CONCEPTUAL MAPPING ON THE PARABLE OF THE GOSPEL OF LUKE: A COGNITIVE APPROACH

Raymundus P. Lokangleu
roylokang94@gmail.com
Ni Nyoman Tri Sukarsih
trisukarsih_dp@yahoo.com
Komang Tri Sutrisna Agustia
trisutrisna.agustia@yahoo.com
Dhyana Pura University

ABSTRACT

This thesis presents a cognitive approach in order to identify the categories of conceptual metaphor and to know the conceptual mapping of those conceptual metaphors found on the parable of the Gospel of Luke.The qualitative research method was used to analyzethe data in the parable of Luke and supported by purposive sampling technique. The conceptual metaphor theory by Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1993, 2003) was used to distinguished the categories of metaphor which are orientational, ontological, and structural which then mapped into different kinds of conceptual metaphor mappings.Firstly, the data were collected, selected, and classified into three metaphorical categories which are orientational, ontological, and structural metaphor. Then, the data were analyzed to find the correspondence of source domain and concrete domain and from there the data were mapped through conceptual mapping. The findings are in the parable of Luke, there are more structural metaphor than the other metaphors which are orientational and ontologicalmetaphor. There are 2 data belong to orientational metaphor, 3 data are belong to ontological metaphor, and 7 data are belong to structural metaphor.
Keywords: conceptual metaphor, conceptual mapping, correspondences

ABSTRAK

Skripsi ini menggunakan pendekatan kognitif untuk mengidentifikasi kategori konseptual metafora dan untuk mengetahui pemetaan konseptual dari metafora yang terdapat dalam perumpamaan injil Lukas. Data dianalisis menggunakan metode penelitian kualitatif dan didukung dengan teknik pengambilan sampel.Teori konseptual metafora dari Lakoff dan Johnson (1980, 1993, 2003) digunakan untuk membedakan kategori metafora antara lain metafora orientasi, ontologis, dan struktural yang kemudian dipetakan ke dalam pemetaan konseptual metafora yang berbeda. Pertama-tama data dikumpulkan, dipilih, dan diklasifikasi ke dalam tiga kategori metafora antara lain metafora orientasi, ontologis, dan struktural.Kemudian data dianalisis untuk menemukan korespondensi dari ranah sumber dan ranah sasaran dan dari sana, data dipetakan melalui pemetaan konseptual. Hasil yang didapat dalam injil Lukas antara lain terdapat lebih banyak metafora struktural daripada metafora lain yakni metafora orientasi dan ontologis. Terdapat 2 data yang tergolong metafora orientasi, 3 data tergolong metafora ontologis, dan 7 data tergolong metafora struktural.
Kata kunci: metafora konseptual, pemetaan konseptual, korespondensi

I.   INTRODUCTION

1.1   Background of Study

Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) is a vital sub-discipline of Cognitive Linguistics which focuses on the cognitive processes behind language representation and particularly on the conceptual motivation behind figurative meaning.Some linguists began to approach the question of figurative meaning by suggesting the existence of stable knowledge structures which are held in the human memory system. Some scholars have hypothesized that these knowledge structures which have psychological reality are basically metaphorical.

The major reference points on this topic were initially stated by GeorgeLakoff and Mark Johnson (1980)in their bookentitled*Metaphors We Live By*.The book has had a large impact on many research areas including in the field of biblical interpretation, which is the contexts for this research. *"The essence of metaphor,"* they write, *"is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another"* (1980:5). Metaphors may thus be said tostructure our understandings because *"metaphors have entailments through whichthey highlight and make coherent certain aspects of our experience"* (1980:156).

Lakoff and Johnson (1980/2003) do not classify conceptual metaphors systematically, although they explain some types of metaphors in separate chapters like conventional metaphor, orientational metaphor, ontological metaphor and image schema. Grady (1997a) divides metaphors in primary metaphors and compound metaphors. Grady's division stems from the "invariance aspects of metaphors" or

metaphorical systems which group or form a larger system of metaphors (Lakoff, 1987: 36) and "a generic-level metaphor" (Lakoff and Turner, 1987: 17).

The principle of the source and target domain of metaphor is derived from the nature of human experience in identifying and categorizing all things around us. When things are not clearly distinguished or bounded, we still categorize them by the up-down orientation, front-back, on-off, near-far, centre-periphery, etc. We also categorize other things like mind, emotion, feeling, anger, love, desire, politics, etc as objects, entities, substances, containers, states, etc. In this respect, the cognitive side operates to understand these vague or abstract concepts in terms of more delineated concepts. For example, we do not really know what the mind is; we also do not know exactly how the mind of woman is, but we often find sentences like *mind is a machine, mind is a computer, mind is a brittle object, my mind is rusty this morning,* etc. This is the function of ontological metaphor: to give or provide "existentialstatus for the target concepts" (Kövecses, 2006: 128). In other words, abstract experiencesreceive a more concrete status via ontological metaphors.

The Gospel of Luke was analyzed in this study because the parable in the Gospel of Luke is interest the writer the most and also the Gospel of Luke has many parables with deep meaning for a better life. This research has been used the conceptual metaphor concept to analyze biblical sentences from the parable of Luke such as verse 5:9-10

(And Jesus said to Simon, *"Do not be afraid; from now on you will be catching men."*) and verse 9:59-60 (Jesus said to him, *"Let the dead bury their own dead, but you go and proclaim the kingdom of God"*).

1.2 Problems of the Study

1) What types of Conceptual Metaphor are found in the parable of Luke?

2) What is the mapping between correspondences from those Conceptual Metaphor found in the parable of Luke?

1.3 Aims of the Study

This study has two objectives, that is common purpose and special purpose, which can be described as follows:

1.3.1 General Purpose

1) To find out the types of Conceptual Metaphor in the parable of Luke.

2) To analyze the mapping between correspondences from those Conceptual Metaphor in the parable of Luke.

1.3.2 Specific Purpose

1) Tocategorize the conceptual metaphor found in the Gospel of Luke and to explain why the metaphor is in the category of conceptual metaphor.

2) To find out the real meaning behind the metaphor used as the parable in the Gospel of Luke, using the theory of Conceptual Metaphor by Lakoff and Johnson.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Conceptual Metaphor Theory

Metaphors are central to our ways of understanding. Lakoff and Johnson (1999) argue that the mind is inherently embodied, thought is mostly unconscious and abstract concepts are largely metaphorical. Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 3) claim that "metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature." Their book *Metaphors We Live By* has had a large impact on many research areas except for agriculture and environmental decision making, which are the contexts for this research. "*The essence of metapho*r," they write, "*is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another*" (1980: 5, emphasis in original). Metaphors may thus be said to structure our understandings because "*metaphors have entailments through which they highlight and make coherent certain aspects of our experience*" (1980: 156).

2.2 Conceptual Metaphor Category

Conceptual metaphors can be classified according to the cognitive functions that they perform. On this basis, three general kinds of conceptual metaphors have been distinguished structural, ontological, and orientational. Lakoff and Johnson distinguish between three types of conceptual metaphor which can be seen below:

a) Orientational Metaphor

Orientational metaphors are grounded in the physical experience environment; most of them are spatial in character,

such as up-down, front-back, near-far, etc. Orientational metaphors organize entire systems of concepts in a systematic way; for example up-down metaphors: HAPPY IS UP – SAD IS DOWN, HEALTH AND LIFE IS UP – SICKNESS AND DEATH ARE DOWN, MORE IS UP – LESS IS DOWN, and many more (Lakoff and Johnson 2003: 15-17). Even if they are based on physical experience common to all humans, these metaphors are also determined by culture; for example, in some cultures the future is ahead, and in others it is behind us (Lakoff and Johnson 2003: 14).

b) Ontological Metaphor

Ontological metaphors are grounded in our experience with physical objects and substances (Lakoff and Johnson 2003: 25). Thinking of a non-physical or abstract phenomenon as an object allows us to identify, quantify and refer to it, and provides great explanatory power. Important ontological metaphors are container metaphors, which structure the world in terms of inside-outside, and metaphors where an object is specified to be a person (Lakoff and Johnson 2003: 33), for example INFLATION IS AN ADVERSARY, which comes out in expressions such as "if there's much more inflation, we'll never survive" or "we need to combat inflation" (Lakoff and Johnson 2003: 26).

c) Structural Metaphor

Structural metaphors are concepts structured in terms of another concept, and are much more detailed and specific than the other two types, providing rich opportunities of highlighting and masking different aspects of a concept, rather than just identifying or quantifying it. One example of this type is ARGUMENT IS WAR.

2.3 Source Domain (SD) and Target Domain (TD)

The term target and source domain were introduced by Lakoff and Johnson in *Metaphors We Live By* (1980). Although the more traditional terms *tenor* and *vehicle* (Richards, 1936) are roughly equivalent to target domain and source domain, respectively, the traditional terms fail to emphasize the interaction between the two domains.

Conceptual metaphor mapping *THEORIES ARE BUILDING* (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980) is a mental metaphorical structure which is derived from an idiomatic expression for example *The theory is on shaky ground*. The structure of the target concept (theory) is an entity relation corresponding to the concept of source entity (building), as shown on the table below:

Table 2.1
Correspondences between Theory and Building Concepts
(Lakoff and Johnson, 1980)

TARGET (Theory)	SOURCE (Building)
Theorist ⟶	Builder
Formulation ⟶	Construction
Ideas ⟶	Materials
Assumptions ⟶	Foundation
Vality ⟶	Sturdiness
Revision ⟶	Renovation

III. RESEARCH METHOD

The primary data source of this research was from the *BibleGateway.com* (Online Bible) new international version (NIV). The data that has been analyzed in this research are all from the parable of Luke. There are 17 parables in the Gospel of Luke. One example of the data that will be analyzed is the metaphor of *Salt* in Luke 14 : 34, "Salt is good, but if it *loses its saltiness*, how can it be made salty again? It is fit neither for the soil nor for the manure pile; it is thrown out. Whoever has ears to hear, let them hear."

3.1 Method and Technique of Collecting Data

The qualitative research method was used in this study in order to analyze the data and to categorize the type of conceptual metaphor found in the Gospel of Luke. The data has been collected from *BibleGateway.com*. Some of the steps to collect the data were reading the Gospel of Luke, finding the parable that are in there, taking notes on the sentences or parable that has been used and then clasifying the sentences based on the types of conceptual metaphor. Lastly, choosing the words or phrases from the parable that will be used as the data.

3.2 Method and Technique of Analysis Data

Based on the research problem, the example of the data analysis can be illustrated as follows:
a) Categorize the types of Conceptual Metaphor
Data :

Luke 11 : 34 Metaphor of Lamp	"Your *eye is the lamp* of your body. When your eyes are healthy, your whole body also is full of light. But when they are unhealthy, your body also is full of darkness."

The types of conceptual metaphor invovled in this parable is Ontological Metaphor. It is an ontological metaphor because of the clause *eye is the lamp* which in this case the eye is analogized as a lamp.

b) Draw a conclusion from analysis that has done

According to Lakoff and Johnson (2008), understanding our experiences in terms of objects and substances allows us to pick out parts of our experience and treat them as discrete entities and substances of a uniform kind. From the data above, it can be seen that *eye is the lamp* is analogized as personification metaphors that shows the part of human body. Noun *lamp* as an abstract entity is analogized as *man (who has an eye)* entity as physical object.

IV.   FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

From the data collection, there are twelve (12) parables found in the Gospel of Luke which 3 data are belong to orientational metaphor, 2 data are belong to ontological metaphor, and 7 data are belong to structural metaphor. The followings are some examples of data analysis taken from the writer's research:

1)   Orientational Metaphor of *Fruit*

Metaphor in this data is the kind of orientational metaphor of fruit because the word fruit isa metaphysic concept and also important in the context of that sentence. The verb *cut* in the imperative sentence *cut it down* from this parable of Fig Tree which is a metaphorical utterance and a source domain can be explained through CM.

So he said to the man who took care of the vineyard, 'For three years now I've been coming to look for fruit on this fig tree and haven't found any. ***Cut it down***! Why should it use up the soil?' (Luke 13 : 7)

The verb *cut* from the clause *cut it down* is an abstract entity which can be understood in conceptual mapping. The clause consist of verb *cut*, pronoun *it* which refers to the object fig tree, and adverb *down*. The verb *cut* means make an opening or wound in something with something sharp. Adverb *down*literally means to or at a lower level or places; from the top towards the bottom of something (*Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary, 2008*). The verb *cut* is conceptualized into *die* (Neville, 2001) as target domain which can be mapped through CM: DIE IS DOWN. It can be said that, *cut it down* is analogized as *die*. Furthermore, the verb *cut* as source domain in this context mean 'be execute' as target domain.

The coherrence of the source domain from the metaphor can be seen through the fig tree which is a native plants from Asia Minor and Siria. The length of this tree can reach to 12 meters and also this tree can live on the ground rocks. Fig tree often bear fruit before its leaves and usually bear fruit twice a year (*Hillyer, 1998*). It can be seen that, from the data above, it's been three years since the owner came back to see the tree but the tree never bears fruit. This refer to the verse of Luke 13:7.

Table 4.1 Mapping of Die is Down

DIE IS DOWN		
Source : Fig tree	→	*Target : Man*
Bear fruit	→	Repentance
Cut	→	Die / Be execute

On the mapping, the verb *cut* refers to *die* as more concrete concept. Through the mapping of DIE IS DOWN, *die* is analogized with something that comes down vertically. It can also be seen that, the verb *cut* as source domain which is an abstract concept can be understood based on the similarity of the characteristics in the target domain *die (DOWN)*. The similarity in characteristic of those two component that become the basis of metaphor is when the fig tree does not bear fruit, then it will be cut down as well as human who refuses to repent, will be execute.

The relation between the source and target domain has been shown with the similarity of those two components which the verb *cut* can be conceptualized to the fig tree that does not bear fruitwith the human who does not bear repentance so that it can support the concept *die*. Furthermore, it can be explained that the fig tree that does not bear fruit can be paired with human who refuses to repent because of the similarity of those two components.

2) Ontological Metaphor of *Grave*

In this data, the word*grave*, which is the kind of ontological metaphor from the noun phrase*unmarked graves* as source domain, the sentence can be explain because of its metaphorical utterance. "Unmarked Graves" as a symbol in the parable can be interpreted through Conceptual Mapping as it can be seen on the verse below:

Woe to you, because ***you are like unmarked graves***, which people walk over without knowing it. (Luke 11 : 44)

In this data, the phrase *unmarked graves* is metaphorically analogized as human. The phrase consist of adjective *unmarked* as the core and noun *graves* as an ontological expression. Not marked or bearing identifying markingsis what this adjective *unmarked* literally means (*www.oxforddictionaries.com*).

Meanwhile, noun *grave* literally means hole in the ground for a dead body (*Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary, 2008*).

In Hebrews ancient time, Jewish people never did cremation for a dead body. At that time there are few kind of graves which are unmarked grave, family grave (decorated grave), kings grave and grave in a cave that might be has marked on top of it. Usually the graves would be colored white to make it visible especially at night so that people would not touch it. According to the law of Moses in the Gospel of Numbers 19 : 16, people who walks over grave or touches with a dead body without knowing it will be unclean for seven days.Also the door (big flat stone) would be locked to avoid wolf or thief (*Hillyer, 1998*).

Table 4.2 Mapping of Unmarked Graves is Man

UNMARKED GRAVES IS MAN		
Source : Unmarked Graves	→	*Target : Man*
Decorated	→	Grooming
Locked grave door (Big flat stone)	→	Self-defense
Bad influencer	→	Pharisees

On the mapping, the word *you*in clause *you are like unmarkedgraves* is refer to pharisees. As abstract entity, the clause is analogized to pharisees as unmarked graves which is concrete source domain.The clause *you are like unmarked graves* as target domain is analogized as *pharisees who has bad influence to others* as source domain.As it can be seen in the Gospel of Numbers 19 :16, people who walks over grave without knowing it will be unclean for seven days.

The coherrence of source domain and target domain from metaphorical expression *you are like unmarked graves*shows that pharisees through their life's example will influence others in a bad way without them knowing it. Pharisees likes to have a front seat in the synagogues and also likes to be greeted in the marketplaces. As Jesus criticize them for being hypocritical. From this text, it can be learned that people should not be like Pharisees who demands respect and defile others with their teachings and practices while at the same time unaware of their defilment.

3) Structural Metaphor *Sawdust*

The noun *sawdust* in this data is the kind of structural metaphor because of its metaphorical utterance. Interpretation of the meaning and significant of this story can be explain through Conceptual Mapping so that this entity can be well understood.

"Why do you look at the **speck of sawdust** in your brother's eye and pay no attention to the plank in your own eye? How can you say to your brother, 'Brother, let me take the speck out of your eye,' when you yourself fail to see the plank out of your eye, and then you will see clearly to remove the speck from your brother's eye." (Luke 6 : 41-42)

The noun phrase *speck of sawdust* is consist of noun *speck*, preposisition *of*, and noun *sawdust* as structural expression. Those two noun in this noun phrase almost has the same meaning. The word speck literally means tiny piece of dirt and sawdust literally means tiny pieces of wood that fall from wood as it is sawn (*Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary, 2008*).

From the data above (1), the clause *speck of sawdust* as source domain which is an abstract entity can be well understood by way of metaphorically conceptual as concrete abstract. In other words, through conceptual mapping, that entity can be mapped to an ideal target domain. The conceptual mapping of *speck of sawdust* is *small mistake* as target domain. The coherrence of this metaphor was taken from the Hebrew

word *karfos* or "become dry". The noun means small and dry twigs, small straw flakes, or even a strand of hair which may fly into the eye. Figuratively, the word was used by Jesus to intepret small mistake (*Hillyer, 1998*).

Table 4.3 Mapping of Speck of Sawdust is a Small Mistake

CK OF SAWDUST IS A SMALL MISTAKE	
Source : Sawdust	*Target : Small Mistake*
Tiny pieces of wood	Small piece of wrong action
Made by human through sawn tool	Made by human through action

As it can be seen on the mapping, the metaphor speck of sawdust which conceptualized into small mistake as target domain can be mapped through CM: *SPECK OF SAWDUST IS A SMALL MISTAKE*. In other words, it can be explained that the *speck of sawdust* which is a tiny pieces of dirt or wood in a conceptual metaphor is analogized as *small mistake* because of the similarity in the characteristics which sawdust is a tiny pieces of wood made by human through sawn tool as well as small mistake that made by human through action.

In the similarity of characteristics between source domain (*SPECK OF SAWDUST*) and target domain (*SMALL MISTAKE*), it can be understood that through conceptual mapping the metaphor *speck of sawdust* is figuratively used to intepret *small mistake*. In other words, people often judge others by their small mistake without looking at the mistake that they made which might be bigger mistake.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions that can be taken from this study are :

1) Metaphorical categories in this study which was related to the first problem have important point, especially to the religious text in the Gospel of Luke. The perspective cognitive is needed to classify the metaphorical expressions in the Gospel of Luke in order to understand those three categories. The characteristics of the metaphorical expressions in the Gospel of Luke are also important to help the writer to classify those expressions. There are 13 metaphorical expressions found in the Gospel of Luke. There are 2 data belong to orientational metaphors, 3 data are belong to ontological metaphors and 7 data are belong to structural metaphors.

2) The mapping between source and target domain was used to answer the second problem. The mapping are chosen to show the relation between source and target domain in the metaphorical expressions found in the Gospel of Luke. In this study, the mapping are explained by seeing the cultural perspective, the facts, the literal meaning and the real life. The mapping are explained the relation between source and target domain that known generally because it comes from reality and then to connect and analyze the other meaning between source and target domain. For example, the word *foundation* that known as a base of a building in literal meaning and on the otherside, the word could be widely describe through metaphorical mapping. The word is

analogized as *faith* because in ancient time, people were build a stone house with stone as the foundation to make a strong basis for the building to avoid a big flood that would sweep every building that it passes. As well as human, the human faith must be strong so that faith becomes a strong foundation in all aspects of life.

REFERENCES

BibleGateway.com

Deli Nirmala. 2010. Korespondensi Konseptual antara Ranah Sumber dan Ranah Target dalam ungkapan metaforis di Surat Pembaca Harian Suara Merdeka. Semarang: *Jurnal Universitas Diponegoro*. Vol. 15, No. 9.

Grady, J. 1997.*Foundation of Meaning: Primary Metaphors and Primary Scenes*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.

Hogan, K.M. 2009.Mother Earth as a Conseptual Metaphor in 4 Ezra.New Orleans: *SBL Annual Meeting*

King, P. 2012. Metaphor and Methodology for Cross-Cultural Investigation of Hebrew Emotions. *Papua New Guinea: Journal of Translation*. Vol. 8, No. 1.

Kövecses, Z. 2002. *Metaphor*: *A Practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kurniawati. 2015. *A Study of Conceptual Metaphor in Suzanne Collin's The Hunger Games*. East of Java: Jember University

Lakoff, G. 1992.*Metaphor and War: The metaphor system used to justify war in the Gulf*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. 1980/2003.*Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. and Mark, T. 1989.*More than Cool Reason*: *A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Langacker, R.W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar* Vol. 1: Theoretical Prerequisites. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Neville, R.C. 2001. *Symbols of Jesus.A Christology of Symbolic Engagement.*Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tri Sukarsih N.N. 2015. *Conceptual Metaphor in the parables on the Gospel of Luke: A Translation Study of English – Indonesian.* Denpasar: Udayana University.

Valleria Angelina, P.V. dan Tri Sukarsih N.N. 2016. Metaphors Correspondences of Source and Target Domain on the Gospel of John. *Bali: Litera Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*. Vol. 2, No. 2.

Valleria Angelina, P.V. 2016.*Metaphor Correspondences of Source and Target Domain on the Gospel of John*. Denpasar: DhyanaPura University.

Wahyu Suryantini, N.L. 2017. *Conceptual Metaphor in The Jakarta Post Business Article: Cognitive Perspective*. Denpasar: DhyanaPura University.

Wiradharma, G. and Tharik, A.WS. 2016. Metafora dalam Lirik Lagu Dangdut: Kajian Semantik Kognitif. Arkhais: *Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*. Vol. 7, No. 1, Januari-Juni 2016.