

УДК 8.085
ББК 80.7

Хазагеров Г.Г.

Khazagerov G.G.

**ON MONSTROSITY OF
METAPHOR
IN COGNITIVE PARADIGM**

**О МОНСТРУОЗНОСТИ
МЕТАФОРЫ
В КОГНИТИВНОЙ
ПАРАДИГМЕ**

В статье подвергается критике современная теория о «метафорах, которыми живем». Когнитивная метафора рассматривается скорее как инструмент, чем как социальный гид. Опыт риторики тоталитаризма показывает нам, как метафора теряет свою власть с потерей автоматизма восприятия. Сопротивление метафоры критическому анализу зависит от метонимического компонента в составе метафоры. Метонимия сама по себе представляет собой большую опасность как орудие пропаганды, чем метафора.

Ключевые слова: *метафора, метонимия, топос, риторика, тоталитарная риторика.*

DOI: 10.18522/1995-0640-2016-2-91-101

Хазагеров Георгий Георгиевич – докт. филол. наук, профессор Института филологии, журналистики и межкультурной коммуникации Южного федерального университета

Тел.: 8(863)263-42-28

E-mail: khazagerov@gmail.com

© **Хазагеров Г.Г., 2016.**

The exaggerated idea of «the power of metaphor» dominating among linguists and non-linguists keeps us from comprehending both the true nature of inherent limiters of this power, and the nature of the factors increasing efficiency of metaphor. Study of totalitarian rhetoric brought me to the thoughts stated below, but I will lean on other material as well. In the beginning I would like to formulate four questions which would activate our agenda.

1. Is there a difference in dependence of a person on situation «it is a way of speaking» and «it is a way of thinking»?

2. In what cases do we speak of persuasion and when of manipulation in relation to metaphors?

3. In totalitarian propaganda why does a broadly used cognitive metaphor lose its role of the social guide and turns into «duckspeak» (to use Orwell's term)?

4. What is more vulnerable for the critical analysis: metaphor or metonymy?

1. Power of Metaphor

We will try to answer the first question. In both «it is a way of speaking» and «it is a way of thinking» there is a hint, a pattern according to which the speech or thought can be expanded. Rhetoric as the art of commonplaces called such hints *topoi*. *Topos* can be understood as a material source in discussion of a subject in dispute or a subject in a general conversation [Gasparov, p.436]. For example, theme «love relations» can be expanded by means of such auxiliary subthemes as «family», «morals», «faithfulness», «adultery», etc., and also by means of vari-

ous commonplaces, ordinary statements or catchwords connected with these subthemes. For example: «Love is blind», «All sins, except a sin against itself, Love should forgive», etc. Both these subthemes, and these statements are *topoi*, tools for expansion of a subject in speech or thought. G. Lakoff, the most well-known author who made a contribution to the theory of cognitive metaphor writes: «English has many everyday expressions that are based on a conceptualization of love as a journey, and they are used not just for talking about love, but for reasoning about it as well» [Lakoff]. The whole group of metaphors Lakoff writes about are *Topics*. These are the ways and tools designed to help talk and/or reason about love. We can name another group of metaphors which serves the same domain: love – an ailment. All of these are in the same row of means for developing of a theme.

Topics are the natural way of thought [Grimaldi, p. 130]. But when we deal with a metaphor in communication and when we deal with a metaphor in cognition, different things take place even though we deal with the same metaphor. In the first case «Natural» can mean «loyal», in the second – «trivial».

«It is a way of speaking» means that if I speak otherwise, I will violate certain conventions, and I will run risks to be misunderstood. I should make special efforts to impose new *Topics* and defiantly ignore the habitual ones. I will end up in the position of a paradoxicalist, the witty man, avant-gardist, maybe, even the nihilist and the sociopath. Language does not belong to me alone and when I leave the habitual circle, I have to prove publicly that there was a need to do it. I bear responsibility to the society.

«It is a way of thinking» means something different. In my thoughts I am accountable to nobody. Let's assume – a real case from school life – I solve a geometrical problem at the mathematical Olympiad. Similar problems are traditionally solved by means of additional constructions. But I am sure that it is a deadlock and I resort to the vector analysis which was infrequently used in the solution of school problems in plane geometry. It leads to the result. Cognitive tools prepared by language, which does not belong to me alone, at the time of the solution of the problem are at my disposal, and I choose the ones I need not among those which are obvious and within immediate reach but those which allow me to solve my problem. This is what intellectual abilities of a human being are all about. This is exactly what all people do – they reject useless metaphors, no matter how deeply they have taken root in the language. We treat tools as tools, but not as masters of our life. Certainly, due to a misunderstanding we are able to take a wrong tool, but we would put it back right away. The very ability to use metalanguage serves as our assistant. We can make a conscious choice because metaphors aren't attached to us as conditioned or moreover unconditioned reflexes in I.P. Pavlov's experiments with dogs. We are able to subject metaphors to critical analysis in scientific articles. If we were in heavy bondage to metaphors, i.e. if it were not for the metalanguage ability, we would not have been able to do it.

Quite a different situation occurs in “it's a way of speaking” case. It is more complicated, and metaphors in rhetoric and poetics were originally studied in a situation of speaking. All the new theory of metaphor literally

from the very first lines of Lakoff's and Johnson's fundamental book starts with renunciation of poetic metaphor. [Lakoff, Johnson] Poetic metaphor is always the resultant of conventional and unconventional ways of speaking. The poet can't ignore the conventional ways, even if he is in avant-garde, and there is no way a poet would serve as a mere mouthpiece, even if he is a classicist. But the status of metaphors created a priori, earlier, of course, is higher for the poet than for a thinker. In science old models of metaphors are simply discarded, in art metaphors become immortal.

Answering the first question we can draw the following conclusion. Metaphors are communicative and cognitive tools, part of topoi or common places system. «Power» of a metaphor eventually boils down to the use of an inadequate tool for solving a cognitive task. For if the tool is adequate, the «power» is no more than selecting a correct synonym or a punctuation mark. But no one writes about the dominance of commas on our minds. Choice of inadequate tools (big tick instead of hardly visible screwdriver) is directly proportional to the automatism (in other words - irresponsibility) of the tool user.

In defense of the cognitive metaphor theory, it should be noted that in most cases we have the irresponsibility manifested. People who study the behavior in business, teach us that in seventy percent of the cases, we rely on ready-made patterns and «turn on our brain» in the remaining thirty [Kahneman]. Note that these stereotypes are not always of metaphorical origin (below we will focus on competition between metaphor and metonymy for first place in clouding of consciousness).

Metaphor only pushes us to choosing an option or turning it down. This means that the question of what are the attendant factors should be put on the agenda (among those within the competence of linguists) *ceteris paribus* which either help us to «turn the brain on», or which are those which on the contrary, contribute to the automatic consumption of metaphor and put us under its «power». But first, it will be useful to question the issue of benefit and harm of metaphors, without which our understanding of their power will be incomplete. In our list of questions it is the problem of differentiating between manipulation and persuasion in metaphor usage.

2. Metaphor: Benefit and Harm

Political discourse scholars mention schematic simplification of theme as a positive phenomenon which helps recipients to understand the situation in the absence of resources of time and energy [Neuman, Russell, p. 15]. It is clear, however, that such schemes determine the point of view supported by the author. This brings us to speech manipulation. Any explanation is, in a certain way speech manipulation, it is never an explanation as such since it either is not pragmatic information or shapes our understanding of the reality actual for us. Speech influence may have the nature of persuasion, manipulation, deception or order. For us the key issue is the opposition of manipulation to persuasion.

Manipulation is defined as the hidden speech influence. Persuasion acts «face to face»: the thesis is openly formulated, arguments are laid out openly.

It is possible to argue with them, they can be accepted. Even in commercial ads, a mainly manipulative genre, there are elements of persuasion, when useful properties of goods are concerned and uniqueness of the trade offer is justified. But when a posh car is advertised by an absolutely smashing girl (hardly a metaphor, but it is rather a metonymy – beautiful ladies accompany owners of beautiful cars), we have the case of hidden speech influence: we are pushed to purchase – desirable associations are being constructed by the seller.

Both open arguments and manipulation can be present in an explaining scheme. In case when metaphor plays the role of such a scheme, its open and hidden effects depend on the security of metaphor from rational reasoning, which in its turn is determined by at least three factors. These factors are: the actualization of communicative frame (the idea “Here comes the metaphor” is either explicitly or implicitly expressed); presence of metonymic component in the metaphor; and involvement of the recipient into the metaphorizing process. Let’s start with the third factor, since this phenomenon as far as I know, has not been described yet.

After Orwell linguists began to notice totalitarian metaphors in rhetoric and with malice to find their counterparts in democratic discourse, ignoring the freedom of speech amendment and possibility of a confutation. Metaphors of totalitarian rhetoric and their analogs are the very conceptual metaphors which cognitive science is busy developing. Let’s turn to an example.

«Spiders of capitalism» is a false frame which from the very beginning interprets a situation of employment in such a way that it is impossible to talk about mutual benefit of the worker and employer. The recipient of the metaphor receives the explanatory scheme which simplifies for him comprehension of political economic truth. The scheme is false, but it can’t be challenged because its effects are hidden. Spiders really eat flies, flies can’t really get out of webs. But a fly fighting in a web doesn’t produce material wealth for its own benefit or for the benefit of other flies, and the spider doesn’t release it, granting it with a salary, no matter how pathetically insubstantial it is. Moreover, flies don’t form labor unions, spiders don’t do charity work, etc. The metaphor is sly, it proves in the doubtful and unverifiable way the thesis which isn’t formulated openly: interests of workers and capitalists are fundamentally contradictory, and one has to exterminate the other. Nazi metaphor “Jews are rats” is constructed in the same way: they are not German, and they eat the German bread. But rats don’t make a contribution to the German culture and have nevertheless a morphology which is a bit different, compared to a German or a Jew, etc., etc. Same thesis: you and a rat have nothing in common, do away with it. And once again there is an explanatory scheme before us. It explains, in particular, why Germans lost World War I.

But the totalitarian rhetoric is arranged in such a way that it does not solely replicate favorite metaphors, but also involves recipients into reproduction and multiplication of those metaphors. The fact that people in a totalitarian state do not have a choice of what to promote was correctly noted by external observers [Richard, Anderson], but this does not mean that the

population itself did not reproduce propaganda according to the set samples. For this purpose dozens of specially organized communication platforms were arranged. The situation led to the fact that the metaphor lost the automatism of perception and became the subject of jokes. If you are repeatedly forced to publicly play with metaphor «spiders of capitalism», while maintaining the seriousness on your face, you will eventually feel very clearly that this is just a metaphor, and you may be tempted to develop it in a joking manner. At the end of the Soviet period, the very expression «spiders of capitalism» caused a smile even among party workers. In the above case, the metaphor lost its manipulative potential against the wishes of the authorities.

In case when a communicative frame of a metaphor is given directly manipulation is never the speaker's intention. The vivid example of it is a scientific metaphor. Aristotle trusted metaphors. Considering clarity the main virtue of speech, he saw metaphors as a means of clarifying the idea, of revealing new sides of things [Aristotle]. The whole theory of scientific metaphors that emerged after mankind recovered from the rationalist critique of metaphor as a bad argument [Richards, p. 2], ignes fatui, messing up scholars astray, and gradually mastered the category of «model», develops Aristotle line. In fact, this metaphor-catachresis (like «semantic field» in linguistics), or simply ways to enhance the depiction («granular nature of something»). The first are related to the enrichment of semantics and the risk that the model would be counterproductive (truth as a criterion for the model is replaced by productivity). However, in any case, scientific metaphor is not manipulation, as its modeling is declared openly and the presumption of a rational approach is recognized initially.

The main criterion in telling a manipulative metaphor from purely descriptive technique is metaphors' resistance in relation to rational analysis. If we are told that the material has a granular structure, the concept of grains is not a fatal obstacle to a rational understanding of the situation. The same thing would happen to the Maslow's pyramid. All its levels can be challenged, and the pyramid metaphor does not get in the way.

One of the genres popular in the Middle Ages was metaphor-antapodosis, i.e. commented parable or unfolded metaphor. This genre was rational by definition. If instead of «spiders of capitalism» metaphor we constructed antapodosis, the picture would look different. We would have to say: «The spider catches flies by spreading his web. Spider is an employer. Web is payment for the work. Flies are workers». Such rationalization of the metaphor would open it for analysis. In particular, it would make it possible to expand those metaphors that we have cited above, which would prove by contradiction that this metaphor is not true to life. But if we say, «Spiders of capitalism drink our blood», we give an emotionally colored picture, which is to a much greater extent protected from conscious, rational view of the situation with capitalists and workers, than in the case of the antapodosis parable.

A special case is poetry and artistic language, which could be understood as a continuous manipulation or pack of lies, if its communicative frame was not built into the culture. Reputation of a human being or of publication is

also a communicative frame a priori, involving a critical attitude to metaphors which come from the edition or the person. In this case, the speaker's communicative frame occurs involuntarily. It does not mean that this person or this newspaper always manipulate. Even in a totalitarian state, not everything was manipulative. But the communicative frame includes critical analysis and that's where it looks like a game with metaphors generated by their multiplication and involvement of recipients into propaganda.

With regard to the metonymic component in metaphor which enhances its resistance to rational analysis, we will look at it later, when we will specifically talk about metonymy. Now, let's say it again, there are factors that reinforce and weaken the possibility of a critical perception of metaphor. Where I can't take a metaphor critically, I am equipped with a cognitive tool which is not entirely convenient. Where such a possibility is open, I have tools, which I can use for a rational solution of problems.

3. Metaphor's Functional Death

Metaphors which are called dead by Romantic tradition are considered to be decisive by cognitive linguistics. Occasional metaphors, created by poets are considered to be «alive». Below, however, we will focus on the functional death of metaphor – of the moment when it no longer determines our thinking and does not serve as a guide in social behavior, we will talk about «Metaphors We No Longer Live By», to paraphrase the title of George Lakoff's and Mark Johnson's classic work.

Totalitarian rhetoric is characterized by the general control and positive censorship (Orwell's terms), which exists in society in addition to regular censorship [Оруэлл], i.e., firstly, certain ways of thinking and common places are prohibited and secondly, other ways of thinking, common places and metaphors are prescribed. Propaganda functions with an unprecedented intensity, endlessly repeating its common places and with the same speed extensively implementing these common places into texts of all genres, including monolingual dictionaries and encyclopedias (in full accordance with «1984»). The latter is particularly interesting, since under the guise of information, say, about power stations, morality is introduced about the benefit of socialism over capitalism, which, as I have already written, is reminiscent of medieval Russian Thesaurus (Azbukovnik). Children's stories and scholarly monographs are oversaturated with propaganda clichés, and at the same time a place of honor among other topics is occupied by metaphor, since the base metaphor is construction of an edifice – the edifice of communism.

Metaphor extensiveness means it is engaged in replication by the great number of authors, almost everyone who is dealing with public word. Authors are followed by ordinary citizens, because the sphere of public speech is unusually expanded and includes such written genres, as factory newspaper and wall newspaper; such oral genres as public speeches at endless meetings and the so-called «Political Information» gatherings, which were already practiced at school. At the same time replication of metaphors is connected with their development. Conceptual metaphors, such as the construction of communism,

due to the possibility to expand and form whole metaphor families like metaphors which explain love through journey in Lakoff's example. Therefore, basic political metaphors are in operation all the time, they vary, practically the whole population is engaged in this forced activity on their development. The result is inevitable: the perception of metaphors becomes less automatic. People are enticed to use political metaphors playfully, countless puns and jokes are being created. Some of them are ambivalent and therefore quite innocent for the system, although for them it was possible to be sentenced to a term in a camp, and in later years get into trouble. Some of them contain a critical perception of reality, a true analysis, which disavows metaphors. And they both play an important role later, when propaganda ceases to have effect. In particular, the ambivalent jokes about Soviet ideology played a role in the formation of the ambivalent, totally ironic style in the nineties. It is the so-called «st'ob». But this is beyond the interests of our articles. For us it is important to emphasize the idea of self-destruction of totalitarian metaphors through their de-automatization, conscious use, getting into the bright field of consciousness – all of this provoked by the very mechanism of totalitarian propaganda.

The power of metaphor, its disorienting force is destroyed by linguistic reflection and linguistic reflection starts working when the perception of metaphors loses automaticity. And one more consequence which may be derived from self-destruction of totalitarian rhetoric, which took place in the Soviet Union long before the fall of the Soviet regime. In the world of communication there originate those tectonic shifts which are changing the world picture existing in the world of cognition. World picture sets the coordinate system, and this shows the «power of language». However, trends that can change the coordinate system are germinated in the depths of live communication, but not in dictionaries. Those who saw in Orwell's Utopia nothing but the New-speak appendix missed the main thing: human communication in that laborious world. This is what the novel is all about. And those who lived in those worlds perfectly well remember how the authorities tried to destroy natural communication between people and to impose «doublethink».

4. Metaphor and Metonymy: Symbiosis and Competition

But both in totalitarian propaganda and in other more ordinary walks of life, along with the metaphor – a technique of persuasion and manipulation – there have always existed metonymy, plus there existed metaphor with a metonymic component. The latter is characteristic of the artistic, religious and totalitarian discourse. Therefore, in response to the last question on our list, we will continue talking about totalitarian rhetoric, and then turn to the artistic and religious experience. We are going to talk about metaphors with metonymic elements. And only then we are going to talk about metonymy as such.

There is an amazing way to erase the boundaries between political dreams and reality. This method can be called homogeneous metaphors or metaphors with metonymic components. Love can be described through journey. But this metaphor will pipe up very differently if you apply it to a couple who really travels. The expression «it was in the beginning of our

journey» means not only the beginning of a relationship, but also preserves the literal meaning. This is exactly how metaphor «smelting of new socialist life» is arranged. On the one hand, smelter is a metaphor, on the other - it is really a characteristic part (metonymy, synecdoche) of life in the USSR during active industrialization period. Metaphor makes assumptions about reality, metonymy tears out a piece of reality. Homogeneous, grounded metaphors make a stronger impression than the usual metaphors. Their resistance towards analysis is maximal. They are most easily absorbed unconsciously. Destruction comes to them from the other side. It comes through a moral or physical obsolescence of the captured reality. I have shown details of this mechanism in my book «Rhetoric of Totalitarianism» [Хазарев].

Along with the stupid propaganda machine, which used homogeneous metaphors to create a symbolic world, in which working skills acquired metaphorical meaning (steelworker, welder, machinist), a remarkable poet Boris Pasternak created his poetry. His innovation, noticed by Jacobson, was the fact that he turned to the poetics of metonymy, while the main way of poetry is the way of metaphor [Якобсон]. But Pasternak's metonymy has a special character. This is metaphorical metonymy or metonymic metaphor. That is why latest calculations seemed to deny Jacobson's words. When the poet says: «Bluer than drake's plumage dawn rose over Kama», he uses drake's color to characterize the pre-dawn light, color of the sky. This metaphor as such looks exotic enough. But the matter probably is that real drakes, soaring above the river, came into the picture of the dawn. And that makes a seemingly exotic metaphor quite convincing. Readers familiar with the works of Pasternak, would be able to find a lot of similar examples.

Initially homogeneous metaphor was conceptualized in the theory of the symbol, which appeared in the Byzantine Empire during the dispute with the iconoclasts. Defending the sanctity of icons, Dionysius the Areopagite shows that icons are not just signs of deity (metaphorical component), but are connected with sanctity as its parts. [Бычков] This theory of symbol later became an asset for the understanding of symbol in literary theory.

It seems to me that the scale of metaphor's rational analysis has metaphors-symbols as its maximum and scientific metaphors-models as its minimum. Metaphor-antapodosis adjoins the latter – dry allegory, which is usually contrasted with symbol.

Taken by itself metonymy has a higher resistance with respect to critical analysis than a metaphor. Many stable superstitions are based on metonymic associations: «all diseases come from doctors», to «to run into a priest is an unfortunate sign». The second example can be found in Chekhov's story, when a priest shows up on purpose, he runs into his enemy on the road, in order to «prevent him from being elected». Examples of the first delusion are tragic: these are murders of doctors, who were believed to «disseminate cholera». Association by contiguity are more convincing than association by similarity. They do not have violent excogitations.

But the most powerful form of metonymy is synecdoche as a way of typifying. After the triumphal march of Eleanor Rosch prototype theory

[Лакофф, p. 28 – 85], which allegedly even shook the Aristotelian logic, there is no need to prove what role in the conceptualization of reality is played by these prototypes. Sparrow is not just a bird, but the bird «to the fullest extent», it can be interpreted as a symbol of a bird. If the child asks what is a bird, you do not say it – it's a two-legged feathered creature, but you say it is, for example, a sparrow. There are certainly different prototypes in different cultures. This fact does not contribute to mutual understanding, more so since the category of prototypes is not limited to innocent objects such as birds, but is used in the description of national features as well.

The ability to manipulate using prototypes is much stronger than with the help of metaphors. Even if we assume an infinite replication of the prototype with the participation of propaganda recipients we have all the ground to assume that the moment of sobriety will come later. Creation of the typical Russian, American or a Jew using the material of reality is much easier and safer than doing it with the help of zoomorphic metaphors. Any person, who is in his right mind, understands anyway that a Jew is not a rat, and a Russian is not a bear. But the «typical» can be fought only with the help of statistics, and we do not always have it at our disposal, we do not always have a tendency to use it, and in addition we believe «our own eyes» (e.g. television picture) more than some figures and numbers.

Thus, metonymy is a more dangerous manipulation tool than metaphor, the danger of manipulative metaphors increases with the addition of metonymic component.

And finally, the question of metaphor and metonymy visualization.

The totalitarian rhetoric flourished in the age of newspapers, we live in the age of television and other screens. Visualization in modern culture is taken for granted. How do metaphor and metonymy behave in the visualization process?

Visualization of metaphor has always been difficult. Drawings to fables, allegorical art and political posters, based on metaphor, inevitably emphasize the conventionality of metaphorical associations. It is only surrealist paintings which manifest metaphor's homogeneity and revitalize dry schemes. Metaphorical caricature, like any metaphor, offers an explanatory scheme, and yet it is designed more for a like-minded associate, who is probably using the same frame, but which is not visualized, than offers a new conceptualization of reality. It seems to me that visualization is an additional problem for metaphor, while in the language it lives a natural life. If love relationship are illustrated by the theme of journey, it would look like a joke with a literal image of phraseological units, like pictures «It is raining cats and dogs» or its Russian analogue «It's pouring out of the bucket».

Visualization for metonymic typifying is its natural environment. And here television builds its row of images, making its own selection, representativity of that selection it is not obliged to be proved. Here lies the possibility of the oldest and most simple kind of manipulation: to show what is profitable for you, and not to show what is unprofitable. This age-old method was used in first Soviet newspapers [Lippmann]. Moreover, it was already known

to Cicero. But since it is «better to see once than to hear ten thousand times» in visualization era it becomes especially effective.

Introduction of communicative aspect into the theme of metaphor and comparison of metaphor with metonymy deprive cognitive metaphor of monstrous features.

5. Conclusions

As demonstrated by cognitive science, metaphor really exists in language, in communication and also in thought, and in cognition. However, metaphor still remains what it has always been believed to be – a trope, a figure of speech. In transition from speech to thought its impact does not increase, but decreases, since solution of cognitive problems diminishes dependence on stereotypes and conventions as compared to the solution of communicative problems.

In addition, the innate ability of human beings to use metalanguage generally puts significant limits on the power of metaphor.

Positive strength of language is hidden in communication, in the way it is organized, in the way the very society is organized. These are not cognitive structures a priori defined by language or imposed by a manipulator which hold obstacles in using this strength and turning it into evil. And the game goes around stimulation and suppression of the critical analysis in using language structures. By itself, metaphor has a very insignificant potential for suppression of such an analysis, and is inherently not a monster, but a tool in the hands of human beings, one of the common places, Topics used for the organization of speech and thought.

The totalitarian rhetoric, willy-nilly has created a laboratory experiment and proved by the very fact of its existence and fall that propaganda metaphor is not an all-powerful god who regulates our behavior and way of thinking, but a doomed to failure attempt to manipulate the public consciousness. This attempt collapsed under seemingly favorable circumstances: there was no criticism, and all the official metaphors were forced to be used by everyone. The experience of totalitarian rhetoric has highlighted the factors leading to the de-automatization of political metaphors, and then to its ridicule and disavowal. It has also shown what type of metaphor is most resistant to critical analysis. But the whole scale of metaphors from those obviously conventional to those which are able to withstand a certain degree of critical thinking, all of them are unable to resist the meta-language dismantling.

Metonymic component in metaphors makes them most invulnerable and able (to a certain degree) «to dominate the consciousness». At the same time metonymy and synecdoche as a kind of metonymy are perceived less rationally in comparison with metaphor. When through the category of typical a metonymic beginning is being visualized, the chances to avoid rational analysis are significantly higher than that of visualized metaphor.

We can even suppose that political metaphor, which dominated in the thirties, the most dangerous variety of which is constructed similar to artistic or religious discourse (metaphors-symbols with metonymic component), has no future. Its heyday ended with the flowering of totalitarianism, which died

under the weight of bulky self-disavowing metaphors. There are new challenges on the agenda. Metaphor - is not a monster.

References

- Aristotle*. Rhetoric // <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/rhetoric.1.i.html>
- Grimaldi W.* Studies in the Philosophy of Aristotle's Rhetoric. Wiesbaden. 1972.
- Kahneman, Daniel.* Thinking Fast and Slow Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011.
- Lakoff, George.* The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor © Copyright George Lakoff. To Appear in Ortony, Andrew (ed.) Metaphor and Thought (2nd edition), Cambridge University Press. 1992
- Lakoff, George Women, Fire and Dangerous Things What Categories Reveal about the Mind // http://platonanet.org.ua/load/knigi_po_filosofii/kognitivnye_nauki/george_lakoff_women_fire_and_dangerous_things_what_categories_reveal_about_the_mind/17-1-0-406
- Lakoff, George, Johnson Mark.* Metaphors We Live By. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Lippmann W., Merz, Ch.* A Test of the News // The New Republic. 1920. Vol. 33(2).
- Neuman, W. Russell, Marion R. Just and Ann N. Crigler.* Common Knowledge: News and the Construction of Political Meaning. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Orwell, George.* Literature and Totalitarianism // http://www.orwell.ru/library/articles/totalitarianism/english/e_lat
- Richard D., Anderson, Jr.* Metaphors of Dictatorship and Democracy: Change in the Russian Political Lexicon and the Transformation of Russian Politics // <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/2697273?uid=3738032&uid=2129&uid=2&uid=70&uid=4&sid=21104683900993>
- Richards Ivor A.* The Philosophy of Rethoric. NY, Oxford University Press. 1950.
- Бычков В.В.* Образ как категория византийской эстетики // Византийский временник. 1973. Т. 34,
- Гаспаров М.Л.* Античная риторика как система // Михаил Гаспаров Об античной поэзии. С. 424-412
- Хазагеров Г.Г.* Риторика тоталитаризма. Ростов н/Д., 2012.
- Якобсон Р.О.* Заметки о прозе Пастернака // Работы по поэтике. М., 1907.

Khazagerov G.G. (Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation)

On Monstrosity of Metaphor in Cognitive Paradigm

In the article modern theory of «metaphor we live by» is challenged. Cognitive metaphor is considered rather as a tool than a social guide. It acts like topos. The experience of the rhetoric of totalitarianism shows how metaphor loses its power via loosing unconscious perception. The resistance of metaphor to critical analysis depends on metonymical component of metaphor. Metonymy itself is more dangerous means of propaganda than metaphor.

Key words: *metaphor, metonymy, topos, rhetoric, totalitarian rhetoric*

Khazagerov Georgy Georgievich – Ph.D. of philology, professor. Russian language dpt. Institute of philology, journalism and cross-cultural communication. Southern Federal University. Phone: 8(863) 263-42-28.