THEORETICAL BACKGROUNDS OF CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR

Farruh Usmanov, Ph.D., Associate Professor
Samarkand State Institute Of Foreign Languages
Kaliya Kuralbaevna Kiyasova,
Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences,
Acting Associate Professor,
Uzbekali Zhanibekov South Kazakhstan Pedagogical University.
Rustam Davronovich Jo'raqulov,
Candidate of Philological Sciences, Professor, SamSIFL

ABSTRACT: The article deals the metaphors are considered to be one such type of linguistic deviation that leads to foregrounding and defamiliarization. However, the assumption that these violations are deliberately used for the sake of drawing attention to their status as being violations becomes problematic when considered in light of the findings of Conceptual Metaphor Theory.

Keywords: metaphor, conceptual, concept, structure, phenomenon, linguistic expressions.

INTRODUCTION

According to E.S. Kubryakova, cognitive linguistics reveals language as a cognitive tool that plays an important role in coding and transferring knowledge [5, 19]. Cognition is the mental act or process by which knowledge is acquired, including perception, intuition, and comprehension; it is a cognitive process of transferring and analyzing information. In the process of language activity people activate their knowledge of various spheres, knowledge about the world and people, in order to make this process easier.

Cognitive analysis of the literary text involves some cognitive principles of distribution the information in the text. One of the principles is the principle of iconicity which presupposes a correspondence between the picture of the world and representation of it in the language. Iconicity is the conceived similarity between a form of language and its meaning. There are three iconic principles:

1) The principle of sequential order - the sequential order of events described is mirrored in the speech chain. Under the principle of sequential order, we tend to map the order that events occur in a sentence to the order in which they occur in real life. Finally, a classical example of the principle of sequential order comes from Latin, namely the famous sentence spoken by Julius Caesar in 47 BC. If the sentences encode chronologically ordered events, the sequence of sentences corresponds to the chronological order of events.

2) The principle of quantity: A larger chunk of information will be given a larger chunk of code. Less predictable information will be given more coding material. More important information will be given more coding material.

3) The principle of proximity: conceptual distance tends to match with linguistic distance. “Entities that are closer together functionally, conceptually, or cognitively will be placed closer together at the code level, i.e., temporally or spatially. Functional operators will be placed closest, temporally or spatially at the code level, to the conceptual unit to which they are most relevant”.

Another cognitive principle in the selection of information is foregrounding. The notion of foregrounding was first introduced by Prague linguistic circle and now this notion is widely used

in constructing literary text. Foregrounding in literary texts strikes reader's interest and captures their attention. It is a device that highlights certain aspects of the text, establishes the hierarchy of meanings, themes, bringing some to the fore, and shifting others to the background [6, 12].

According to Lakoff and Johnson [4, 44] metaphor exists at the level of

culture, social relations, and individual here-and-now experience. For Lakoff, the locus of metaphor is not in language at all but in the way we conceptualise one mental domain in terms of another. The view that metaphor plays a fundamental structural role in organizing our conceptual systems, rather than serving a deviant rhetorical effect, is now generally accepted. Nonetheless, the traditional assumptions of metaphor would deserve to recall briefly as follows:

- All everyday language is literal, and none is metaphorical.
- All concepts entailing full comprehending can be realised literally, without metaphor.
- Only literal language can be true.

The reason for the distinction of significance between this traditional view and contemporary tenet is based on the discovery of the phenomenon conceptual metaphor. It is the very system of metaphor that our conceptual system employed so in an intensive way in daily life, mostly for the abstract concepts. In any languages there are numerous instances that are necessarily and spontaneously used in everyday life but not for rhetorical purposes.

The past many years have seen a radical reappraisal of the role of metaphor in both language, and general cognitive processing. Once viewed as a peripheral and somewhat aberrant or deviant phenomenon, metaphor is now recognized to play a central role in the organization and acquisition of conceptual structure. From this perspective, language is viewed as fundamentally metaphorical in nature and metaphor is given a central role in the development of conceptual structure. The idea that the conceptual metaphors systematically structure the way that many domains are understood has subsequently been used to help explain, among other things, the nature of emotion concepts [3, 77] and the meaning of idioms [2, 137-138]. A conceptual metaphor is a generalization that can be inferred from diverse surface forms of language to inferred system of thoughts [1, 107].

Conceptual metaphors typically employ a more abstract concept as target and a more concrete or physical concept as their source. For instance, metaphors such as 'the days – the more abstract or target concept- ahead' or 'giving my time' rely on more concrete concepts, thus expressing time as a -more concrete- path into physical space or as a substance -that can be handled and offered as a gift. Different conceptual metaphors tend to be invoked when the speaker is trying to make a case for a certain point of view or course of action. For instance, we associate 'the days ahead' more with leadership, and 'giving my time' more with bargaining – if time is a substance, clearly, it should be treated for things of substance, and this metaphor makes that more obvious than the path metaphor. Selection of such metaphors tends to be directed by a subconscious or implicit purpose, in the mind of him or her who chooses them.

A conceptual domain is any coherent organization of experience. To see these target domains by making use of such source domains as war, journey. food, it is worth considering some classic examples of each from Lakoff and Johnson. The small capitals for the statement of conceptual metaphors and italics for metaphorical linguistic expressions [4, 102-103]:

AN ARGUMENT IS WAR.

Your claims are *indefensible.*

He *a/lacked every weak point* in my argument.

His criticisms were *right on lodge.*
I *demolished* his argument.
If you use that *strategy,* he'll *wipe* you *out.*
He *shot* down all of my arguments.
LOVE IS A JOURNEY.
Look *how far* we've come.
We're *at a crossroads.*
We'll just have to *go our separate ways.*
We can't *turn back* now.
I don't think this relationship is *going anywhere.*
Where we are?
This relationship is a *dead – end street.*
We're just *spinning our wheels.*
Our marriage is *on the rocks.*
We've *gotten off the track.*
THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS.
Is that the *foundation* for your theory?
The theory needs more *support.*
We need to *construct* a *strong* argument for that.
We need to *b1lttress* the theory with *solid* arguments.
So far we have *put together* only *the framework* of the theory.
IDEAS ARE FOOD.
All this paper has in it are *raw* facts, half-baked ideas, and *warmed-over* theories.
There are too many facts here for me to *digest* them all.
I just can't *swallow* that claim.
That's food for thought.
She *devoured* the book.
Let's let that idea *simmer on the back burner* for a while.
Let me stew over that for a while.

CONCLUSIONS

Summing up of all what has just been said we can conclude that conceptual structure is not merely a matter of the intellect - it involves all the natural dimensions of our experience, including aspects of our sense experiences: colour, shape, texture, sound, etc.

REFERENCES

1. Cameron L. Identifying and describing metaphor in spoken discourse data. In: L. Cameron and G. Low (eds), Researching and applying metaphor, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2002. – P. 105-132.
2. Gibbs R. W. Introspection and cognitive linguistics: Should we trust our
own intuitions? Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics 4, 2006. – P. 135-152.
3. Kövecses Z. Metaphors of anger, pride, and love: A lexical approach. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 2003. – 197 p.
4. Lakoff G. and Johnson M. Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought. New York: Basic Books. 1980. – 163 p.

5. Кубрякова Е. С. Об установках когнитивной науки и актуальных проблемах когнитивной лингвистики // Известия АН. Серия литературы и языка, том 63, № 3, 2004.
6. https://sites.google.com/site/derzispit/6-speak-on-the-stylistic-analysis-on-the-graphic-level