

Metaphorical Construction and Interpretation of Kiswahili Compound and Complex Clauses

Mary Njeri Ndung'u and John H. Habwe
University of Nairobi

Abstract

This paper investigates Kiswahili metaphorical constructions at the clause level. It argues that whereas Kiswahili metaphor has been studied for a considerable length of time grammatical features of Kiswahili metaphor are poorly understood. Further the conceptual aspects of the Kiswahili metaphors have not been conclusively studied to date. This paper therefore seeks to determine how these metaphorical expressions are constructed and how they express the conceptual metaphor. Conceptual Metaphor Theory as proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Langacker's theory of Cognitive Grammar (CG) (1987, 1991) are used in informing this study. The paper therefore examines the form-meaning components in a Kiswahili clause in order to identify how they are syntactically and semantically structured in the construction of metaphor.

Key Words: Kiswahili, Metaphor, Mapping, Clause, Cognitive

Background to the Study

Metaphor is one of the most preponderant features of human language. For this reason many studies over the years have discussed it to determine its significance and its operations. One of the earliest views on metaphor that has continued to influence studies to date is by Aristotle in his famous book *Poetics*. In this book, Aristotle maintains that a metaphor is a strategy of referring to something by using another thing's name. Equally important has been Richards (1936) view on metaphor by using the interaction theory. According to this view, there is a link between metaphorical expression and context. These two facets interact to create the desired meaning.

However, the most appealing engagement on metaphor to date is by Johnson and Lakoff (1980). The two argued that a metaphor is not just a literary ornament but rather a device by which thought is made possible. Using a cognitive approach they argue that a speaker uses a concrete domain to map onto an abstract domain and thus facilitating clearer understanding of something that is being said.

Although metaphor has been studied in Kiswahili little effort has been made to discuss its grammatical formations and to study metaphor as a conceptual entity (Simala, 1998; Lumwamu, 2018; Chacha, 1998). Chacha (1988) for instance examined the social meaning that is assigned to Kiswahili poetry which focused mainly on the metaphorical inferences in Swahili poetry. The study revealed that meaning of Swahili poetry is governed by context which creates boundaries that allow members of a speech community to negotiate and agree on how to interpret the poems at hand and the metaphors that are used.

Sullivan's (2007) research on Construction Grammar focused on the role of grammatical constructions in metaphorical language. She analyzed metaphorical phrases by arguing that words in particular constructional slots represent the metaphor's target domain thus carrying non-metaphorical meaning. Her study shows how linguistic metaphor is used on certain patterns of constructional meaning that have already been identified and studied in non-metaphorical language.

Gibbs et al. (2011), for example, have observed that when speakers utter metaphors they often intend to communicate messages beyond those expressed by the metaphorical meaning in an expression. They further note that a speaker may also use a metaphor to strengthen a previous speaker's intention or to add new information about the metaphor to the listener to some context. At the same time, metaphors could be used to express other social and affective information that is more difficult to convey using non-metaphorical speech. The paper has demonstrated that people infer different pragmatic messages from metaphor in varying social situations beyond those conveyed by non-metaphorical language.

Vierke (2012) examined the function fulfilled by metaphorical speech in Swahili contexts. She realized that Kiswahili metaphor has been recurrently used as a politeness strategy in political speeches as a way of safeguarding the face of either the speaker or the listener. This approach to metaphor is contrary to the traditional approach towards metaphor where a metaphor is seen as an aesthetic figure of speech rather than a conceptual mechanism used in language. Lumwamu (2018) interrogated the role of metaphorical language in the advancement of the International Criminal Court (ICC) objectives in the transitional justice debates in Kenya. He established that most of the metaphors are explained by considering the interdependency of their semantic, pragmatic, and cognitive dimensions. This study therefore while examining the metaphorical grammar at clause level also examines how mapping is executed and the adequacy of the same in contexts.

Methodology

The study is largely library based and qualitative in nature. The methodology applied in this study is therefore made up of four steps: identification, description, analysis, and discussion of metaphorical constructions. The researchers collected

some metaphorical constructions found in the texts by (Mazrui 1981, 2003; wa Mberia 2004, 2008; wa Mberia, 1997, 2011 and Arege, 2009) through purposive sampling. The constructions are authenticated through description as metaphorical constructions through the researcher's intuitive knowledge. The grammatical constructions that construct metaphor in Kiswahili are analysed guided by the two theories; CMT (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980) and Cognitive Grammar (Langacker, 1987). The mapping processes and identification of constructions which manifest source domain and target domain as used in CMT are established and discussed in order to make conclusions on how constructions in Kiswahili metaphors interact in communicating metaphorical language and the extent to which they are used to express the cultural context of language users.

Theoretical Framework

Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) was first proposed by Lakoff and Johnson in 1980 and it has made significant progress since its inception to date. There are key ideas about CMT on which the theory is based. Metaphors are fundamentally conceptual in nature and metaphorical language is considered secondary. Conceptual metaphors are grounded in everyday experience, that is, one has to show the understanding of a metaphor guided by his or her embodied experience on the metaphor. Constructions which communicate metaphor are largely abstract and are a matter of mind and thought, that is, their understanding is based on the understanding of the concrete entity or the source domain in a metaphorical construction, though not entirely, metaphorical. Language users cannot escape from thinking in metaphors because metaphors are part of what he or she produces and reproduces everyday and this happens without much effort.

Abstract concepts have a literal meaning but are extended by metaphors, often by many mutually inconsistent metaphors. According to CMT, most abstract concepts are only complete through the use of metaphors. For example, love is not love without metaphors of magic, attraction, madness, union, nurturance, and so on. Language users' conceptual systems are not consistent throughout, since the metaphors used to reason about concepts may keep varying as a result of language users' cultural orientation and metaphors context of use. The theory also points out that people live their lives on the basis of inferences they derive through metaphor.

The key ideas about the theory are:

- a. Metaphors are fundamentally conceptual in nature; metaphorical language is secondary;
- b. Conceptual metaphors are grounded in everyday experience;
- c. Abstract thought is largely, though not entirely, metaphorical;
- d. Metaphorical thought is unavoidable, ubiquitous, and mostly unconscious;

- e. Abstract concepts have a literal meaning but are extended by metaphors, often by many mutually inconsistent metaphors;
- f. Abstract concepts are not complete without metaphors. For example, love is not love without metaphors of magic, attraction, madness, union, nurturance, and so on;
- g. Language users' conceptual systems are not consistent throughout, since the metaphors used to reason about concepts may keep varying in different contexts.
- h. People live their lives on the basis of inferences they derive through metaphor.

Cognitive Grammar (Langacker, 1987) on the other hand is rooted in the cognitive and embodied experience of language by looking at how the grammatical subsystems encode concepts which relate to domains of entities like space, time, and force-dynamics and also on how grammar encodes conceptual phenomena such as attention and perspective (Evans and Green, 2006). Cognitive grammar lays emphasis on simplex or minimal units of grammar like morphemes or complex ones like morphologically complex words as opposed to complex semantic and phonological ones, which Langacker calls constructions. Cognitive Grammar lays emphasis on the semantic association between the component sections of a complex structure rather than on the structure building (Evans and Green, 2006). Langacker organizes grammatical units from the most basic, words (and their morphemes) and phrases to larger units, clauses and sentences. Several concepts of Langacker's Cognitive Grammar adapted in this study include conceptual autonomy and conceptual dependence, elaboration, trajector, landmark, and profile-base relation. Cognitive Grammar analysis constructions and head-dependent relations from the valence point of view not only at the clause level but also at the phrase and word level. It is worth noting that this theory has been purposively selected to guide in the identification of Kiswahili metaphorical grammatical constructions in the selected literary texts, investigating and explaining how they are structured in the formation and interpretation of metaphor, and determining the extent to which they express socio-cultural context and embodied experiences of language users.

Metaphorical Interpretation in Kiswahili Compound and Complex Clauses

Traditional grammar maintains the distinction between coordination and subordination which are distinct in compound and complex sentences respectively. However CG notes that it is often problematic to basically distinguish between coordination and subordination since in some instances both share certain linking attributes. For instance in the following Kiswahili literal constructions:

1. a. *Mbwa anabweka na paka analala.*
(The dog is barking **and** the cat is sleeping.)
- b. *Mbwa anabweka ilhali paka analala.*
(The dog is barking **while** the cat is sleeping.)

The construction *na* (and) in example (1a) is used as a conjunction and it could be replaced by the construction *huku* (while) in (1b) which is also considered a conjunction. It is notable that in example (1b), *ilhali* (while) is categorised as a Kiswahili subordinating marker but it is used in the example above as a coordinating marker, referred to by Langacker (1991) as a subordinating conjunction. The distinction between subordinating and coordination markers is of interest in this section because both markers are utilized in the identification of Kiswahili compound and complex sentences but not for metaphorical interpretation.

Vitale (1981), for example, notes that coordinated syntactic units in compound sentences consist of two or more clauses of equal status (for instance, both clauses directly dominated by the root sentence) conjoined by various conjunctions. The clauses are typically of the same formal and functional category and their linear order can be inverted without semantic consequences. That is, whether the autonomous clause is sentence initial or sentence final and the phrase in which it is embedded is altered, the metaphorical meaning of the construction does not change the direction of mapping from the source domain to the target domain. For instance, see the following metaphorical constructions:

2. a. *Vitendo vyangu zaidi ya maneno yangu ni ushahidi wa ukarimu wangu..*
(Actions my more than words my are evidence of generosity my.)
(My actions above my words are evidence of my generosity.)
(Mberia 2011:4)
- b. *Zaidi ya maneno yangu, vitendo vyangu ni ushahidi wa ukarimu wangu..*
(More of words my, actions my are evidence of generosity my.)
(Above my words, my actions are evidence of my generosity.)

Both examples (2a) and (2b) are compound sentences which are formed as a result of compounding the clauses *maneno yangu ni ushahidi wa ukarimu wangu* (my words are evidence of my generosity) and *Vitendo vyangu ni ushahidi wa ukarimu wangu* (my actions are evidence of my generosity) which are also categorised by Vitale (1981) as simple sentences with compound subjects, or complex noun phrases. The compound sentence is a product of two simple sentences or two autonomous clauses. As expressed by Bluhdorn (2008) symmetrically connected conceptual units such as those in example (2a) and (2b)

are of the same semantic category and have a common semantic function. From the compound sentence in example (2a), two simple sentences are generated:

3. a. *Vitendo vyangu ni ushahidi wa ukarimu wangu.*
(Actions my are evidence of generosity my.)
(My actions are evidence of my generosity.)
- b. *Maneno yangu ni ushahidi wa ukarimu wangu.*
(Words my are evidence of generosity my.)
(My words are evidence of my generosity.)

It is notable that the two clauses share a common predicate which has a copula verb *ni* (are) and a complement *ushahidi wa ukarimu wangu* (evidence of my generosity). The two clauses are constructions sharing a predicate complement *ushahidi wa ukarimu wangu* (evidence of my generosity), manifests the LM and are the dependent element whose attributes are mapped on the subject NP *vitendo vyangu* (my actions) in (3a) and *maneno yangu* (my words) in (3b) which are the TRs and also the autonomous elements in the constructions. In the interpretation of example (3a) the compound sentence has a compound NP marked by the coordinating conjunction *zaidi ya* (above my) which is a PP and a subordinating conjunction, according to Cognitive Grammar. It is notable that the PP has no semantic function but it has a major role of coordinating the two noun phrases *vitendo vyangu* (my actions) and *maneno yangu* (my words) to form a compound NP. The encyclopaedic entries of the complement *ushahidi wa ukarimu wangu* (evidence of my generosity) such as, ready to share in prevailing economic hardships, generous, does not lie, gives willingly, etc, are mapped on both the NPs to show that Natala who is addressing Tila does not need to look for evidence elsewhere but close by through her words and above all through her actions. The metaphor communicated is therefore supported by the construction actions speak louder than words, which is been manifested.

Further, the Kiswahili compound sentences other than the one analyzed in example (3a) are found to have other structures that have different but related syntactic and semantic structures where a single NP is noted to be shared by two predicates (Vitale 1981). This is as illustrated in the following example:

4. a. *Jicho lilitafunwa na kumezwa na risasi.*
(Eye it was chewed and to swallowed by bullet.)
(The eye was chewed and swallowed by the bullet.)

(Mberia, 2008:54)

The speaker of the construction in example (4a) is Waito in Mberia's *Maua kwenye Jua la Asubuhi*, explaining to Nali about the kind of things he had witnessed when he and his team had gone to offer services to victims of tribal clashes in one of the hospitals. He used the war metaphor in example (4a) to describe one of the happenings he had witnessed, that *jicho lilitafunwa na*

kumezwa na risasi (the eye had been chewed and swallowed by the bullet). Example (4a) is a structural combination of two simple sentences illustrated in (4b) and (4c) below.

- b. *Jicho lilitafunwa na risasi*
(Eye it was chewed by bullet.)
(The eye was chewed by bullet.)
- c. *Jicho lilimezwa na risasi.*
(Eye it was swallowed by bullet.)
(The eye was swallowed by a bullet.)

It is significant to note that the two connected propositions/clauses in example (4a) forming a compound sentence have equal status, that is, the compound sentence has two different predicates which are true about *jicho* (eye). The clauses in (4b) and (4c) are asymmetrical readings of the compound sentence in (4a) *Jicho lilitafunwa na kumezwa na risasi* (The eye was chewed and swallowed by a bullet.) as they are coordinated by the conjunction *na* (and). In both clauses, *jicho* (the eye) is the trajector while *risasi* (the bullet) is the landmark. However, the two clauses have two different elaboration sites; *lilitafunwa* (was chewed) and *lilimezwa* (was swallowed) respectively, although both elaboration sites rely on each other for comprehensive metaphorical interpretation of the compound sentence. From this explanation, it is interesting to note that the construction in example (4b) *jicho lilitafunwa na risasi* (eye was chewed by bullet) carries the causal interpretation and the causal landmark *risasi* (bullet) of the construction in example (4c).

Investigating a complex sentence is also of interest in this study since it allows for the scrutiny of metaphor construction in that sentence. A complex sentence according to Cognitive Grammar is marked through subordination. In Kiswahili as explained by Vitale (1981) and later by Matei (2008), the formation of a Kiswahili complex sentence is twofold; either through the subordination of two subordinate clauses or through subordination of a subordinate clause and a dependent clause. For instance, in the following example:

- 5. *Delamon ni lile fisilinalotunyonya bila huruma.*
Independent dependent/subordinate
(Delamon is that hyena it is which us suck without mercy.)
(Delamon is that hyena which exploits us without mercy.)
(Mazrui, 2003:58)

The speaker on example (5) is Lanina in Mazrui's *Kilio cha Haki*, addressing customers at Mzee Ingeli's kiosk. Lanina uses the animal metaphor in example (5) as a challenge to the workers who were taking too long to realise the exploitation by Delamon, the farm owner. In *Kilio cha Haki*, the entity *fisi* (hyena) is conceptualized as an animal that takes advantage of other animals in the jungle;

by waiting for other animals to hunt then wait to benefit from the whole or the remains of the carcass. These attributes about *fisi* (hyena) are conceptually marked on Delamon. It is notable that the subordinating clause *linalotunyonya bila huruma* (which is sucking us without mercy) is a modifier which gives the complement *fisi* (hyena) more and extra attributes for the mapping process to be successful. That is, Delamon is not just a hyena, but a hyena which sucks workers without mercy. The mapping is from a merciless hyena which helps in the conceptualization of Delamon's character.

Example (5) is a complex sentence with an autonomous construction *Delamon ni fisi* (Delamon is a hyena) and a dependent relative clause *linalotunyonya bila huruma* (which sucks without mercy). These two clauses despite having different syntactic status; the autonomous clause *Delamon ni fisi* (Delamon is a hyena) being the syntactically independent element in the sentence and the dependent element *linalotunyonya bila huruma* (which sucks us without mercy) being the syntactically dependent element, are compounded to form a complex sentence. It is evident that the two clauses subordinated to form the sentence in example (5) are as follows:

6. a. *Delamon ni lile fisi.* (main clause)
(Delamon is that hyena.)
(Delamon is that hyena)
- b. ... *linalotunyonya bila hurumu* (embedded clause)
(... which it is us sucking without mercy.)
(... which is exploiting us without mercy.)

It is significant to note that the main clause in (6a) embeds the hierarchically lower clause as described in CG, in example (6b) which is the subordinate clause. That is, the two clauses in example (6a) and (6b) are characterized as having subordinating relations. The expression *lile fisi* (that hyena), which is a noun phrase predicate in the predicate *ni lile fisi* (is that hyena) in the main clause, is the construction which is modified by the subordinate clause. The construction *fisi* (hyena) forms the conceptual background framework into which the construction *linalotunyonya bila huruma* (which is sucking us without mercy) is manifested. The subordinate clause *linalotunyonya bila huruma* (which is sucking us without mercy), is a relative clause elaborating the trajector *Delamon* and whose encyclopaedic entries are mapped onto *Delamon*. The subordinate clause is also a source domain because it is elaborating the expression *fisi* (hyena) in which it is subordinated. This gives a clear explanation on how embedded clauses are understood in relation to semantic organization of the main clause which has the landmark as the source domain and the trajector as the target domain. Hence the trajector *Delamon* is elaborated in relation to the landmark, the subordinate clause, as well as by the trajector *fisi* (hyena) both having the copula verb *ni* (is)

as the elaboration site. It is interesting to note that the subordinate relative clause is interpreted in relation to the semantic structure of the complex sentence in which it is subordinated.

Further, the main clause *Delamon ni lile fisi* (Delamon is that hyena) in example (40) characterizes the landmark *fisi* (hyena) as ground following (Langacker, 1987) in Cognitive Grammar, that is, the construction in which the subordinate clause is grounded. On the other hand the construction *linatunyonya bila huruma* ((is sucking us without mercy) is the subordinate construction which takes a position in relation to the conceptual mapping or it is the construction whose encyclopaedic entries are mapped from and onto Delamon. Since the trajector is understood in terms of the subordinate clause *linalotunyonya bila huruma* (which sucks us without mercy), the subordinate clause also elaborates the trajector. Thus, the construction Delamon and the subordinate clause are the trajector and the autonomous elements in the complex sentence.

In light of the analysis of Kiswahili complex sentences, it is significant to note that the understanding of the Kiswahili complex clause is dependent on the understanding of the subordinate clause so that the subordinate clause is seen to determine the domain of interpretation for the main clause. That is, in example (5), the subordinate clause *linalotunyonya bila huruma* (which is sucking us without mercy) may manifest the source domain or the target domain showing that it determines the metaphorical interpretation of the complex sentence.

Metaphorical Interpretation in the Kiswahili Dependent Clauses

Langacker (1991) in Cognitive Grammar (CG), describes two ways which precisely describe a clause as subordinate. Sometimes there is usually a subordinate morph that makes it dependent on another clause such as the Kiswahili subordinating words *ikiwa* (if), *tangu* (since), *halafu* (then), etc in Kiswahili and second is where one clause contained inside another clause, that is, one clause must be an element of the other in some grammatical or semantic sense, irrespective of its phonological placement. In Cognitive Grammar, the subordinate clause make a reference to conceptual dependence , that is, D is conceptually dependent on A to the extent that A elaborates a salient substructure of D. In a case of two clauses, A is defined as the subordinate clause while D is defined as the main clause. For instance, in the complex sentence *nchi uliyejipamba kwa weusi unanyanyaswa* (country which is clothed in black is been exploited) has *nchi unanyanyaswa* (you are been exploited) as D, while *uliyejipamba kwa weusi* (which has clothed itself in black) as A.

The structure of a Kiswahili sentence as defined by Maw (1969) is that of one having more than one clause at two extremes; univariation which is manifested through 'linkage' between constituent clauses and multivariation which is manifested through 'dependence' between constituent clauses. The

multivariation of clauses is relevant in this section as it provides insight in the analysis of dependent/subordinate clauses in Kiswahili in order to examine the construction of metaphorical expressions. Subordinate clauses hence function as subparts of complex sentences. These clauses, according to Matei (2008) carry meaning, are grammatically correct and have a syntactic structure acceptable in a specific language, but they cannot function on their own as complete sentences. The fact that the dependent clauses have incomplete meaning and structure makes it interesting to examine them in this section with the aim of investigating whether they communicate metaphor the way smaller linguistic structures do. Further, their interest in this analysis is to investigate their function in the conceptual mapping process, either manifesting the source domain or the target domain.

In Kiswahili, subordinate clauses require other subordinate clauses or main clauses to have a meaningful interpretation. In most cases the subordinate clauses can function as an adjectival or an adverbial to the main phrase on which it is appended. Their function in a complex sentence calls for their investigation in order to examine their role in the construction of metaphor in constructions where they are formed. For instance, in example (42),

7. *Lini mtazinduka mwache tabia hii inayolinufaisha lile fisi lile beberu*
(embedded clause)

linalotunyonya bila huruma?

(embedded clause)

(When you will awake you stop behaviour this it that benefit that hyena that he-goat it us suck without mercy?)

(When will you come to your senses and stop this behaviour **which benefits that hyena**, that he goat, **which sucks us without mercy?**)

(Mazrui, 2003: 58)

In example (7), the speaker is Lanina in Mazrui's *Kilio cha Haki*, addressing a male customer at the hotel of Mzee Ingeli who had come to take *uji* (porridge). One of the customers had attempted to make a move on Lanina by asking her if she was one of the food items on sale in the kiosk's price list. Lanina found that unacceptable, who in her speech to the customers who are also farm workers, tells them it is time they respected their sisters. She further put emphasis on when they would realize the oppression of Delamon by using the construction in example (7).

In the example above it is notable that, the constructions ...*inayolinufaisha lile fisi...* *linalotunyonya bila huruma* (which benefits that hyena... which sucks us without mercy) are subordinate clauses and sub-parts of the complex sentence. The subordinate markers in these subordinate clauses are the subordinate relativizer morph *-yo-* (it) in *inayolinufaisha* (which benefits) and *-lo-* (it) in *linalotunyonya* (which sucks us). Kiswahili subordinate clauses as mentioned by

Matei (2008) also perform grammatical roles similar to those performed by smaller grammatical constructions like nominal expressions. For instance, the highlighted subordinate clauses in example (7) have the semantic roles as modifiers of the nouns *fisi* (hyena) and *beberu* (he-goat) respectively. This shows that the clause *inayolinufaisha lile fisi* (that which benefits that hyena) is an adjectival or a modifier of the noun phrase *tabia hii* (this behaviour) while *linalotunyonya bila huruma* (which sucks us without mercy) is a modifier of the noun phrase *lile beberu* (that he-goat). It is worth noting that the nominal complement and the subordinate clause used to refer to Delamon has the augmentative marker *li-* in the complement *lile fisi* (that hyena) and *linalotunyonya* (which sucks us) to express the magnitude of hatred the workers have towards Delamon.

The subordinate clause *inayolinufaisha lile fisi* (that which benefits that hyena), has the verb *nufaisha* (benefit) which makes it elaborate the LM and thus becomes the source domain and the dependent element in the construction *tabia hii inayolinufaisha lile fisi* (This behaviour which benefits that hyena.). The NP *tabia* (behaviour) is the TR and thus the target domain and the autonomous element which is conceptualized through the interpretation of the subordinate clause. The subordinate clause modifies the NP *tabia hii* (this behaviour). It is worth noting that mapping is from the source domain *inayolinufaisha lile fisi* (that which benefits that hyena) to the target domain *tabia hii* (this behaviour). The entries of the verb *nufaisha* (benefit); doing something beyond ones power and under pressure, without any rebellion as a result of rules and regulations put in place, and for the benefit of the oppressor, are mapped on to the construction *tabia hii* (this behaviour). *Tabia* (behaviour) is understood as possessing the attributes of benefitting both *fisi* (hyena) and *beberu* (he-goat). The subordinate clause as used in communication would possibly make the listener or perceiver of the construction have a deeper understanding of 'behaviour' that benefits both the 'hyena' and the 'he-goat' which have been used metaphorically to refer to the 'oppressor'.

It is interesting here to note that the choice of abstract nouns which are also the target domains in the construction is as a result of embodied experience and cultural orientation of the language users, following Lakoff and Johnson (1980). Hence, the subordinate clause *linalotunyonya bila huruma* (which sucks us without mercy) in the construction *lile fisi lile beberu linalotunyonya bila huruma* (that hyena that he-goat which sucks us without mercy), has the verb *nyonya* (suck) which is the elaboration site of the metaphorical construction from which the NP *lile beberu* (that he-goat) is understood. *Lile beberu* (that he-goat) is the target domain and the autonomous element onto which the attributes of *nyonya* (suck) in the clause *linalotunyonya bila huruma* (which sucks us without mercy) are mapped, that is, those of benefitting from someone without sweating for it,

exploiting ones rights and freedom, etc. This transfer has such attributes mapped on *lile fisi lile beberu* (that hyena that he-goat) which represents the TR and the target domain in this metaphorical construction.

In the context in question *fisi* (hyena) is an animal known to depend on the efforts of other animals for survival. In the jungle for example, a pack of hyenas will lay an ambush on another such as a leopard which has caught its prey. The pack will fight and chase away the leopard which desperately leaves at no will. Similarly, *beberu* (he-goat) in the same context is an animal that is overbearing and dominates other goats/animals in the herd. Usually, it is the lead goat and other goats follow the direction it dictates. In this regard, both the hyena and the he-goat in example (42) are animals which dominate others. Their attributes are revealed in the subordinate clause *linalotunyonya bila huruma* (which is sucking us without mercy).

In investigating the subordinate clause, Langacker (1991) classifies subordinate clauses into relative, complement and adverbial clauses which have different functions while used in complex sentences. A relative subordinate clause modifies a noun, a complement subordinate clause functions as a clausal participant, while an adverbial subordinate clause modifies a relational expression. The subordinate clauses are as illustrated by the following Kiswahili metaphorical constructions:

8. a. *Mauaji ya aina hii ni ugonjwa unaohitaji dawa kali.*
(Killings of type this are disease it now requires medicine strong.)
(Such kind of killings is a disease that requires strong medicine.)
(Mberia 2003: 9)
- b. *Wengi waliamini kuwa ng'ombe wa kigeni pia ana maziwa.*
(Many they did believe that cow of foreign also has milk.)
(Many believed that a foreign cow also has milk.)
(Arege 2009: 46)
- c. *Mnazichuma habari kutoka kwangu halafu mnazijengea mnara.*
(You now search information from me then you now build wall.)
(You source information from me then you build a wall on it.)
(Arege 2009: 62)

The examples (8a) above has the subordinate clause *unaohitaji dawa kali* (that requires strong medicine) which is a relative subordinate clause, *kuwa ng'ombe wa kigeni pia ana maziwa* (that a foreign cow also has milk) in (8b) is a complement subordinate clause, while *halafu mnazijengea mnara* (then you build a wall on it) in (8c) is an adverbial subordinate clause.

Included also in Langacker's list of subordinate clauses is the infinitive subordinate clause which in Kiswahili is illustrated as follows:

- d. *Isitoshe ukiendela kuifungia siri kifuani...*
(It is not enough, you if continue to lock secret in chest...)
(If you continue to lock secret in your chest...)
(Mberia 2008: 55)

In example (8d), *kuifungia siri kifuani* (to lock secret in the chest) is an infinitive subordinate clause. In the sections that follow, an investigation on how subordinate clauses are used in the construction of meaning in Kiswahili metaphor is carried out.

Metaphorical Construction in Kiswahili Relative clauses

Relative clauses are finite subordinate clauses which modify a head noun in a NP and which contain a relative pronoun. According to Langacker (1991), for a relative clause to be considered a subordinate clause, it has to function as one component of a larger structure that elaborates a main clause element, for instance the NP or the VP. The main clause element elaborated by the relative clause is the trajector while the subordinate clause elaborates the landmark of the NP or VP. This kind of a clause in Kiswahili often occurs as a qualifier in a nominal group, following Maw (1969:17) as illustrated in:

9. *Nchi uliyejipamba kwa weusi...*
Relative pronoun/clause
(Country itself clothed in black...)
(A country which has clothed itself in black...)
(Mazrui, 2003: 76)

The context of the metaphorical construction above is *Kilio cha Haki* with the speaker Mzee (old man) speaking to himself in sorrow, mourning the predicament of the African continent. He refers to the African continent as *nchi uliyejipamba kwa weusi...* (country which has clothed itself in black...). Of interest in example (9) is the clausal subject which is a complex NP with a subordinate relative clause *uliyejipamba kwa weusi* (which has clothed itself in black). The subordinate clause is marked by a relative pronoun *-ye-* (which) in the verb *uliyejipamba* (**which** has clothed itself) which is interpreted as having a referential syntactic role in the relative clause, that is, it is relative to the subject of the clausal subject carrying the semantic structure used in the interpretation of the metaphorical construction. Similarly, the relative clause also has an object morph marked by the referential *-ji-*. The referential marker *-ji-* marks the NP to be interpreted as having a subject doing an action in relation to itself. From the construction in example (44), we generate the deep structure of the NP which has all the syntactic categories displayed. It is notable that both examples (9) and (10) have a common semantic structure.

10. *Nchi umeipamba nchi kwa weusi.*
(Country it has clothed country with black.)
(A country that has clothed itself in black.)

The NP in the example above, has the verb *umeipamba* (it has clothed) which manifest the source domain of the subordinate clause through its encyclopaedic entries such as clothe, adorn with jewels, etc which are mapped on *nchi*(country), the target domain. Conceptual mapping in this construction is from the source domain and the dependent element *umeipamba nchi kwa weusi* (it has clothed itself in black)and conceptually mapped onto the target domain, *nchi* (country), which is the clausal subject, the trajector, and agent and also the autonomous element in the construction. From the construction in example (10), the syntactic relationship between the subordinate clause and the subject NP *nchi* (country) in which it is subordinated is that the subordinate relative clause depends on the subject/agent NP to complete its meaning thus making it a dependent clause and the dependent element from where conceptual mapping emanates/originates. This syntactic structure shows a similar semantic organization on mapping where the NP *nchi* (country) is the autonomous element and the target domain, while the subordinate clause *uliyejipamba kwa weusi* (which has clothed itself in black) is the dependent element and the source domain. All the highlighted encyclopaedic entries or frames of one clothing or adorning him/herself in black; black here used as a metonymy to refer to the state of sadness and backwardness the country is being pushed into, are mapped on the subject *nchi* (country). The verb *umeipamba* (has clothed) in the subordinate clause, therefore, is the dependent element and the source domain in the mapping. Additionally, the relative clause is the modifier and a qualifier of the NP *nchi* (country) with an attributive function of an adjective to that NP.

Of more significance also in the Kiswahili relative clause is the participle clause. This subordinate clause in Kiswahili has no overt/open subjects and is commonly marked by a continuous/progressive marker/morph *-na-* (-ing). The function of the participle clause is to modify the NP in which it is subordinated thus justifying why it is a sub-category of a relative clause. The following example illustrates a Kiswahili participle clause:

11. *Mauaji ya aina hiyo ni ugonjwa unaohitaji dawa kali.*
Relative/participle clause
(Killings of type that is disease which is requiring medicine strong.)
(Such kind of killings is a disease which that require strong medicine.)
(Mberia, 2008: 9)

The metaphorical construction above is an excerpt spoken by Kabitho in *Maua kwenye Jua la Asubuhi*, addressing Tungai in reference to the killings which followed after the destruction of property during the tribal clashes. Kabitho

expresses how killings which had taken place could only be described as *ugonjwa unaohitaji dawa kali* (a disease which is requiring strong medicine).

In example (11), the relative participle clause *unaohitaji dawa kali* (which is requiring strong medicine) is a modifier of the nominal predicate in the copula clause *mauaji ya aina hiyo ni ugonjwa* (such kind of killings is a disease). Since it has a defined nominal phrase, it will receive interpretation, by putting into consideration that the agent NP *mauaji ya aina hiyo* (such kind of killings) is equated to *ugonjwa* (disease) which is being modified by the relative clause. It is therefore notable that metaphor construction is between the clausal subject *mauaji ya aina hiyo* (such kind of killings) and the relative clause *yanayohitaji dawa kali* (which is requiring strong medicine) such that all the highlighted attributes of *ugonjwa unaohitaji dawa kali* (a disease which requires strong medicine) are conceptually mapped on *mauaji ya aina hiyo* (such kind of killings). The attributes of the participle clause such as, one that weakens the body, requires quick intervention could kill, etc, are mapped on *mauaji ya aina hiyo* (such kind of killings). The attributes of 'which require strong medicine' are mapped on 'killings' which is the target domain and the autonomous element which allows mapping to be completed and thus having the metaphor communicated successfully. From the context of use of the metaphorical construction, the embodied experiences of *ugonjwa unaohitaji dawa kali* (disease which requires strong medicine) is a disease that is likely to cause death. Therefore, the disease requires quick intervention the same way killings would require urgent intervention in order to protect loss of human life. It is evident that the NP *ugonjwa unaohitaji dawa kali* (a disease which is requiring strong medicine) is understood literally and does not evoke any metaphorical interpretation. However, the copula clause *mauaji ya aina hiyo ni ugonjwa* (such kind of killings is a disease) evokes metaphor and it is a copula construction.

The metaphorical construction *mauaji yanayohitaji dawa kali* (killings which are require strong medicine) is very significant in the debate in Kiswahili metaphor. The subordinate relative participle clause has the VP *yanayohitaji dawa kali* (which are requiring strong medicine). The form and meaning of the verb *yanayohitaji* (which requires) validates it as a subordinated clause because it has the subject relative marker/morph *-yo-* (which) and the progressive/participle marker/morph *-na-* (-ing) which classifies it as a participle clause. The VP in the subordinate clause manifests the source domain and it is the dependent element from which mapping onto the target domain and the autonomous element *mauaji ya aina hii* (killings of this kind) takes place. The encyclopaedic entries of the VP in the subordinate clause; of an ailment that has to be dealt with, not easy to cure, already established itself, etc, are mapped on to the NP *mauaji ya aina hii* (killings of this kind). The metaphorical construction *mauaji ya aina hii* (killings of this kind) is interpreted to evoke loss of human life

frame where people lose their lives in large numbers without putting into consideration the sanctity of human life. Further an incurable ailment frame is evoked by the subordinate clause *yanayohitaji dawa kali* (which are requiring strong medicine) since any disease which is referred to as requiring strong medicine must have made doctors to have sleepless nights in search of its cure and in this case in *Maua kwenye Jua la Asubuhi*, Kabitho and Tunga have had sleepless nights trying to come up with a solution that would bring to an end these killings.

In Kiswahili, it is interesting to note that the relative subordinate clause can occur in the present, past or future tenses (Matei 2008: 204) as given in the following generated examples:

12.

a... utakaokuwa unahitaji dawa kali. (future tense)

(...which will be it requiring medicine strong)

(... which will be requiring strong medicine.)

a... unahitaji dawa kali (present tense)

(... which is it requiring medicine strong)

(... which is requiring strong medicine.)

In the examples above the past and future morphs *-li-* and *-ta-* in examples (12a) and (12b), are identified through auxiliary verbs *uliokuwa* (which **was**) and *utakaokuwa* (which **will be**) respectively. The relative/participle morpheme *-na-* does not undergo any structural change in all the three tenses in the main verb *unahitaji* (requiring) in example (12a), (12b), and (12c). Similarly, conceptual mapping and evocation of metaphor in the three constructions does not vary. From this observation, it is evident that the tense morph in the auxiliary verbs *uliokuwa* (that was) and *utakaokuwa* (that will be) do not have any implication on the construal of meaning during conceptual mapping of domains from the source domain to the target domain, although tense and aspect morphs could be interpreted as having a metaphorical extension but an area not within the scope of this study.

Infinitive Clauses/Non-finite Clauses

Langacker (1991) describes an infinitive clause as a subjectless clause with a marker *-to-*. Kiswahili infinitive clause is classified as a dependent clause which carries no grammatical subject, since it has undergone deletion. Hence the verb cannot be modified by prefixes as the case with other Kiswahili lexical verbs. An infinitive clause is specifically dependent on the independent clause of the complex sentence for it to have a complete meaning that is it is only through the independent clause that the infinitive dependent clause can be meaningfully and

structurally understood. Further, the Kiswahili infinitive subordinate clauses are marked in two distinct ways; one, through the use of the prefix *ku-* (to) in a nominal verb or through the introduction of the coordinating preposition *-a-* (for) prefixed by a class marker of the noun being modified, (Maw, 1969). The prefix *-a-* in the PP that marks an infinitive clause is an optional construction in the subordinate clause as it can undergo deletion and the clause would still remain semantically and structurally meaningful. This is so because the *-a-* marker is usually followed by a non-finite verb with the prefix *ku-*. An instance of this is as illustrated in the following metaphorical constructions:

13. *Isitoshe, ukiendelea kuifungia siri kifuani itageuka kuwa msumeno uanze kukukereza fahamu.*

(Not enough, **you if continue to shut secret chest inside** it will change to be saw it start to you cut mind.)

(Besides, **if you continue to shut in that secret inside your chest**, it will turn into a saw and start tormenting you.)

(Mberia, 2008: 55)

14. *Ikiwa ulimi umeweza kuwa kisu cha kuulia.../Ikiwa ulimi unaweza kuwa kisu kuulia...*

(If tongue it has become knife **for killing**.../If tongue it has become knife to kill...)

(If a tongue can turn into a knife **for killing**.../If a tongue can turn into a knife to kill) (Mazrui, 2003: 76)

15. *Ikiwa ulimi unaweza kuwa kisu kuulia...*

(If tongue it is can be knife to kill...)

(If a tongue can be a knife for killing...)

In example (13), the speaker is Waito in *Maua kwenye Jua la Asubuhi*. He is trying to source information from Chugu about the underway plans of fighting back another tribe. Waito informs him that concealing information that would in the long run be important in solving the current tribal clashes would be understood as putting away information from others which would later torment him if things turn for the worst, that is, if tribal clashes cause more killings. In example (14), the speaker is Lanina in *Kilio cha Haki* while at the cells after she had been arrested on claims of causing the death of Delamon after inciting the farm workers. She is responding to the lawyer who had gone to visit her in the cells through the construction in example (14).

In example (13) the infinitive subordinate clause *ukiendelea kuifungia siri kifuani* (if you continue to shut in that secret inside your heart) carries the infinitive clause *kuifungia siri kifuani* (to conceal that secret inside your heart) marked by the infinitive morph *ku-* in the verb *kuifungia* (to conceal). This subordinate clause can receive metaphorical interpretation on its own without

relating it to other constructions in the main metaphorical construction. The clause has the VP *kuifungia* (to shut in) which is the profile determinant of the clause and the source domain trigger because it carries the infinitive morph *ku-* (to) in the verb *kuifungia* (to conceal/to shut for). The VP is the dependent element from which mapping is done. *Siri kifuani* (secret in the chest) is a predicate argument which has a double object, the DO *siri* (secret) and the IO *kifuani* (in the heart) which is also an adverb of place.. The noun *siri* (secret) is the element which receives conceptual mapping from the meaning of the non-finite verb *kuifungia* (to shut in). It is also the TR while the locative noun *kifuani* (in the heart) is the LM as illustrated in the construction *siri imefungiwa kifuani* (secret has been concealed in the heart). The interpretation is that all the highlighted attributes of the verb *kuifungia* (to shut in) such as enclose, out of reach, no freedom, etc, are conceptually mapped on *siri* (secret) which is an abstract entity. For a language user to understand the metaphor, she or he has to conceptually think about or see *siri* (secret) as an entity that can be shut in, in the chest.

Further, the verb *funga* (close) has the encyclopaedic entries of an entity that has an opening, a door, a space inside, lockable, etc. Such entries are mapped on *siri* (secret) such that the verb is the elaboration site on which the TR NP *siri* (secret) is elaborated. From this interpretation, *siri* (secret) is construed as an entity in which a human body part, *kifua* (chest), can conceal and hide it from ease of access. Similarly, the infinitive subordinate clause *kuifungia siri kifuani* (to conceal that secret inside your chest) also gets metaphorical interpretation by relating it with other constructions in the main clause especially the construction *itageuka kuwa msumeno uanze kukukereza fahamu* (it will turn into a saw and start tormenting you) in which it is subordinated. It is notable that the construction *msumeno uanze kukukereza fahamu* (a saw and to start tormenting you) has the infinitive clause *kukukereza fahamu* (to start tormenting you) which could receive metaphorical interpretation on its own or it could be interpreted within the main clause in which it is subordinated.

Metaphorical Construction in Kiswahili Adverbial Clauses

According to Maw (1969), Kiswahili subordinate adverbial clauses have the same function as an adverb, or a prepositional phrase. These adverbial clauses function as adjuncts in a clause and therefore are optional elements in a Kiswahili sentence/construction. In Kiswahili the adverbial clauses perform grammatical functions of marking time, location, reason, purpose, conditions, and concessions/contrast in relation to the verb, among other functions. These Kiswahili adverbial subordinate clauses are introduced or marked by subordinating conjunctions like *kabla ya* (after), *kwa kuwa* (since) *kwa sababu* (because), *ili* (so that), *huku* (whereas), and *ikiwa* (if) (Matei 2008). The following example is a metaphorical construction with subordinating adverbial clause:

16. a. *Ikiwa ulimi umeweza kuwa kisu cha kuulia, kwa nini hauwezi kuwa sabuni ya kusafishia?*

(If tongue has become knife for killing, why not it able be soap for cleaning?)

(If the tongue could be a knife for killing, why can't it turn into soap for cleaning?)

Example (16) has the subordinate clause *ikiwa ulimi umeweza kuwa kisu cha kuulia* (if the tongue has become a knife for killing) and *kwa nini hauwezi kuwa sabuni ya kusafishia?* (why can't it turn into a soap for cleaning?) which are dependent on each other to complete a complex sentence and also to make each subordinate clause meaningful. It is notable that in a complex sentence, either the main clause and the subordinate clauses or the subordinate clause and another subordinate clause share the same subject (Maw 1969:20). Both subordinate clauses share the same subject argument *ulimi* (tongue) which is conceptually understood through the attributes of the construction *kisu cha kuulia* (knife for killing) and *sabuni ya kusafishia* (soap for cleaning'). It is significant to note that each of the subordinate clauses receives metaphorical interpretation independent of each other. Thus, the following constructions are derived:

b. *Ikiwa ulimi umeweza kuwa kisu cha kuulia...*

(If tongue it has become knife for killing...)

(If a tongue can turn into a knife for killing...)

c. *Kwa nini (ulimi) hauwezi kuwa sabuni ya kusafishia?*

(Why can't (tongue) it become soap for cleaning?)

(Why can't (tongue) it turn into a soap for cleaning?)

As observed in example (16b) above, the argument NP has *ulimi* (tongue) equated to a knife for killing. All the highlighted attributes of a knife that can be used to kill; sharp-edged, has a handle, able to cut, metallic, etc are mapped on *ulimi* (tongue). On further analysis on the construction on one hand, and on further examination on the construction, the metaphor *ulimi ni kisu* (a tongue is a knife) is construed where according to Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), nouns are found to effectively communicate metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). From example (16c), *ulimi* (tongue) is also equated to soap for cleaning thus construing the metaphor *ulimi ni sabuni* (the tongue is a soap). It is notable that from the metaphor *ulimi ni sabuni* (tongue is soap), *sabuni* (soap) is the entity that elaborates the noun *ulimi* (tongue), thus *ulimi* (tongue) is the target domain while *sabuni* (soap) manifests the source domain. In considering the subordinate clause that manifests the source domain, that is, the clause *kwa nini (ulimi) hauwezi kuwa sabuni ya kusafishia?* (why can't it (tongue) be soap for cleaning?), the soap is construed as the source domain which licences elaboration of the target domain *ulimi* (tongue). In both examples, (16b) and (16c), it is significant to note that the

attribute of *kisu* (knife) and those of *sabuni* (soap) are conceptually mapped on *ulimi* (tongue) for easier conceptualization of what *ulimi* (tongue) is expected to do, that is either as a knife for causing death or as a soap for cleaning.

If one was to look at the complex sentence again in example (16a), one would note that conceptual mapping is also realised across the two subordinate clauses, by mapping across the two constructions, the nominal *kisu cha kuulia* (knife for killing) and *sabuni ya kusafishia* (soap for cleaning), so that the metaphorical construction *kisu cha kuulia ni/kimekuwa sabuni ya kusafishia* (knife for killing is/ has become soap for cleaning) is generated. This further explains that ‘knife for killing’ is understood within the frame or domain of *soap for cleaning*. That is, an entity *sabuni ya kusafishia* (soap for cleaning) that has the attributes of removing dirt and stains has its attributes mapped on the construction *kisu cha kuuli* (knife for killing) thus having it equated to another entity (knife), which is construed as a dangerous tool used to cause harm rather than being used productively. From the above analysis, interpretation of the metaphorical construction in example (51a) indicates that concrete entities succeed in the conceptualization of abstract entities, following CMT in Lakoff and Johnson (1980). It is therefore realised that the entity *ulimi* (tongue) which is an abstract entity is understood in terms of the concrete entities *kisu* (knife) and *sabuni* (soap).

Of significance also is that from the other subordinate clause in example (16b), *ikiwa ulimi umeweza kuwa kisu cha kuulia* (if the tongue has become a knife for killing) is also given a metaphorical interpretation independently. In that case, the NP *ulimi* (tongue) is construed to have all the encyclopaedic entries of *kisu cha kuulia* (knife for killing), that is, double edged, sharp, has a pocket, metallic, etc. This means that what a knife can do to cause death is mapped on to what a tongue can do, by producing words of incitement which cause hatred, then war, which lead to killings. *Kisu cha kuulia* (knife for killing) is the source domain and the dependent element while *ulimi* (tongue) is the target domain and the autonomous element.

It is also interesting to note that the Kiswahili adverbial subordinate clause can be clause initial, medial, or final, as noted by Maw (1969:21) that is, the sequence of clauses in the clause may be reversed or rearranged without altering the structure and semantic organisation of elements in the sentence. For instance, the construction in example (51a) can be clause final as given in the following example:

17. *Kwa nini ulimi hauwezi kuwa sabuni ya kusafishia ikiwa (ulimi) umeweza kuwa kisu cha kuulia?*
(Why tongue cannot be soap for cleaning **if (tongue) it has become knife for killing?**)

(Why can't a tongue be used as a tool for problem solving if it can be used as a knife for causing death?)

Notably the syntactic organization of the adverbial clause in example (17) does not change the semantic structure of that construction or alter the mapping process between the autonomous elements and the dependent elements in each of the subordinate clauses.

Conclusion

This paper has examined Kiswahili metaphorical constructions at the clause level. Further, the paper also investigated the mapping process at clause level. The paper was largely aided by Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Construction Grammar. The paper has established that metaphor clause level in Kiswahili has syntactic slots are occupied by constructions which are used in communicating metaphor. The most relevant construction in a clause is the verb which relates semantically with other constructions; the Subj., Obj., Adjunct, and Complements in communicating metaphor. These constructions have semantic roles of agent, patient, beneficiary and instrument. They are form-meaning pairs which in Construction Grammar and Cognitive Grammar disregard linguistic categories levels of syntax, morphology and phonology.

The role of subordinate clauses in metaphorical interpretation was examined in order to establish if they are interpreted within the sentence they are dependent on, whether they play the role of smaller constructions like the adverb and adjective, or whether they are independent in the construction of metaphor. It was however found that subordinate clauses in some instances have the relative clauses, work together with the NP in which they are subordinated for complete mapping to take place. This is because the subordinate clause is the carrier of the verb which is the source domain whose attributes are mapped on the subject NP. It is notable also that the relative clause functions as an adjectival within the NP thus manifesting the attributes of the source domain for a successful conceptual mapping of the target domain, the noun or NP which is the profile determinant within the NP. In other instances it is significant to note that where the subordinate clause is within the predicate functioning as the modifier of a complement in a copula clause, the subordinate clause maps its attributes, first, on the noun complement, and secondly on the subject argument. Additionally, of significant to note is that there are subordinate clauses which are independent on the construction of metaphor, for instance the infinitive clause. In such an instance, it is noted that the infinitive verb in the subordinate clause conceptually maps its attributes on to the grammatical constructions that follow. The study further established that the diminutive and augmentative affixes *-ki-* and *-li-* respectively are used with a specific purpose in the metaphorical constructions. It was revealed

that while –*ki-* was used to show that however much a person could be perceived as less important, the more she tries to justify her worth to others, for example

It is worth noting that, since data for analysis has been sourced from literary texts, the study concludes that the authors manage to communicate to the audience through the use of metaphors which utilize linguistic features. It is clear that metaphor is not just a linguistic phenomenon but a conceptual entity which involves transfer of what is known about one concept to another concept. The concrete or source concepts from the source domains are culturally embodied, that is they are experienced and perceived by the language user through experience and that is why they are easily mapped on to the target domains which are abstract, to enhance conceptualisation. The metaphors used are not limited to creative writing as figures of speech but are pervasively and routinely used in everyday language.

References

- Arege, T. M. (2009). *Kijiba cha Moyo*. Nairobi: Longhorn Publishers.
- Chacha, N. C. (1988). 'Meaning and Interpretation of Swahili Poetry: A Portrayal of a Changing Society'. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Yale University.
- Croft, W., & Cruse, D. A. (2004). *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, V., & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gibbs, R. W. et al. (2011). 'Inferring Pragmatic Messages from Metaphor. In *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*. Vol. 7.1, pp 3-28. Lodz: Lodz University Press.
- Habwe, J. H., & Karanja, P. (2004). *Misingi ya Sarufi ya Kiswahili*. Nairobi: Phoenix Publishers.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Vol. I. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, R. W. (1991). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol. 2. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Lumwamu, P. (2018). 'Metaphoric conceptualization of International Criminal Court Justice and Peace Building in Kenya.' *Globe: A Journal of Language, Culture and Communication*, Vol. 6: pp. 150-168. Globe: Research Articles.
- Matei, A. (2008). *Darubini ya Sarufi: Ufafanuzi Kamili wa Sarufi ya Kiswahili*. Nairobi: Phoenix Publishers.
- Maw, J. (1969). *Sentences in Swahili: A study of their Internal Relationships*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.

- Mazrui, A. (1981). *Kilio cha Haki*. Nairobi: Longhorn.
- Mberia, K. (1997). *Natala*. Nairobi: Marimba Publications.
- Mberia, K. (2004). *Maua Kwenye Jua la Asubuhi*. Nairobi: Marimba Publications.
- Mgullu, R. S. (1999). *Mtalaa wa Isimu: Fonetiki, Fonolojia na Mofolojia ya Kiswahili*. Nairobi: Longhorn Publishers.
- Simala, I. (1998). Sexist Overtones in Kiswahili Female Metaphors: A Critical Analysis. in *Organization For Social Sciences Research in Eastern Africa*. Addis Ababa. Ethiopia
- Sullivan, K. (2007). 'Grammar in Metaphor: A Construction Grammar Account of Metaphoric Language'. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of California, Berkeley.
- Vierke, C. (2012). 'Mafumbo: Considering the Functions of Metaphorical Speech in Swahili Contexts'. In Marlo, M. R., Adams, N. B., Green, C. R., Morrison, M., and Purris, T. M. (Eds). *Selected Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Conference on African Linguistics: African Languages in Context*: Pgs 278-290. Somerville, MA Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Vitale, J. A. (1981). *Swahili Syntax*. Dordrecht: Fortis.

