most probable reason is that the discourse segments used were unplanned. The data were spontaneous utterances, so rather than speakers endeavouring to create coherence within metaphors, the speakers endeavoured to make coherent the subject of their discourse and unconsciously or consciously used metaphors for that purpose. These findings compare with the findings of Shen & Balaban (1999) where both global and linear analysis found very high levels of metaphorical coherence in planned passages as compared to unplanned passages. The levels of coherence were relatively low in unplanned passages. Their study disputes the view by the proponents of CMT that unplanned discourse can display consistency in distribution of metaphors, such that there can be metaphors clustered around the root metaphor.

These results lead to the conclusion that is in agreement with Shen and Balaban (1999) that for metaphorical coherence to be fully realized as proposed by the proponents of CMT, the study requires tactful planning of discourse segments around a given root metaphor, and not a strategy by chance adopted unconsciously by natural producers of discourse.

REFERENCE

- [1]. Berberovic, S., & Delibegovic, D. N. (2021). *A Cognitive Linguistic Study of the Use of Creative Figurative Language in American Political Discourse*. Livre De Lyon.
- [2]. Cienki, A. (2005). Researching Conceptual Metaphors that (may) Underlie Political Discourse. *ECPR Workshop on Metaphor in Political Science*. Emory University.
- [3]. Caballero, R. (2007). Metaphor and Culture: Universality and Variation. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22(1), 109-108.
- [4]. Gachara, M. (2012). Gikuyu Metaphor of Marriage Negotiations: A Cognitive Linguistics Perspective. *Unpublishe PhD Thesis*. Kenyatta University Repository.
- [5]. Gathigia, M. (2010). Metaphors of Love in Gikuyu: Conceptual Mappings, Vital Relations and Image Schemas. *Unpublished PhD Thesis*. Kenyatta University.
- [6]. Kamalu, I. (2020). Metaphorical Naming of Selected Dreaded Diseases and Medical Conditions in Igbo Language and Thought. *Topics in Linguistics*, 21, 28-40.
- [7]. Karnedi, P. (2015). Challenges to Metaphorical Coherence across the Languages and Cultures. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*(4), 68-87.
- [8]. Kovecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- [9]. Kovecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A practical Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- [10]. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live by*. The University of Chicago Press.
- [11]. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors We Live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- [12]. McCarthy, M. J. (2019). Metaphorical Coherence and Incoherence in NASA'S Education and Public Outreach. *PhD Dissertation*. Texas Tech University.
- [13]. PRAGGLEJAZZ. (2007). MIP: A Method of Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse. *Metaphor and SyMBOL*, 22(1), 1-39.
- [14]. Shen, Y., & Balaban, N. (1999). Metaphorical (in) Coherence in Discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 28(2), 139-153.
- [15]. Steen, G., Dorst, A., Hermarmann, J. B., Kaal, A. A., Krennmayr, T., & Pasma, T. (2010). *A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification; From MIP to MIPVU*. John Benjamins.
- [16]. Zhang, x. (2009). An Analysis of Conceptual Metaphorin Western Commercial Advertisements. *Asian Social Science*, 5(12).

Emise Kageni Miriti, et. al. "Cross Metaphorical Coherence in Gichuka Social Discourse." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 27(06), 2022, pp. 42-53.