

Metaphors in Encoding Inalienability in Kiswahili

Josephine Dzahene-Quarshie

Abstract

Using data from a text corpus and the framework of conceptual metaphors, this paper establishes that inalienable possession constructions in Kiswahili are generally encoded metaphorically in that often, semantically, there is no correlation between the inalienable possession and the corresponding verb. Contextually, the construction often involves the expression of abstract phenomena such as emotions, and various states of mind. Also, although some of these constructions can be viewed as conceptual metaphors in general and body metaphors in particular, analyzing them in terms of source and target domain may be problematic. It also demonstrates that distinct inalienable constructions display different levels of metaphors depending on the inalienable possessions present and their real life affinity with the verb involved and also that the metaphoric status of such constructions may not stem from the structure of the construction, but rather the intimate possession present and its relationship with the verb.

Ikisiri

Kwa kutumia data kutoka katika matini mbalimbali na kiunzi cha nadharia ya sitiari, makala hii inabainisha kwamba baadhi ya tungo zinazoonisha umiliki siachanifu na kitenzi kinachokubaliana nao hutafsiriwa kisitiari. Hii ni kwa sababu hakuna uhusiano wa kisemantiki kati ya umiliki siachanifu na kitenzi kinachokubaliana nao. Mara nyingi tungo za aina hii, hueleza dhana dhahania kama vile hisia na hali kadhaa za kiakili. Hata hivyo, ingawa kimantiki baadhi ya tungo hizi huonekana kama sitiari kwa ujumla na mahususi kama sitiari za mwili, ni vigumu kuzichambua muundo wake kwa kuzingatia chanzo na lengo. Pia, inaonesha kwamba, tungo tofautitofauti za umiliki siachanifu huonesha viwango mbalimbali vya sitiari kutokana na umiliki siachanifu unaowasilishwa na uhusiano wake na kitenzi husika, na kwamba usitiari wa tungo hizo hautokani na muundo wake, bali umiliki wa ndani uliopo na uhusiano wake na kitenzi.

1.0 Introduction

Studies have established that there is a distinct category of conceptual metaphors that specifically involve the self and body, often referred to as body metaphors (Goschler, 2005; De Koning & Tabbers, 2011). By self and body, we refer to concrete and abstract things such as physical parts of the body and abstract states of mind such as emotions and sensations also referred to as body affects in Goschler (2005) and intimate possessions in Dzahene-Quarshie (2010). It has also been established in previous studies that often inalienable possession constructions

express emotions and mental states (Larson, 1999; Kockleman, 2009). Furthermore, some studies have discussed the use of body parts and other intimate possessions to express emotions metaphorically, thus the body is experienced through language (Larson, 1999; Kövecses, 2013).

Beyond the grammatical encoding of inalienability evidenced in various types of inalienable possession constructions, there is evidence that they are often non-literal and therefore metaphoric. Despite its fairly cross-linguistic characteristics, both the scope and grammaticality of inalienable possession constructions differ from language to language. Kiswahili is one of the many Niger-Congo languages in which inalienability is grammatically encoded. However, it is an area of syntax that has not been explored extensively. As indicated in Dzahene-Quarshie (2013), this and related constructions in various languages have been referred to by various labels such as ‘external possession construction’ (Schrock, 2007: 1), ‘inalienable possession’ construction (Tomioka & Sim, 2007: 1) and ‘affected possessor construction’ (Hyman & Duranti, 1982). These and related constructions in Kiswahili which have been referred to as affective constructions in Dzahene-Quarshie (2010) have been discussed extensively in Dzahene-Quarshie (2010, 2013, 2016).

In this study, the affective constructions referred to as intransitive affective constructions in Dzahene-Quarshie (2010, 2013, 2016) are my focus. My objective thus is to examine closely these particular inalienable possession constructions in Kiswahili of the Bantu group of Niger Congo language family spoken in East Africa within the framework of conceptual and body metaphors to illustrate that beyond the grammatical encoding of inalienability, often such constructions are metaphoric in terms of their conceptualization, syntactic structure and meaning. Data for the study include mainly constructions from a text corpus in Dzahene-Quarshie (2010, 2013, and 2016).

1.1 Affective Constructions

Constructions which involve inalienable possessions are often grammatically distinct in many languages of the world such as Haya (Hyman, 1977), Sotho (Voeltz, 1972), Baule (Larson, 1999), Korean (Tomioka and Sim, 2007), Q’eqchi-Maya (Kockleman, 2009) and Swahili (Dzahene-Quarshie, 2013, 2016). Such constructions often enjoy some privileges that alienable possessions do not. The following are examples of the constructions that the study discusses.¹

¹ The intransitive affective construction is discussed extensively in Dzahene-Quarshie (2010; 2013; 2016).

- (1) *Kichwa* *ki-na-ni-uma*²
 7-Head 7SM-PRES-1OM-hurt
 Head aches me
 ‘My head is aching.’

² The following abbreviations and notations are used for the interlinear annotations.

Interlinear annotations

Tenses

PERF perfect tense

PRES present tense

PST past tense

Verbal elements

SM subject marker preceded by noun class number in Kiswahili
 examples. Eg. 1SM

OM object marker preceded by noun class number and followed by grammatical
 person if animate in Kiswahili examples. Eg. 1OM3

The following table is a guide to the Kiswahili concord system.

Noun Class Number	Noun Class Prefix	Subject Marker	Object Marker	Associative Marker
1 (1 pers) (2 pers) (3 pers)	m- or ø	ni- u- a-	-ni- -ku- -m-	wa
2 (1 pers) (2 pers) (3 pers)	wa-	tu- m- wa-	-tu- -wa- -wa-	wa
3	m-	u-	u-	wa
4	mi-	i-	i-	ya
5	j(i)- or ø	li-	li-	la
6	ma-	ya-	ya-	ya
7	ki-	ki-	ki-	cha
8	vi-	vi-	vi-	vya
9	n-	i-	i-	ya
10	n-	zi-	zi-	za
11	u-	u-	u-	wa
11 (plural a)	n-	zi-	zi-	za
11 (plural b)	ma-	ma-	ma-	ya
14	u-	u-	u-	wa
15	ku-	ku-	ku-	kwa
16	pa-	pa-	pa-	pa
17	ku-	ku-	ku-	kwa
18	mu-	m-	m-	mwa

- (2) *Akili* *zi-me-m-ruka*
 10-intellect 10SM-PERF-1OM-jump
 intellect has jumped him
 ‘He is out of his mind.’

These are structurally distinct constructions in which a person affected (the possessor represented by an object prefix) and a part of the body or other thing intimately connected with them (‘possessee’), feature as two independent arguments of the verb rather than components of a single noun phrase (Dzahene-Quarshie, 2010: 11). This indicates the relationship between the inalienable possession and the person affected by the action of the verb. This phenomenon has been described as ‘possessor raising’ (Keach & Rochemont, 1994), and this promoted or affected person has also been referred to as the ‘extensive case’ (Scotton, 1981a; 1981b). The privilege of these constructions are that, they express a possessive relation between the intimate possession and affected person (their possessor) without the conventional possessive marker or genitive connector. So in (1) instead of ‘my head is aching’, we have ‘head aches me’; in (2) instead of ‘his mind has jumped’, we have ‘mind jumps him’. Often the intimate possession and the verb constitute collocations. That is, there is a regular co-occurrence of certain intimate possessions with certain verbs. An example is *tiririka* ‘trickle’ which collocates with *machozzi* ‘tears’ (see (4) below). Contextually, these constructions often occur in narrative continuums where it is necessary to describe such non-verbal or abstract phenomena such as emotions, fear, sorrow, anger and various states of the mind.

In Kiswahili this special encoding of inalienability goes beyond body parts and kinship terms to include other nouns that are intimately connected to a person such as emotions and mental states Dzahene-Quarshie (2010). About five categories of such nouns participate in affective constructions; they are illustrated in Table 1. below.

Table 1. Categories of Inalienable/intimate possessions adapted with modifications from Dzahene-Quarshie (2013: 94)

Inalienable/Intimate Possessions	Kiswahili	English
Body parts	<i>kichwa, macho</i>	head, eyes
Body fluids/gases	<i>damu, jasho</i>	blood, sweat
Emotions/sensations	<i>jitimai, hofu</i>	grief, fear
Clothing	<i>nguo</i>	clothing
Other abstract nouns	<i>akili</i>	intelligence

2.0 Framework of Conceptual and Body Metaphors

In the literature, metaphor is a highly researched concept and it has been defined severally from diverse perspectives. Several theories of metaphor have been propounded over the years (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, 1999; Lakoff, 1992; Goschler, 2005; Kövecses, 2010, 2013). The term cuts across literary, cognitive and linguistic divides. As a literary term, it has been classified as a figure of speech. Various types of metaphors have therefore been identified; conceptual, novel, conventional, poetic, body, new etc. However certain general features run through all categories of metaphors. One fact that stands out clearly is that in totality metaphors are non-literal expressions.

This non-literal notion about metaphors is affirmed by Lakoff and Johnson's (1992: 3) statement that "as soon as one gets away from concrete physical experience and start talking abstractions or emotions, metaphorical understanding is the norm." Their definition involves the conceptualization of one domain or experience in terms of another. That is the conceptualization of a Source domain in terms of a Target domain (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). A classic example of a conceptual metaphor cited in Lakoff and Johnson (1980) is 'argument is war' which indicates that argument is conceptualized as war because they share some similarities; they can be won or lost, they can be fierce etc. As Fass (1988) argues, metaphors are expressions which show similarity between two things on some aspects and substitute one concept for another based on their similarities as demonstrated by Lakoff and Johnson's 'argument is war'. Eubanks (1999: 420) points out that "Studies of conceptual metaphors have usually limited the kind of data admitted as relevant ... chiefly to brief, formulaic utterances such as proverbs, idioms, and short quotations, thereby excluding most actually occurring metaphorical utterances", such as body metaphors. Kuzmina (2013) intimates that often studies on metaphors have concentrated on the conceptualization of metaphors at the thought (semantic) level rather than at language (syntax) level. She notes that whatever is conceptualized at the thought level is expressed by language and is therefore "revealed in a syntactical structure of the utterance". For instance, a person experiencing a state as in 'There was much pain in him' may be referred to metonymically through a body part.

Thus, body metaphors are metaphors which involve a wide range of body affects (intimate possessions) including body parts, emotions, mental states etc. Kövecses (2013: 82) states that in body metaphors, the target domain can be an entity or event within a speech community. Goschler (2005) identifies three types of body metaphors; one in which the body affects are the source domain and other things the target domain as in 'the memory of a computer / I see what you mean'; one in which the roles are reversed, that is, other things are the source domain and the body affects the target domain, as in 'His argument is weak'. The third type which involves body parts and bodily states, she argues, is a more complex type and warns that in these the categorization of body as source or target domain is problematic in that "metonymic and metaphorical relations seems to overlap and it is not clear whether the body is the source or target domain here." as in 'His blood

boiled’ (Goschler, 2005: 43). It is in this third category of body metaphors that often affective constructions are found, thus reflecting the complexity of this category of metaphoric constructions in Kiswahili.

Metonymy is another figure of speech similar to, but distinct from metaphor. They appear similar because both metaphors and metonymies are literary devices which involve the substitution of one thing for the other. Some believe that many metaphors are based on metonymies, especially, body metaphors. Specifically, this blurred difference or overlap becomes apparent when dealing with the category of body metaphors including metaphors such as ‘Happiness is a physical force’ in a sentence like ‘He was Hit by Happiness’ which Kövecses (2010: 111) refers to as emotion metaphor.

3.0 Analysis of Data and Discussion

I will now illustrate and examine the metaphoric features and properties of these inalienable possession constructions in Kiswahili using the framework of conceptual and body metaphors where applicable bearing in mind the complexities and difficulties raised by Goschler (2005) and Kövecses (2010).

3.1 Semantic Correlation between Intimate Possessions and their Corresponding Verbs

Comparable to Goschler’s (2005) claim, body metaphors in Kiswahili occur in several varieties and for the purpose of this study, I distinguish three categories of constructions in terms of meaning and conceptualization in the data and I deal with each category separately. I demonstrate that these three sub-groups of inalienable possession constructions display three different levels of metaphorical conceptualization depending on the type of intimate possession in the construction and the semantic dynamics of the verb they occur with.

It must be noted also that the peculiarity of these constructions is the presence of the affected person. In other words, in Kiswahili the self/affected person is present in the conceptualization of physical or abstract states experienced within or on the body such as sensations and emotions and this is reflected in the verbal expression of this notion through its (grammatical /lexical) representation in the construction as a separate argument (object) (see Dzahene-Quarshie, 2010).

3.1.1 Constructions which Involve Physical Body Parts or Body fluids and Semantically Corresponding Verbs

In this construction type, there is a semantic correlation between the intimate possession and the verb making them literal in terms of meaning as in (1), *kichwa* ‘head’ and *uma* ‘pain’; (3), *mgongo* ‘back’ and *pwita* ‘throb’; (4), *machozi* ‘tears’ and *tiririka* ‘trickle’; (5), *jasho* ‘sweat’ and *mwagika* ‘pour-out’; and (6), *masikio* ‘ears’ and *washa* ‘itch’.

- (3) *Mgongo u-na-ni-pwita*
 3-back 3SM-PRES-1OM-throb
 back throbs me
 ‘My back is throbbing.’
- (4) *Machizi ya-li-m-tiririka*
 6-tears 6SM-PAST-1OM-trickle
 tears trickled him
 ‘He shed tears.’
- (5) *Jasho li-na-m-mwagika*
 5-sweat 5SM-PRES-1OM-pour out
 Sweat is pouring him
 ‘He is sweating profusely.’
- (6) *Masikio ya-na-m-washa*
 6-sweat 6SM-PRES-1OM-set alight
 Ears are itching him
 ‘His ears are itching.’

However, the question is, does the presence of the affected person in a direct object position make the construction non-literal where ‘head’ is the instigator of the action of the verb? On the other hand, it is arguable that the possessor is the ultimate experiencer of the action of the verb, but does the fact that the possessed item is represented as the instigator make its conceptualization metaphoric? For example, the instigator of the action of the verb *uma* ‘hurt’, is usually a human being or an object, but here in (1) *kichwa* ‘head’ which is a part of the human body (whole) is personified. The same occurs with examples (3) – (6). In (3) *mgongo* ‘back’ corresponds with *pwita*³ ‘throb’. The back hurting is a common human experience, however, in this construction *mgongo* ‘back’ is personified as the instigator of the action of the verb and so is *masikio* in (6). And in (4) - (6) *machizi* ‘tears’ corresponds with *tiririka* ‘trickle’; *jasho* ‘sweat’ corresponds with *mwagika* ‘be poured out’ and *masikio* corresponds with *washa* ‘itch’, but again, *machizi* ‘tears’, *jasho* ‘sweat’ and *masikio* ‘ears’ are personified. The body part in each case is conceptualized as the agent which performs the action of the verb on the affected person. It may be argued that the personification of the intimate possession indicates the conceptualization of these constructions is metaphoric. But on the contrary, there is a literal correspondence between the intimate possession and the verb. Therefore, it follows that the presence of the affected person as a direct object of the verb simply indicates the possessive (intimate) relationship between the intimate possession and the affected person (Dzahene-Quarshie, 2013), since in an alternative construction the possessive marker can be used instead of the affected person as a direct object (as will be discussed later). It

³ This verb *pwita* ‘throb’ is more commonly used with *jipu* ‘boil’.

is for this reason that Hinnebusch and Kirsner (1980) argue that the use of the affected person in such constructions do not constitute grammatical encoding of inalienability but rather marks focus on the affected person instead than the intimate possession.

In terms of source and target domains, it can be argued that the lexical items of this particular construction and the literalness of its meaning do not merit its classification as a metaphor. The question here is, can (1), (3), (4), (5) and (6) be said to be comprehended via conceptual metaphors? They cannot, because neither the intimate possession nor the verbs in the constructions can be said to represent the source or target domain.

3.1.2 Constructions which Involve Physical Expression of Abstract States via Body Parts

In this second category of affective constructions, the intimate possession is a body part or bodily fluid or gas and semantically it may or may not have logical associations with the verb it occurs with as in (7) – (9).

- (7) *Macho* *ya-me-mw-iva*
 6-eyes 6SM-PERF-1OM-be ripe
 His eyes have ripened him
 ‘His eyes have become red with pain/anger.’
- (8) *Moyo* *u-na-ni-piga*
 3-heart 3SM-PRES-1OM-piga
 Heart beats me
 ‘My heart is beating.’
- (9) *Damu* *i-na-m-chemka*
 9-blood 9SM-PRES-1OM-boil
 Blood is boiling him
 ‘His blood is boiling.’

In other words, in (7) – (9) respectively, *macho* ‘eyes’ are literally not associated with *iva* ‘ripening’, nor *moyo* ‘heart’ with *piga* ‘beating’, nor *damu* ‘blood’ with *chemka* ‘boiling’, although cognitively they are. More importantly, (7) – (9) involve internal or external expression of an abstract state representative of an emotion via a body part or body affect.

These represent intense emotional or mental states that are expressed physically through a body part, body fluid or body gas. In (7) ‘his eyes are ripe’, one’s eyes being ripe is a physical representation of an abstract state. Thus, when one is angry or under emotional stress, it reflects in the eyes, the white of the eyes become reddish (ripe). In (8) ‘My heart is beating’ is a physical representation of an abstract state. The thudding of the heart is a physical internal reaction to an abstract stimulus. This stimulus is a physical (internal) action that depicts a mental

state of fear, shock, anxiety etc. In (9) ‘His blood is boiling’ is a fairly cross-linguistic metaphor. It is one of the body metaphors cited in Goschler (2005). Again one’s blood boiling is a physical expression of an abstract state such as anger or rage which is triggered by an internal or external stimulus. Goschler (2005: 43) states that this is not a physical state we can experience and that they are exaggerations. However, cognitively we can relate to them. Kövecses (2010) also argues that such constructions demonstrate that there are correspondences between our external experiences and our internal emotional and cognitive states. In these constructions, what is a part is being perceived as the whole and objects are perceived as animate, hence, they are personified. But beyond this, compared to the earlier constructions (1), (3) – (6) these (7) – (9) are clearly non-literal and highly metaphoric in terms of meaning and also metonymic because generally, they ‘indicate certain physical aspects of the body involved in emotion’ (Kövecses, 2000). Indeed, in a narrative continuum it is possible to attribute (7) – (9) conjointly to the expression of a person’s mental state representing several different emotions simultaneously, as a response to negative external or internal stimuli such as disappointing or enraging news or a scare triggered from within or without. It ought to be noted that the peculiarity of these constructions is that there are no fixed interpretations for them. They may be employed to express different states of the mind. In terms of source and target domains, one could argue that the verbs constitute the source domain and the intimate possessions the target domains in that the intimate possessions are being related to verbs with which they have no literal affinities. However, in the conceptualization of these constructions, the intimate possessions are also conceptualized metaphorically since the meaning derived is abstract that is an emotion; fear, anger etc. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that all three examples are highly metaphoric.

3.1.3 Constructions which Involve Abstract Intimate Possessions and Verbs which Do not Correspond Semantically

In the previous section, the constructions had physical parts of the body, body fluids or gases linked to unrelated verbs expressing emotions and mental states. This category of constructions exhibits yet a distinct level of figurative constructions. Thus the intimate possession is an emotion and semantically it does not correspond to the verb it occurs with. In (10), (11) and (12) ((2) repeated here as (12) for convenience) below there is no direct association between *jitimai* ‘grief’ and *vaa* ‘clothe’, *hofu* ‘fear’ and *jaa* ‘fill’ nor *akili* ‘intelligence’ and *ruka* ‘jump’ respectively as compared to *kichwa* ‘head’ and *uma* ‘ache’ or *mgongo* ‘back’ and *pwita* ‘throb’ or *machozi* ‘tears’ and *tiririka* ‘trickle’. They are also distinct from (7) – (9) in that here the exact emotion is stated explicitly. Thus, emotions such as grief and fear are stated explicitly unlike (7) – (9) where the emotion or mental state is deductive.

- | | |
|---------------------|-------------------|
| (10) <i>Jitimai</i> | <i>i-me-m-vaa</i> |
| 5-grief | 5SM-PERF-1OM-wear |

Grief has worn him
 ‘Grief has enveloped him.’

- (11) *Hofu* *i-li-m-jaa*
 9-Fear 9SM-PST-1OM3-fill
 Fear filled him
 ‘He was filled with fear.’

- (12) *Akili* *zi-me-m-ruka*
 10-intelligence 10SM-PERF- 1OM- jump
 Intelligence has jumped him
 ‘He is out of his mind’/ ‘he is insane.’

In (10), the emotion *jitimai* ‘grief’ is conceptualised as a cloth that clads a person. In (11), *hofu* ‘fear’ is conceptualised as a substance that fills the body which is also conceptualised as a container. In (12), intelligence is conceptualised as something that possesses the ability to jump out of a person’s body, disassociating it from him. *Akili* ‘intelligence’ is conceptualized as a concrete object that jumps out of the person. The affected person again is conceptualized as a container from which the personified intelligence jumps out. This particular construction is more complicated than (10) and (11) because beyond the conceptualization of intelligence as a personified object which jumps out of a person, there is a second level of conceptualization which interoperates the whole act as expressing a state of insanity.

So in (10) – (12), emotions, mental states which are abstract in reality are being perceived as concrete objects. So what is internal is being expressed in a more physical way via the use of these particular verbs. This category of body/emotion metaphors can be analysed in terms of source and target domains. Unlike the second category of constructions, these (10) – (12) lexically reflect directly the emotions or mental states they express and in addition they are expressed metonymically via the verbs they occur with. It is easier to identify the intimate possessions as the target domains and the verbs as the source domains. The emotions or mental states *jitimai* ‘grief’, *hofu* ‘fear’, and *akili* ‘intelligence’ constitute the target domains and the verbs *vaa* ‘clothe’, *jaa* ‘fill’ and *ruka* ‘jump’ constitute the source domains respectively.

In addition to emotions, the intimate possession in this construction type may be other abstract states or entities such as state of health as in (13) or words as in (14). In (13), *ugonjwa* ‘sickness’ represents the state of a person’s health, while (14) *maneno* ‘words’ represents an abstract or intangible entity (sound waves).

- (13) *Ugonjwa* *u-me-m-pata*
 11-sickness 11SM-PERF-1OM-get
 Sickness has got him
 ‘Sickness has got to him.’

- (14) *Maneno ya-me-m-choma*
 6-words 6SM-PERF-1OM-burn
 Words have burned him
 ‘The words have pricked him.’

In (13) and (14), *ugonjwa* ‘sickness’ and *maneno* ‘words’ again are conceptualized as concrete and also as instigators of the action of the verbs *pata* ‘get’ and *choma* ‘burn’ respectively. Here the affected person is perceived as the recipient of the action of the verb which is instigated by the intimate possession. *Ugonjwa* ‘sickness’ is conceptualized as an agent who gets hold of the affected person, and *maneno* ‘words’ as an agent who burns the affected person. *Ugonjwa* ‘sickness’ and *maneno* ‘words’ also constitute target domains and *pata* ‘get’ and *choma* ‘burn’ constitute source domains.

3.2 Metaphors in Encoding Inalienability

Having demonstrated that the affective constructions above do exhibit varying levels of metaphoric features, it is plausible to argue that, in as much as inalienability is encoded grammatically through the ‘argumentation’ of the affected person, (introduction of the affected person a direct object to the verb) inalienability is also to a large extent encoded metaphorically. Affective constructions are distinct in several ways. The introduction of the affected person as the direct object of a verb does not change the state of the construction from literal to non-literal thus making examples (1), (3) – (6) non metaphoric despite the presence of the affected person as the direct object of the verb. Thus (1), (3) – (6) have non-affective variants and these reflect the literalness of the constructions as demonstrated below:

Kichwa (changu) kinauma
 Head (my) is aching

Mgongo (wangu) unapwita
 Back (my) is throbbing

Machozi (yake) yalitiririka
 Tears (his) trickled

Jasho (lake) lilimwagika
 Sweat (his) poured out

Masikio (yake) yaliwasha
 Ears (his) itched

Furthermore, in affective constructions which involve the physical expression of abstract states and the intimate possessions involved are mainly body parts, fluids or gases as stated above, it is arguable that there is a non-literal interpretation; there is no direct literal correlation between the intimate possession and the verb. Literarily, there is no semantic correlation between *macho* ‘eyes’ and *iva* ‘ripe’; *moyo* ‘heart’ and *piga* ‘beat’; *damu* ‘blood’ and *chemka* ‘boil’.

Their non-affective variants are also possible but unlike the first group their non-affective counterparts are still metaphoric because of the surface semantic disconnect between the intimate possession and verb as observed below.

Macho (yake) yameiva
(His) eyes are ripe/red

Moyo (wake) unapiga
(His) heart is beating

Damu yake inachemka
(His) blood is boiling

Finally, for constructions in which the intimate possession is an emotion and does not correspond to the verb unto which it is mapped semantically, metaphorical conceptualization typical of conceptual metaphors is involved. The source and target domains are easily identifiable. Interestingly unlike the other two categories of affective constructions, non-affective variants of (10) – (14) are not grammatically acceptable as indicated below.

**Jitimai (yake) ilivaa*
Grief (his) wore

**Hofu (yake) ilijaa*
Fear (his) filled

**Akili (yake) iliruka*
Intellect (his) jumped

**Ugonjwa (wake) ulipata*
Sickness (his) got

**Maneno (yake) yalichoma*
Words (his) burned

This implies that in this category of constructions, the metaphoric conceptualization goes beyond the affinity between the intimate possession and the verb. The grammatical representation of the affected person is factored into the overall conceptualization such that without the affected person, the construction is not acceptable both at the grammatical and semantic levels. On the contrary, the second category (7) – (9) demonstrate that inalienability is metaphorically encoded depending on the type intimate possession involved and its relationship with the verb in the construction, thus here it is not the presence of the affected person that makes the construction metaphoric but rather the dynamics of the affinity between the intimate possession and the verb it occurs with.

4.0 Conclusion

In conclusion, this study has attempted to establish the fact that beyond the privileged treatment of affective constructions which are manifested through the grammatical encoding of inalienability through possessor raising, affective constructions are often metaphoric. The expression of emotions, mental and bodily states in affective constructions may be both grammatically and metaphorically encoded and just grammatically encoded. It has also demonstrated that: there are different levels of metaphors depending on the intimate possession involved in the construction as well as the verb. Also reference to physical body parts as argued by Kövecses (2010) and Goschler (2005) do not necessarily connote a concrete domain, but they can be used to convey mental states that are connected to physical features. I have also attempted to demonstrate that there are at least two different levels of metaphorical conceptualization of inalienability represented by two different construction types in terms of the individual constituents which represent the intimate possession and their semantic relationship with the verb. In contrast, the first category of affective constructions also demonstrated that not all affective constructions are necessarily metaphoric in their conceptualization. The present study represents a preliminary study on metaphors in encoding inalienability and therefore calls for further more detailed studies.

References

- Dzahene-Quarshie, J. (2010). *Inalienable Possession: The Syntax of Personal Reference in Swahili*. Lap Lambert Publishing GmbH & Co. KG Saarbrücken.
- Dzahene-Quarshie, J. (2016). Inalienable possession constructions in Akan and Swahili, *Kiswahili*, 79: 92-103.
- _____ (2013). Object marking in Inalienable Constructions in Swahili, *Legon Journal of the Humanities*, 24:119-142.
- De Koning, B. & Tabbers, H. (2011). Facilitating Understanding of Movements in Dynamic Visualizations: An Embodied Perspective, *Educational Psychology Review*. 23(4): 501-521.
- Eubanks, P. (1999). Metaphor and Beyond: New Cognitive Developments, *Poetics Today*, 20(3): 419-442.
- Fass, D. (1988). Metonymy and Metaphor: What's the Difference. Conference Proceedings of the 12th Conference on Computational Linguistics 1: 177-181. DOI: 10.3115/991635.99167.1
- Goschler, J. (2005). Embodiment and Body Metaphors, *Metaphorik*, 9:33-52.
- Hinnebusch, T. and Kirsner, R. (1980). On the Inference of 'Inalienable Possession' in Swahili, *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics*, 2:1-16.
- Hyman, L.M. (1977). The Syntax of Body Parts. In: *Haya Grammatical Structure: Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 6, Duranti & Hyman (eds.), 99-117. University of Southern California.
- Hyman, L. M. & Duranti, A. (1982). On the object relation in Bantu. *Syntax and semantics, Studies in Transitivity*, 15, P. Hopper and S. Thomson (eds), pp. 217-239.

- Keach, C. N. and Rochemont, M. (1994). On Syntax of Possessor Raising in Swahili, *Studies in African Linguistics*, 23(1): 81-106.
- Kockleman, P. (2009). Inalienable Possession as a Grammatical Category and Discourse Pattern, *Studies in Language*, 33(1): 25-68.
- Kövecses, Z. (2000). Metaphor and Emotion, citeseerx.ist.psu.edu.
- Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2013). The Metaphor–Metonymy Relationship: Correlation Metaphors are Based on Metonymy, *Metaphor and Symbol*, 28:2: 75-88.
- Kuzmina, S. (2013). Conceptual metaphor in Syntax: Sentence Structure Level. *Moderna Språk*, 2: 99-114.
- Lakoff, G. (1992). Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. In Andrew Ortony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought* (2nd Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Conceptual Metaphor in Everyday Language, *The Journal of Philosophy*, 77(8): 453-486.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Larson, M. (1999). Inalienable possession in *Baule* and its neighbors. In Proceedings of the 1999 Annual Conference on African Linguistics. University of Illinois. Retrieved from [homepage.tudelft.nl/q22t4/LingLit/Larson_ACAL30.pdf]
- Schrock T.B. (2007). Syntactic Exorcism: Toward an LFG Analysis of Swahili ‘External Possession’. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics*, 11:259-275.
- Scotton C.M. (1981). Extending Inalienable Possession: The Argument for an Extensive Case in Swahili, *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics*, 3:159-174.
- Scotton, C.M. (1981). Rethinking Inalienable Possession in Swahili: The Extensive Case, *Studies in African Linguistics, Supplement*, 8: 121-124.
- Tomioka, S. & Sim, C-Y. (2007). The Event Semantic Root of Inalienable Possession. retrieved from http://www.semantics.archive.net/Archive/WVIM2M3Y/sim_tomioka_possession.pdf
- Voeltz, E.F.K. (1972). Possession in Sotho. *Studies in African Linguistics, Supplement 6*: 255-266. (Papers in honour of William E. Welmers).