

# METAPHOR AND METONYMY IN ANCIENT DREAM INTERPRETATION: THE CASE OF ISLAMIC-IRANIAN CULTURE

RAHMAN VEISI HASAR

Assistant Professor of Linguistics

Department of Linguistics and English Literature

Faculty of Foreign Languages, University of Kurdistan

Pasdaran Blvd., Sanandaj, 66177-15177 Iran

e-mail: r.veisi@uok.ac.ir

## ABSTRACT

This paper aims to investigate the relevance of metaphor and metonymy to ancient dream interpretation in Islamic-Iranian culture. To this end, a most-referenced book of dream interpretation is analysed according to the conceptual metaphor theory. The results show that metaphor and metonymy play an important role in this ancient discourse. The metaphorical dream is based either on a resemblance between the dream as the source domain and its interpretation as the target domain, or on some symbolic metaphors arising from cultural conventions. The metonymic dream is formed by a contiguous relationship between the dream as the vehicle entity and its interpretation as the target entity. Concerning metaphorical dream interpretation, it can be argued that the overt content of the dream is mapped onto the latent content by resemblance or cultural convention. As regards metonymic dream interpretation, it can be said that the overt content of the dream is mapped onto the latent content by a conceptual metonymy based on socio-physical context. In addition, there are two other procedures of dream interpretation based on realistic representation and the technique of reversion. These cases do not apply figurative devices like metaphor and metonymy. Also, the dreamer's personal knowledge of his or her life does not play a significant role in the discourse of dream interpretation in Islamic-Iranian culture.

**KEYWORDS:** metaphor • metonymy • conceptual metaphor theory • dream interpretation • Islamic-Iranian culture

## INTRODUCTION: DREAM RHETORIC FROM SIGMUND FREUD TO GEORGE LAKOFF

Sigmund Freud was the first person to discover the rhetoric of dreams. He considered the dream as a rhetorical work composed by various techniques such as ellipsis, repetition, apposition, allegory, antonomasia, metaphor and metonymy (see Lacan 2006: 221). In this regard, Freud (2010 [1955]) distinguishes two kinds of dream formed by two different figurative devices: the work of condensation, and the work of displacement. He regards dream-displacement and dream-condensation as “the two governing fac-

tors to whose activity we may in essence ascribe the form assumed by dreams" (ibid.: 324). The rhetorical structure of dreams and their latent meanings are simultaneously codified and unravelled by these devices. The condensation is a process by which different features of two or more entities are united to form a kind of *collective figure*. As regards the displacement process, the impulse of a specific target is shifted towards different targets. Consequently, the meaning of an item is transformed to a new target. By the agency of these two devices, different desires, anxieties, various people and objects appear as disguised players in the rhetorical scenario of the dream. The Freudian heritage of dream interpretation was reinterpreted in the light of structural linguistics by Jacques Lacan. Using the Jakobsonian approach to metaphor and metonymy (see Jakobson 2002), Lacan (2006: 425) identifies condensation and displacement with metaphor and metonymy respectively. Thus, condensation is related to paradigmatic relations, and displacement to syntagmatic ones. As two structural transformations of meaning, they play a central role in the structure of dream.

Presenting conceptual metaphor theory (CMT), George Lakoff (1992; 2007) tries to shed new light on the relationship between the metaphor and dream interpretation. Conceptual metaphor as a cognitive phenomenon is composed of two conceptual domains, the source and the target. The source domain (such as a boxing match) is used to conceptualise the target domain (such as business competition) through some conceptual correspondences; mental correspondences make a conceptual metaphor such as ECONOMIC COMPETITION IS A BOXING MATCH (see Lakoff and Johnson 2003 [1980]; Lakoff 2007; Kövecses 2010). This conceptual metaphor may provoke various linguistic expressions such as "Sony knocked out Samsung" and "the president could not stand the final punch by his opponent". Lakoff (2007) believes that conceptual metaphors can be realised in different ways like ordinary language, cartoon, literary work, myth, etc. Dreaming is another manifestation of the omnipresent phenomenon of the metaphor in human life (ibid.: 306). Illustrating the relevance of metaphor to dreaming, Lakoff presents a cognitive account of the pharaoh's dream. In biblical tradition, it is said that Pharaoh dreamed of seven fat cows that were eaten by seven thin ones, and seven full ears of corn devoured by seven withered ones. Joseph the prophet interpreted this dream as follows: there will be seven good years followed by seven famine years; and the famine years will consume what is produced in the seven years of abundance. From a cognitive point of view, this dream and its interpretation are based on some conceptual metaphors, including TIME IS A MOVING ENTITY, ACHIEVING A PURPOSE IS EATING, and RESOURCES ARE FOOD. Lakoff (1992: 8) describes Freud as the pioneer in the field of dream interpretation, although he criticises Freud's achievement for overemphasising the sexual aspects of the dream. He tries to investigate different dimensions of the symbolism of the dream. In this regard, Lakoff (ibid.: 9) presents a formula for the role of metaphor in dream interpretation as follows:

$$D \dots M \longrightarrow I, \text{ given } K$$

In this formula, D is the overt content of a dream while I as the meaning and interpretation is the latent content. M as the collection of conceptual metaphors relates the overt content to the latent. The interpretation is not done in isolation but is presented according to the knowledge of the dreamer's life history (K). By way of illustration, Lakoff (ibid.) interprets a repetitive dream with which an academic became obsessed. Every

night the academic dreamed of being blind. This academic was obsessed by the phobia of having insufficient knowledge in the university. Blindness is a metaphor for lack of sufficient knowledge. Then according to this metaphor, "I can't see" maps onto "I don't know" (ibid.: 9). Therefore, metaphor (M) is the device by which D (overt content) is mapped onto I (latent content or interpretation) according to the dreamer's life history (K).

#### DREAM AND ITS MEANING IN ISLAMIC-IRANIAN PHILOSOPHY

Shihab al-Din al-Suhrawardi (1154–1191 AD) was the first Iranian philosopher who explained the phenomenon of dream from a philosophical perspective. He is well known as the founder of the philosophical school of Hikmat al-Ishraq (see al-Suhrawardi 2001). Explaining the phenomena of dream, revelation, and mystical experiences, al-Suhrawardi distinguishes three ontological modes, more specifically *reason*, *idea* and *material worlds*. The reason world as the highest and the most transcendental world is completely devoid of material entities. It includes abstract and immaterial entities and truths. The material world, as represented by the earth, is formed by material and physical entities. The idea world in between is also empty of any material content, however it includes abstract images and geometric schemata. The pure images of the idea world are derived from objective entities belonging to the material world. Nevertheless, the question is, what is the relevance of this metaphysical ontology to the cognitive phenomenon of the dream? The answer lies in the abstract nature of the reason world. The truths and the ideas existing in the reason world are abstract and inaccessible to human beings. However, they can be tangible to human beings when embodied in the mask of pure image and schemata existing in the idea world. This means that human beings conceive the abstract truths of the reason world in terms of pure images of the idea world. In other words, the idea world combines images and abstract truths in order to visualise abstract ideas for human beings. The abstract truths of the reason world are manifested in dreams, revelations and mystical experiences by using the images of the idea world (Sheykholeslami 2011: 30). Accordingly, every kind of understanding is allegorical. When a human is asleep, he or she is released from the material world and gets closer to the idea world. As a result, they can see some truths and news from the reason world in the guise of some images allegorically or metaphorically. (Ibid.: 44–45)

Muhammad Husayn Tabatabai (1971: 141), a contemporary Iranian philosopher, tries to explain the dream phenomenon according to this ontological system. He believes that if human beings become completely free of their bodies, they can perceive the abstract truths of the reason world. While trapped in their bodies, human beings can observe the abstract truths in the mask of imaginary disguises of the idea world. What can be inferred from this philosophical discourse is that, in Islamic-Iranian philosophy not only the dream and revelation but also the idea world has a kind of metaphorical nature. In other words, the truths belonging to the reason world are mapped onto pure images that belong to the idea world by virtue of metaphorical correspondences.

In contrast to the modern discourse of dream interpretation, the dreamer's personal knowledge about her or his life has no efficient role in Islamic-Iranian dream interpretation. The interpreter interprets the dream only by making a correspondence between

the imagery of the dream and ancient symbolism. Similar images in different dreams seen by various people with different personalities can have the same interpretation in this ancient discourse. This attribute is the distinctive feature determining the discourse of the ancient books on dream interpretation. That is to say, these books provide a stable symbolism of dreams in the absence of the dreamer's personal knowledge of his or her life.

Dream interpretation books in Islamic-Iranian culture, just like dictionaries, include many entries arranged in alphabetical order. Each of the entries indicates a visual phenomenon that is seen in the dreamer's dream. Under each specific entry, there is an interpretation, meaning that anyone could find out the meaning of their dreams by checking the entries in the book. For example, if a dreamer sees a specific fruit in dream, he or she can check the entry of that fruit in the interpretation book in order to find its interpretation. Accordingly, the traditional books of dream interpretation supply an unvarying symbolism for deciphering the dreams (see Akbari 1991; Teflisi 1992; Ebne Sirin 2002). These books apply some figurative devices for presenting the relationship between the visual structure of the dream and its interpretation. This paper aims to investigate these figurative devices from a cognitive perspective. It will shed light on the ways the entries and their interpretations are related to each other. For this purpose, a book of dream interpretation will be analysed according to the conceptual metaphor theory. Finally, the formula for ancient dream interpretation will be presented from a cognitive perspective. The objective of this analysis is to unravel the differences between the traditional and modern procedures of dream interpretation.

#### METHOD AND MATERIAL

The data of the present study is based on one of the most referenced books of dream interpretation *Kamelo Tabiir* (Teflisi 1992), written in Persian in 1164 AD by Abolfazl Kamaladdin Habishe Ebne Ebrahim Ben Mohhammad Teflisi (1105–1205 AD). Since this book is the first Persian dream interpretation book, and also most of the succeeding books published thereafter are just copies, it was chosen as the only source of data for the present study. In addition, this book is considered by the researcher as an Islamic-Iranian cultural phenomenon for several reasons: first, it is based on the spiritual and religious tradition of Islamic culture that was established long before the emergence of the book itself; second, because it was written in Persian it had a great effect on the succeeding Persian books of dream interpretation in Iran. Accordingly, it is considered an Islamic-Iranian cultural phenomenon in the present paper. This book involves 730 entries along with their interpretations. As mentioned above, each entry (like an entry in the dictionary) refers to an entity or an event (such as a sword or a game) seen in a dream, with the interpretations presented under each entry.

Investigating the relationship between the entries of this book and their interpretations, the present paper tries to illustrate the rhetorical devices employed by this discourse to interpret the dreams. The data is analysed according to the conceptual metaphor theory, conceptual metonymy theory (see Lakoff and Johnson 2003 [1980]; Lakoff 2007) and the method of metaphorical identification procedure (MIP; see Pragglejazz 2007). According to MIP, if the contextual meaning of a word is different from its basic

meaning, and also if they are understood in comparison to each other, the word may be marked as metaphorical. The basic meaning refers to the literal sense of the word as recorded in the dictionary; and the contextual meaning refers to the meaning of the word in the sentence. Illustrating the methodology of the paper, the following examples are analysed according to the CMT and MIP.

*qæssa:b – didæne qæssa:b dær xa:b dæilil bærg mærg ʔæst. ʔægær dær xa:b binæd ke qæssa:b be xa:ne ja: kɔ:tʃeje ʔu ʔa:mæd, dær ʔa:ndʒa: kesi bemiræd* ('butcher – seeing a butcher in a dream signifies death, if the dreamer sees that a butcher comes to his or her home or to an alley, someone will die there'). In this example, the relationship between the entry (butcher) and the interpretation (death) is based on a conceptual metaphor. Regarding MIP, the basic meaning of the entry (butcher) is different from its contextual meaning (death). In addition, they are understood in comparison to each other. Accordingly, this entry may be categorised as a metaphorical one. In this example, the entry of butcher as the source domain is mapped onto the entry of death as the target domain. Accordingly, seeing a butcher conforms to seeing death. Then, the source domain of *qæssa:b* (butcher) is used to conceptualising the target domain of *mærg* (death). DEATH IS A BUTCHER as an ontological metaphor maps the entry onto its interpretation. The presence of a butcher in a place is the overt content (D) and the event of death in that place is the latent content (I). Therefore, the metaphor of DEATH IS A BUTCHER (M) maps the D onto I. However, the knowledge about dreamer's life is not important here.

The next example illustrates a non-metaphorical dream interpretation: *ja:fiæne noqre – be hæma:n ʔænda:ze noqre mja:bæd* ('finding silver coins – he or she will find the same amount of silver coins in reality'). In this example, the basic meaning of the entry (silver as a metallic element) does not contrast with its contextual meaning (interpretation: silver coins). In other words, the literal meaning of the entry remains intact in the sentence. Accordingly, this entry cannot be categorised as a metaphorical one. The technique of realistic representation underlies this kind of interpretation.

Apart from metaphorical and realistic techniques of dream interpretation, the conceptual metonymy has a significant role in ancient dream interpretation. The primary function of the conceptual metonymy is a referential one by which something is applied to refer to something else. The conceptual metonymy includes many types, involving part of a thing for the whole thing, producer for the product, object for user, etc. (Lakoff and Johnson 2003 [1980]: 36–38) Different kinds of conceptual metonymy are characterised by a contiguous relationship between two objects (Kövecses 2010: 173). In other words, the first object as the vehicle entity refers to the second object as the target entity; consequently "a vehicle entity can provide mental access to a target entity, when the two entities belong to the same domain" (ibid.).

The following example illustrates a case of dream interpretation that is based on a conceptual metonymy: *tʃini ʔa:la:t – dær xa:b dæilil bærg zæni xa:deme ʔæst* ('chinaware – in a dream it signifies a female servant'). In this example, the tool (chinaware) is used to refer to the user (female servant). The female servant uses this tool to serve food for the guests. Both the vehicle entity (chinaware) and the target entity (female servant) belong to the mental domain of housekeeping.

Analysing the data, the present paper shows that there are four types of relationship between entries and interpretations. In the first group, there is a metaphorical relationship between the entry and the interpretation. In other words, the entry as the source

domain is mapped onto its interpretation as the target domain in a metaphorical way. In the second group, there is a metonymic relationship between the entries and the interpretations. More specifically, the entry as the vehicle entity refers to the interpretation as the target entity in terms of a socio-physical contiguity. In addition, the third group is characterised by a realistic representation according to which the entry is interpreted literally as a real event in the future. No figurative device is used in this group. Finally, in the fourth group there is a reverse relationship between entries and interpretations. In other words, the entry and the interpretation are opposite in meaning. Accordingly, the metaphorical group is about 77%, metonymic dreams 13%, realistic dreams 8% and reverse dreams 2%. In the following sections, we try to investigate these groups in details.

### METAPHORICAL DREAMS

As mentioned, the metaphorical group of dream interpretations forms a large percentage (77%) of the data. In this group, the entry as the source domain conceptualises its interpretation as the target domain in terms of a similarity. Therefore, an underlying conceptual metaphor brings the entry and the interpretation together. It can be argued that the metaphor relates the overt content of the dream to its latent meaning. To clarify this issue, the following examples are presented.

*ya:r – ʔægær kæsi dær xa:b binæd ke be ya:ri ræft, zenda:ni miʃævæd* ('cave – if someone sees in a dream that he has gone to a cave, he will be put in jail'). In this example, the entry of cave has been used in a metaphorical way because its basic meaning (a natural hole) is in contrast to its contextual meaning (a building where criminals are kept), and because the two meanings are also understood in comparison with each other. Accordingly, the entry of cave as the source domain is employed to conceptualise the meaning of jail as the target domain. JAIL IS A CAVE maps the entry onto its interpretation. Being in the cave is the overt content (D), and being in the jail is the latent content (I). The metaphor of JAIL IS A CAVE maps D to I in the absence of K (personal knowledge). In this case, the dark, wet, and closed environment of the cave is compared to the dark, wet, and closed place of the old jail.

*tæra:zu – tæra:zu dær xa:b qa:zi ʔæst. ʔægær dær xa:b kesi be ʔv: tæra:zu da:d, qa:zi:je pærhizka:r ʔa:ndza: ba:ʃæd* ('scale – scales are the judge (jurist) in a dream. If someone gives the dreamer a scale in a dream, there is a just judge in that land'). In this example, the entry of scale is applied metaphorically, mainly because its basic meaning (a device to measure weight) is in contrast with the contextual meaning (judge); additionally, they are comprehended in comparison with each other. The entry of scale as the source domain is mapped onto the interpretation of judge as the target domain, whereby the conceptual metaphor A JUDGE IS A SCALE is made. Seeing a scale is the overt content that is related to seeing a judge as the latent content via the metaphor of A JUDGE IS A SCALE. The situation of evaluating the objects' weight using the scale is compared to that of the judge evaluating the deeds of people.

*a:ru:y zædæn – ʔægær binæd ke ʔa:ruy zæd dær bida:ri soxæni gujæd ke zeft ʔæst* ('belching – if he sees that he belched (in a dream), he will say obscene words (in reality)'). In this example, the word belch is a metaphorical word: its basic meaning (an unpleasant

sound through the mouth) is comprehended in comparison to its contextual meaning (obscene words said by a person). Accordingly, the entry of malodorous belch is mapped onto the interpretation of obscene words. Then, the metaphor OBSCENE WORDS ARE MALODOROUS BELCHES links the overt content of the dream (malodorous belch) to the latent content (obscene word) without using the K component. In this example, the unpleasant sound of a belch and people's negative reaction to it are compared to the displeasing sound of obscene words and the addressee's negative response.

*ʔæstær – didæne ʔæstær dær xa:b dæilil bær zæne na:za: ʔæst* ('mule – seeing a mule in a dream signifies an infertile woman'). In this example the mule is used metaphorically. While its basic meaning refers to a kind of four-footed animal, its contextual meaning refers to an infertile woman; in addition, the shared property (being infertile) leads the interpreter to understand the latter against the former. Accordingly, there is a metaphorical mapping between mule as the source domain and infertile woman as the target domain. The overt content of the dream (D) is mapped onto the latent content (I) by the metaphor INFERTILE WOMAN IS A MULE. Through metaphorical analogy, the infertility of mule is compared with that of infertile women.

*dær da:m ʔofta:dæn – dæilil ke be mækro hileje kæsa:ni gerefta:r miʔævæd* ('to be trapped – signifies that the dreamer will be deceived by someone's ruse (trick)'). Concerning this example, the word trap is metaphorically interpreted as a kind of trick. In other words, being trapped refers figuratively to being deceived by a trick. Accordingly, it can be argued that the basic meaning of trap (a device for catching animals) is in contrast to its contextual meaning (a technique for deceiving people); in addition, the latter is conceived against the former. Trap as the source domain is mapped onto the ruse as the target domain. The metaphor RUSE IS A TRAP relates the overt content of a trapped animal (D) to the latent content of a deceived person (I). In this example, the situation of being trapped like an animal in a hunter's trap is compared to being deceived by a person's ruse. The similarity and parallelism between these situations give rise to this metaphor.

In what follows, some other examples of metaphorical dream interpretation are presented.

*guz: idæn – gu: zidæn dær xa:b dæilil bær soxæne ze fi ʔæst* ('to fart – to fart in a dream signifies obscene words'): SPEAKING OBSCENELY IS FARTING.

*qæʔæs – didæne qæʔæs dær xa:b dæilil bær zenda:n ʔæst* ('cage – seeing a cage in a dream signifies jail'): JAIL IS A CAGE.

*ʔa:b da:dæn be ba:γ – dær xa:b dæilil bær dzema:ʔ kærdæn ba: zæna:n ʔæst* ('watering the garden – in the dream, this signifies intercourse with a woman'): EJACULATION IS WATERING.

*ba:z kærdæne qofli – ʔægær dær xa:b binæd qofli ba:z fod, dæilil bær ʔin ʔæst ke ʔomuræʔ gofa:jeʔja:bæd* ('opening a lock – if a dreamer sees that a lock is opened, it signifies that his or her problems will be solved'): PROBLEMS ARE LOCKS and SOLVING A PROBLEMS IS OPENING A LOCK.

*gu:r – gu:r dær xa:b dæilil bær zenda:n ʔæst* ('grave – grave signifies jail'): JAIL IS A GRAVE.

In regard to these examples, it is apparent that the source domain shows a resemblance to the target domain in certain aspects. The dream interpreter makes an analogy between the source and the target domains by considering the perceived similarity.

Metaphorical mapping by analogy is based on similarity between two different situations at different levels including attribute mapping between two objects, relational mapping between two relations, and system mapping between two situations (see Holyoak and Thagard 1995; Freeman, 2003). All of these metaphorical mappings are based on similarity. By regarding the distinction between resemblance metaphors and metaphors based on experiential correlation (see Grady 1999), one can conclude that the metaphors in the above examples can be regarded as resemblance metaphors. As far as the experiential metaphor is concerned, the metaphor should be motivated by a cognitive experience in the context. For instance, the metaphor of ANGER IS HEAT is motivated by some physiological experiences (blood pressure and body heat). However, resemblance metaphors cannot be explained according to physiological or natural experiences. Nevertheless, they are based on a kind of similarity between the source domain and the target domain. It may be argued that these metaphorical dreams are interpreted by the resemblance metaphors made by iconic parallelism between the overt content of the dream (D) and the latent content (I). As a result, the formula for metaphorical dream interpretation is as follows:

$$D \dots \dots M \longrightarrow I \text{ (perceived similarity)}$$

In this formula the resemblance metaphor (M) maps the overt content (D) to the latent content (I) by making an analogy between source and target domains according to a kind of similarity.

In contrast to dream interpretations based on resemblance metaphors, there is a different type of metaphorical dream containing no resemblance between the domains. The relationship between the source and target domains is motivated by neither resemblance nor experiential correlation. The following examples illustrate this group.

*ʔesfena:dʒ – ʔægær dær xa:b ʔesfena:dʒ binæd dæilil bæŕ ɣæmo ʔændu:h ʔæst* ('spinach – seeing spinach in a dream signifies grief and sadness'). In this example, spinach has been used metaphorically; since its basic meaning (a kind of vegetable) is radically different from its contextual sense (sadness), and they are also understood in comparison to each other in the ancient symbolism according to its cultural convention. Spinach as the source domain is employed to conceptualise sadness as the target domain. The metaphor SADNESS IS SPINACH maps the overt content of the dream (spinach) onto the latent content (sadness). There is neither resemblance nor experiential correlation between spinach and sadness. This metaphorical correspondence is only made by virtue of a cultural convention.

*ʔa:tæf – didæne ʔa:tæf dar xa:b, fa:h ʔæst* ('fire – fire is the king in a dream'). In this example, fire is also a metaphorical word because its basic meaning (flame and heat) is comprehended in contrast to its radically different contextual sense (king) according to cultural conventions. Accordingly, the entry of fire as the source domain is mapped onto the interpretation of king as the target domain. The overt content (D) is connected to the latent one (I) by the metaphor KING IS FIRE. This metaphor is motivated by neither experiential correlation nor resemblance.

*gætf – didæne gætf dær xa:b dæilile dʒængo doʃmænist* ('plaster – seeing plaster in the dream signifies war and enmity'). The contextual sense of plaster (war) as a metaphorical word is completely different from its basic meaning (a white substance); additionally, they are understood in comparison to each other in virtue of cultural conventions.

There is a metaphorical mapping between the entry of plaster as the source domain and the interpretation of war as the target domain. The overt content of the dream is mapped onto the latent concept by the metaphor WAR IS PLASTER.

*kæma:ne hælla:dzi: – kæma:ne hælla:dzi dæilil bæ r mæ rde mona:feq da:ræd* ('cotton carding tool– cotton carding tool signifies a hypocritical man'). In this example, the entry of cotton carding tool is a metaphorical word. In other words, the basic meaning (a specific tool) contrasts the contextual meaning (hypocritical man); in addition, they are understood in comparison with each other with regard to conventional symbolism. Cotton carding tool as the source domain conceptualises the hypocrite as the target domain. The metaphor HYPOCRITE IS A COTTON CARDING TOOL makes a connection between the overt content of the dream and the latent content without using the K component.

*xærguf – dær xa:b dæilil bæ r zæne fa:sed ʔæst* ('rabbit – in dream, a rabbit signifies a perverted woman'). In this example, the entry of rabbit is used as a metaphorical word because its basic meaning (a kind of animal) is different from its contextual meaning (a woman); and they are understood in comparison with each other according to cultural symbolism. The entry of rabbit as the source domain is used to conceptualise the interpretation of perverted woman as the target domain. Accordingly, the metaphor PERVERTED WOMAN IS A RABBIT maps the overt content of the dream onto the latent content.

There are some other examples, as follows.

*feku:fe – dær xa:b dæilil bæ r bima:rist* ('blossom – in dream blossom signifies sickness'): SICKNESS IS A BLOSSOM.

*tʃu:b – dær xa:b nefɑ:q ʔæst* ('wood (stick) – wood is hypocrisy in the dream'): HYPOCRISY IS WOOD.

*pærde: – ʔægær kesi dær xa:b binæd pærde?i ra:, dæilil bæ r ʔæm ʔæst* ('curtains – seeing a curtain in a dream signifies sorrow'): SORROW IS A CURTAIN.

*a:jene – a:jene dær xa:b fæ rma:n ræva:ʔi ʔæst* ('mirror – mirror in the dream is sovereignty'): SOVEREIGNTY IS A MIRROR.

*hævidʒ – dær xa:b dæilil bæ r ʔæmo ʔændu:h ʔæst* ('carrot – it signifies sadness and sorrow in the dream'): SORROW IS A CARROT.

As mentioned, the metaphors that underlie the above examples are not motivated by resemblance or experiential correlation. Despite the first metaphorical group being made by a similarity between the source and target domains, metaphors in the second group are produced by cultural conventions. The distinction between similarity-based and conventional metaphors was firstly noticed by Ivor Armstrong Richards (1936). As Richards says, there is grounds for perceiving similarity between the tenor and the vehicle in some metaphors, but some others do not include any kind of similarity; in which case the tenor and the vehicle in the second group are just put together "to see what will happen" (ibid.: 123). Considering the Peircian distinction between iconic signs in which the sign bears a kind of resemblance to its object, and the symbolic sign in which the sign denotes its object by virtue of convention (see Peirce 1998: 143; Merrell 2001: 29; Hiraga 2005: 31–33; Short 2007: 214–220), it can be argued that, the first group of metaphors, which is based on analogy, can be described as iconic metaphor, whereas the second group, which is based on convention, can be described as symbolic metaphor. Symbolic metaphors are made by the conventions of the discourse of dream

interpretation in Islamic-Iranian culture. Consequently, the dreamer can find the meaning of his dream just by having faith in the symbolic conventions. Symbolic metaphors are a kind of ontological metaphor in which two different domains are imposed on each other without a fine-grained correspondence. Revising the Lakoffian (1992) formula for symbolic dream interpretation, one can conclude that the overt content of the dream (D) is mapped onto the latent content (I) by the symbolic metaphor (M), which is supplied by the Islamic-Iranian discourse of dream interpretation:

D.....M —————> I (cultural conventions)

Finally, let's review some interesting animal metaphors in metaphorical dream interpretations.

*ʔa:hu: – ʔægær dær xa:b bebinæd ke ʔa:hu:ʔi gereft, kæniz ja: zæni ziba: bedæst miʔa:væræd* ('deer – if a person has a dream in which he catches a deer, he will take a beautiful woman or a female slave'): BEAUTIFUL WOMAN IS A DEER.

*Kæbutær – didæne kæbutær dær xa:b dæilil bær zæn ʔæst* ('pigeon – seeing a pigeon in a dream signifies a woman'): WOMAN IS A PIGEON.

*ʔezdeha: – ʔezdeha: dær xa:b dæilil bær dofmæni bozorg væ niru:mænd ʔæst* ('dragon – seeing a dragon in a dream signifies a great and powerful enemy'): POWERFUL ENEMY IS A DRAGON.

*pælæng – pælæng dær xa:b dæilil bær dofmæni qævi va tæva:na: da:ræd* ('leopard – a leopard in a dream signifies a powerful and forceful enemy'): POWERFUL ENEMY IS A LEOPARD.

*bærre – bærre dær xa:b dæilil bær færzænd ʔæst* ('lamb – lamb in a dream signifies a child'): CHILD IS A LAMB.

In the above examples, an animal as the source domain is used to conceptualise the human as the target domain. There are some other animal metaphors used in the book of dream interpretation: THIEF IS A WEASEL, A LEWD PERSON IS A CROW, FAMILY MEMBERS ARE LICE, A WEAK ENEMY IS A SCORPION, A WEAK MAN IS A BUTTERFLY, A PERVERTED WOMAN IS AN ELEPHANT, AN UNCIVILISED MAN IS AN OSTRICH, A THIEF IS A CAT, A CHILD IS A CALF, and A RICH PERSON IS A SQUIRREL.

#### METONYMIC DREAMS

As mentioned, the second group is characterised by a metonymic relationship between the entry and the interpretation. This group is about 13% of the data. In this group, the item seen in the dream (which appears as the entry in the book) and its interpretation (which is presented under the entry) have a contiguous relationship with each other. Since they belong to the same mental domain, the interpreter associates the entry with the interpretation. Thus, the entry as the vehicle entity provides a kind of mental access to the interpretation as the target entity.

A considerable number of metonymic dreams were about women. Accordingly, we prefer to mention them first, followed by the others. It should be noted that the dream interpretation book by Teflisi belongs to a traditional and non-modern society (12th century AD), therefore the typical woman in this book is probably a housewife

or a female slave (*kæniʒ*). These women worked in the kitchen, washed the clothes and, briefly, were responsible for the housekeeping affairs. Some of the relevant examples are as follows.

*ta:be – dær xa:b dæliʒ bæʁ zæn ʔæst* ('frying pan – in dream, it signifies a woman). In this example, it can be argued that woman and frying pan belong to the mental domain of housekeeping. The frying pan is used by a woman as a housewife. Therefore, the first item (frying pan) can provide mental access to the woman as the second entity. The former is the vehicle entity and the latter is the target entity. It should be noted that in the traditional society of Iran, the main job of the women was housekeeping. Consequently, it can be said that the frying pan and the woman are in a contiguous relationship with each other.

*ʔa:ʃpæʒxa:ne – dær xa:b zæni xa:deme ʔæst* ('kitchen – in a dream is a female servant'). In this example, the entry of kitchen as the workplace of the female servant is used to refer to the interpretation of female servant. The place is the vehicle entity and the person who works there, the target entity. The two objects are related by a conceptual metonymy.

*di:g – dær xa:b kædba:nuje xa:ne ʔæst* ('pot – pot in dream is the maid of the home'). In this example, the pot refers to the interpretation of the maid of the home. The pot as the vehicle entity is used to refer to the woman (user) as the target entity. Both of them are in a metonymic relation. The first object supplies mental access to the second one.

*tæʃt – tæʃt dær xa:b zæni xedmætka:r ʔæst* ('washtub – in dream, the washtub is a female servant'). In this example, a tool that is used by women is used to refer to its female users. The washtub is the vehicle entity and the female servant is the target entity. Both are parts of the mental domain of housekeeping.

*pesta:n – pesta:n dær xa:b doxtær ʔæst. Hær moʃkel væ noqsa:ni ke motavadzehe ʔa:n ba:ʃæd, motavadzehe ʔa:na:n ʔæst* ('breast – breast in the dream signifies a girl. Any problem or deficiency of the breast in the dream is related to a deficiency of the girl'). In this example, the entry of breast and its interpretation of girl have a contiguous relationship to each other. The body part as the vehicle entity (breast) is used to refer to the whole person as the target entity (girl). Accordingly, the conceptual metonymy of 'a part for the whole' is used to map the dream onto its interpretation.

Regarding the above examples, one can conclude that the entry as a visual phenomenon in metonymic dreams is the vehicle entity providing mental access to the interpretation as the target entity. Both the vehicle entity and the target entity are included in the same mental domain. Apart from metonymic dreams about women, there are other different metonymic dreams that have different topics.

*hædʒæræʎ ʔæswæd – ʔægær dær xa:b binæd ke be hædʒæræʎ ʔæswæd dæst besu:d, xæbæri ʔæz mærdome hedʒa:z be ʔv: resæd* ('holy black stone in the Hejaz region – if the dreamer sees in the dream that he or she touches this stone, the people of Hejaz region will give him a message'). The holy black stone is a holy stone situated in the Hejaz region. Accordingly, this stone is in a contiguous relationship to people from Hejaz. The entry of stone is the vehicle entity and the interpretation of people from Hejaz are the target entity. These items belong to the mental domain of Hejaz region. The first entity (a stone in Hejaz) provides mental access to the second entity (people from Hejaz).

*ta:dʒ – didæne ta:dʒ be sæltænæt mærbu:t ʔæst* ('crown – seeing a crown in a dream is related to kingship'). In this example, the crown as the vehicle entity supplies mental

access to kingship as the target entity. The crown as the first entity is used by the king as the second entity.

*bordʒo ba:ru: – didæne bordʒo ba:ru: dæli:l be ha:kem væ pa:de:fa:h ʔæst* ('castle – seeing a castle in a dream signifies rulers and kings'). The entry of castle as the place where kings live, is the vehicle entity that provides mental access to the king as the target entity.

*da:ru:foru:f – didæne da:ru: foru:f dæli:l bæ:r tæ:bib ʔæst* ('pharmacist – seeing a pharmacist signifies a doctor'). The pharmacist as the doctor's assistant gives rise to mental access to the doctor. So, the pharmacist is the vehicle entity for the doctor as the target entity.

*da:s – didæne da:s dær xa:b dæli:l be mæ:ʔi:fæt ʔæst* ('scythe – seeing a scythe signifies livelihood'). The entry of scythe as a tool for working and earning money is used to refer to the idea of livelihood. The scythe is the vehicle entity that provides mental access to livelihood as the target entity.

*leba:se zende – leba:se zende dar xa:b dæli:l bæ:r fæ:gro fe:la:kæt ʔæst* ('worn out clothes – worn out clothes signify poverty and misery'). The entry of worn out clothes as the clothes worn by poor people provides mental access to poverty. The worn out clothes as the vehicle entity and the poverty as the target entity belong to the same mental domain.

In the above examples, the entry as the vehicle entity supplies mental access to the interpretation as the target entity. The entry and the interpretation have a contiguous relationship with each other. Both of the items belong to the same mental domain. Concerning Lakoff's (1992) formula for dream interpretation, one can maintain that in metonymic dream interpretation, the overt content of the dream (D) is mapped onto the latent content (I) by a conceptual metonymy. Background knowledge of contiguous relationships in the socio-physical context is necessary to recognise these relationships. Consequently, the formula for metonymic dreams is as follow:

D.....M (metonymy) —————> I (knowledge of socio-physical context)

At the next section, we briefly discuss two different groups of dream interpretations that are based on neither metaphor nor metonymy.

## REVERSE AND REALISTIC DREAMS

As mentioned earlier, the group of reverse dreams is about 2% of the data. In this group, the entry and the interpretation are opposite in meaning; accordingly, they are called reverse dreams. The rhetorical device underlying this group is the technique of reversion. Therefore, the dream is interpreted by being reversed by the interpreter. There are some examples, as follows.

*dæst zæ:dæn – ʔægær binæd ke dæst mizænæd væ fa:di mikonæd, be ɣem dotʃa:r mi:fæ:væd* ('applauding – if a person sees in a dream that he applauds happily, he will be sad').

*xænde – xænde dæli:l bæ:r ændu:h ʔæst* ('laughing – laughing signifies sorrow').

*ɣem – ɣem dæli:l bæ:r fa:di væ soru:r ʔæst* ('sorrow – sorrow signifies happiness and pleasure').

*ʔæro:si – dæli:l bæ:r mæ:ra:seme ʔæza:st* ('a wedding ceremony – a wedding signifies a ceremony of mourning').

*tævallode doxtær væ pesær – tævallode doxtær dæilil bær tævallode pesær væ tævallode pesær dæilil bær tævallode doxtær ʔæst* ('birth of a boy, birth of a girl – birth of a girl signifies that of a boy, and the birth of a boy signifies that of a girl').

As regards the above examples, the rhetorical device of reversion supplies the dreamer with the interpretations. The following formula illustrates the hermeneutic procedure for this kind of interpretation. In this formula, D is transformed into its contradictory proposition using the reversion technique:

D.....technique (reversion) —————> I (-D)

In contrast to reverse dreams, realistic dreams literally conform to their interpretations. In other words, the dream predicts an event in the future. No technique or figurative device is employed in this group. The realistic dream group is about 8% of the data. The following cases exemplify this group.

*ja:ftæne kiseje pul: – ʔægær dær xa:b binæd ke kiseje pu:l ya:ft, be hæma:n ʔænda:ze pu:l mya:bæd* ('finding a purse with money – if a person sees in a dream that he or she has found a purse with money, that person will find money to the same extent').

*hædʒ ræftæn – dæilil be færafæ residæn be hædʒ da:ræd* ('make the Hajj pilgrimage – this signifies that the dreamer will have the honour of making the Hajj pilgrimage').

*dʒængidæn ba: kesi – ʔo: ba: færdi xa:hæd dʒængid, væ ʔægær dær xa:b bær ʔo: piru:z fod, dær va:qeʔpiru:z misævæd* ('fighting with a person – the dreamer will fight with someone, and if the dreamer wins in the dream, he or she will win in reality').

*mofrek fodæn – ʔægær dær xa:b binæd mofrek fode ʔæst, gomra:h væ mofrek misævæd* ('to become a polytheist – if a person sees in a dream that he or she has become a polytheist, he or she has been misled and will become a polytheist').

*xa:ndæne ʔa:jeje befæræt – ʔægær dær xa:b ʔa:jeje befæræt xa:nd, ʔa:n befæræt be ʔo: mireæd* ('reading a verse of good news [in the Quran] – if the dreamer sees in a dream that he or she reads a verse of good news [in the Quran], then that good news will happen to him or her').

Regarding these examples, it is evident that the entry and its interpretation correspond to each other. Therefore, this group includes those dreams that are supposed to happen in reality. There is no figurative device in this group. The following formula illustrates the underlying technique of realistic interpretation:

D —————> I (D)

## CONCLUSION

The dream interpretation books in Islamic-Iranian culture are composed of many different entries under which their interpretations are presented. Each entry refers to the image, entity, or event that can probably be seen in a dream, and the interpretations convey the meanings of the dreams according to some hermeneutic devices. The primary question of this study was what is the relationship between a specific entry and its suggested interpretation? The paper tried to answer this question from a cognitive perspective. The results show the agency of four hermeneutic devices including metaphor, metonymy, reverse representation, and realistic representation in the Islamic-Iranian discourse of dream interpretation.

As far as the metaphorical dream is concerned, an underlying conceptual metaphor makes a relationship between the entry and its interpretation. In other words, the entry as the source domain is mapped onto the interpretation as the target domain in virtue of a visual similarity. This similarity motivates the metaphorical correspondences between the source and the target domains. The resemblance metaphor maps the overt content of the dream (entry) onto the latent entry (interpretation) according to iconic parallelism. However, there are some metaphorical dreams in this discourse that are not motivated by visual and conceptual similarity. They were described as symbolic metaphors, because the entry and the interpretation are mapped together in terms of cultural conventions. Therefore, the similarity and the established symbols in this discourse provide the meanings of the dreams. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the personal history of the dreamer's life does not have an effective role in the traditional approach to dream interpretation.

Concerning the metonymic dreams, the entry as the vehicle entity provides mental access to the interpretation as the target entity. In the metonymic dream, the entry has a contiguous relationship to its interpretation. In other words, the entry can associate the interpretation in terms of metonymic relationships such as 'the part for the whole', an instrument for the user, etc. The underlying conceptual metonymy links the overt content of the dream to the latent content. The metonymic relations are perceived according to the historical-cultural context of the dreamer or the interpreter.

As regards the reverse dreams, the basic meaning of the entry is changed to its opposite meaning by the interpreter. In other words, the reverse dream pictures an event in the future in a reverse way. In this group, the basic meaning of the entry and the sense of the interpretation are opposite. Finally, the realistic dream supplies a realistic representation of the dreamer's life. It means that the dream represents a forthcoming event realistically. The basic meaning of the entry remains unchanged in the interpretation in this group.

The results also show that the metaphorical dream is about 77% of all the data; while the other groups taken together (metonymic, realistic, and reverse dreams) cover only 23% of the data. This statistic fact reveals that the Islamic-Iranian discourse of dream interpretation is mainly based on metaphorical imagery. In other words, it can be argued that this discourse on the whole is a metaphorical discourse.

#### REFERENCES

- Akbari, Mohammad-Reza. 1991. *Tabiire Xabe Moaberane Iranii va Ghere Irani*. Tehran: Ordibehesht.
- Al-Suhrawardi, Shihab al-Din. 2001. *Hikmat al-Ishraq*. Tehran: Hekmat.
- Ebne Sirin, M. 2002. *Dream Interpretation*. Qom: Lahiji.
- Freeman, Margaret. 2003. Poetry and the Scope of Metaphor: Toward a Cognitive Theory of Literature. – *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Cross-Road: A Cognitive Perspective*, edited by Antonio Barcelona. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 253–281.
- Freud, Sigmund. 2010 [1955]. *The Interpretation of Dreams*, translated by James Strachey. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Grady, Joseph. 1999. A Typological Motivation for Conceptual Metaphor: Correlation vs. Resemblance. – *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*, edited by Raymond Gibbs and Gerard Steen. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company, 79–100.

- Hiraga, Masako K. 2005. *Metaphor and Iconicity*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230510708>.
- Holyoak, Keith J. and Paul Thagard. 1995. *Mental Leaps: Analogy in Creative Thought*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Jakobson, Roman. 2002. The Metaphor and Metonymic Poles. – *Linguistics and Literary Criticism*, edited by Farzän Sojudi and Maryam Khuzan. Tehran: Ney Publishers, 39–46.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2010. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford; New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lacan, Jacques. 2006. *Ecrits*, translated by Bruce Fink, Heloise Fink and Russell Grigg. New York, NY; London: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Lakoff, George. 1992. *Metaphor, The Language of the Unconscious, The Theory of Conceptual Metaphor Applied to Dream Interpretation*. Santa Cruz, CA: University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Lakoff, George. 2007. The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. – *The Cognitive Linguistic Reader*, edited by Vyvyan Evans, Benjamin Bergen and Jörg Zinken. London; Oakville: Equinox, 267–315.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 2003 [1980]. *Metaphors We Live By*. London: University of Chicago Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226470993.001.0001>.
- Merrell, Floyd. 2001. Charles Sanders Peirce's Concept of the Sign. – *The Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*, edited by Paul Cobley. London; New York, NY: Routledge, 28–39.
- Peirce, Charles Sanders. 1998. *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce 2*. Bristol: Thoemmes Press.
- Pragglejaz Group. 2007. MIP: A Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse. – *Metaphor and Symbol 22* (1), 1–39. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926480709336752>.
- Richards, Ivor Armstrong. 1936. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. London; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sheykhosslami, Ali. 2011. *Khyal, Mesal va Jamal dar Erfane Eslami*. Tehran: Matn.
- Short, Thomas L. 2007. *Peirce's Theory of Signs*. Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511498350>.
- Tabatabai, Muhammad Husayn. 1971. *Almizan fi Tafsir*, translated by Mohammad Baqer Musavi. Tehran: Mohammadi.
- Teflisi, Abolfazl Kamaladdin Habishe Ebne Ebrahim Ben Mohhammad. 1992. *Kamelo Tabiir*. Qom: Rauf.