Metaphors and Symbols:

A Comparison of C. G. Jung's Symbol Analysis

and Conceptual Metaphor Theory

Réka Szabó

Pázmány Péter Catholic University

2014

I. Introduction

The dissertation has four main parts. In the first part I give the scientific literature background of the topic. Afterwards I compare the two theories from one theoretical and two practical point of view. Based on the practice of the psychotherapy and the cognitive linguistics I draw a parallel between the research fields and the methodologies of the two disciplines and I show how they can complement each other and what are the benefits of using the tools both of them.

I.1. Previous studies and raising questions

The comparison of analytical psychology and cognitive linguistics might seem an unusual research topic. Although there are several studies in psychology that discuss the role of metaphor in therapy (see e.g. Arlow 1979, Barker 1985, 1996; Borbely 1998, Cox–Theilgaard 1987, Ingram 1994, Zeig–Gilligan 1990), and cognitive linguistics touches the use of conceptual metaphors in psychology to a certain extent (e.g. Kövecses 2005), the overlaps of the two disciplines have not been recorded yet and, more importantly, neither of them has used the results of the other for his own research purposes. The combination of the freudian psychoanalysis and the conceptual metaphor theory can be found in the works of István Fónagy and his approach is most closely related to my own.

What are the contributions which the Jungian analysis can give to the conceptual metaphor theory? How is it possible to find overlaps between two such distant fields of studies as analytical psychology and cognitive linguistics?

I.1.1 Cognitive linguistics

The most important innovations of cognitive linguistics were made in the field of the semantics (see Johnson 1987, Lakoff 1987, 1993, Langacker 1987, 1990,

Fauconnier–Turner 1998, 2002). Especially the cognitive interpretation of metaphor brought something new to the linguistics (see Lakoff–Johnson 1980, Kövecses 1986, 2005, Lakoff–Kövecses 1987, Lakoff 1993, and the vast literature based on these). In cognitive linguistic view, metaphors are emerging between concepts, not between words. In the everyday language most expressions are metaphorical that reveal the existence of the conceptual metaphors. For example speaking about a relationship we use phrases such as *to overcome something, we've come far, we've stuck*, *we're at a crossroads, I don't think this relationship is going anywhere* (examples from Lakoff–Johnson 1980). Looking at these expressions we can see that the way we talk and think about love derives from the way we talk about journeys (Kövecses 2010). The preceding expressions that have to do with love and that come from the domain of journey are linguistic metaphorical expressions, whereas the corresponding conceptual metaphor that they make manifest is LOVE IS A JOURNEY (Kövecses 2010, 4). Most often we use metaphors to describe and express abstract concepts, especially to describe emotions that are highly elusive.

I.1.2 Analytical Psychology

Analytical psychology is one field of depth psychology, which accepts the existence of the unconscious. According to Jung, reliable communication between the conscious and unconscious parts of the psyche is necessary for wholeness. The "language" of the unconscious are images. Their messages come to the sphere of the conscious in the form of symbolic images, which carry underlying meanings. In therapies, uncovering the images happens by talking about them. The meaning of the inner images can be discovered with meaning pairing and association. From the cognitive linguistic perspective, associations are metaphorical or metonymical meaning pairs. Consequently, the understanding of symbolic pictures is possible via metaphorical talk or thinking. In this respect, metaphor is a work tool of therapy since the 1900s.

II. Comparison of the theories

II.1. Studying meaningful images and culture as the starting point

The so-far described topic makes it clear that both theories head towards the meaning of images. This is the basic point of their connection. Actually the topic of the researches is two different aspects of the same phenomenon. The unconscious content appears in the conscious as a picture. We try to interpret this picture by giving meaning to it, or by connecting some parts or characteristic features of it to the putative content and at the end we form words out of it. The metaphorical expressions are created in this way. The main aim of psychological analysis is to get to know the unconscious concepts through the meaning giving; the cognitive linguistics examines the meaning making itself: the creating of concepts, language and the mechanisms on which are based these processes in the mind. Their main tool for this is the examination of the pictures carrying a meaning.

In order to understand the meaning of pictures, both call for the help of culture, which is the second common basis in the researches of the two fields.

One particular characteristics of this is that psychological processes are approached from the direction of universal human culture and not from the direction of pathology (Antalfai 2007a, 166).

The psychologist is seeking for the meaning of the inner pictures, and discovers them through the associations given. Usually the personal and collective symbolic meanings are mixed in these associations.

In cognitive linguistic view, human meaning making activities determine the most important characteristics of concepts created by the human mind. We build our inner world on the basis of what we experience in the outside world. According to several anthropologists, frames are more or less the same for members of particular cultures and, therefore, cognitive linguistics often considers culture as a complex web of understandings that are based on frames and that members of the community share among themselves.

II.2. Research of the relationship between meaning and cognitive processing

The third point in which the two fields connect is the methodology with which they determine meaning. Both systems consider the process of meaning making essential, since it is the processes themselves that influence meaning. It is part of the basic notions of cognitive linguistics that language is inseparable from cognition; meaning can be understood via the examination of meaning making. It argues that language is governed by general cognitive principles, rather than by a special-purpose language module. It examines meanings in correspondence with our responses to the environment, the culture, and the world.

According to analytical psychology, not the concrete physical experiences are recorded in the individual who is getting to know the world, but the image of these together with the phantasies and emotions attached to them and created by them (Jung 1946, 169). The events happening to people get into the psyche in a somewhat disfigured format and got recorded there together with the emotional responses created by them. This is how the two fields conceptualize with their own terminology that meaning in itself cannot be determined, the process of meaning making has to be taken into consideration as well.

II.3. Emotions in the forefront of researches

It follows the fourth connecting point: cognitive linguistics discovered most conceptual metaphors in the field of expressing emotions. The subject of metaphor studies are often the world of emotions, the leading of life, morality, the linguistic expressions of mental states. This connection arises naturally from what was explained above.

Emotions in analytical psychology are obviously in the focus of attention. From a psychological perspective, the basis of personality is affectivity. The regulation of this is the main role of all therapies. In psychotherapy, the pairing of images and meanings reveal the psychological background of the patient's understanding of

life. Therefore, the two fields again meet: researches are focused at emotions, at the understanding of the world and at the symbolical or metaphorical expression of these.

III. COMPARISON OF PRACTICES

III.1. Metaphor in psychotherapy

I.1.3 Analysis of dreams in personal therapy

After the comparison of the theories, there are two practical comparisons in the dissertation. First, I examine the relationship of symbol and metaphor in the approach of psychotheraputic practice. In the frame of the therapeutic conversation and art therapy drawing analysis I discuss that using metaphors in understanding symbols is an established methodology in psychology. This idea is partially elaborated in the literature outlined above. The new approach in these chapters is the discussion from a cognitive perspective: the therapist and the patient are establishing conceptual metaphors in order to understand and reveal the patient's dream. A source domain is given, but they are looking for the target domain. They solve the problem with the help of a blend. The more correspondences the patient is able to make between the source and the target domains, the more his/her quality of life improves.

I.1.4 Drawing analysis in groupe therapy

The situation is just the reverse of the case of art therapy: the target domain is given (way of life), and the task is to find source domains to this in order to help the patient conceive what his/her way of life means to him/her. It is conceiving and the creation of symbols that helps awareness.

IV.   SYMBOL IN THE SOURCE AND TARGET DOMAIN OF METAPHORS

In the third comparison, I approach the research question from the direction of metaphorical linguistic data. With the help of several examples, I illustrate that metaphorical meaning is based on symbols. Cognitive linguistics groups metaphorical linguistic expressions around one conceptual metaphor. This grouping is to be continued at the following level: conceptual metaphors too can be arranged along symbols. The image in the symbol gives the source domain, and the meaning content gives the target domain to be expressed. A systematic overlook on the relationship of symbols and metaphors is of extensive help for cognitive linguists since it gives ways to metaphors yet not discovered.

With the help of further metaphorical linguistic data I further illustrate how the symbols influence the meaning of words. In light of the correspondences, it is possible to discover the deeper layers of the meaning of metaphorical linguistic expressions, as well as to set the boundaries of the target and source domains more effectively. This gives a new aspect to researches not only on phrases but also on the meaning structure of particular words.

V.   CONCLUSION

The comparison made from these three different points of view shows how the jungian symbol theory and the conceptual metaphor theory complement each other. The meaning making processes, the researches of the emotions, the differences between the cultures and the examination of the meanings connected to the pictures, these all verifies that the two sciences are dealing with the same human cognitive processes, although their concrete aim and tools are different. From these differences many prospering research fields can blossom: the subtler definition of the conceptual metaphors and metaphorical linguistic expressions and the deeper analysis of their meanings becomes possible as well.

References

Arlow, Jacob A. 1979. Metaphor and the psychoanalitic situation. *Psychoanalytic Quaterly* 48: 363-384.

Barker, Philip 1985. *Using Metaphors in Psychotherapy*. New York, Brunner/Mazel.

Barker, Philip 1996. *Psychoterapeutic Metaphors: A Guide to Theory and Practice*. New York, Brunner/Mazel.

Borbely, Antal F. 1998. A psychoanalytic concept of metaphor. In: *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 79, 923–936.

Cox, Murray–Alice Theilgaard 1987. *Mutative Metaphors in Psychotherapy – The Aeolian Mode*. Tavistock, London.

Fauconnier, Gilles–Mark, Turner 1998. Conceptual integration networks. *Cognitive Science* 22/1, 133-187.

Fauconnier, Gilles–Mark, Turner 2002. *The Way We Think*. New York, Basic Books.

Fónagy Iván 2001. *Languages within language: an evolutive approach*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Johnson, Mark 1987. *The Body in the Mind. The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Jung, Carl Gustav 1946. Die Struktur der Seele. In: *Seelenprobleme der Gegenwart*. Rascher Verlag, Zürich.

Jung, Carl Gustav 1977. *The Psychology of Consciousness*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York.

Jung, Carl Gustav 1981. Symbole und Traumdeutung. In: *Das symbolische Leben*. GW18/1, Patmos-Walter Verlag, Düsseldorf. 199-285.

Jung, Carl Gustav 1993. A tudattalan megközelítése. In: *Az ember és szimbólumai*. Szerk. Marie-Luise von Franz. Göncöl Kiadó, Budapest.

Ingram, Joyce L. 1994. The role of figurative language in psychoterapy. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 9: 271-288.

Kast, Verena 2006. *Träume. Die geheimnisvolle Sprache des Unbewussten*. Patmos Verlag, Düsseldorf.

Kövecses, Zoltán 1986. *Metaphors of anger, pride, and love: A lexical approach to the study of concepts.* Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Kövecses, Zoltán 2005. *Metaphor in Culture. Universality and Variation.* Cambridge University Press, New York.

Kövecses, Zoltán 2010. *Metaphor. A Practical Introduction.* (2nd edition). Oxford University Press, New York.

Lakoff, George 1987. *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things. What categories Reveal about the Mind.* The University of Chicago Press. Chicago and London.

Lakoff, George 1993. The contemporary theory of metaphor. In: Ortony, A. (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought.* 2nd ed, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 202-251.

Lakoff, George–Johnson, Mark 1980. *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George–Kövecses, Zoltán 1987. The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English. In: D. Holland–N. Quinn (eds.): *Cultural models in language and thought.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 195–221.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar.* Volume I. Therotical Prerequirites. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1990. *Concept, Image, and Symbol. The Cognitive Basis of Grammar.* Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, New York.

Szabó Réka 2010: *Archetípusok és szimbólumok megjelenése a mindennapi metaforákban.* In: AKK-Online, az Anyanyelvi kultúraközvetítés c. konferencia internetes kötete (to appear).

Szabó Réka 2012: A szimbólumok és a fogalmi metaforák kapcsolata. In: Balázs Géza–Veszelszki Ágnes szerk., *Nyelv és kultúra, kulturális nyelvészet.* Magyar Szemiotikai Társaság, Budapest.

Szabó Réka 2014. Kognitive Metapher in der Psychotherapie. In: Polzenhagen–Kleinke–Kövecses–Vogelbacher (eds.) *Cognitive Explorations into Metaphor and Metonymy.* Peter Lang, Frankfurt (Main) (to appear).

Zeig, Jeffrey K.–Gilligan, Stephen G. (eds) 1990. *Brief Therapy. Myths, Methods, and Metaphors.* Brunner/Mazel, New York.

Publications on the research topic

A szimbólumok és a fogalmi metaforák kapcsolata. 'The relation of symbols to conceptual metaphors'. In: Balázs Géza–Veszelszki Ágnes szerk., *Nyelv és kultúra, kulturális nyelvészet*. Magyar Szemiotikai Társaság, Budapest. 2012, 87–92.

A természetes szimbólumok befolyása a mindennapi metaforákra. 'The influence of natural symbols on common metaphors'. In: Parapatics Andrea főszerk. *2012. Félúton 7. A hetedik Félúton konferencia (2011) kiadványa.* URL: http://linguistics.elte.hu/studies/fuk/fuk11/

Archetípusok és szimbólumok megjelenése a mindennapi metaforákban. 'Appearance of archetypes and symbols in common metaphors.' In: AKK-Online, az Anyanyelvi kultúraközvetítés 2010 c. konferencia kiadványa (to appear).

Kognitive Metapher in der Psychotherapie. 'Conceptual metaphor in psychotherapy.' In: Polzenhagen–Kleinke–Kövecses–Vogelbacher (eds.): *Cognitive Explorations into Metaphor and Metonymy.* Peter Lang, Frankfurt (Main). 2014 (to appear).