# METAPHORIZED ANIMALS: AN INVESTIGATION OF ANIMAL METAPHORS IN *KING LEAR*

**Zahra JAFARI**[•]

**Abstract**

Conceptual Theory of Metaphor (CTM), first proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), is an approach to metaphor which releases it from the bounds of language and instead places it in the domain of cognition. According to this approach, metaphor and cognition are in a bilateral relationship, that is, each metaphor has a cognitive basis and conceptualization in the mind mostly takes place via metaphors. In this regard, the main function of metaphor is to lay ground for talking about one concept in terms of another concept. In this process, some features of one conceptual domain (source domain) which is mostly concrete are transferred to another domain (target domain) which is mostly abstract.

Since metaphor is among the widely used tropes in literary discourse, CTM can be used for analyzing the role of metaphors in such discourse. Relative to other approaches, this approach can provide a better explanation for the presence of different metaphorical structures in literary texts. On the basis of this, the present article aims to investigate the role of animal metaphors in *King Lear* from the viewpoints of traditional rhetoric and CTM and show the advantages of the latter over the former for explaining the role of metaphorical structures in contributing to the coherence of this play.

**Keywords:** Metaphor, Conceptual Theory of Metaphor, Traditional Rhetoric, Animal Metaphors, *King Lear.*

## 1. Metaphor: Traditional and non-traditional approaches

### 1.1. The Rhetorical Device

Metaphors have been used through hundreds and even thousands of years of human civilization so that human beings communicate with one another more effectively and more accurately. It is believed that the use of metaphor is not restricted to poetic language, but exists all over our daily lives.  Metaphor comes from the Greek word *meta* meaning "over," and *pherein* meaning "to carry." It refers to a particular set of linguistic processes where aspects of one object are carried over or transferred to another object, so that the second object is spoken of as if it were the first one (Hawkes, 1972: 1). Aristotle considers it to a sign of genius to be a master of metaphor "since a good metaphor implies an intuitive perception of the similarity in dissimilarities" (Poetics 1459 a 5-8).

Ortony (1993: 3) argues that "any serious study of metaphor is almost obliged to start with the works of Aristotle". Aristotle's views have influenced most of the traditional approaches to metaphor.

[•] MA of Translation Studies, University of Isfahan.

Traditional theories of metaphor distinguish two terms within a metaphor, the target or tenor and the vehicle or source. The target is the term that receives a literal interpretation; the vehicle creates the metaphorical relation. Metaphors are thus characterized by the specific relation between target and vehicle.

Aristotle's treatment of the phenomenon is not only the oldest, but vividly the most influential one. His definition of metaphor appears first in *Poetics* and receives further notice in *Rhetoric*. Aristotle believes metaphor to be a rhetorical device. He specifies the categorical relations between vehicle and target, resulting in four specific types of metaphor. The first three types of metaphor are devices in which one word is replaced with another, but the last one has a different nature. He defines these types as:

(1) From genus to species

(2) From species to genus

(3) From one species to another

 (4) In the way of analogy.

In contemporary approaches some of these types are not considered metaphors; for instance, the first two types are known as synecdoche, and the third could be considered as metonymy. Further, the focus has shifted from the structure of the metaphor to its interpretation.

Aristotle's analysis in the *Poetic* deals mainly with the structural relations between the terms in a metaphor; what these relations refer to are not discussed. Aristotle's thoughts on metaphor are known to be the motivation behind many of the existing interpretations of metaphor which deal with different concerns of this phenomenon such as the nature and functioning of metaphor, or the processes of metaphor recognition and interpretation.

Scholars such as Cicero, Quintilian and Vico view metaphor suitable for ornamenting language or comparing things, but not qualified for analytic thought. Like Aristotle, both Cicero and Quintilian have discussed metaphor in terms of style as a figurative device. Both writers viewed metaphor as a shorter form of simile. Cicero believed that what made metaphor in the first place was necessity and only later it became a way of giving excellence to a speech. "Necessity," he said "was the parent (of metaphorical speech) compelled by the sterility and narrowness of language; but afterwards delight and pleasure made it frequent" (Buck, 1899: 2). Cicero held that in order to ornament a speech in terms of vocabulary one can use rare words, new coinages or metaphors.

Later, Quintilian concludes that we use this figure "sometimes perforce, but sometimes with a view to significance or force of expression" (Buck, 1899: 3). Further, he argued that the change from a simple to metaphorical word is made because it is either necessary or because it helps to embellish a speech. He declared that "metaphor has been invented for the purpose of exciting the mind, giving a character to things, and setting them before the eye" (Buck, 1899: 24).

**1.2. The Cognitive Process**

It was not until 1960s and 1970s with the work of Max Black that scholars began discovering the conceptual nature of metaphor. Until this time, the theoretical view on the nature and function of metaphor had been based on the thought that metaphor is essentially a rhetorical device. In the contemporary theory metaphor occupies a central role both in thought and the development of language.

A shared disapproval of traditional view of metaphor as a figurative device can be observed in the thoughts of scholars recognizing metaphor as a conceptual process. Richards (1936) has argued against the traditional views of metaphor, stating that metaphors are present in all human discourse. He (1936: 93) notes that "in the simplest formulation, when we

use a metaphor we have two thoughts of different things acting together and supported by a single word, or phrase, whose meaning is a resultant of their interaction". Richards emphasizes that the main use of metaphor is to extend language and, since language is reality, to expand reality. Reddy (1979) agrees with Richards' views, saying that we attempt to understand one another from our own views of reality. For him, communication is essentially metaphorical, making metaphor a natural tool of communication.

Gibbs' (1994: 2) remark that figurative language has been "traditionally viewed as the tool of poets and politicians" is an example of the criticism on traditional approach to metaphor. Also, Turner (1987: 16) holds that discussions on metaphor are based on "a supposed definition of metaphor" that establishes similarity. According to Searle (1979), metaphor represents a class of linguistic expression that says one thing and means another; thus, resembling cases of irony and indirect speech acts. A characteristic of all such types of linguistic expression is that the literal utterance is in some sense "defective", they have "obvious falsehood, semantic nonsense, violation of the rules of speech acts, or violations of conventional principles of communication" (Levin, 1988: 112). Moreover, Leech (1981) believes that a metaphor is a form of linguistic deviation. These deviations from linguistic or other socially adopted names have been given the special name of foregrounding. The foregrounding figure is the linguistic deviation, and the background is the language.

Theorists like Goodman (1968), Searle (1979), and Nunberg (2002) have rejected the classical distinctions among different forms of figurative language. Instead, they treat metaphor, simile, metonymy and synecdoche as a single unified phenomenon. They do not question metaphor's effectiveness, only the means by which its effects are achieved. The central claim of these theorists is that a sentence used metaphorically has no distinctive cognitive content aside from its literal content.

## 2. Traditional Analysis of Animal Metaphors in *King Lear*

The term *imagery* has been adopted to refer to metaphor or figures closely related to metaphor by writers discussing Shakespeare's tragedies (Ellis-Fermer, 1980). Ellis-Fermer (1980: 94) believes that metaphor, being almost inseparable from poetic expression, must find some place in poetic drama and thus, as the art matures, be drawn into closer and closer functional relation". Based on Spurgeon (1935), the most important images are those which contribute to the overall meaning of an individual play. It must be noted that she uses the term "image" as an umbrella term that covers both metaphor and simile.

In poetic drama imagery enriches the content of the play. One of the functions of imagery is revealing the underlying mood of the work in question, intertwining different parts, and in this, emphasizing the idea or the mood that the poet has chosen for the play. Ellis-Fermer (1980: 85) urges that this function must be present in any poetic drama considered as a work of art: "the main preoccupation of the poet's mind must be revealed in greater or less degree by all the aspects of the play that is the issue of the preoccupation". In this regard, Samuel Taylor Coleridge has famously referred to Shakespeare as "myriad-minded" emphasizing that "the body and substance of his works came out of the unfathomable depths of his own oceanic mind" (Punter, 2007: 13).

Imagery functions as a tool in poetic drama to bring forth to the notice the revelation of character. Each of Shakespeare's characters has his individual imagery which is ultimately related to the theme of the play. In this, the characters reveal themselves by their instinctive choice of subjects in which to image their thought, by the form of the image, and often also by the relation between subject and theme.

The animal images present in the play demonstrate how negative qualities in man can degenerate him from human status to that of animals and beasts. Each character in the tragedy is associated with certain types of animals. Goneril □ whose heartless ingratitude seems to be most disturbing for Lear □ is compared to sea-monster, fox, wolf, vulture, serpent, … all of

which are animals known for their ferociousness and preying. Goneril is a "detested kite" in her father's eyes, a bird of prey which according to Onions (1980) is used here to show her as a rapacious person.

The metaphors that are used by Lear toward Goneril suggest her savage and unnatural behavior in respect to her father: she is one of the "pelican daughters", the bird that was believed to feed his young with its blood (Schmidt, 1971:849); reinforcing the idea of her ingratitude further. She is called a "she-fox" by her father, an animal that is known to be sly and cruel. Even her own husband, the Duke of Albany, is appalled by her merciless behavior, calling her and Regan "Tigers, not daughters" to vivify how unacceptable and barbarous such behaviors are to those still maintaining their human status.

Another character of the play, Oswald, is also dehumanized by others to the level of animals: in his rage Lear calls him mongrel, dog, and cur for calling him "My lady's father" not the King. Using this type of imagery and comparing Oswald to lower animals, both his social status and his treachery is emphasized upon. Further, he is called a "wagtail" by Kent which is a opprobrious term for a bobbing or obsequious person (Onions, 1980: 244), and a "goose" which is a reference to his coward behavior in "Smile you my speeches, as I were a fool? Goose, and I had you upon Sarum plain, I'd drive ye cackling home to Camelot" (II. ii. 83-85).

The chaos in Lear's world is a by-product of his own faults: it is initiated by his misjudgments, empowered by his wrath and rage, and spirals down to his fall by his alienation from the human world. The disastrous outcome of this situation  his madness  is artfully illuminated through the images others (especially the fool) employ in regard to him. McCloskey indicates that the Fool's bitter statement, "For you know, nuncle, The hedge-sparrow fed the cuckoo so long, That it had it head bit off by it young" (I. iv. 234-236) is not only a sharp and crude image of ingratitude, but it is also an image of Lear's own foolishness, his misjudgment, his improvident helplessness, and his egoistic blindness (1962: 322). Additionally, the imagery of the snail and the oyster carries to the lowest pitch of figurative expression the blindness of Lear, his lack of judgment, the low order of the ratiocination from which proceeded his initial error (McCloskey, 1962: 323).

Clemen, (1966) believes that the increase of images in Lear's speech through the acts is a result of his being isolated in the human world; consequently, throwing him back upon himself. As he proceeds through these stages the imagery becomes coordinated by his emotional and mental status. Lear's metaphors suggest an obsession with the act of ingratitude. This notion of ingratitude and callousness comes best to life in the serpent metaphor: "that she may feel How sharper than a serpent's tooth it is To have a thankless child!" (I.iv.290-291).

Knight (1964) discusses how the emphatic use of animal images running through the play suggests a contrast between actions of humans and the natural world in terms of ethics. Lear's daughters are human beings, yet cruel as beasts, lacking any sense of sympathy. In Knight's word "they are therefore throwbacks in the evolutionary process: they have not developed proper humanity" (1964: 183). Lear's warning to Kent as "Come not between the dragon and his wrath" (I.i.122 ) is a clear foreshadowing for how the events would turn for Lear as a result of his wrath and inability to see the nature of those around him. As King Lear stops to see those around him he uses the words "less as a means of communication with others than a means of expressing what goes on within himself" (Clemen, 1966: 134). Evans (1952) concludes that what visualizes the violence of action in King Lear is the presence of lower animal images employed by Lear.

The world of animals is also evoked by the imagery: they give the play not only background and atmosphere, but also a vital connection with earthly existence (Bradley, 1904: 266). All of these images contribute to the central theme of the play; thus, amplifying and supporting the mood of the tragedy.  Shakespeare spares none of his characters from the

suffering; implying that as long as evil is loose in the world it will befall on both the tragic protagonist and "the bystander who, because no one is isolated, is enmeshed in the general human situation (Bechtold, 1948: 289).

### 3. Conceptual Metaphor Theory

Metaphor has been one of the issues of detailed research and analysis in various currents of linguistics. Since each current theorizes language differently, there are different approaches to metaphor in linguistics. One of the recent approaches to metaphor in linguistics is *Conceptual Metaphor Theory* (CMT) or *Contemporary Theory of Metaphor* which emerged from Cognitive Linguistics. Proposed first by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), CMT can be considered as one of the pillars of Cognitive Linguistics. It can be said that no linguistic theorization regards such a pivotal status for metaphor as Cognitive Linguistics does.

Since Cognitive Linguistics emerged as the by-product of rapid developments in cognitive sciences in 1960s and 1970s, CMT considers a crucial role for cognition and cognitive forces in the formation of different metaphors. Thus, it is not accidental that metaphors in this approach are considered conceptual rather than linguistic. As Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 6) put it:

Metaphor is not just a matter of language, that is, of mere words. We shall argue that, on the contrary, human thought processes are largely metaphorical.

Considering metaphors as building blocks of human thought and conceptual structure is one of the most important features of CMT which distinguishes it from traditional and other linguistic approaches to metaphor. Indeed, it can be said that such an approach frees metaphor from the bounds of language and instead locates it in the vast realm of human cognition.

Another characteristic of CMT is its claim to the ubiquity of metaphor in everyday language. As opposed to traditional views, CMT does not consider an exclusive field of usage for metaphors. In traditional approaches, metaphor, like other tropes or figures of speech, is mainly a device or embellishment which is imposed on ordinary language and consequently transforms such language into poetic or figurative language. Hence, an exclusive area of usage, i.e. literature, is considered for metaphor and metaphorization in this view. Due to this, the focus of traditional studies of metaphor is mostly on literary texts and the like. On the contrary, CMT does not regard an especial position for literature in researches on metaphor and metaphorical language. Since metaphors are necessary for the formation of concepts or conceptualization, their presence can be explored in any linguistic manifestation of those concepts, not simply in one specific domain like literature. In other words, conceptualization and linguistic manifestation of concepts are not at all secure from the influences of metaphorization and this matter guarantees the presence of conceptual metaphors in different domains.

Another feature of CMT is its emphasis on the role of bodily experiences and embodied practices in the formation of different metaphors. This means that human experiences of the real world provide the basis for many metaphors we encounter in our everyday language. In this regard, Evans and Green (2006: 286) relate CMT to two principal hypotheses of cognitive semantics:

1) Embodied cognition which considers bodily experiences as the origin of conceptual structure.

2) Semantic structure is a reflection of conceptual structure.

The first hypothesis shows that metaphors are not only related to cognition but also to a special kind of cognition, that is, embodied cognition. Such hypothesis can explain the salient role of body organs and bodily actions in the formation of various metaphors. The second hypothesis states that the true location of metaphors is not in language but in cognition. In other

words, metaphors should be studied conceptually rather than semantically because they are concepts, not linguistic elements.

For validating their theory of metaphor, Lakoff and Johnson (1999: 119) enumerate and criticize some central tenets of traditional theory. These tenets are as following:

1) Metaphor is a matter of words, not thought.

2) Metaphorical language is not part of ordinary conventional language.

3) Metaphorical language is deviant.

4) Metaphors express similarities.

Since CMT is a critical reaction to traditional theory and its tenets, the definition it provides for metaphor should be free of such tenets. Semino (2008: 5) provides one such definition:

Conceptual metaphors are defined as systematic sets of correspondences, or mappings, across conceptual domains, whereby a target domain is partly structured in terms of a different source domain.

In this definition, metaphors are considered to be essentially conceptual, not linguistic. Thus, metaphor is a matter of thought, not words. In addition, there is no point in this definition showing that metaphors belong to a special kind of language since it mainly delineates metaphors in terms of concepts, not language. Finally, this definition does not consider similarity as an essential element for defining metaphor. Instead, it uses the notion of "correspondence" or "mapping" which is held between different conceptual domains in the process of metaphor formation. Correspondence or mapping is a general term which denotes any kind of link or connection held between different conceptual domains and thus it does not necessarily mean similarity. The advantage of this term over similarity is that there are many different correspondences between various conceptual domains which are not based on similarity between those domains.

Defining metaphor in such a way leads to the characterization of different kinds of metaphor. In this view, metaphors can be classified in terms of factors such as conventionality, function, generality and nature (Kovecses, 2010). The functional classification is one of the most famous ones in this regard. Accordingly, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) propose a triad categorization as following:

1) Structural metaphors: one concept is metaphorically structured in terms of another.

2) Orientational metaphors: a whole system of concepts is organized with respect to one another.

3) Ontological metaphors: a kind of metaphor responsible for identifying our experiences as entities or substances.

This categorization shows that each type of metaphor is responsible for fulfilling certain functions and thus different metaphors are used for different concepts. Although these metaphors are different from each other, there is a point of similarity between all of them. In each metaphor, there is a conceptual domain (target domain) which is structured in terms of another domain (source domain) and the important point is that the first domain is more abstract than the second one. In other words, if we consider the relationship between the two domains as *A is B*, it can be said that A is the abstract domain which is metaphorized and B is the concrete domain through which the process of metaphorization is carried out.

## 4. Cognitive Analysis of Animal Metaphors in *King Lear*

Although CMT does not consider a privileged status for literary texts, such texts are among the most studied data in CMT analyses. One of the reasons of using CMT for metaphor

analysis in literature emerges from its power for describing and explaining metaphorical systems in literary works. Since the main function of metaphor is representation of reality or some aspects of reality (Semino, 2008: 31), the set of metaphors used by a specific writer in his/her works can elucidate his/her attitude towards reality and the world. Thus, such analysis can show how metaphors are at the service of writers for construing reality and consequently foregrounding some aspects of it and backgrounding other aspects.

Whereas different writers use different metaphors in their works, CMT shows that some kind of systematicity can be observed in such variegated metaphors. In fact, one of the main claims of CMT is that metaphors in literature are not in essence different from metaphors in other fields and they are mainly constructed on the basis of ordinary language metaphors. As Lakoff and Turner (1989: 67) put it:

Poetic thought uses the mechanisms of everyday thought, but it extends them, elaborates them, and combines them in ways that go beyond the ordinary.

This shows that there exist certain tools for transforming ordinary thought into poetic thought. In other words, ordinary thought or language plays a crucial and constructive role in the formation of poetic thought or language. In this regard, Lakoff and Turner (1989) mention a number of processes through which ordinary language is transformed into poetic language. These processes are as following:

1) Extending: a conventional conceptual metaphor is taken and expressed in a new way via introducing new elements in the source domain.

2) Elaborating: an existing element of the source domain is elaborated in an unusual way. As opposed to extending, no new element is added to the source domain in elaboration.

3) Questioning: the very appropriateness of common ordinary metaphors is questioned by the poet.

4) Combining: it is perhaps the most powerful mechanism to go beyond everyday conceptual metaphors. Here, different conceptual metaphors are combined and as a result a composite metaphor is formed.

It can be said that these are the main mechanisms for creating metaphors and metaphorical systems in literary works. Each literary work may include one or all of these mechanisms. As mentioned before, the important point is that these mechanisms are based on everyday conceptual metaphors. In other words, ordinary conceptual metaphors function as raw material which is processed by those mechanisms and as a result novel literary metaphors are created.

The plays of Shakespeare, in general, and his tragedies, in specific, are considered as the masterpieces of play writing. One of these tragedies is *King Lear* which has a high status among his tragedies. In this tragedy, Shakespeare uses different stylistic selections and techniques for creating a prototypical tragedy. Among various tropes used in this play, metaphor has an outstanding position undoubtedly. This play consists of several metaphorical systems, each of which has its own specific function. One of these metaphorical systems is the system of animal metaphors which has been elaborated by Shakespeare to fit into the overall structure of the tragedy. Thus, investigating this metaphorical system can help us understand the structure and organization of this masterpiece.

In the framework of CMT, animals are among the most productive source domains (Kovecses, 2010: 19). Different animals and their characteristics can be used metaphorically for referring to human beings and human characteristics. On the basis of this, a very productive conceptual metaphor is proposed in CMT:

## MAN IS ANIMAL

As mentioned before, in this formula man is regarded as target domain whereas animal is regarded as source domain. As a result, a set of correspondences or mappings between the two domains is held. Such mappings are unidirectional, that is, from animal domain to man domain and not vice versa. For example, consider the following sentence:

a) That man is a *sly fox.*

In this sentence, the attribute of slyness or the power of deceiving others, which is considered to be one of the intrinsic characteristics of foxes, is allocated to the man via the image of a fox. What should be noticed is that we cannot replace the position of man and sly fox because such replacement will change the conceptual metaphor "MAN IS ANIMAL". This sentence is the linguistic expression or manifestation of that conceptual metaphor and thus it should accord with that metaphor.

For studying the role of animal metaphors in *King Lear*, we should first explore the linguistic manifestations of these metaphors and, then, explore the conceptual metaphors underlying such linguistic expressions. For example, consider the following sentences:

**a)** Lear: Peace, Kent! Come not between the *dragon* and his wrath (I.i.122)

**b)** Lear: My lady's father! my lord's knave: you whoreson *dog*! you slave! you *cur*! (I.iv.83-84)

**c)** Lear: More hideous when thou show'st thee in a child than the *sea-monster*! (I.iv.267-268)

In these sentences, different linguistic manifestations of "MAN IS ANIMAL" conceptual metaphor are mentioned. The italic words are animal metaphors. As these examples show, this conceptual metaphor can be specified as following:

## MAN IS A WILD ANIMAL

All metaphorized animals in these sentences are wild animals. The selection of these animals is not accidental. Each of them represents the attitude of Lear towards the person he talks. In the first example, he warns Kent not to mediate between him and her daughter Cordelia. He refers to himself as dragon to show his superiority and power over others. In this case, we have an instance of composite metaphor. The two conceptual metaphors which are combined in this case are:

## MAN IS ANIMAL

## EMOTIONS ARE ANIMATE ENTITIES

Lear not only refers to himself as dragon but also considers his wrath as an entity which is live and Kent should not place himself between Lear and his feeling of anger. Via this composite metaphor, Lear implicitly shows how irrational he can be when he is angry. Thus, this composite metaphor is at the service of the poet for showing the irrationality of Lear.

In examples (b) and (c), Lear uses the image of wild animals for referring to two persons. In the first case, he refers to Oswald, the servant of Goneril, as a mongrel and cur. By using this metaphor, Lear characterizes Oswald as a poor loyal servant. At the same time, he uses these two words which have sexual connotations as well. These words refer to certain type of dogs which are of mixed breed. Thus, a set of correspondences are established via these metaphors:

1) Oswald as a poor loyal servant of Goneril (the loyalty of dogs)

2) Oswald as a person with unknown parents (mixed breed dogs)

In the third example, Lear uses the metaphor of a sea-monster for referring to his daughter Goneril. In this case, another version of "MAN IS ANIMAL" conceptual metaphor is used by Lear. Since he regards his daughter as a cruel person, he uses the image of a dangerous animal or monster for depicting her. Hence, he specifies that conceptual metaphor as:

MAN IS A DANGEROUS ANIMAL

In another case, he uses the following sentence for referring to Goneril:

**d)** Lear: Detested kite, thou liest! (I.iv.270)

Again, he uses the metaphor of a bird of prey for referring to his disloyal cruel daughter. It can be said that, in this case, he regards Goneril as a hawk in search of its prey. By using this metaphor, he foregrounds the opportunist nature of his daughter who grasps any opportunity for gaining power and money.

These are just a few examples of metaphorized animals in this tragedy. In general, it seems that different linguistic manifestations of animal metaphors in this play have a common goal which is showing and representing different characteristics of human being. In addition, these metaphors have a major role which is reinforcing the coherence of the play. It can be said that different animal metaphors contribute a lot to the coherence of this tragedy which is, in fact, a play about human being and its various characteristics. This matter is best represented by the following part:

**e)** Edgar: A serving-man, proud in heart and mind;…. false of heart, light of ear, bloody of hand; hog in sloth, fox in stealth, wolf in greediness, dog in madness, lion in prey (III.iv.85-95)

This statement by Edgar shows very well how different animals are corresponded to different characteristics and consequently when these metaphorized animals are used as source domain for referring to human being as target domain, their characteristics are also transferred to human beings. Therefore, these metaphors play a major role for creating a coherent text about different characteristics of human beings.

**Conclusion**

Metaphor is one of the mostly used and discussed tropes in literary works. Due to this, there are various approaches to this figure of speech. Traditional approaches, derived mainly from the works of Aristotle, focus on formal approaches of metaphor in literary texts. On the basis of this, these approaches propose classifications of metaphor which are mainly based on formal features of metaphors in literary works. The main claim of such approaches is that metaphor is indeed a kind of implicit similarity and thus similarity plays a major role in creating any metaphor.

On the other hand, Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), emerged from Cognitive Linguistics, is an approach to metaphor analysis which emphasizes the conceptual nature of metaphors. In this approach, metaphors are considered conceptual rather than linguistic. Sine metaphors are rooted in cognition; formal characteristics are useless for defining metaphors in this approach. Instead, a functional classification of metaphors is proposed which is usable for analyzing metaphors in different texts, not simply literary texts. The power of this approach is in its insistence on the ordinary nature of literary metaphors. According to this approach, literary metaphors are created on the basis of everyday language metaphors via certain mechanisms; that are, extension, elaboration, questioning and combination.

The CMT analysis of animal metaphors in *King Lear* shows that such an approach is very helpful in elucidating the structure and organization of this tragedy. The results of this study show that the conceptual metaphor "MAN IS ANIMAL" is vastly used in this play, but it is specified and subcategorized, too. The subcategorizations like "MAN IS A WILD ANIMAL", "MAN IS A DANGEROUS ANIMAL", "MAN IS A BEAST OF PREY" etc, are all

used for representing characteristics such as irrationality, disloyalty, opportunism, brutality, cruelty etc. As a result, a coherent metaphorical system about human characteristics is formed which, consequently, forms a coherent text about various human characteristics. In general, it seems that CMT is a more effective analytic tool for describing and explaining the role metaphorical systems play for injecting coherence into different texts.

**REFERENCES**

ARISTOTLE, (1984). *Rhetoric and Poetics*. Tr. by W. Rhys Roberts and Ingram Bywater. New York: The Modern Library.
BECHTOLD, Heilman, R. (1948). *This Great Stage: Image and Structure In King Lear*. Washington: University of Washington Press.
BRADLEY, A. C. (1904). *Shakespearean Tragedy*. London: McMilan.
BUCK, Gertrude. (1899). *The Metaphor: A Study In The Psychology of Rhetoric*. Michigan: Inland Press.
CLEMEN, W. (1966). *The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery*. London: Methuen.
ELLIS-FERMER, Una (1980). *Shakespeare's Drama*. New York: Methuen.
EVANS, B.I. (1952). *The Language of Shakespeare's Plays*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
EVANS, V. & GREEN, M. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
GIBBS, R. W. (1994). *The Poetics of Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
GOODMAN, N. (1968). *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company.
HAWKWS, T. (1972). *Metaphor*. London: Methuen.
KNIGHT, Wilson G. (1964). *The Wheel of Fire: Interpretations of Shakespearian Tragedy With Three New Essays*. Cleveland and New York: Meridian Books
KOVECSES, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
LAKOFF, G. & JOHNSON, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
LAKOFF, G. & JOHNSON, M. (1999). *Philosophy In The Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.
LAKOFF, G. & TURNER, M. (1989). *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide To Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
LEECH, G. (1981). *Semantics*. London: Penguin Books.
LEVIN, Samuel R. (1988). *Metaphoric Worlds: Conceptions of Romantic Nature*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
MCCLOSKEY, John C. (1962). "The Emotive Use of Animal Imagery In King Lear". *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Volume 13, Issue 3, pp. 321-325
NUNBERG, G. (2002). "The Pragmatics of Deferred Interpretation" In Laurence Horn and Gregory Ward (Eds.)(2002). *The Blackwell Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp.344-364). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
ONIONS, C.T (1980). *A Shakespeare Glossary*. Oxford: Clarend Press.
ORTONY, A. (Ed.) (1993). *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
PUNTER, David. (2007). *Metaphor*. London and New York: Routledge.
REDDY, M. (1979). "The Conduit Metaphor: A Case of Frame Conflict" In Our Language About Language" In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and Thought* (pp. 164-201). New York: Cambridge University Press
RICHARDS, I. A. (1936). *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
SCHMIDT, Alexander (1971). *Shakespeare Lexicon and Quotation Dictionary*. New York: Dover Publication.
SEARLE, J. (1979). Metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and Thought* (pp.92-123). New York: Cambridge University Press.
SEMINO, E. (2008). *Metaphor In Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
SHAKESPEARE, William (Ed.)(1901). *King Lear*. New York: The University Society.
SPURGEON, C. (1935). *Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
TURNER, M. (1987). *Death Is The Mother of Beauty*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.