

Shahverdiyeva U. H.

Baku Slavic University

METAPHORS IN AMERICAN FILMS

The cognitive significance of conceptual metaphor is manifested in the uniqueness of specific metaphorical transfers. Discourse, and media discourse in particular, reveals the potential of conceptual metaphor. Outside of discourse, it can only be interpreted, but this invariant meaning is, as a rule, maximally abstract. Only discourse reveals the potential volume of the content of a conceptual metaphor. Of course, the given fragment is a special case of the implementation of the conceptual content of a metaphor, which is directly related to the uniqueness of textual coherence. This once again confirms the idea that language is given in texts. The totality of texts demonstrates linguistic entities that remain in vain outside of the text. On the other hand, the totality of texts is nothing other than discourse. The analysis showed that modern American cinema is a unique space for the implementation of a conceptual metaphor. In our opinion, in addition to all the well-known advantages of modern American cinema, its greatest historical and cultural significance is that it is a chronicle of American English.

Since Hollywood films play an exceptional role in the American global media discourse, we believe it was absolutely necessary to analyze some characteristic fragments from famous films. Each of these films is an outstanding phenomenon in the history of cinema and, therefore, the history of culture. They are memorable for many features, but the speech of the characters and, accordingly, the discourse play a special role in them. The speech of characters from American films has spatio-temporal characteristics and is, in fact, a cultural monument of its time. The semiotic significance of metaphorical transfer is manifested in the models of formation of secondary nomination units. This is a completely systemic value, which presupposes systematization against the background of the entire lexical-semantic system of language.

Key words: metaphor, American films, character, discourse, language.

Introduction. The final fragment from the film “Scent of Woman” was chosen for analysis. The film is well-known and popular. The focus here is on Colonel Slade’s final speech at the meeting at Byrd School. Let us briefly recall the situation. Three school students made fun of the principal, literally throwing mud at him. The main character named Charlie turned out to be an accidental witness to the unworthy behavior of these students. The principal offers him to “turn them in”, in exchange for which he promises to recommend Charlie to the university on exceptional terms, i.e. he will study for free and, moreover, receive a scholarship.

The purpose of the article is to analyze discourse in American films.

The main problem. The conversation with the principal took place on Friday, and for the weekend Charlie accompanies the blind Colonel Slade to New York. In New York, they become friends, Charlie takes the colonel’s fate very close to his heart and saves him from death. At the meeting at Byrd School, the colonel suddenly appears unexpectedly and with his speech actually saves Charlie from expulsion from school, since the school principal, having not

received support from Charlie, recommends the disciplinary committee to expel him. The colonel’s speech is extremely characteristic in terms of the use of conceptual metaphors. Let us cite this fragment.

Trask: Mr. Sims, you are a cover-up artist and you are a liar.

Slade: But not a snitch.

Trask: Excuse me?

Slade: No, I don’t think I will.

Trask: Mr. Slade.

Slade: This is such a crock of shit.

Trask: Please watch your language, Mr. Slade. You are in the Baird School not a barracks. Mr. Sims, I will give you one final opportunity to speak up.

Slade: Mr. Sims doesn’t want it. He doesn’t need to be labeled: “Still worthy of being a ‘Baird Man.’” “What the hell is that? What is your motto here? “Boys, inform on your classmates, save your hide” – anything short of that we’re gonna burn you at the stake? Well, gentlemen, when the shit hits the fan some guys run and some guys stay. Here’s Charlie facing the fire; and there’s George hidin’ in big Daddy’s pocket. And what are you doin’? You’re gonna reward George and destroy Charlie.

Trask: Are you finished, Mr. Slade?

Slade: No, I'm just gettin' warmed up. I don't know who went to this place, William Howard Taft, William Jennings Bryan, William Tell – whoever. Their spirit is dead – if they ever had one – it's gone. You're building a rat ship here. A vessel for sea goin' snitches. And if you think your preparing these minnows for manhood you better think again. Because I say you are killing the very spirit this institution proclaims it instills! What a sham. What kind of a show are you guys puttin' on here today. I mean, the only class in this act is sittin' next to me. And I'm here to tell ya this boy's soul is intact. It's non-negotiable. You know how I know? Someone here – and I'm not gonna say who – offered to buy it. Only Charlie here wasn't sellin'.

Trask: Sir, you are out of order!

Slade: Outta order? I'll show you outta order! You don't know what outta order is, Mr. Trask! I'd show you but I'm too old; I'm too tired; I'm too fuckin' blind. If I were the man I was five years ago I'd take a FLAME-THROWER to this place! Outta order. Who the hell you think you're talkin' to? I've been around, you know? There was a time I could see. And I have seen boys like these, younger than these, their arms torn out, their legs ripped off. But there isn't nothin' like the sight of an amputated spirit; there is no prosthetic for that. You think you're merely sendin' this splendid foot-soldier back home to Oregon with his tail between his legs, but I say you are executin' his SOUL!! And why?! Because he's not a Baird man! Baird men, ya hurt this boy, you're going to be Baird Bums, the lot of ya. And Harry, Jimmy, Trent, wherever you are out there, FUCK YOU, too!

Mr. Trask: Stand down, Mr. Slade!

Slade: I'm not finished! As I came in here, I heard those words, “cradle of leadership.” Well, when the bow breaks, the cradle will fall. And it has fallen here; it has fallen. Makers of men; creators of leaders; be careful what kind of leaders you're producin' here. I don't know if Charlie's silence here today is right or wrong.

I'm not a judge or jury. But I can tell you this: he won't sell anybody out to buy his future!! And that, my friends, is called integrity! That's called courage! Now that's the stuff leaders should be made of. Now I have come to the crossroads in my life. I always knew what the right path was. Without exception, I knew. But I never took it. You know why? It was too damn hard. Now here's Charlie. He's come to the crossroads. He has chosen a path. It's the right path. It's a path made of principle – that leads to character. Let him continue on his journey.

You hold this boy's future in your hands, committee. It's a valuable future. Believe me. Don't destroy it! Protect it. Embrace it. It's gonna make ya proud one day – I promise you.

This is actually the final and culminating fragment of the film. Metaphor plays a key role not only in Colonel Slade's speech, but in the dialogue as a whole. A serious metaphor, playing a key role in the speech of the school principal, is the metaphor of “cradle of leaders or leadership”: cradle of leadership. In general, the concept of “cradle” is universal and thus common to all mankind. The content of the concept itself is so vividly aphoristic that it is difficult to assume the opposite, i.e. a situation where this concept is not subject to metaphorization.

By declaring that the Byrd School is a cradle of leadership, the principal takes on a very large responsibility. According to him, the educational institution he heads plays an extremely important role in American history. Thus, at the present stage, he exclusively plays this main view and historical and cultural role. The metaphor of the cradle of leadership stretches in time and space, acquiring completely new meanings or consequences. This happens because any universal conceptual metaphor that is meaningful to all mankind legitimately provides historical and cultural value in space and time. In other words, the metaphor of the cradle of leadership not only realizes the meaning of the cradle of leadership, but realizes it on the terms of American reality. In order to feel the meaning of this concept, it is absolutely necessary to know the American mentality, the American dream, the history of the conquest of the country and the construction of the state. Even the meaning of the word leadership, as well as the concept of leadership, presented in the lexeme leadership, implies knowledge of what leadership and a leader are for the United States. It is no coincidence that we used the word *проходить*, since understanding cannot be questioned. Understanding presupposes knowledge of the lexical meaning of a word, which can always be clarified in explanatory dictionaries. *Prohodit* is not always realized even on the basis of knowledge of the vertical context. Of course, background knowledge contributes to feeling or deep and profound awareness of the meaning. However, knowledge alone is not enough; in accordance with the internal form of the word *проходить*, emotional perception is necessary. Such a deep process always occurs subconsciously. From this, we can draw another global conclusion. In particular, a conceptual metaphor turns out to be in demand only in the context of the “native” culture, i.e. the culture for which this text and context are written.

Consequently, the metaphor of the cradle of leadership is adequately perceived only by its own addressee. The essence of the deep mechanism of perception is such that a sign as a semiotic reality is conventional, but it actualizes not conventional, but real images. This circumstance makes natural languages a unique and unrepeatable space of meaning, and, for example, translations from one language to another are highly formal substitutes. Thus, the conceptual metaphor of the cradle of leadership plays an extremely important role in this situation, since it acts as an organizing tool for the discourse. Everything else said by the school principal is actually drawn to this metaphor. For example, without proper logical grounds, he accuses Charlie of being a liar and a clown. The accusation is completely unfounded, but even less so in the structure of his speech, in the space of this discourse, it looks logically consistent, since we are talking about the traditions of the school and the duty of each student to support these traditions. Another thing is that traditions do not imply “snitching”, but in the speech of the principal and from the point of view of how he builds values, it does not look immoral at the explicit level. In this regard, two significant details should be pointed out. The first is related to Charlie’s apology. The second is related to the fact that Colonel Slade accepts the principal’s logical game and smashes him with his own weapon. The fact that Charlie apologizes suggests that he feels that he is doing something reprehensible. But that makes his act all the more valuable. In other words, he is not just doing something that the director doesn’t like, but doing something that contradicts “Byrd’s traditions.” And even understanding this cannot force him to “give up the criminals,” he simply cannot bring himself to do it.

Colonel Slade also starts using the cradle of leadership metaphor, but offers a completely different interpretation. If the director connects the “cradle of leadership” with loyalty to traditions, which he understands as “betraying friends for the sake of the school’s survival,” then the colonel talks about “loyalty to friends for the sake of honor and valor.” He immediately emphasizes that “the cradle has fallen.” And he explains it. You’re building a rat ship here. This metaphor is also widely known. The colonel resorts not just to a metaphor, but to an expression that is of great importance in the life of every military man. The fact is that a military man, even in peacetime, is ready or must be ready for battle by vocation. Peacetime is a respite or time given to a warrior for preparation. In wartime, his comrade-in-arms acquires primary importance for a warrior. Therefore, in the army, the

concept of “rear” becomes a strong metaphor, i.e. the one or those who ensure your safety, cover you. Therefore, the rat ship has a rich presupposition and as a metaphor actualizes a wide range of background information. The metaphor has two components, and both components themselves have a great symbolic meaning. Thus, the “rat” is characterized by such cognitive features as “greed” and “cowardice”, “egoism” and “betrayal”. The ship is a kind of symbol of home. Apparently, this conceptual meaning reflects the mentality of peoples living by the sea, seafaring peoples, the Phoenicians, Greeks, and the English. The ship unites people and animals in a small area of land in the middle of a huge sea element. The ship saves them, but in a moment of danger, the rats are the first to escape. Moreover, the escape of the rats serves as evidence of the death of the ship. The opposite symbol, i.e. the symbol of human nobility, is the behavior of the captain, who is the last to leave the ship. Thus, the colonel uses a metaphor that exposes the director’s position. The addressee of the discourse is entirely on the colonel’s side, as evidenced by the committee’s decision. The colonel is not satisfied with using a metaphor that is understandable to everyone, but also explains it. What the hell is that? What is your motto here? “Boys, inform on your classmates, save your hide” – anything short of that we’re gonna burn you at the stake? Well, gentlemen, when the shit hits the fan some guys run and some guys stay. Here’s Charlie facing the fire; and there’s George hidin’ in big Daddy’s pocket. And what are you doin’? You’re gonna reward George and destroy Charlie.

Roughly speaking, “save your own asses,” that’s what you teach your students. That’s why you’re building a rat ship here. But the Colonel uses an even stronger metaphor, which plays a huge role in his life. He says that when a fire starts, some run away, others stay. Here’s Charlie facing the fire. George is hiding in his father’s big pocket. Metaphors are generally available and understandable, but they play a key role not only in this fragment, but in the context of the film as a whole, and in the context of American history and culture. The fact that George is hiding not just anywhere, but in a pocket (his father’s big pocket) is not at all a random metaphor. A “big pocket,” as should be clear, is not just a place to hide, but a rich and quiet place. In the structure of the meaning of the metaphor “big pocket” (big Daddy’s pocket), the most important cognitive feature is the feature “wealth.” Of course, “wealth” is also associated with such a feature as “authority”. There is also a presupposition. While in New York, the Colonel and Charlie discuss this difficult situation. The Colonel tells him that he

will certainly “sing like a canary”, go to university and join the long line of American men who “deserve respect”. This dialogue in the hotel is generally very typical. Charlie says that there are things that simply cannot be done. The Colonel replies that he does not understand this, “explain” – he says to Charlie.

This fragment also uses other conceptual metaphors that are of great significance to Westerners. For example, the colonel says that someone wanted to buy Charlie's soul. We are all familiar with the presupposition of this metaphor, which goes back to very ancient mysteries and is indeed saturated with associations that have not lost their meaning to this day. In the minds of most modern people, this classic situation is associated with Goethe's Faust. As is well known, Faust sells his soul to the devil for the love of a beautiful young girl. The European Middle Ages creates a certain myth around this idea – the possibility of achieving what you want by making a deal with the devil. Thus, Colonel Slade actualizes a huge layer of background information with just a hint that someone tried to make a deal with Charlie. He explains the essence of the deal without revealing the nuances and defines it as a temptation of the soul, thus actualizing the already famous gospel context. It is enough to recall the famous passage from the Gospel, when the devil tells Christ that he will give him all the kingdoms of the world if he worships him. To this Christ replies that one should serve only God. In this case, the truth, for “you cannot serve God and mammon”, “you cannot serve two masters”, therefore, it is necessary to make a choice. According to the colonel, Charlie makes the right choice, he chooses the right path, the path of principles that leads to the creation of character: He's come to the crossroads. He has chosen a path. It's the right path. It's a path made of principle – that leads to character. Let him continue on his journey. The word path in English has a very serious emotional load.

In some ways, it resembles the Azerbaijani word *yol*. To understand the conceptual reinterpretation of this word in the Azerbaijani language, it is enough to recall the oath of those walking on the road, especially drivers, *bu yol haqqı*, as well as the wish *yolun açıq olsun*. The colonel creates an original authorial construction, linking the concepts of “path; path” and “journey”. Let him continue on his journey.

In general, this speech by Colonel Slade is a chain of conceptual metaphors, strung one on top of the other. Configurations of conceptual metaphors are created that organize the discourse as a whole. It is therefore appropriate to list them in the order in which they occur in the text. These are words and phrases such as *snitch*, *crook of shit*, *watch your language*,

hell, *burn you at the stake*, *shit hits*, *some guys run and some guys stay*, *facing the fire*, *hidin' in big Daddy's pocket*, *I'm just gettin' warmed up*, *spirit is dead*, *building a rat ship here*, *vessel for sea goin' snitches*, *minnows*, *you are killing the very spirit this institution proclaims it instills*, *this boy's soul is intact*, *non-negotiable*, *offered to buy it*, *an amputated spirit*, *this splendid foot-soldier*, *with his tail between his legs*, *you are executin' his SOUL*, *ya hurt this boy*, *cradle of leadership*, *when the bow breaks*, *the cradle will fall*, *he won't sell anybody out to buy his future*, *crossroads in my life*, *right path*, *path made of principle*, *Let him continue on his journey*, *You hold this boy's future in your hands*. Each of these metaphors and metaphorical combinations appeals to universal spirituality, therefore they are understandable and highly expressive. Due to this, they have a priority character in the structure of discourse, attracting all the information. The same circumstance makes them functionally loaded signs and thus basic components of communication. In other words, metaphors here are the main means of increasing the communicative effect of an utterance, or discourse. Of course, such functional loading is characteristic of all units of secondary nomination and in the structure of any discourse. However, here they form a system and, due to this, the skeleton of the discourse. Even without knowing the content of the discourse, interpreting one metaphor after another, it is quite possible to restore it entirely. From the cognitive point of view, as already noted, each of them represents a significant concept that actively participates in the formation of universal spirituality. From the point of view of connotation, the discourse is binary divided into positive and negative cognitive features. These features are correlative both in themselves and in the structure of the discourse. For example, “to sell out”, “not to sell out”, “to remain in the face of fire”, “to run away, to hide”, “difficult”, “easy”, “principled”, “lack of principle”, etc. One of the central metaphors in the discourse under consideration is the metaphor *snitch*. Strictly speaking, a *snitch* is a derivative metaphor formed from the verb to knock. The unit of secondary nomination here is precisely the verb, the derivative noun is secondary, but no less expressive. The mechanism of formation of this metaphor is transparent, here two actions are correlated: physical and ethical. “To hit, to beat with something against something, thus making noise” is correlated with “denunciation”. The English *snitch* is built on a different basis. The nominative meaning of this word corresponds to the sememe “nose”. The associative feature that serves as the basis for metaphorization is one of the functions of this respiratory organ, namely, the sense of smell.

Thus, in the structure of the English metaphor, the cognitive feature “to find out, to specifically find out” is actualized, not so much “to report” as “to specifically find out”. If we draw parallels with the tradition, then it is “to spy”. Of course, the nuances are important, but not enough to differentiate the situations. And yet, abstracting from the specific situation, in this film snitch means “one who sniffs out and tells tales” or “an informer”. The word “stukač” does not necessarily mean “an informer”, it is someone who witnessed something and reported it when asked, i.e. he might not have said it if he had not been asked. Thus, the content of the metaphors is different, but situationally they are related.

Conclusion. The analysis of this small fragment from the film “Scent of a Woman” very clearly demonstrates the role of conceptual metaphor in the structure of American media discourse. Of course, one could say that all these metaphors play a key role in themselves, i.e. they are self-sufficient. This is indeed the case. The difference between discourse and the language system in terms of the status of metaphor lies, on the one hand, in the manifestation of the content of the metaphor, and on the other, in the disclosure of its organizational capabilities. In addition, discourse presents metaphors themselves systematically. In the language system, metaphor has systemic-semiotic and cognitive significance.

Bibliography:

1. Lakoff G. Metaphors we live by. London, The university of Chicago press, 2003, 256 p.
2. Machin D., Mayr A. How to Do Critical Discourse Analysis: A Multimodal Introduction. London, SAGE Publications Ltd, 2012, 240 p.
3. Taghiyeva U.H. Metaphor in Azerbaijani and Russian Media Discourse // International journal of English Linguistics. 2015, № 5, p. 141–144.
4. Tannen D. Discourse 2.0: Language and New Media (Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics). Washington, Georgetown University Press, 2013, 192 p.
5. Thornborrow J. The Discourse of Public Participation Media: From talk show to Twitter. New York, Routledge, 2014, 210 p.
6. Thurlow C., Mroczek K. Digital Discourse: Language in the New Media (Oxford Studies in Sociolinguistics). Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011, 480 p.

Шахвердієва У.Г. МЕТАФОРИ В АМЕРИКАНСЬКИХ ФІЛЬМАХ

Когнітивне значення концептуальної метафори виявляється в унікальності конкретних метафоричних переносів. Дискурс, і зокрема медійний дискурс, розкриває потенціал концептуальної метафори. Поза дискурсом його можна лише інтерпретувати, але це інваріантне значення, як правило, максимально абстрактне. Тільки дискурс розкриває потенційний обсяг змісту концептуальної метафори. Звичайно, наведений фрагмент є окремим випадком реалізації концептуального змісту метафори, що безпосередньо пов'язано з унікальністю текстової зв'язності. Це ще раз підтверджує думку про те, що мова дана в текстах. Сукупність текстів демонструє мовні сутності, які марно залишаються поза текстом. З іншого боку, сукупність текстів є нічим іншим, як дискурсом. Аналіз показав, що сучасний американський кінематограф є унікальним простором для реалізації концептуальної метафори. На нашу думку, окрім усіх загальновідомих переваг сучасного американського кіно, його найбільше історико-культурне значення полягає в тому, що воно є літописом американської англійської мови.

Оскільки голлівудські фільми відіграють виняткову роль в американському глобальному медіадискурсі, ми вважаємо конче необхідним проаналізувати деякі характерні фрагменти з відомих фільмів. Кожен із цих фільмів – видатне явище в історії кіно, а отже, й історії культури. Вони запам'ятовуються багатьма рисами, але особливу роль у них відіграє мова персонажів і, відповідно, дискурс. Мовлення героїв американських фільмів має просторово-часові характеристики і є, по суті, пам'яткою культури свого часу. Семіотичне значення метафоричного переносу виявляється в моделях утворення вторинних номінаційних одиниць. Це цілком системне значення, яке передбачає систематизацію на тлі всієї лексико-семантичної системи мови.

Ключові слова: метафора, американські фільми, персонаж, дискурс, мова.