



Analýza metafor v díle Williama Shakespeara

Bakalářská práce

Studijní program: B1101 – Matematika
Studijní obory: 7504R015 – Matematika se zaměřením na vzdělávání
7507R036 – Anglický jazyk se zaměřením na vzdělávání

Autor práce: **Ondřej Hlaváč**
Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Renata Šimůnková, Ph.D.





TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF LIBEREC
Faculty of Science, Humanities
and Education



Analysis of Metaphors in William Shakespeare's Work

Bachelor thesis

Study programme: B1101 – Mathematics
Study branches: 7504R015 – Mathematics for Education
7507R036 – English for Education

Author: **Ondřej Hlaváč**
Supervisor: Mgr. Renata Šimůnková, Ph.D.



ZADÁNÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(PROJEKTU, UMĚLECKÉHO DÍLA, UMĚLECKÉHO VÝKONU)

Jméno a příjmení: **Ondřej Hlaváč**
Osobní číslo: **P12000545**
Studijní program: **B1101 Matematika**
Studijní obory: **Matematika se zaměřením na vzdělávání**
Anglický jazyk se zaměřením na vzdělávání
Název tématu: **Analýza metafor v díle Williama Shakespeara**
Zadávací katedra: **Katedra anglického jazyka**

Z á s a d y p r o v y p r a c o v á n í :

Práce se zabývá problematikou analýzy metafor v textech Williama Shakespeara. Cílem práce je vymezit pojem metafory jako jedné ze základních básnických tropů a následně ji klasifikovat. Součástí je i rozbor metafor jedné ze Shakespeareových divadelních her. Při vypracování budou využity následující metody: studium odborné literatury, analýza získaných dat, vymezení pojmu metafora pro praktický výzkum, sběr a analýza dat z originálu a překladů.

Rozsah grafických prací:

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:

Forma zpracování bakalářské práce: **tištěná/elektronická**

Jazyk zpracování bakalářské práce: **Angličtina**

Seznam odborné literatury:

- (1) LAKOFF George, JOHNSON Mark 2003. Metaphors we live by. London: The University of Chicago press.
- (2) HILSKÝ, Martin, 2010. Shakespeare a jeviště svět. Praha: Academia.
- (3) HILSKÝ, Martin, 2011. William Shakespeare - Dílo. Praha: Academia.
- (4) LEVÝ, Jiří, 1963. Umění překladu. 4.vyd., 2013, Praha: Apostrof.
- (5) HORYNA, Břetislav. Teorie metafor. 1. vyd., 2007, Olomouc: Nakladatelství Olomouc.
- (6) JOHNSON, Samuel, 2002. LYNCH, Jack, ed., Samuel Johnson's Dictionary: Selections from the 1755 Work that Defined the English Language, Delray Beach, Levenger Press.
- 7) GREENBLATT, Stephen, 2005. Will in the World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare. London: Pimlico.

Vedoucí bakalářské práce:

Mgr. Renata Šimůnková, Ph.D.

Katedra anglického jazyka


Datum zadání bakalářské práce: **30. dubna 2014**

Termín odevzdání bakalářské práce: **4. května 2015**



doc. RNDr. Miroslav Brzezina, CSc.
děkan

L.S.



PhDr. Marcela Malá, M.A., Ph.D.
vedoucí katedry

V Liberci dne 30. dubna 2014

Prohlášení

Byl jsem seznámen s tím, že na mou bakalářskou práci se plně vztahuje zákon č. 121/2000 Sb., o právu autorském, zejména § 60 – školní dílo.

Beru na vědomí, že Technická univerzita v Liberci (TUL) nezasahuje do mých autorských práv užitím mé bakalářské práce pro vnitřní potřebu TUL.

Užiji-li bakalářskou práci nebo poskytnu-li licenci k jejímu využití, jsem si vědom povinnosti informovat o této skutečnosti TUL; v tomto případě má TUL právo ode mne požadovat úhradu nákladů, které vynaložila na vytvoření díla, až do jejich skutečné výše.

Bakalářskou práci jsem vypracoval samostatně s použitím uvedené literatury a na základě konzultací s vedoucím mé bakalářské práce a konzultantem.

Současně čestně prohlašuji, že tištěná verze práce se shoduje s elektronickou verzí, vloženou do IS STAG.

Datum:

Podpis:

Acknowledgement:

I would like to thank my supervisor, Mgr. Renata Šimůnková, Ph.D.,
for her kind help and patience

Anotace: V teoretické části se práce snaží přinést ucelený pohled na metaforu jako na jeden ze základních komunikačních nástrojů. Seznamuje s důvody, proč metafory používáme, vymezuje metaforu strukturální, orientační a ontologickou, jak je člení George Lakoff ve své knize „Metafory, kterými žijeme“. Zmíněná kniha je pro celou práci zásadní. Na základě metaforických pojmů a dalších komponent metafory, které kniha nabízí, jsou poté jednotlivé metaforické výrazy rozebrány. K analýze těchto metafor autor zvolil originální text hry Williama Shakespeara Král Lear. Hra je nejprve zkoumána jako celek a poté, v druhém oddílu praktické části, jsou metaforické výrazy podrobeny hlubšímu výkladu interpretace s ohledem na zmíněné pojmy. Výsledky práce dokazují jednak, že není vždy jednoduché vyjádřit obsah charakteristik, které metafora přenáší z jedné entity na druhou, a za druhé otevírají prostor pro nové uvažování o metafoře.

Klíčová slova: metaforický výraz, metaforický pojem, metafora strukturální, metafora orientační, metafora ontologická, personifikace, metonymie, interakční pojetí metafory, tenor a vehikulum, mrtvá metafora

Abstract: The theoretical part of this work wants to provide a comprehensive overview of the issue of metaphors as one of the basic communicative tools. Furthermore, it concerns reasons why we use metaphors and defines a metaphor structural, orientational and ontological, as are defined by George Lakoff in his work *Metaphors We Live By*. The publication is for the thesis crucial. Metaphorical expressions are, based on metaphorical concepts and other components of a metaphor, which the publication offers, examined in William Shakespeare's *King Lear*. Firstly, the play is analysed as a whole and then, secondly, metaphorical expressions are analysed for the greater understanding of interpretation. On one hand results of the thesis prove that it is not always easy to express the content of characteristics a metaphor transfers from one entity to another and on the other it opens a space for new thinking about a metaphor.

Key words: metaphorical expression, metaphorical concept, structural metaphor, orientational metaphor, ontological metaphor, personification, metonymy, interactive approach, tenor, vehicle, dead metaphor

INTRODUCTION	11
1. METAPHOR.....	14
1.1 Engagement in Metaphors	14
1.1.1 Aristotle	15
1.1.2 A word about “outstanding” William Shakespeare.....	16
1.2 A metaphor in linguistics (George Lakoff).....	17
1.2.1 Steps before metaphorical concept.....	17
1.2.2 Tenor, vehicle and transfer of meaning.....	19
1.2.3 Metaphorical concept and metaphorical expression.....	20
1.2.3.1 Subcategorizing of metaphorical concepts	22
1.2.3.2 Metaphor coherency	23
1.2.3.3 Highlighting and Hiding.....	23
1.2.4 Structural Metaphor.....	25
1.2.4.1 The Conduit Metaphor.....	26
1.2.5 Orientational Metaphors.....	28
1.2.6 Ontological Metaphors	29
1.2.6.1 Personifications.....	31
1.2.7 Metonymies	32
1.3 Different categorizing of metaphors	34
1.3.1 Dead and vital metaphor.....	34
1.4 Theory of Metaphor	35
1.4.1 Interactive approach	35
1.4.1.1 Max Black.....	36
1.4.2 John Rogers Searle	36
1.4.3 Difference between Black and Searle.....	37
1.4.4 Considering people	38
1.4.5 Why we use metaphors (Theses of Andrew Ortony)	38
1.4.5.1 Compactness thesis	39
1.4.5.2 Inexpressibility thesis	39
1.4.5.3 Vividness thesis	39
2. FINDING METAPHORS – METHODOICAL APPROACH	40
2.1 The source.....	40

2.2 The method of analysing.....	40
3. ANALYSIS OF THE KING LEAR AS A WHOLE	43
4. ANALYSIS OF THE CHOSEN SEGMENT	47
CONCLUSION	59
LITERATURE	61
USED WEB ADRESSES.....	62
NOTES	63

INTRODUCTION

Construction of a person's language is something that one often doesn't think about much. We just use it "automatically" (unconsciously) as a tool for communication. We want to understand others and we want to be understood. If we are successful, we have no reason to contemplate how language functions (especially when studying the mother language is not our profession). That is also why we do not realize how limited our working vocabulary literally is. The meaningful part of our communication is hidden somewhere "between the lines": words will gain metaphoric significance; word order "shakes up" emphasis in sentences; new space is opened for emotions, fantasy and humour. As communication gains new dimensions, it is possible to say much more than what words, in their literal sense, are able to convey. As mentioned, we usually are not conscience of this characteristic in employing our mother-tongue. We have grown up in it; we think in it; we use it unconsciously. Sometimes we notice that besides technical manuals, something like poetry exists, which has the power to waken emotions we did not know we had.

This beauty and complexity is better understood when studying other languages. Anyone who has started to learn a foreign language, remembers the "Ah ha!" moment when the strange bunch of letter he/she has been staring at, suddenly gave information which made sense. The secret was revealed, the cipher broken. Remember now the legendary movie "Le Gendarme á New York" and the joy with which they grabbed their first English sentence, "My flowers are beautiful!" Every beginner may remember the euphoria of the first "Ah ha!" Now it seems, there are fewer words ahead to learn, and the foreign tongue has now become "my" tongue. And then usually, the anti-climax comes. A person is dutifully studying and the triumphant proof of mastering the foreign language has yet to be felt. Even if the meaning of what was said appears to be understood, still it does not suffice. We have the inclination that between the lines, or behind them, something is still hidden: something very important, something that has the power to change or highlight the meaning of words and give them an absolutely new meaning. When understanding this special logic of using language, we make the task to fully comprehend easier.

The same applies for the converse. To express more sophisticated thought in a foreign language, we must first fully understand the logic of our mother-language in order to

realize what we want to say. Some information can be easily literally translated; some must be explained; for some we must add examples. Anyone who has tried to translate a joke into another language and/or culture knows exactly what we are writing about. Almost every time, the punchline is lost. Laughter is awaited, and instead of it, a confused no-comprehending smile comes. With our first attempts to express ourselves in a foreign language, we suddenly realize how sophisticated our mother-language is and how much information is hidden behind the words.

Many languages have this tool of using hidden meanings. (Based only on knowledge of Czech and English, English-speakers as do Czechs, use many instruments to make our claims tinged with emotions, helping to aid understanding). The genius of all worldwide acclaimed authors is about the ability of letting the reader stand on the ground of comprehension (of what has author meant), and simultaneously having our head in clouds and run away with author's fantasy, humour and/or emotions.

One of the possible tools to help manage this difficult task is a metaphor and its employment. Metaphors are a strange linguistic figure: a spell which allows the writer (or *rhetor*) to say something different than he means, and the reader (or listener) still gets what the author means. Some kind of a special telepathic linkage is created between the writer and his/her reader. A metaphor is able to simplify, shorten and enrich at the same time, by referring to a story, experience or situation that the reader already knows. A metaphor also has the ability to camouflage the message. Understanding the hidden meaning of metaphors needs imagination and a capability of roaming from the explicit definition of words. For example, it is no wonder that the true depths of literature or poetry, is normally hidden for people with autism. Their limits often do not allow them to understand words in other than a literal meaning, if at all. Thus they miss the metaphoric logic of a statement. It is same with the student who translates a text from a foreign language, but does not understand what the text is saying (as with using Google Translate).

The connection between the author and his/her reader cannot depend only on imagination. It needs to go hand in hand with the knowledge of items of both stories (experiences, subjects, etc.): that which is written, and that which is meant. This bank of knowledge can also be historical or local. Over the course of time, some metaphors may lose their meaning. For example, when they refer to something that has disappeared from our contemporary lives (e.g. thanks to technological development) they may lose their

intelligibility. Instead of creating a broad sense, they become an encumbrance since they must be explained. It is similar with metaphors which are linked to certain geographical areas. For example, in Equatorial Africa, one would not understand metaphors about cold or snow. Conversely Inuits of the northern hemisphere would not grasp our Czech expression, “Don’t stretch your neck like a giraffe¹ [to be nosy about a happening].”

The aim of this paper is to bring light to the term of Metaphor, and rules of its usage. We want to show its beauty, and reveal at least partly, the magic which makes it wonderful spice of interpersonal communication and literature. As the most illustrative example of a metaphor usage, I have chosen *King Lear*, a play of William Shakespeare. The genius of William Shakespeare exhibited itself among other things, in his ability to balance his epic narration with metaphors which are super temporal and are still actual even today. To this day they are understandable even for readers outside the era and place of the Elizabethan age. Metaphors are brilliantly contained in each of Shakespeare’s works. For my purpose, I will use the story of King Lear and his three daughters. Through the ages and even today, the issue of relationships in a family and family crises continues to be more acute and actual than ever.

Before we dedicate ourselves to issues concerning metaphors we have to say that in the thesis author used his own translations of Czech citations with the originals provided at the end in notices.

1. METAPHOR

1.1 Engagement in Metaphors

Before we start, the problem of a metaphor (from the scientific point of view) has always been to answer a linguistic question similar to the following one, “Is a metaphor sufficient enough to compete with logic in exactness and objectivity?” Horyna puts it:

It is generally known that a metaphor doesn't have a very good reputation in philosophy. Ordinarily it is considered to be something inappropriate and to speak metaphorically means to speak doubtfully, figuratively, imprecisely, with insufficient degree of necessity and argumentativeness. However, a metaphor is something we cannot do without in philosophy and it makes it (philosophy) something, whether fortunately or not, what is close to a poetry² (translated from Horyna, p. 13).

However improbable it may seem, a metaphor is present not only in belles-lettres, but also in our “every-day life” more than we think. When we return to our question, “Is a metaphor sufficient enough to compete with logic in exactness and objectivity?”, a seemingly simple answer is deeply rooted in philosophy, linguistics (and associated branches), and by consequence of this, not easily reachable. Today’s literary science opinion is that a metaphor is considered a *trope* (or expression) with “other than literal sense.” We will not go that far to prove and show “where the truth lies.” As mentioned earlier, our aim is “to describe the described” and offer a holistic picture about a metaphor. A metaphor is a topic which has been discussed many times, and about which a great deal has been written. Also because there are as many perspectives as people concerning a metaphor (and these perspectives are mostly disjunctive), this work definitely does not aim at discussing them all. We venture to suggest here that there have been hundreds of them and therefore, bearing in mind the scope of this paper, impossible and unnecessary to comprehend.

From all of those authors who have plunged into this problematic issue which concerns items of philosophy, rhetoric, poetry and linguistics (metaphors interfere in many fields of

a human cognition), we will write only about some of them pointing out their most important thoughts. As one of the first who covered this topic we would name Aristotle. In later years, with the increased interest in language (early years of 20th century), we can add also linguistic point of view with names such as I. A. Richards, Max Black, Paul Ricoeur, John R. Searle, and George Lakoff. From the philosophical angle we can name here Plato, Heidegger, Hannah Arendt or Jan Patočka and finally, on the side of “practitioners,” there stands William Shakespeare and Martin Hilský as an interpreter of his (Shakespearean) metaphors. All of these are notable figures who to a greater or lesser extent, contribute to problematics of a metaphor. We will highlight only some of them, avoiding the philosophy insight, starting chronologically in the Ancient Greece.

1.1.1 Aristotle

One of the first, or probably *the* first person, who had stated a clear definition of the term metaphor is Aristotle, the best of Plato’s students. He did so in his work of *Poetics* and *Rhetoric*. The first who actually used metaphors was probably Homer, as his works the Iliad and the Odyssey are full of metaphors. Aristotle often used examples of Homer’s sentences. As we have written, the definition of a metaphor is assigned to Aristotle, therefore we will return to him. His definition had remained almost unchanged until as already mentioned, in the 20th century, when a metaphor came into the focus of many discussions.

In *Poetics*, Aristotle states that a “metaphor” is a transfer of meaning from one thing to another: from brand to breed, or from breed to brand. What this transfer exactly means will be discussed later in “A metaphor in linguistics.” By “analogy” Aristotle means when a second article is connected with the first one and the third with fourth. Sometimes a poet uses a second instead of the fourth or the opposite way. The Philosopher gives an example: A goblet is connected with Dionysus as well as a shield with Ares. A poet then uses Ares’s goblet or the shield of Dionysus. Those are types of “figurative language” which help to enhance a poet’s (resp. rhetor’s) vocabulary. Then Aristotle follows that the language of poets (rhetors) should consist of unconventional words, either a metaphor or a dialect. Every poet should be aware however, that when using too many metaphors, a puzzle is born. And when he/she uses dialects often, it is “a barbarism.” Only using it abstemiously

can reduce “everydayness” and “lowness.” Precisely, his idea of moderation is carefully interwoven into his work. It is essential, he says, that a poet (as well as a rhetor) is using as many of those lifting, unconventional words as long as it is not exaggerated and therefore improbable. On one hand, Aristoteles highlights the necessity of enhancing impression, but on the other stresses the importance of truthfulness (Aristotelés, 1999, p. 370-375).

1.1.2 A word about “outstanding” William Shakespeare

Because the following chapter deals with metaphors from the linguistic point of view, for the first time we would like here to imply Shakespeare’s relation to metaphors. If we agree with Aristotle in his claim that a discourse must be “lifting” and full of metaphors or other unconventional words to the point of truthfulness, we must admit that Shakespeare is the right person who at the time lifted language above all imaginary levels (some authors say that Shakespeare invented about 1,500 - 3,000 new words).

Although William Shakespeare had never deeply employed himself with problematics of theory of metaphor, every single of his works could be a text on which a metaphor is explained and taught. Based on the complex image Hilský proposal in the broad introduction of translation of the complete work of Shakespeare, it is reasonable to think that in addition to his (Shakespeare’s) DNA, it was also his rich life which formed his genius. A possible reason why he was able to so clearly describe the reality and also successfully foresee the future (and become super temporal) might be he knew all kinds of human feelings. We have a reason to think that a man who was able to write in such quality must have been greatly receptive. His life was full of various kinds of people and different types of strong experiences: on the one hand those experiences which a person would have rather forgotten and on the other those which, on contrary, every detail we would love to remember. Every person will work with memories differently and also because we cannot remember exactly every detail we use figurative language which can better depict emotions and feelings.

1.2 A metaphor in linguistics (George Lakoff)

Although most people can recognize a metaphor, very few can give the precise definition. It is hardly surprising because often even teachers do not know how to explain the term “metaphor” correctly. Often having remembered it from earlier years of study, one might say from rote learning that a metaphor is “a transfer of meaning on the basis of exterior similarity.” But precise comprehension is vague so in later years, this confusion about metaphors can continue. In 1980, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson published a book, *Metaphors We Live By*. Thirty-four years later, it has been translated and published into the Czech language (2014). This book complexly describes the issue of metaphor on a deeper level. For the first time, it outlines a system through which metaphors are functioning. This system contributes to a better understanding of the system of metaphors, and using them better as well.

Metaphor is for most people a device of the poetic imagination and the rhetorical flourish—a matter of extraordinary rather than ordinary language. Moreover, metaphor is typically viewed as characteristic of language alone, a matter of words rather than thought or action. For this reason, most people think they can get along perfectly well without metaphor. We have found, on the contrary, that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature (Lakoff, p. 3).

1.2.1 Steps before metaphorical concept

The primary and major form of communication by humans to express their thoughts and feelings is through language. Words are our main and the most common meaning-carriers. For us it is important to realize that every language has its own system and therefore words cannot be linked randomly. It is not only a matter of intellect, by which we mean that we do not need to be using grammar perfectly, knowing all syntactic functions of clauses and words in those clauses to be able to create words and connect them into sentences. (By writing this we do not mean that grammar is not important, but for what we are discussing

now, it has only partial importance.) Sometimes new expressions or word phrases come into existence also “by accident.” Someone says something mistakenly, but he/she likes it so he/she starts using it regularly. This system of connected words has been continuously developing during the history of mankind. And rightly through these words everything we discuss and how we discuss it is structured. The best way to demonstrate these connections could be to observe the vocabulary of our own personal language; or the language of a randomly chosen individual; or in extension, the language of a whole nation. Thus metaphors have come into existence. Although metaphors appear to be non-exact, they, especially through this particular non-exactness, help us to express the reality around us more precisely. To be correctly understood, we will take the example of the term *table leg*. A table itself in reality has no legs in the proper sense of the word. People and animals have legs. However, in most cultures in the world, everyone understands intuitively what “leg” is. Now, in trying to express this *table leg* in “exact language” by another term, preferably as short as the previous original *table leg*, we could state, “Piece of wood which supports a desk top or a table top surface to stand.” as the first experiment. A second attempt might be “An overlapping piece of material (from which the table is made of) which supports the table desk.” There can be many other versions of explaining examples for this metaphor. Although “exact language” has its place in our world (for example, it would be impossible to do mathematics without it and it also helps in marriage), sometimes it is easier to describe the reality from a distance and use a metaphor such as: *a table leg*. What we understand by leg is something narrow and vertical that supports something.

The usage of a metaphor is of course double-sided. On one side there is an author, and on the other a listener who is to decode the message of the speaker, writer. Martin Montgomery consequently explains the role of the listener in his textbook “*Ways of Reading: Advanced Reading Skills for Students of English Literature*.” We decode an author’s intention by exactly how we understand figurative (and therefore also metaphorical) language. “*Inferencing is a process of assigning a meaning to uses of language by making educated guesses based on evidence from the text and other sources.*” As we have written in the introduction, under the term “educated guesses and other sources” we can understand the knowledge of historical or other consequences, author’s life, his/her other works and for example his/her way to type. “*Deciphering figurative*

language involves ‘reading between lines’ to discover what the author is ‘really’ saying.” (Montgomery, p. 121) About the individual steps how to recognize a metaphor, and what should suitable solutions of a particular metaphor consist of we will write about later in the beginning of our methodical approach.

1.2.2 Tenor, vehicle and transfer of meaning

The previous chapter has helped us to understand that each unit of a language (word, phrase, clause, sentence...) is connected to our experience. When saying i.e. “*a wolf*,” normally everybody can imagine what a wolf is. However, someone may be imagining an animal, while another person is imagining a cruel person. Everyone is using his/her personal experience to recall their meaning of a word. Of course it is not possible (and it would also not be the aim of a language) that every word would have an infinite number of meanings. But it may happen that two or more things have a same or similar experience connected and thus can be treated in the same way.

According to I. A. Richards in his work *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, elements between which the transfer is done can be entitled “*tenor*” and “*vehicle*.” Tenor is what carries the meaning which is being transferred from vehicle. Vehicle is the part of a metaphor which gives its meaning to tenor. Tenor is something that can have various meanings, depending on what the second part of a metaphor is – something that does not change (from Latin; tenor – “uninterrupted course”, “a holding on”; tenere – “to hold”).

“She is a rose.”

“She is a poem.”

“She is a bullet.”

“She is a butterfly.”

“She is a lily-of-the-valley.”

“She” is a tenor.

Vehicle (Latin; vehiculum – “means of transport, vehicle carriage”, vehere – “to bear, carry, convey”) is the second part of a metaphor; something that transfers back its meaning and connected experience to the tenor. Vehicles from the examples above are: rose, poem, bullet, butterfly, lily-of-the-valley (tenor, eventually). Rose can be a symbol of beauty, womanhood, etc. Every vehicle is “lending” to her (she- tenor) its own attributes. Every

vehicle has different attributes. For example when we say “She is a bullet,” we probably do not usually mean it as an attribute of beauty.

Using figurative language, tenor and vehicle construct an imaginary frame in which metaphors used in similar situations are possible to use. If we use figurative language, this couple forms a frame of a picture, and metaphors are the picture framed. Every single tenor and vehicle is framing a picture of so-called coherent metaphors (about coherency we will write later); where every metaphor represents a single “brush-stroke.” That means not every metaphor can be part of this picture of a particular tenor and vehicle. And every “brush-stroke” in our picture is a metaphor which represents a relationship between two (usually two) unknowns. Or we can imagine it also as a line of a mathematical function, which describes the relation between x and y (vehicle and tenor).

Model “tenor-vehicle” is possible to use in every metaphor. The only problem might occur when the metaphor is not easy to categorize such as “She is a butterfly.” or “I am a rock.” (musician Paul Simon) and lies in that tenor and vehicle are not expressed most of the time and therefore one must consider possible adepts of a particular example. Although it is difficult to recognize a tenor or a vehicle in the example “He crushed my arguments,” still presumably, a considerable amount of people will find the metaphor.

1.2.3 Metaphorical concept and metaphorical expression

Metaphorical concept, which is a term by George Lakoff, is in many aspects similar to *tenor-vehicle model*. Everything that functions in that model will function in a *metaphorical concept* as well. The advantage of *tenor and vehicle model* is that we can title each element separately. If we want to use a particular element, we will use this. Otherwise we will use the expression *metaphorical concept* for the reason that it better reflects that our language is structured metaphorically. Nevertheless, both of them illustrate the equality (similarity) between the two compared elements.

Examples of metaphorical concepts may look like (it is in fact tenor and vehicle linked together by forms of the verb to be: something is something else): *Life is a journey*; *people are animals*; *time is a non-renewable resource*; etc. In the following paragraph we will discuss the metaphorical concept *argument is war* and how to find metaphors in the picture framed by vehicle and tenor (resp. argument and war).

A metaphor transfers the meaning of “war” into the term “argument.” Imagine that argument functions as a war. We can win or lose the argument. Our arguments can be “*crushed*.” We hold our position. We use different strategies (Lakoff, p. 4). War has “lent” its attributes to argument. And not only attributes: we may even be treating our argumentative partner as an (hostile) opponent who shows that the metaphor becomes “above-language” (*i.e.*, we are looking at him/her carefully and prepared for what he/she says). For the sake of completeness, several more examples from the book of Lakoff are proposed.

(1) *He attacked every weak point in my argument.*

(2) *His criticisms were right on target.*

(3) *If you use that strategy, he'll wipe you out.*

(4) *He shot down all my arguments.*

(5) *I demolished his argument.*

(6) *I've never won an argument with him.*

(Lakoff, p. 4)

Before we continue, a clear distinction between *metaphorical concept* and *metaphorical expression* must be made. The common metaphorical concept for examples 1-6 is *argument is a war*. Metaphorical expressions are then: *attacked every weak point, right on target, strategy, wipe you out, shot down, demolished and won*. Lakoff illustrates the metaphorical concept as a dictionary of specific words and expressions (in our case it could be military dictionary). A certain metaphorical concept can have infinite number of metaphorical expression, or at least maximum of what the particular language is able to provide and what similarities people can “experience.”

Now, when we know the difference between metaphorical expressions and concepts we face the fact that we could still not be understood even if using appropriate expression of a particular concept. (This statement implies that there could be some “inappropriate” expressions – that is correct, but it will be discussed later.) Now we resume where Lakoff further explains how the transition in a metaphor is made. This can however, too

easily presume that we all live in cultures where all dialogues and their content are performed in this “warlike” way.

Try to imagine a culture where arguments are not viewed in terms of war, where no one wins or loses where there is no sense of attacking or defending, gaining or losing ground. Imagine a culture where an argument is viewed as a dance, the participants are seen as performers, and the goal is to perform in a balanced and aesthetically pleasing way. In such a culture, people would view arguments differently, experience them differently, carry them out differently, and talk about them differently. But we would probably not view them as arguing at all: they would simply be doing something different. It would seem strange even to call what they were doing “arguing.” Perhaps the most neutral way of describing this difference between their culture and ours would be to say that we have a discourse form structured in terms of battle and they have one structured in terms of dance.

(Lakoff, p. 4-5)

1.2.3.1 Subcategorizing of metaphorical concepts

There is one additional thing about metaphorical concepts to discuss. We have not yet described their systemacity, their, Lakoff calls it, “subcategorizing.” It is a special type of subcategorizing because sometimes concept (in fact vehicle) can be an umbrella term for the others. Using Lakoff’s example: *Time is money*. Money can be also a limited resource and thus we have *Time is limited resource*. Limited resources are usually valuable. *Time is a valuable commodity* (Lakoff, p. 9). If we use vehicles, let us say then, *Money is limited resource and that is a valuable commodity*. As we wrote that sometimes concept can be an umbrella term for the others, and therefore we can start subcategorizing differently: *Time is a valuable commodity* pointing out the aspect which says that valuable things are not too many and then continuing to *Time is a valuable commodity*. In this point we must stop because way from *Time is a valuable commodity* to *Time is money* is, let us say, long and does not provide much logic as the other way round. “*These subcategorization relationships characterize entailment relationships between metaphors (Lakoff, p. 9).*”

1.2.3.2 Metaphor coherency

With subcategorizing, another important topic is mentioned. Metaphor coherency is what is considerably mentioned in Lakoff's book. We will not go as far as Lakoff, but we at least mention what is sufficient for our purposes. At first, let us get into context with the metaphorical concept: *Love is a journey*

- | | |
|--|---|
| (1) <i>Look how far we've come</i> | (6) <i>It's been a long bumpy road.</i> |
| (2) <i>We're at a crossroads</i> | (7) <i>We're just spinning our wheels.</i> |
| (3) <i>We can't turn back now.</i> | (8) <i>Our marriage is on the rocks.</i> |
| (4) <i>This relationship is a dead-end street.</i> | (9) <i>We've gotten off the track</i> |
| (5) <i>We're stuck.</i> | (10) <i>This relationship is foundering</i> |

(Lakoff, p. 44)

All of these metaphors are coherent and they in fact refer to different kind of a "trip". As Lakoff illustrates, on a journey we can travel by car, train or it can be a sea voyage (to name a few). Associated with a car trip, we can use metaphorical expressions such as – long, bumpy road or dead-end street. When we are "travelling" by a train (or a ship) we can suddenly find ourselves off the tracks (or foundering). All of these metaphors are metaphors of journey and therefore coherent. Lakoff then offers the next supplementary metaphorical concept which shows the coherency as good as the previous one. Time is a moving object because we can hear at various places. "Really? That time really flies, let's go home!" or, especially during a timed test time, students can think that time creeps along (Lakoff, p. 45). And because time does speed up, we will move to the next chapter.

1.2.3.3 Highlighting and Hiding

Based on what Lakoff has claimed, metaphor has also one more important characteristic: it can highlight or hide different aspects of the vehicle. In his words:

“The very systemacity that allows us to comprehend one aspect of a concept in terms of another (e.g., comprehend-ing an aspect of arguing in terms of battle) will necessarily hide other aspects of the concept. In allowing us to focus on one aspect of a concept (e.g., the battling aspects of arguing), a metaphorical concept can keep us from focusing on other aspects of the concept that are inconsistent with that metaphor.”

(Lakoff, p. 10)

“My armor is like tenfold shields, my teeth are swords, my claws spears, the shock of my tail thunderbolt, my wings a hurricane and my breath death!” says Smaug (a colossal dragon) in *The Hobbit* by J. R. R. Tolkien. Using these metaphors, Smaug wants to incite fear, and show that he is almighty King-under-the-Mountain. By saying “his wings are a hurricane,” he probably did not mean that his wings are a wind with high velocity, circular movement, especially in the western Atlantic Ocean (Cambridge Dictionary). He means to express that he has the power to destroy whatever he wants – buildings, villages, cities - exactly how hurricane destroys. We can see here both highlighting and hiding as well. In the context of the story of the Hobbit, in the cavern of the City under the Mountain and after a long journey which Hobbits (small people) had travelled, no one is imagining a hurricane in the context of a weather forecast. It is more a demand to emotional side than to rational reality. This metaphor highlights the “frightening” aspect of a hurricane and hides the aspect of “describing a type of weather.” By highlighting one or more aspects of an object, others aspects are hidden or camouflaged. Highlighting is a difficult process because it presents a kind of challenge. It presumes we know exactly in what situation to use a particular metaphor. To highlight properly involves knowledge of two things.

First is that we know the situation or connected experience to make ourselves clear (to the contrary, our metaphor would not be understood). Secondly, if we have no experience with the situation which we want to describe by a metaphor, we must be able to use proper, demonstrative and pleasant words (metaphor should be an enhancing device of speech, as Aristoteles puts it) easy to understand for at least our readers and listeners. When we highlight certain aspects, we consequently hide other aspects.

As Lakoff pointedly reminds, also different people will understand the same sentence differently: *“We need alternative sources of energy. This means something very different to*

the president of Mobil Oil from what it means to the president of Friends of the Earth (Lakoff, p. 12).” Lakoff then implies an interesting discovery: *The meaning is not right there in the sentence – it matters a lot who is saying or listening to the sentence and what his social and political attitudes are (Lakoff, p. 12).*

1.2.4 Structural Metaphor

One of the commonest and most widely used types of metaphor is a structural metaphor. When Lakoff uses the term “structured metaphorically,” he in fact means: structural metaphor.

When we talk we usually are not aware that we are using metaphors. Our lives are based on discovering things, recognizing human behaviour, gleaning new experiences, comparing situations; thus structuring one type of a situation by another. That is exactly why we do not recognize that we are using a metaphor when we say for example: “When Hercule Poirot started, I was glued to the sofa!” Neither we nor our listener would probably spot a metaphor. The metaphor exactly (almost literally) described the reality of the situation.

We have illustrated the concept *argument is war* and now we will explore other examples of metaphorical concepts of a structural metaphor which, in English, are often used and “lived.” Lakoff reveals many metaphorical concepts of structural metaphor and by a few following collocations he illustrates how they are present even in our daily vernacular.

Take for example the mentioned metaphorical concept: *Time is money*. Time is *structured* on experience with money.

- (1) Do not waste my time.
- (2) This gadget will save you hours.
- (3) I don't have the time to give you.
- (4) How do you spend your time these days?
- (5) Put aside some time for playing chess!
- (6) We invested a lot of time into that garden.
- (7) Do you have much time left?
- (8) We are running out of time. (Lakoff, p. 8)

It is no coincidence that this metaphorical concept has developed. “Time” and “money” are intertwined. In European countries or countries of “the Western” world, “time” is a valuable commodity. We can *invest* our time, *save* it, *waste* it or *lose* it – the same activities that we can do with money. One reason might be that money is thought to be better a quantitative and measurable entity than time. Using an economical vocabulary, we often “buy” the time of other people (services). Our wages (salary) are based on hourly rate of pay (annual rate), reflecting the time ratio aspect of money to our service/output. One last example could be damage to a company through stagnant development: profit loss can be measured by time during which the company did not generate profit.

1.2.4.1 The Conduit Metaphor

So far we have covered trivially structured metaphors. We are adding the Conduit Metaphor here to show that structural metaphors can be also “multi-levelled”. This means they can consist of several combined metaphorical concepts. In 1979, (a year before George Lakoff published his book), Michael Reddy came out with *The Conduit Metaphor*. He describes a very complex metaphor through which our meta-language (language about language) is structured. The Conduit Metaphor contains these three metaphorical concepts.

Ideas (or meanings) are objects.

Linguistic expressions are containers.

Communication is sending.

Lakoff paraphrased the complexity of Reddy’s metaphor subsequently: “*The speaker puts ideas (objects) into words (containers) and sends them (along a conduit) to a hearer who takes the idea/object out of the word/containers.*” (Lakoff, p. 10) We can show here some of the examples Reddy uses to illustrate his Metaphor segmented into 4 parts where a particular aspect is better visible (using Wikipedia where Reddy’s own examples are better organized for our purposes³):

Language is a conduit

- 1) *You can't get your concept across to the class that way.*

- 2) *His feelings came through to her only vaguely.*
- 3) *They never give us any idea of what they expect.*

Speakers insert thoughts into words

- 1) *Practice capturing your feelings in complete sentences.*
- 2) *I need to put each idea into phrases with care.*
- 3) *Insert that thought further down in the paragraph.*
- 4) *She forced her meanings into the wrong lyrics.*
- 5) *Please pack more sensation into fewer stanzas.*
- 6) *He loads an argument with more viewpoints than it can withstand.*

Words contain thoughts

- 1) *The sense of loneliness is in just about every sentence.*
- 2) *His story was pregnant with meaning.*
- 3) *The entire paragraph was full of emotion.*
- 4) *These lines indeed rhyme, but they are devoid of feeling.*
- 5) *Your words are hollow—you don't mean them.*

Listeners extract thoughts from words

- 1) *I couldn't actually extract coherent ideas from that prose.*
- 2) *You found some challenging concepts in the essay.*
- 3) *They wouldn't really get any hatred out of those statements.*
- 4) *Her remark is truly impenetrable.*
- 5) *The author's intentions are going to be locked up in that dense chapter forever.*
- 6) *Hiding the meaning in his sentences is just his style.*
- 7) *They're reading things into the poem.*

What is more in the chapter called “Highlighting and Hiding,” Lakoff substantiates how the Conduit Metaphor (or metaphor itself) masks aspects of the communication process. Sometimes it is very hard to spot a metaphor. As we have said, we often overlook them and think there isn’t one. That is because of a person’s conventional way of thinking about language. Lakoff says that it is hard for individuals to realize that speech could differ from

reality. From “Linguistic expressions are containers,” it follows that words and sentences have meaning even without context or hearer. In “Ideas are objects,” we can understand that also meanings exist without context or people. “Linguistic expressions are containers,” also entails that words and sentences have meaning which is independent of contexts and speakers. The Conduit Metaphor is not in line with those cases where the context is essential to prove whether the sentence has any meaning at all; and if it does what this meaning is. (Lakoff, p.11)

In other words, our mind is full of thoughts, ideas, feelings, emotions, meanings, etc. (i.e. *feeling* cold, *feeling* that it is the right time take a bath, *thought* that it is necessary to do some shopping, *idea* of what a metaphor is, *idea* to be educated and therefore a better man) called by Reddy: *repertoire members* (RMs) which are in a way meta-lingual features. In our everyday language we need to transfer our ideas, thoughts...RMs to other people. In spite of not being able to show them the idea in our mind, we must:

- 1) form *a shape* in our mind – use a metalanguage (is it a thought, meaning, feeling?)
- 2) *pack* it into words (in fact create a package – put it into a container)
- 3) utter it (send to somebody)
- 4) the other person hears it and understand it (takes out of the words/container)

By mentioning The Conduit Metaphor we are one step closer to the next important issue, which is Orientational Metaphors.

1.2.5 Orientational Metaphors

Complexly modelled as the Conduit Metaphor, orientational metaphors are structured differently than the first structural metaphor. Mentioning the first type of metaphor (structural), we already know that it is structured as a word or clause in terms of another word. However, another metaphorical concept exists. Metaphorical concept of orientational metaphors is that it structures or systemizes a whole system of concepts.

In English, there are a considerable number of expressions which are connected with expressions seemingly not being “connect-able.” For example: a) He does *high*-quality

work. b) Things are looking *up*. c) The discussion *fell* into an emotional level. It is reasonable to ask “who” has adjusted those “directions” or “locations?” The next possible question might be why we don’t use the term “*things could not be looking down,*” to mean: a bright future. Again, culture and language can provide the answer. On the basis of our own personal human experience, we can compare sad and cheerful people. Sadness itself is something that “pushes” us down towards the ground. Thus typically, through our physical and cultural experiences, we modify our language. Expressing human feelings has been one of the most complicated human challenges ever. Through the orientational metaphorical concept we have built a platform which better reflects what is sometimes expressed with difficulties. In fact, orientational metaphors determine a set of “unwritten” rules with which we can easily understand. To complete this claim we can state an example of a new metaphorical concept from the class of orientational metaphors: HAPPY IS UP; SAD IS DOWN.

- (1) You’re in high spirits.
- (2) I fell into depression.
- (3) He is really low these days.
- (4) Thinking about her always gives me a lift.
- (5) My spirits sank.

Every metaphorical concept has its own physical and cultural base. For the metaphorical concept HAPPY IS UP, SAD IS DOWN, physical base might be the explanation mentioned above and that is that cheerful, happy people are upright with their entire posture upright, and head upwards. Sad people direct their gaze towards the ground, and have hunched over posture. For other examples of orientational metaphors see enclosures.

1.2.6 Ontological Metaphors

To complete definitions we will need later, Lakoff presents next class of metaphors, entitling them Metaphors of Entities and Substances (or Ontological Metaphors). As the title hints, we need to be able to imagine *discrete*¹ entities via *bounded*² entities. This can be the next experience base through which we are describing hardly describable entities.

We have experience with physical objects and substances; we know what they look like, their characteristics and abilities, and we know what they are used for. Ontological metaphors are used in a way to treat those discontinuous things (i. e. nature, mountains, streets, water...) as if they were bounded. For a human - to categorize those things means to put them into a specially defined form and order, according to what the experience the person has had with it. For example when we look at a vase, we usually examine its shape, design, value, colour, composition, etc. When looking at the sky after a long tiring day, we might contemplate its altitude (depth), colour or even its "freedom." Not everything is as simple to examine as a vase. Lakoff offers the example of Monetary Inflation. Through replacing something bounded and easily describable, for a thing harder to depict (Inflation), it is possible to show one or more aspects of this term for raising prices. In fact, *Inflation is an entity*.

- (1) *Inflation is lowering our standard of living.*
- (2) *Inflation is hacking us into a corner.*
- (3) *Inflation is taking its toll at the checkout counter and the gas pump.*
- (4) *Buying land is the best way of dealing with inflation.*
- (5) *Inflation makes me sick.*

(Lakoff, p. 26)

As we can see in the previous examples, thanks to regarding Inflation as an entity we can better comprehend what inflation is and focus on its particular aspects.

And here we must again thank George Lakoff because he shows that we use ontological metaphors even we do not realize it. We describe feelings, emotions and ideas and mainly events, activities, processes on a rational base, not only in our mind, but we are able to express it according to our experience with it. Through the metaphor, which can transfer everything to an entity or a substance we can compare, categorize, identify and refer to abstract terms or subjects.

- (1) His irresponsibility really confuses me.
- (2) The truth lies somewhere on a half way.
- (3) I could see the joy in his face.

- (4) The world is full of art.
- (5) ...an accumulation of problems...

1.2.6.1 Personifications

Personification is in fact a type of ontological metaphor because we treat things as human beings or enliven entities. In the course of time we can see people have used personification mainly for love, nature, hatred – things connected or framed by love. Among other qualities, therein lies William Shakespeare's strength. He can boost and enliven things which reveal consequences we have not yet come across, which does not make it less truthful.

Taking the example of the inflation we can understand also something more. When regarding the results of inflation as a human-being we not only can recognize it and look at it from different angles but we also can treat it and deal with it as we are talking about characteristics of a particular person. Inflation could be an adversary, as Lakoff puts it, or we can continue; Inflation is a greedy person (*it - eats up, steals, take, desolate - all our profits*). Metaphors have not been invented only for the reason of observing. They deepen the human level of cognition from observing to taking measures. To be accurately understood here are examples of possible personifications:

- (1) The river swallowed the village.
- (2) My alarm clock is laughing at me every morning.
- (3) The discussion gave birth to a solution of the world refugee crisis.
- (4) I could hear New Zealand calling my name.
- (5) "The wand chooses the wizard."
(Rowling, J. K., 1997, Harry Potter and the Philosopher's stone, Bloomsbury)
- (6) "Care keeps his watch in every old man's eye. And where care lodges, sleep will never lie."
(Shakespeare W., Romeo and Juliet, Act 2, Scene 3, Friar Lawrence)

1.2.7 Metonymies

When writing about metaphors we must complete the definition with one more term: “metonymies.” Although metonymies, as Lakoff put it, are different kinds of processes, they have two crucial things in common with metaphors and therefore we add this issue. They demonstrate a relation between two things; and they have both been fundamental discursive means of figurative language since the time of the Roman Empire. As well as metaphor, metonymy is an inseparable part of the theory of metaphor for the simple reason we use one word to describe another one, which is a pattern of a metaphor.

An entity is referring to another entity which has something in common with the first one. That is a pattern of metonymies and in contrast to personifications, they do not assign human qualities to non-vivid objects. Their purpose is to refer. By means of metonymy, a thing is substituted by another one. And to describe the difference between metaphors and metonymies Lakoff says:

Metaphor and metonymy are different kinds of processes. Metaphor is principally a way of conceiving of one thing in terms of another, and its primary function is understanding. Metonymy, on the other hand, has primarily a referential function, that is, it allows us to use one entity to stand for another.

(Lakoff, p. 36)

But to be properly understood and use metonymies correctly, this definition is insufficient. Metonymy has a deeper implication than simply referring. Metonymies, as well as metaphors, structure not only our language but also our views, activities and thinking (Lakoff, p. 36). A possible pattern of a metonymy might look like: producer for product, institution for people responsible, the place for the event, the author for his/her work and finally the part for the whole

Producer for product

- 1) I have bought a new Apple.
- 2) Since yesterday Michael drives a Ferrari.
- 3) He's got a Picasso.

Institution for people responsible

- 1) Pentagon increased the number of troops.
- 2) White house does not know.
- 3) The university will never agree with you.

Controller for the controlled

- 1) Napoleon lost at Waterloo.
- 2) Nixon bombed Hanoi.

The place for event

- 1) Rio de Janeiro is being held every year.
- 2) This year Geneva introduced more motors than the year before.
- 3) Watergate changed our politics.

The author for his/her work

- 1) He reads Ed McBain.
- 2) Heidegger is really difficult.
- 3) Plato is on the shelf.

There is a specific reason that the last example is not in the list: “the part for the whole”. When only a part of a thing represents the whole, it is a special type of a metonymy which is called synecdoche. Apart from that, by using metonymy one thing refers to another one, synecdoche also adds a special purpose and meaning. It has more possibilities, because there are always various types of those “parts” possible to use. Having created synecdoche, we had to choose which “part” will be used in our sentence. Every part of the whole has different qualities, abilities and appearances. We have probably never taken into consideration the fact that often (in Western countries), we substitute the whole body of a person for his/her face. “Show me your grandma!” we can hear. Then the person is given a portrait of that grand-mother and seems to be satisfied. As Lakoff would say, this is the metonymy (synecdoche) which put itself into practise. Several examples of the synecdoche follow.

- (1) Ivan saved up \$20,000 to get some new *wheels*.
- (2) “Is it Dr. Mikulecka? Yes. He is in good *hands* then.”
- (3) “Hey man, nice *threads*!”
- (4) Beautiful are *the feet* that bring the good news. (The Bible, Isaiah 52-7)
- (5) Take thy *face* hence. (Shakespeare, Macbeth)

1.3 Different categorizing of metaphors

The textbook of Martin Montgomery, which we have already written about, provides one important and useful perspective from which we can observe metaphors. The following paragraphs will concern the problem of dead and vital metaphors. It is something that Lakoff’s publication disclaims even in the title of the book “*Metaphors We Live By.*” Lakoff proposes that metaphors are “very much alive”. Although we will use this categorizing in the practical part of this thesis only superficially, we want to stay impartial and therefore we bring this view into the problematics.

1.3.1 Dead and vital metaphor

Montgomery explains that our language is full of metaphors which we even do not recognize as being metaphors. They are much over-used and we can hear them so frequently that we think they have left their non-literality and gained literal meaning. Montgomery further explains that it can be caused by the simple reason that “*as new metaphors are constantly being developed whenever a new area of experience or thought needs new descriptive terms consequently metaphors become over-familiar and cease to be recognized as metaphors at all.*” (Montgomery, p.126) And those types of metaphors are called dead metaphors and do not need too much thinking to be understood.

In contrast to dead metaphors, vital metaphors are like something that “knocks on our head.” Vital metaphors bring new consequences of particular situations and therefore enhance our creative interpretation abilities, a demand which can be heard or not.

1.4 Theory of Metaphor

1.4.1 Interactive approach

The interactive approach concerns basically what we have written so far. It is based on a thought that the term has two different contents: content of metaphorical, and content of literal context. Literal context is primary, and the metaphorical context is secondary. The secondary is meant to be only a system of characteristics which are put into the primary and of which the speaker chooses. One can highlight and mask characteristics which he/she wants by “applying statements; isomorphic (something what has similar shape) with elements, or attributes of the secondary (metaphorical) context. The interactive approach lies in the “interaction” of those two subjects. It is done in three steps (Black, p. 28):

- *The presence of the primary subject inspires the listener to choose attributes or characteristics of that particular secondary subject.*
- *It attracts him to create “parallel implicative complex” (different words or phrases coherent with the primary subject) which can be suitable for the primary subject.*
- *Reciprocally, it can cause parallel changes in the secondary subject.*

When we were explaining in eponymous chapter the metaphorical concept, we used the example of “wolf.” Keeping to that example, Stachová uses “Man is a wolf” for better demonstration of Black’s approach. In spite of being based on the interactive approach, it is not hard to reveal that *man* is the primary subject (the tenor) and wolf is the secondary one (the vehicle). We use *wolf* metaphorically, as a system or an amount of attributes/characteristics. The expression of man and wolf *interacts* with one another: *man* is enriched by characteristics of a wolf and also there is a shift in the semantic meaning of the term wolf. Wolf draws near to the man in those particular characteristics. Stachová uses Hesse’s (Hesse, 1965, p. 10) words, “Man gets more wolfish and the wolf becomes more human.” Indeed, when two or more people use a certain metaphorical concept not for the first time, they are, (using our example of man and wolf), at least for a while thinking about wolves (for example on the lecture about wild life as being humans). In the notoriously known example of the Latin proverb “Homo homini lupus” (A man is a wolf to

another man, being inhuman, cruel and predatory) it is even more visible that a wolf emphasizes its “human” characteristics and therefore becomes more human.

1.4.1.1 Max Black

For Black, a metaphor is an active and creative tool of verbal communication. Max Black was criticized for saying that the secondary subject also obtains aspects of the other one. In fact, that a metaphor functions reciprocally, as we have written above. He further explains this misunderstanding by clarifying what he has meant: although we are speaking here about the interaction of subjects, this interaction and shift in meaning is happening in minds of the speaker and the listener. They are to choose, organize and apply. (Black, p. 29)

1.4.2 John Rogers Searle

“How it is possible that speaker says that S is P but he means that S is R and the listener understands it. (Searle, p. 105)” John Rogers Searle sees the major problem of a metaphor in setting the principles of it – expressed literally, not metaphorically. Searle knows that explaining a metaphor can completely destroy it. When using a figurative language, we have hollow ball of chocolate which we, for analysing, douse with hot water. The ball melts and all that remains is chocolate puree. One might consider that chocolate has remained chocolate, but we think that the beauty was in the shape of sphere. However, Searle thinks that it is possible to set those rules.

Furthermore, Searle refuses that those principles could be based on “similarity” of the two subjects (tenor, vehicle). He supplies his statement by offering the two following examples:

- (1) Richard is a gorilla.
- (2) Sally is a block of ice.

In example (1) he describes Richard as a *mean, nasty and prone to violence*. Why Searle does not permit the similarity is the fact this metaphor works perfectly even in the time when science proves that gorillas are shy, sensitive and loving creatures.

Example (2) clearly wants to express that Sally is unemotional, cold, frigid, not smiling, etc. Searle points out that these characteristics are still adjustable for only one of the subjects. Block of ice cannot be unemotional or not smiling as well as Sally cannot be frozen (we know that temperature of a human body is a point of view, still we think it can be understood what Searle means). Searle does not find the literal similarity between cold or frigid and less emotional (Searle, p. 103, 109).

2.4.3 Difference between Black and Searle

The main difference between Searle and Black, as we understand it, is that Searle wants to set the principles of a metaphor literally; he wants to apply linguistic tools, which seems to be the “main stumbling block.” However, Searle thinks that it is possible to set those rules. Black has no problem with this (with applying also different viewpoints). Also despite Searle, Black’s interaction theory implies that the metaphorical meaning which is inserted into words is still there even after or before using it. In other words, apart of literal, expressions have their own metaphorical meanings (even without people inserting them into words), because they are already there, inserted by various people earlier (something very important is connected to this topic – our memory, which also brings about the metaphorical meaning of words). Thus, if metaphorical meaning is an inseparable part of words we assume that setting those principles as Searle means it, is almost impossible and therefore we again agree with Black. Nevertheless, being a very delicate matter, we of course reserve the option to have been mistaken.

The next reason for us to choose Black’s way of looking is that Black sees in a metaphor not only some kind of interaction of subjects but also way of thinking, therefore he thinks it is possible to explain a metaphor by another one. With this is connected secondary question of Black, why do we try to see the world metaphorically? He sees the answer in that boundaries of word-meanings are not firm in their flexibility; they are intersecting.

1.4.4 Considering people

We have not mentioned yet one, very important, “ability” of people in making metaphors. It is our memory. As Stachová explains the importance of our mind and how we remember things, memory plays a role not only in creating, understanding and using, but also in misunderstanding metaphors. A metaphor, according to Stachová, is not only a game of words and their meanings, but also represents something what has been included in the reality itself. Stachová adds that thoughts and emotions of the relationship between people and reality are connected in our memory. Precisely, our example of “Sally is a block of ice,” we comprehend that Sally is not only a name; Sally is a person, a representative of human feelings. (Stachová, p. 285)

Differences between memories of different people make also differences in understanding and creating metaphors. In fact, it is our front brain lobes that “chose” what will survive in our memory and what not. When we observe it from a macro view, only good metaphors could persist during time. If we accept the fact that metaphors are connected to our mind and if we consider that there are seven billion people on the Earth, where every person has encoded his/her mind with personal experiences in addition to those of their parents, ancestors, etc., we must admit that the source of creating and understanding metaphors is so eminent that to completely describe the theory of metaphor will not be a “walk in the park”.

1.4.5 Why we use metaphors (Theses of Andrew Ortony)

For the end of our theoretical part we can also add what professor Andrew Ortony offers in his pointedly titled book, “*Why Metaphors Are Necessary and Not Just Nice*” – a few reasons why we use (and in fact should use) metaphors in our lives. At the beginning of this work, after he re-discovers for us in the unknown Aristotle’s “heritage” and Plato’s teaching (Metaphor of the Cave), he reminds us that, “*Metaphors, and their close relatives, similes and analogies, have been used as teaching devices since the earliest writings of civilized man (Ortony, p. 45).*” Therefore, he formulates three theses: *compactness thesis*, *inexpressibility thesis* and *vividness thesis*. By these theses he wants to express the necessity of using metaphors. We will start with what Ortony says about his

theses: “*While all three are intimately related I believe them to be distinguishable (Ortony, p. 45-52).*”

1.4.5.1 Compactness thesis

As we understand the compactness thesis, a metaphor has the ability to complexly describe the situation. By saying only “*wearing armour,*” we enable some additional images such as “*providing protection*” or “*giving sense of security*” (Ortony, p. 48) and therefore we compactly express what we want. By using a metaphor, we express a *chunk of characteristics* which supply the meaning of what we want to say.

1.4.5.2 Inexpressibility thesis

In our everyday situations, we gain experiences that we often need to use expressions which are almost impossible to explain by exact, literal language. Ortony gives an example, “*The thought slipped my mind like a squirrel behind a tree.*” and proves that when we want to transfer this into prosaic language we will be driven to another metaphorical expression such as, “*The thought went away.*” (Ortony, p. 49)

1.4.5.3 Vividness thesis

And finally we shall mention the vividness thesis, which is much more difficult to comprehend and easier to misunderstand than the previous two metaphorical theses. As we understand it, the third thesis postulates that our non-literal expressing of reality is much more precise and therefore vivid and livened, than the literal language. Ortony explains, we use language as a means of reconstructing experience and (we think) because we are not frequently able to recover the “*mental image*” of an experience exactly (in literal sense), we use metaphors which fill the “*blank space*” in our mind. Purposely or not, first Ortony supplies his statement with the simile: “*It sounded as if an airplane was flying through the room (Ortony, 1975, p. 51).*”

2. FINDING METAPHORS – METHODICAL APPROACH

2.1 The source

As it was already mentioned in the analysis of metaphors, I have chosen Shakespeare's *King Lear* as the main source to select metaphors from. I have chosen the bilingual publication with the original Shakespeare's text on one side and Czech translation by Martin Hilský on the second one, published by Atlantis in 2005. Apart from the original text, the publication also offers Hilský's useful commentary which is helpful to orientate oneself in the maze of either historical or local consequences.

The aim of the practical part of this thesis is to find and analyse those types of metaphors we have covered in the theoretical part, namely: structural metaphor, orientational metaphor, ontological metaphor, personifications (as a special kind of ontological metaphors), and finally metonymies. Mainly I would like to use the fragment of the play where King Lear calls his three daughters for "vocalizing the magnitude of their love towards him" (Act 1, Scene 1) and then some other individual parts of the play (for example, images of Lear's starting craziness because of being henpecked by the two evil-minded daughters Gonerill and Regan).

2.2 The method of analysing

In this practical part there will be two analyses. Firstly, for the analysis of the whole play we have chosen the text from Martin Hilský's commentary by which he introduces the main text of the play of Shakespeare's *King Lear*. Using this Hilský's text, we will show that the whole play can function as a metaphor of a journey and on its individual parts we will show the examples from the text of the play (it is more explained in the following chapter).

Secondly, for the analysis of the segment from the play, we again borrow Montgomery's words and transform them for our purposes. Montgomery helps us to recognize figurative language (metaphors in our case) by providing three essential steps needed for "a

successful educated guess.” This means in our case nothing but finding the *metaphorical concept* of a certain *metaphorical expression* (Montgomery, p. 122):

- 1) First step lies in the recognition that the literal meaning of that particular word or sentence (*metaphorical expression*) cannot be true.
- 2) However unnecessary it may sound, we must realize that the language unit must have true meaning – and therefore we must deduce it (*find suitable metaphorical concept*).
- 3) And finally try to find a suitable (plausible) non-literal meaning right through that metaphorical concept, or adjacent metaphorical concepts (see the last paragraph in the “metaphorical concept and metaphorical expression” chapter).

This plausibility, Montgomery continues in the next part of the paragraph, depends on different factors (Montgomery, p. 122):

- *The meaning must be capable of being true.*
- *It must fit with the rest of the text.*
- *It must have some relation to what is actually said; the non-literal meaning must have some relation to the literal meaning.*

(Montgomery, p. 122)

In our analysis will be examining these things in each example:

- 1) **Meaning of a particular expression is:** metaphorical, literal, both
- 2) **Metaphorical concept**
- 3) **Tenor** (a receiver of transferred characteristics)
- 4) **Vehicle** (a carrier of characteristics transferred to tenor)
- 5) **Type of a metaphor:** Structural, Orientational, Ontological, Metonymy

If we consider that we are treating such a sophisticated matter as the non-literally expressed thoughts of a deceased author, it is obvious that our results might differ from results of another decoder. In other words, although we will try to find in words of “King

Lear” their appropriate meaning, we cannot guarantee that our results will be the same as Shakespeare’s original intention.

3. ANALYSIS OF THE KING LEAR AS A WHOLE

In the very heart of this Shakespeare's tragedy is an image of a (pilgrim, wayfarer, wanderer) and a journey. From the geographical point of view, Lear wanders from his residence to Dover. As every pilgrimage, also Lear's one has a different, by far most important dimension. Lear wanders from king's palace to wasteland; from his two daughters Gonerill and Regan to Cordelia; from pride to humility; from authoritative egocentrism to compassion and forgiveness; from the crown of gold, symbol of fame, glory and power to a crown of weeds and wild flowers⁴.

(Shakespeare – Hilský, 2012, p. 11)

Although probably not traditional, in this chapter we want to offer a holistic image of the play. Because we are not able to pick all of the innumerable metaphors from the play, we will use Hilský's introduction to Shakespeare's play (mentioned at the beginning of this part) as an imaginary frame filled with our explanation based on the facts from the play (emphasizing the certain aspect).

During the whole play Lear experiences various situations which have a crucial influence in his life (as well as it would have in life of somebody else). To put it simply he learns from his mistakes. This learning could be metaphorically expressed as "wandering" – wandering from mistakes to knowledge (unfortunately for him, Lear is not given second chance). Based also on the awareness of the whole play, even from Hilský's commentary to Shakespeare's Lear it is probable that it could be a metaphor of a journey.

In spite of this "superordinate" view (and because there are many different angles from which we can treat the whole play), we will structure the following analysis according to our metaphorical expressions coherent with the "journey" metaphor (using a metaphorical expression for each aspect of the play- in fact Lear's behaviour during the play) and based on Hilský's text above. According to the interactive approach we presume that words have not only literal meaning, they can be explained also metaphorically and therefore we see the whole play as a message. And that message is nothing else than our metaphorical

concepts *Life is a journey* and *Love is a journey*, meaning that life and love is not a matter of state (being static).

Firstly we would like to comment on the common aspects of the metaphorical concept *Life is a journey* – common aspects of life (tenor) and a journey (vehicle). What characteristics does life borrow from a journey: It can have a *beginning* and an *end*. There are points in our lives we call *U-turns* (on the road it is obvious). We can say about a life or a journey that it has some kind of “surface” – *stony, flat, rocky* or *full of beauty*. Our *comfortable* life can turn into a *painful* or even *agonizing*, as a journey could be as well. Last but not least we can mention *movement*; it is necessary on our travels as well as being a living creature. Although it will be similar with the previous concept, apart from what has been given in the chapter about metaphor coherency, look what *Love* (tenor) can share with *a journey* (vehicle). Love can be slow or fast; conscious or subconscious; educational (*i.e.* for some purpose) or just “coming along for the ride” (without it).

As it was already mentioned we will start the analysis with our metaphorical expressions (only the first one can be taken literally as well) based on Hilský’s text we provided at the beginning of this chapter.

“Lear wanders from his residence to Dover.” As a matter of geographical fact, during the play Lear travels from his previous home to Dover where he meets Cordelia, his third, and most beloved daughter. Dover is for Lear a place where he wants (unsuccessfully) to finally alleviate his own craziness through forgiveness of Cordelia who he had deeply humiliated in the first part of the play. Image of that life and *Love is a journey* we can see here in how much must have Lear “travelled” to realize what Cordelia meant by her “nothing, my lord.” (Act 1, scene 1)

“Lear wanders from king’s palace to wasteland.” Because of his love, he gave all of his wealth away to his two daughters (the third was not able to say “how much she loves him” and was therefore given nothing). These two adjudged him insane, thus Lear leaves his life of luxury, orientating to a place where there is nothing he is used to, a place where he slowly goes crazy. Here we can see the image of *Love is a journey* in that not every journey can end and end happily. *Life is a journey* tells us that this journey can go through very high mountains and therefore can be very difficult.

“Lear wanders from his two daughters Gonerill and Regan to Cordelia.” As onerous the notification of own mistake can be, that the *“Love is a journey”* concept reminds the long road from proudness to honesty. This travel is not only travel of a person but also his thoughts.

“Lear wanders from pride to humility.” This goes hand-in-hand with the previous point. Through the contrast of the evil of his two daughters, Lear understood how wise and loving his daughter Cordelia was. Since comprehending this he would likely give more thought and wisdom to future decisions.

“Lear wanders from egocentrism to compassion and forgiveness.” After realizing that he passed not only his wealth but also his majesty, to forgive was the first imaginary step on his journey from egocentrism to being forgiven by his daughter Cordelia.

“Lear wanders from the crown of gold to a crown of weeds and wild flowers” And finally, *“Life is a journey”* application could have two possible meanings. First, it cruelly shows to our present time that a journey from dignity and honour, to being a fool, can be surprisingly short. Secondly, that the journey from fame, glory and power (in wrong hands), to “real values” can be “stony.” It is known from the play that King Lear was a “true” King and therefore we assume the second application as less probable.

3.1 Sources of inspiration for writing King Lear

According to Hilský, we can see motives of journey also in three major stories which influenced Shakespeare to write King Lear (besides his personal experience). These are the story about King Leir, the biblical King Nebuchadnezzar, and the story of Job in the eponymous biblical book. (Hilský, 2010, p. 586-589) Apart from these, also stories about proud and arrogant kings were favourites at those times.

“The true Chronicle Historie of King Leir and his three daughters” is the most influencing work Shakespeare used for his play. Unlike King Lear, *King Leir* is a Christian play⁵. The fact that Shakespeare had not included some morbid parts of the original King Leir (e.g. the attempt of Gonoril and Ragan to kill Leir, or when Perillus, equivalent of Gloucester, offers his arm as food to starving Leir⁶) contributes to that he (Shakespeare) in fact moved the borders of credibility to be more like in present days. Hilský explains (and we can see

they are also contemporary actual topics), in Shakespeare's time it was popular to write about these issues: good and bad ruling, issues of decentralizing power and examples of good and bad parenthood. Thus, we can expect those types of metaphors in our analysis.

In the times of Shakespeare also religion and the Bible was an important source of what to base our lives on. Knowledge of the Bible was at those times on a different level than nowadays. It is no wonder that Shakespeare was affected by the story of *King Nebuchadnezzar* (Daniel, chapter 2). Unlike Nebuchadnezzar Lear has not the "permission" to survive and revive his life to flourish.

Book of Job (eponymous chapter in the Bible) – story about a wealthy, distinguished and reputable man who lost everything gave Shakespeare innumerable "dazzling" images of craziness, despair and frenzy with which Shakespeare's supplied his metaphors. Hilský rightly says: "*The Old Testament story of Job has inspired not only many images and sayings presented in the text of the tragedy but also it was a model of rendering Lear's suffering*"⁷ (Hilský, 2010, p. 587).

4. ANALYSIS OF THE CHOSEN SEGMENT

Now we will dedicate ourselves to the analysis of the very first part of the play (*Act I, scene I, Lear*). It is when Lear proclaims his plan to pass the kingdom to his three daughters. Consequently they appear in front of Lear and are compelled to tell him “how much they love him“ to determine if they are given a third of the kingdom. Because the kingdom is already split, the whole ceremony seems comic and awkward. (Hilský, 2005, p. 75) After Cordelia says nothing in response, Lear changes his mind and disinherits her. In the moment of Lear’s greatest anger Kent comes and, prepared to die, challenges the King and tries to calm down the situation by telling Lear to consider again this “*hideous rashness.*”

Lear’s and Kent’s discourses are full of figurative language and therefore we will examine them. Although many metaphors are proposed, from their “discussion” we will use only several of them. Before we plunge into the metaphor analysis we should conclude what topics we have covered and what we can expect in the analysis.

We distinguish between structural metaphor, orientational metaphor, ontological metaphor and very specific type of metaphor called metonymy. Metaphorical expressions of structural and ontological metaphors have its metaphorical concept (in the case of orientational metaphor or metonymy it’s a special pattern) and therefore tenor and vehicle (in our analysis orientational metaphor and metonymy have no tenor and vehicle). The tenor receives characteristics from the vehicle and at the same time vehicle, as a folder of characteristics, transfers those certain characteristics to tenor. We should be aware that within the frame of a certain metaphorical concept we can speak about coherency of metaphors and in the case of metonymy – what has been chosen as the subject of reference. Concerning differences between types of metaphor, when we speak about structural metaphor we mean that type of metaphor which explains (through the metaphorical expression) the structural transfer of our experience with something else – from one domain to another domain.

Then we have mentioned orientational metaphors. Orientational metaphors are those types of metaphors which are based on a spatial orientation and experiencing our body in that

space. They have a special metaphorical concept, usually with the orientation such as DOWN or UP.

We also mentioned ontological metaphors which help us to treat unbounded entities (e.g. feelings, emotions, activities, thoughts,...) as being something bounded, tangible. Ontological metaphors are used for the reason we can better describe discrete (unbounded) entities and therefore categorize them, calculate, quantify and so on. The special type of an ontological metaphor is called personification and in this metaphor the tenor receives characteristics or qualities usually ascribed to humans.

Act 1, Scene 1, Lear – King of Britain, Earl of Kent

Lear: „Peace, Kent! Come not between the dragon and his wrath^a. I loved her most, and Thought to set my rest on her kind nursery^b. (To Cordelia) Hence and avoid my sight^c! – So be my grave my peace as here I give father’s heart from her^d. Call France^e! ... Let pride, which calls plainness, marry her^f. I do invest you jointly with my power, pre-eminence, and all the large effects that troop with majesty^g. ... Only we shall retain the name and all th’addition to a king; the sway, revenue, execution of the rest, beloved sons, be yours; which to confirm, this coronet part between you.“

Kent: Royal Lear, whom I have ever honoured as my King, as my father followed, as my great patron followed, as my great patron thought on in my prayers^h –

Lear: The bow is bent and drawn; make from the shaftⁱ.

Kent: Let it fall rather, though the fork invade the region of my heart. Be Kent unmannerly when Lear is mad. Think’st thou that duty shall have dread to speak when power to flattery bows^j? To plainness honour’s bound when majesty stoops to folly. Reserve thy state, and in thy best consideration check this hideous rashness. Answer my life my judgement, thy youngest daughter does not love thee least, nor are those empty-hearted whose low sounds reverb no hollowness^k.

a) **“Come not between the dragon and his wrath.”**

- 1) **Meaning:** metaphorical
- 2) **Metaphorical concept:** man is a deadly (lethal) animal

- 3) **Tenor:** man
- 4) **Vehicle:** deadly (lethal) animal
- 5) **Type of a metaphor:** structural

At the beginning we find ourselves in the centre of Lear's anger – between the dragon and his wrath. By dragon, Lear is meant and his “wrath” is with no one else than Cordelia. Possible interpretation could be also that by the dragon, is meant right Lear's anger. The first option seems more probable. Examining the first option, we can think of possible metaphorical concepts: Lear is a Dragon – Man is a Dragon – Man is a mythological creature – Man is creature – Man is animal – Man is a dangerous animal – Man is a deadly (lethal) animal. When we think about a dragon waiting for his wrath we would probably exclude the view of a mythological creature. The concept must show that Lear is ready to “kill” (disinherit) his own daughter. For this example we would use the concept *Man is a deadly (lethal) animal*. Man (tenor) is associated with characteristics of a deadly (lethal) animal (vehicle). It can be cruelty, bloodlust, dangerousness, strength, hazardousness, insidiousness and making people afraid, scaring them. All metaphors connected to these qualities would be coherent metaphors of this particular concept. It is a structural metaphor because *man* is structured as *a deadly animal*. He in fact behaves like a deadly animal. In hiding and highlighting we can see that in that particular moment Cordelia would probably not consider the dragon as a wonderful mythological creature. In her sudden hopelessness she is going to die (disinherit and lose her father); not examine a creature she has never seen.

b) “set my rest (1) on her kind nursery (2)”

- 1) **Meaning:** (1) metaphorical, (2) metaphorical
- 2) **Metaphorical concepts:** (1) rest is a thing possible to entrust (ontological metaphor) *or different interpretation* rest is a goal (structural metaphor)
(2) Nursery is a hospital bed
- 3) **Tenor:** (1) rest, (2) nursery
- 4) **Vehicles:** (1) thing possible to entrust, goal, (2) hospital bed
- 5) **Type of a metaphor:** (1) ontological (possibly structural) (2) ontological

The meaning cannot be literal and therefore must be metaphorical. *Rest* (noun) indicates here two possibilities – structural and ontological metaphor – abstract thing is behaving like a thing or another (can be abstract) term. First, we will pay attention to the first part. *Rest* functions here as something tangible. We can try to express its metaphorical concept. *Rest* is a thing (as Lakoff proposes we would have run short with this concept – it does not express anything, p. 27) – *Rest* is a thing possible to give – *Rest* is a gift – *Rest* is a thing possible to entrust – *Rest* is a valuable thing – *Rest* is a fragile thing. All those metaphorical concepts say something about the situation of ending of a person’s life. Because the metaphorical expression is not narrow enough, we are not able to exactly define the concept. Nevertheless, all concepts proposed from observing the situation in different angles. We can see here also the possibility of a structural metaphor: *Rest* is a goal (target, aim) – Old age is a delicate matter, and so on... We are not able to say here clearly whether it is an ontological or a structural metaphor, but we presume the ontological because of the fact the text is full of ontological metaphors. We will move to the second part: “*on her kind nursery.*”

The literal meaning cannot make sense, because we cannot, literally, put something on nursery. The meaning must be metaphorical. *Nursery* here functions as something tangible and therefore we assume it is an ontological metaphor. When we apply the metaphorical concept model: *Nursery* is a thing – *Nursery* is a platform – *Nursery* is a platform that feeds – *Nursery* is a plate – *Nursery* is a hospital bed (nurture and care is “brought” by nurses). Again we see here different aspects of how Lear saw his future. In fact we see his affliction, because he was prepared to “give himself” to her. Even though we could manage to name more metaphorical concepts we can see that sometimes metaphorical expressions are difficult to state literally. Highlighting and hiding here is about all those things which would mean something absolutely different than meaning “softly, caring, sensitively treat the old age.”

c) “avoid my sight!”

- 1) **Meaning:** metaphorical
- 2) **Metaphorical concept:** sight is a dangerous and fragile thing

- 3) **Tenor:** sight
- 4) **Vehicle:** dangerous or fragile thing
- 5) **Type of a metaphor:** ontological metaphor

The example of “Avoid my sight,” is a typical example of the ontological metaphor (coherent with the concept of: *visual field is a container* because Lear does not want her to be *in* his visual field), we can see how Shakespeare plays with words and *in different point of view* we can treat it as if it was something dangerous or fragile (in Lear’s case most preferably both). Thus, let us say *Sight (tenor) is a dangerous and fragile thing (vehicle)*. Sight bears the characteristics of being something what we should be aware of and what we can injure only with our presence. The ontological metaphor highlights the aspect of that Lear is injured by Cordelia’s words (*Words are weapons*). Therefore, he does not want to see her, he even warns her (aspect of dangerousness). On the other hand e.g. the aspect of when we avoid something.

d) “be my grave my peace (1) as here I give father’s heart from her (2)”

- 1) **Meaning:** (1) metaphorical, (2) metaphorical
- 2) **Metaphorical concepts:** (1) Grave is a peaceful place, (2) Heart is love, Love is a removable thing
- 3) **Tenors:** (1) Grave, (2) Heart, Love
- 4) **Vehicles:** (1) Peaceful place, (2) Love, removable thing
- 5) **Type of a metaphor:** (1) structural, (2) ontological

The moment of “dragon killing” (disinheriting and abandonment), we can say in the terms of the first example of dragon. *Grave is a peaceful place* could be a possible concept for the first part of the metaphor. Grave (tenor) where is nothing than decaying dead body (or urn with the ashes) borrows the characteristics of a place where nothing intrusive can be done. Grave is structured by the experiences with a peaceful place and therefore it is a structural metaphor. As well it is a kind of irony because Lear would have never say it if Cordelia would answer his question accordingly.

It would be misunderstanding if we consider the second part of the sentence being only a hyperbole. The meaning is also metaphorical. By concept, we suggest: *Heart is Love* and though *Love is a removable thing* (we cannot use the concept *Heart is a removable thing* because it would consequently mislead us again to the hyperbole). So according to Lakoff, this indicates a typical ontological metaphor. Father's love is gaining the ability to be given away. Every metaphorical expression concerning an aspect of "giving away" would be coherent in this situation.

e) **"Call France"**

- 1) **Meaning:** both (the more probable is however metaphorical)
- 2) **Metaphorical pattern:** place for people responsible
- 3) **Type:** Metonymy

The main purpose of metonymies is referring. In this example we can see that even when the sentence makes sense literally, Shakespeare probably meant something different than *calling "France!"* Here we have a Metonymy – France represents French people. Lear calls for French who would take Cordelia, his, at the time, misery. The metonymy pattern is *Place for people responsible* (responsible for taking Cordelia to France).

f) **"Let pride, which she calls plainness, marry her."**

- 1) **Meaning:** metaphorical
- 2) **Metaphorical concepts:** pride is a husband, pride is a priest and pride is a person who escorts to the altar
- 3) **Tenor:** pride
- 4) **Vehicles:** husband, priest, person who escorts to the altar
- 5) **Type of a metaphor:** ontological - personification

In this particular sentence we can see two metaphorical expressions; there have been two different transfers of meaning. First one is a metaphorical transfer between pride (tenor) and plainness (vehicle). We are not analysing this further, the second transfer is for us

more important. Its metaphorical expression is “*Let pride marry her.*” The metaphor of substances and entities, as Lakoff names the ontological metaphor. The pride is given here human abilities (abilities of vehicles – husband, priest,...). We could say in fact pride is human but that would be too wide concept. This particular ontological metaphor has many metaphorical concepts possible and all of them will consist of transferring different human qualities (therefore we assume that it is a personification).

Pride is a husband – Cordelia’s husband. She can do with her husband whatever she wants: love, hate, communicate. Unfortunately to Cordelia, pride is here also a synonym for nothing she gets as her dower. The next possibility is *Pride is a priest* (the person who consecrates the marriage and at those times that was the priest). Although this ontological metaphor is probably more difficult to understand than the others using different concepts, we assume that it will be the right meaning (also because of Martin Hilský’s translation, which emphasizes the aspect that pride is a person who confirms the marriage⁸). For the sake of completeness, we can say *Pride is a person who escorts to the altar* metaphorical concept, meaning that it will not be her father who will accompany her way to altar. All those metaphorical concepts emphasize different aspects of the marriage. All of those metaphorical concepts are concepts of a personification, which is a special type of ontological metaphor; *pride* is meant to be a person and receives human abilities.

g) “my power, pre-eminence and all the large effects that troop with majesty.”

- 1) **Meaning:** metaphorical
- 2) **Metaphorical concept:** power, pre-eminence, effects are troopers
- 3) **Tenors:** power, pre-eminence, all the large effects
- 4) **Vehicle:** trooper
- 5) **Type of a metaphor:** ontological - personification

Aspect of “trooping,” we can use in every separate mentioned item: power, pre-eminence and effects. *Power is a trooper, pre-eminence is a trooper, all large effects are troopers and majesty is a trooper.* They are all under service of *kingship*. We will examine *Power is a trooper* only, as the others remain similar personifications. Power (tenor) is enliven with the abilities of trooper (vehicle). It is *ready for service, ready for orders, ready for fight*. They all *fight* for the same purpose. As in the previous metaphor, also here tenors are given human ability “to troop” and is therefore considered to be the special kind of an ontological metaphor – personification. Being a trooper can also mean to be of the same height and high importance. Rightly this aspect of being ready to serve is in this metaphor highlighted. Lear says that he gives this “army” which will immediately serve. As he later realizes, without this “army” he becomes weak. In this situation all metaphors would be coherent which work with this equality (sameness) of troopers and incoherent those which would say something “what troopers do after they complete their duties.”

h) “in my prayers”

- 1) **Meaning:** metaphorical
- 2) **Metaphorical concept:** prayer is a sacred place
- 3) **Tenor:** prayer
- 4) **Vehicle:** sacred place, chapel
- 5) **Type of a metaphor:** ontological

Although not as imaginative as others, also on this type of example we can see that words can be inserted to prayers (*i.e.* containers). “*As my great patron thought on in my prayers.*”

It seems that prayer can be not only a container, but also some kind of a room, or maybe chapel. *Prayer is a sacred place* could be possible metaphorical concept. This metaphor can be next possible example of ontological metaphors of containers. When giving to *prayer* the shape and form of a place, it is suddenly for a speaker easier to express. Kent says that even in his most intimate moments he thinks of him (Lear) in the most sacred place, by which it is very important moment for him. He is preparing what he wants to say to Lear; to take back his decision. Lear understands it and answers again by a metaphor:

i) “The bow is bent and drawn; make from the shaft”

- 1) **Meaning:** metaphorical
- 2) **Metaphorical concept:** man is a weapon
- 3) **Tenor:** man
- 4) **Vehicle:** weapon
- 5) **Type of a metaphor:** structural

As we understand it, the meaning of the metaphorical expression could be paraphrased as “Be very careful,” says Lear, “I can discredit (or kill) you immediately.” The option of that Lear has someone who has prepared his bow to kill in a second whoever he points at seems to us less probable than he means it as a metaphor of being a bow himself. Make from the shaft (*i.e.* beware of the arrow.⁹ Hilský, 2005, p. 83) then he adds. *Lear is a bow – Man is a bow – Man is a weapon.* Man is *structured* by experiences with weapons. Vehicle transfer the characteristics of being ready to fight, to kill or to remain in the scabbard (leather pocket where a sword usually *comes* from). Therefore this is an example of a structural metaphor. Coherent metaphors will be all based on those characteristics of bow which make it ready for battle, ready for killing; not those aspects (which are masked) which, for example, examine from what type of wood is the bow made of. To be continuing in the “bow” metaphor Lear in fact says what we have written above, “I can immediately kill you or send you far away from this kingdom,” which, unfortunately to Kent, proves to be correct meaning.

j) “duty shall have dread to speak (1) when power to flattery bows (2)”

- 1) **Meaning:** (1) metaphorical, (2) metaphorical
- 2) **Metaphorical concepts:** (1) duty is a servant, (2) power is a servant
- 3) **Tenors:** duty and power
- 4) **Vehicles:** servants
- 5) **Type of a metaphors:** ontological - personifications

Knowing two daughters Gonerill and Regan well, Kent without hesitations starts to explain the situation. For his part of “advocacy” he chooses personifications. Duty is here described as if it was a humble servant who must wait for the master to finish his interests. Therefore we use for the first part of this ontological metaphor metaphorical concept *Duty is a man – Duty is a servant*. Duty (tenor) receives qualities of a servant (vehicle). It was personified (given human qualities to think, communicate, ...). It dreads having to speak to *power*, which is also personified, but differently (with different metaphorical expression).

“Power to flattery bows” again personifies the tenor (*power*) giving it the ability to bow, which also gives us the opportunity to try metaphorical concept *Power is servant*. Both metaphorical concepts indicate ontological metaphors and because of the fact vehicles are servants, we assume those to be personifications

This metaphor can only function when these parts are connected together. Shakespeare wanted, through Kent, to say that it is unacceptable that Lear believes the lies hidden under flattering of his two daughters. The metaphor, as we understand it, means, “Should I agree with you even if you are accepting those lies?” Kent defends Cordelia and wants to calm (*safe*) the situation (he is also astonished how Lear, whom he much respected, likes his daughter’s speeches). If we use our metaphorical concepts together, one servant realizes the second one is lying or during his service doing something he should not (here, flattering has negative connotations) and it must be exemplarily examined (or punished).

k) **“thy youngest daughter does not love thee least, nor are those empty-hearted whose low sounds (1) reverb (2) no hollowness (3)”**

- 1) **Meaning:** (1) metaphorical (seemingly literal), (2) metaphorical, (3) metaphorical
- 2) **Metaphorical concepts:** (1) rumbling is low, (2) sounds are men (singers), (3) hollowness is a sound
- 3) **Tenors:** rumbling, sounds, hollowness
- 4) **Vehicles:** low, men (singers), sound
- 5) **Types of a metaphor:** (1) orientational, (2) ontological - personification, (3) structural

After the assurance that Cordelia loves her father much and is not only able to flatter, the next Kent's part of the sentence refers to Gonerill and Regan meaning they are so loveless they even do not have heart, which is the symbol of love (hyperbole). This hyperbole even emphasizes what comes next in the third part which includes a metaphorical expression. We can divide the expression into three pieces: low sounds, sounds reverb and sounds reverb hollowness (hollowness can be reverberated).

By low sounds is, most probably, meant the beating of the heart (of the empty heart) which proposes that it is only a hollow container. Stop for a while at the term *low sounds*. When we entitle something “*low*” – basically, it is something that a) has a high value, what is important, e.g. low voices, sounds are in the harmony principally those on which the harmony is built, in fact highly important; b) can also refer to some kind of sadness or deprivation (SAD IS DOWN, Lakoff, p. 15). To be down or low means to be frustrated, deprived or sad (based on our physical constitutions and experiences with body). Although Shakespeare probably did not think about this particular expression, we can use it as an exemplary case of an orientational metaphor, whose metaphorical concept, because here we cannot speak of a kind of deprivation, might look like RUMBLING IS LOW. Although it might appear obvious, we must think about the expression low once more again. That sounds are *low* comes from our experience for example of singing. Singing resembles raising or lowering our body in a certain tune. Therefore we assume it is similar with sounds. As already mentioned Shakespeare probably did not think about it, he just “used English”, but it is important mentioning it.

When we move to the second part of the metaphor (sounds reverb), through our metaphorical concept: sounds are men (singers) we can see that sounds are given the human ability to reverberate (giving out the same sound) and therefore we consider this to be a personification.

The third and the last of our metaphor expression examples is based on the metaphorical concept: hollowness is a sound (and therefore can be reverberated). Although it may seem it would be again a personification we must be careful about the tenor. Tenor now is *sound* and therefore the metaphor cannot be a personification. The hollowness is *structured* as a sound (neither sound nor hollowness are tangible things) and therefore this part is considered to be a structural metaphor.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, the theory helped to comprehend what exactly a metaphor is and consists of (what are its components). Its limits are not bounded as much as human memory is not. We have come to realize that the definition of the metaphor is almost unchanged since Aristotle and, since the Ancient Greece time, it also serves to the similar reason – to enhance our discourses by new consequences, experiences and thoughts. What is more, George Lakoff has shown us, by providing many examples from our present-day language, that we use metaphors more often than we used to know. Although we do not realize it, something that is called metaphorical concept is hidden under every metaphor – framing our imagination to understandable expressions. We subconsciously use vehicles as a system of characteristics we want to ascribe to tenors. As well as our memories and experiences are interlinked, so are subcategorized metaphorical concepts. We have learnt that our body and experiences with situations, feelings and acting plays a major role in creating metaphors and it is us who create metaphorical meanings and put it into words.

The practical analysis has brought the recognition of metaphor components in practice by which it opened new space for thinking about metaphors. We have learnt that sometimes it is easier to come up with metaphorical concept and estimate what content is transferred and sometimes it is almost impossible. Nevertheless, Shakespeare's genius lies also in that we usually know what he means by a certain metaphor even without a metaphorical concept. From Shakespeare's lines (even from the small part) we recognised various types of metaphor and through analysing it we could better understand what the author wanted to say. This analysis has shown, at least partially, what we can search for and consequently find in metaphors – world of imagination which is, also thanks to work of Lakoff, better understandable.

The analysis of one dialogue from the play has provided an informational platform on how wide the topic of a metaphor is. The more a person thinks of having comprehended the issue, the more one is then surprised by the enormousness of his/her actual unawareness. Socrates would add, "I know that I know nothing." It is remarkable how much time it takes in learning just some limited issues about Shakespeare, to realize that one's knowledge is still so limited. The theoretical base built for this particular analysis has revealed the

appeal of Shakespearean metaphors only slightly. We were able to reveal only a small part of what content is transferred between the tenor and the vehicle between those metaphors. Although using Black's approach of considering metaphors as a way of thinking, and thus the possibility of giving the explanation at least metaphorically (use another metaphor to explain the first one), it proved to be a complicated problem – as complicated as establishing a metaphorical concept. It was even highly difficult to move from Montgomery's step one (realizing the meaning is other than literal and excluding that meaning is a nonsense), to find a suitable metaphorical concept.

Nevertheless, this work has opened many issues to be addressed and interesting possibilities for further research. What we regard as essential is reconstructing the theory base, by providing new items of language from the philosophic point of view, and deepening the knowledge of the cognitive skills needed, to being able to comprehend the interrelation between real and communicated experience. Then we can see the option of the selection of a particular type of metaphor (e.g. structural animal metaphors or metaphors portraying human characteristics, personifications in fact), and analysing it in the play.

LITERATURE

- 1) ARISTOTELES: *Rétorika/Poetika*, Petr Rezek: 1999. Translated into Czech by Antonín Kříž
- 2) BLACK, M.: *More about metaphor*. In: *Metaphor and Thought*. University Press, Cambridge 1977.
- 3) HASSE, M.: *The explanatory function of metaphor*. In: *Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science*. Proceedings of the 1964 International Congress. Amsterdam 1965.
- 4) HILSKÝ, M.: *William Shakespeare: DÍLO*. Academia: 2012.
- 5) HILSKÝ, M.: *Shakespeare a jeviště svět*. Academia: 2010.
- 6) HORYNA, B.: *Teorie metafor*. Olomouc, s. r. o.: 2007
- 7) KRATOCHVÍL, Z.: *Filosofie živé přírody*. Praha: 1996.
- 8) LAKOFF, G., JOHNSON, M.: *Metaphors we live by*. The University of Chicago Press: 2003.
- 9) ORTONY, A.: *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge University Press: 1993.
- 10) ORTONY, A.: *Why metaphors are necessary and not just nice*. Educational Theory 1975.
- 11) REDDY, M. J.: *The conduit metaphor - A case of frame conflict in our language about language*. In *Metaphor and Thought* (2nd ed., pp. 164–201). Cambridge University Press: 1993.
- 12) SEARLE, J. R.: *Metaphor*. In: *Metaphor and Thought*. University Press, Cambridge, 1977.
- 13) SHAKESPEARE, W.: *Král Lear/King Lear*. Atlantis: 2005. Brno. (Bilingual, into Czech translated by Hilský, M.
- 14) STACHOVÁ, J.: *Metaphor according to J. R. Searle and Max Black*. In: *Slovo a slovesnost*, volume 53 (1992), number 4, p. 283-292
- 15) VAŇKOVÁ, I.: *Man and linguistic picture of the (natural) world*. In: *Slovo a slovesnost*, volume 60 (1999), number 4, p. 283-292

USED WEB ADRESSES

- 1) Digital Library of the ASCR (4th April 2016): <http://kramerus.lib.cas.cz/search/>
- 2) Wikipedia – Conduit Metaphor (20th September 2015):
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conduit_metaphor
- 3) Hannah Arendt – Jazyk a metafora:
http://eldar.cz/myf/txt/arendtova_-_rec_a_metafora.htm
- 4) Online Etymology Dictionary - <http://www.etymonline.com/index.php>

NOTES

- 1) „Nenatahuj krk jako žirafa.“
- 2) „Vcelku běžně je známo, že metafora nemá ve filosofii nejlepší pověst. Zpravidla bývá považována za něco nemístného a mluvit v metaforách znamená mluvit filosoficky nejistě, obrazně, obrazně, nepřesně, s nedostatečnou mírou nutnosti a argumentativnosti. Proto se objevují názory, podle nichž je ve filosofii vlastně každá metafora špatná.“ ... “Zároveň je však metafora něco, bez čeho se ve filosofii neobejdeme a co z ní dělá, ať již našťěstí nebo bohužel, stále cosi, co má blízko k poezii.”
- 3) Reddy supplies his metaphor with more than one hundred and fifty examples and on the mentioned Wikipedia website we have found the examples fittingly categorized.
- 4) „V samém srdci této Shakespearovy tragédie je obraz poutníka a cesty. Geograficky vzato putuje Lear ze svého sídla do Doveru. Ale jako každá cesta poutníková i Learova pouť má ještě jiný, daleko důležitější rozměr. Lear putuje z královského paláce do pusté přírody, od svých dcer Regan a Gonerill ke Kordelii, od pýchy k pokoře, od panovačné a autoritářské sebestřednosti k soucitu a odpuštění, od koruny ze zlata, symbolu slávy, bohatství a moci, k věnečku z plevele a polního kvítí.“
- 5) „Ve srovnání se Shakespearovým Králem Learem se Král Leir jeví jako hra výrazně křesťanská (Hilský, 2010, p. 589).“
- 6) „Neméně důležité jsou další Shakespearovy odchylky od Krále Leira. Shakespeare vynechal mnohé epizody obsažené v Leirovi, například pokus Gonoril a Ragan zavraždit Leira, nebo scénu, v níž Perillus, obdoba Glostra, nabídne hladovějícímu Leirovi k snědku svou paži.“
- 7) „Starozákonní příběh Jóba inspiroval nejen mnoho obrazů a úsloví přítomných v textu tragédie, ale byl zcela nepochybně Shakespearovi modelem pro ztvárnění Learova utrpení.“
- 8) „a ji ať provdá zpupná upřímnost!“
- 9) „Dej pozor na šíp!“