

DEAD METAPHOR

Karjawbaev Orazali Esbosinuli

*Karakalpak state University named after Berdakh,
Bachelor degree of the faculty of English linguistics 3-rd year student.*

Scientific advisor, Toleubayeva A.O

Abstract: A lexical item that has lost its original meaning or some prior meaning in the chain of semantic change is referred to as a "dead" metaphor. Consequently, in order to comprehend a dead metaphor, one does not have to refer to the original meaning. Occasionally, a traditional metaphor may "delexicalize," revealing its more original meaning (much like with puns, whether intentional or not). In summary, a dead metaphor results from a semantic change that occurs across a language's history. This is a slow process, maybe like other social processes. Additionally, it can be reversed for specific discourse purposes, such as "revitalizing" a dead metaphor.

Keywords: Metaphor, theory of metaphor, political language, literary language, and comparison language metaphor, figurative metaphor, individual genuine metaphor.

Introduction: Lakoff takes a direct shot at this image, saying, "The term dead metaphor is a holdover from a traditional folk theory of language that has turned out not to be workable." The definition of "dead metaphor" is subject to change when actual study challenges that notion. The old theory's "dead metaphors" have been shown to be a variety of highly different occurrences, including the most active metaphors—those that we employ often in our daily thoughts. The notion that language structures are epiphenomena of the Cognitive Unconscious lays the basis for Lakoff's critique of the phrase "dead metaphor" as it is often used. Put another way, metaphors, or "semantic transfers," are essentially unconscious mental processes that words are merely symptoms of these prior and independent mental processes. Incidentally, it is hard to understand why Lakoff thinks that this vision is 'empirical', if the hypothetical semantic transfers are not only unconscious by definition, but also remain unconnected to the material (hence, potentially observable) substratum. If at all, the notion that the phrase "dead metaphor" encompasses "a host of quite disparate phenomena" only makes sense in relation to Lakoff's theory. We won't get into specifics at this time. It is sufficient to note that the deep level of the Cognitive Unconscious is where the metaphorical vitality requirement is found. In particular, the surface structures that are 'most alive' are those that are associated with the most fruitful semantic transfer programs. To use one example of a "structural metaphor," consider the statement "argument is war." In this context, Lakoff discusses "systematic mappings," which he contrasts with "one-shot mappings," which are shown by exceptional or lyrical

metaphors. There are some uneasy outcomes from this strategy. Should "metaphor" be reinterpreted as a "mental mapping," metaphoricity can no longer be determined by the linguistic, conventional level, or "the literary." Thus, Lakoff is compelled to reinterpret what is meant to be literal. He proposes a rather broad main conceptual level which arises naturally when people behave in a certain context; semantic transfers are thought to be the source of the remaining components of their conceptual system. This notion is practically impossible in view of the research conducted by Vygotsky and Piaget.[1:93] I think both scholars demonstrated unequivocally that conceptions emerge through a protracted process of symbolic social interaction rather than on their own. It is sufficient to note that Lakoff not only radically redefines concepts that "people find meaningful in their lives," but also significantly reduces their significance. These concepts include "the literal," "the metaphorical," "live metaphor," and "dead metaphor." They have no use in real life since they are theoretical constructions established in relation to an idealized mental level. Finding undisputed examples of these ideas might even be challenging (the "dead conceptual metaphor" is one example of this). The last line of Lakoff's piece on the death of metaphor, "It is important to be aware of the theory-dependent status of traditional terms such as literal and dead metaphor," could not be further from the truth in this regard. They bring with them antiquated and clearly incorrect notions, and if not carefully used, they will presuppose those old theories and stifle discussion of contemporary research". [2:88] The claim that conventional terminology are "theory-dependent" is untrue. In their colloquial sense, these phrases just identify occurrences that are pertinent to practical situations. Analyzing every falsehood in this sentence would lead us too far, though. I want to focus more on another effect of Lakoff's thesis since it directly affects how important metaphors are in our daily lives. If "oneshot mappings," which are instantiated by creative or poetic metaphors, are what we live by, then "systematic mappings," which are instantiated by conventional metaphors, are probably less significant and more peculiar. The link between these conceptual levels is never described on the theoretical level. Do "systematic mappings" appear in our thoughts all at once? or more gradually, through the collection of relevant one-shot mappings? Lakoff frequently discusses how one domain gives another structure. For example, it appears that the term ARGUMENT IS WAR encompasses a wide variety of metaphors from many "domains" or "subdomains." It's important to keep in mind that assigning specific words, which are examples of conceptual metaphors, to semantic domains is completely arbitrary because a phrase's meaning is always contextual and varies depending on the situation.[3:79]

I'm more interested in the relative significance of the two conceptual levels. According to Lakoff, "systematic mappings"—conventional metaphors in ordinary language—achieve the majority of human thinking. Hence, they are "more alive" than

one-shot mappings, or conceptually fruitful. This perspective stands in sharp contrast to the Romantic understanding of language and cognition, as demonstrated, for example, by Humboldt's "energetic definition" of language, which states that language "is no product (Ergon), but an activity (Energeia)." to express an original thought through the development of novel linguistic articulation techniques.

"Language is fundamentally metaphorical; that is, it identifies previously unrecognized relationships between things and sustains our understanding of them until words that represent them eventually become signs for subsets or classes of thought rather than representations of whole ideas. At that point, language will cease to serve any higher purpose for human communication if new poets do not emerge to reorganize these associations." In this passage, Shelley discusses the process of "apprehension" of novel objects of mind, or "relations of things," that have not yet been observed. In order to guide thought along a new path, this act of revelation necessitates the use of metaphor—a "twisting" of the traditional means of representation. "Semantic transfers" are not the foundation of such imaginative metaphors. They are rather like springboards, they require a leap of imagination.[4:87]

If we go back to the text by Thoreau, we can understand this more clearly. During the conversation, I mentioned that we need consider the tone from the perspective of the vehicle in order to understand the meaning of a metaphor. We ought to consider "the anglers' outings" (tenor) in this specific context as though they were "stitches" (vehicle). As is previously known, the decision about the car was influenced by two different pictures: either the more abstract representation of the fishers' frequent trips to and from the pond, or the image of tracks in the snow as seen from above (or concurrently by both of these images). The reader's job is to reassemble the picture such that, to paraphrase Shelley, "stitching" becomes the most fitting expression of an "integral thought." Many hints in the text imply that the "wild men" are tools in the hands of Nature or Nature's emissaries (the most significant of which, in my opinion, is the viewpoint chosen: the scene needs to be viewed from a far enough distance to encompass the pond and the towns; consequently, the anglers are barely perceptible). [5:90] It may appear as though "wild men" are employed by Nature herself to "stitch" the rifts created by settlements in the "fabric" of natural life. This illustration demonstrates that a live metaphor, or "one-shot metaphor" as Lakoff refers to them, is not about "conceptual transfer," but rather about a scene's ongoing reconstruction. It is intended to direct the reader's attention and one's own thought process (provided that it is not very rigid) toward a novel, albeit perhaps unusual, understanding of the world. In other words, revelations are understood via the use of living metaphors. The query

posed in the article's title still needs to be answered. How do our characters see this problem? Lakoff emphasizes the final result. According to him, a single mechanism of genesis is indicated by several linked conventional phrases (systematic mapping in the Cognitive Unconscious). In contrast, Shelley utilizes metaphor to highlight the first state—the act of apprehension. There are "lower" and "nobler" uses of language, in his opinion. The more honorable endeavor for poets, who are true thinkers, is to grasp something novel. People in the general public do not possess "integral thoughts"; rather, they merely "chop up" the poetic vision into "portions or classes of thought" by repeating what poets have found without reflection. Traditional metaphor is language degraded.[6:43]

Conclusion

The two methods have different historical roots. Lakoff takes a "scientific" stance, searching for a system or process that underlies variety of events. From a "romantic" perspective, Shelley believes that occurrences are the product of a creative spirit. Undoubtedly, Lakoff's method is incompatible with the historical and social context of his subject. Conventional metaphors originate in communal life, not in the Cognitive Unconscious. They appear to have a "rational design" in that a certain viewpoint (such as the idea that a disagreement is similar to a battle) is adopted time and time again across generations and employed for the desired expressive ends. However, it seems that Shelley overstated the "poetic" origins of language. He is undoubtedly correct about the significance of the ability to find new perspectives, to get new things into focus through metaphor. But his view of social reality as constituted by disorganised poetic visions is obviously wide of the mark.[7:23]

References:

1. Aitchison, Jean. (1999). *Linguistics*. 5th ed. London: Teach Yourself Books.
2. Branden, John. (2009). "Metaphor and Context: A Perspective from Artificial Intelligence."
3. In *Metaphor and Discourse*, ed. Andreas Musolff and Jorg Zinken. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
4. Charteris-Black, Jonathan. (2004). *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
5. Charteris-Black, Jonathan. (2005). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
6. Means, David. (2005). "The Secret Goldfish." in *The Best American Short Stories*, ed. Katrina Kenison and Michael Chabon, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
7. Renton, N. E. (1990). *Metaphorically Speaking, A Dictionary of 3,800 Picturesque Idiomatic Expressions*. New York: Warner Books.
8. Lakoff. (1977). *The Rule of Metaphor: The Creation of Meaning in Language* London: University of Toronto Press.