



Farruh USMANOV,

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages Senior teacher of the department of English Philology PhD

E-mail: ufarruh16@gmail.com

Based on the review of SamSIFL, PhD. Associate professor, M.M.Oblokulova

THE PROBLEM OF CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR AND LINGUISTIC EXPRESSIONS

Annotation

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.

Key words: Metaphor, conceptual, concept, structure, phenomenon, linguistic expressions.

ПРОБЛЕМА КОНЦЕПТУАЛЬНОЙ МЕТАФОРЫ И ЯЗЫКОВЫХ ВЫРАЖЕНИЙ

Аннотация

В статье рассматривается, что метафоры рассматриваются как один из видов языковых отклонений, который приводит к выделению на первый план и диффамиларизации. Однако предположение о том, что эти нарушения намеренно используются для привлечения внимания к их статусу как нарушений, становится проблематичным, если рассматривать их в свете выводов теории концептуальной метафоры.

Ключевые слова: Метафора, концепт, концепция, структура, феномен, языковые выражения.

KONTSEPTUAL METAFORA VA LINGVISTIK IBORALAR MUAMMOSI

Annotatsiya

Maqolada metafora lingvistik og'ishlarning turlaridan biri sifatida qaralishi va bu ta'kidlash va demarizatsiyaga olib kelishi haqida keltirilgan. Biroq, bu qoidabuzarliklar ataylab ularning holatiga e'tiborni jalb qilish uchun ishlatilgan degan taxmin, kontseptual metafora nazariyasi nuqtai nazaridan qaralganda, buzilishlar muammoli bo'lib qoladi.

Kalit so'zlar: Metafora, tushuncha, tushuncha, struktura, hodisa, lingvistik iboralar.

Introduction. 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].

Literature review. According to Lakoff and Johnson [4] 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]. A conceptual metaphor is a generalization that can be inferred from diverse surface forms of language to inferred system of thoughts [1].

Research Methodology. 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.

Discussion and results. 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]:

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 are we?

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 *blltress* 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.

As for the relationship between the conceptual metaphor and the

metaphorical linguistic expression, the linguistic expressions (i.e., ways of talking) make explicit, or are manifestations of, and the conceptual metaphors (i.e., ways of thinking). Kövecses Z. points out this nexus "it is the metaphorical linguistic expressions that reveal the existence a/the conceptual metaphor" [3].

For example, the conceptual metaphor LIFE (target) IS A JOURNEY (source) motivates common linguistic metaphors such as we're on the right (wrong) track (path), we've come too far down this road to turn back now, he's looking for a change of direction, and a great many more typical everyday expressions as well as more elaborate extensions that occur in poetic language. Through these linguistic instances it is strongly possible to hypothesize the existence of a wide range of conceptual forms.

All the expressions above use different words and since it are much more than a linguistic device it becomes possible to talk about them as fundamentally the same metaphor. Lakoff

suggested that metaphors create meaning [4]: Conceptual systems are projected from a familiar concrete or "embodied" domain to a more abstract domain. In contrast, Murphy puts forward that metaphors do not provide new structure for the target domain, but rather display a structural parallelism between these two domains.

Gibbs states that image schemas emerge throughout "sensorimotoractivity" as we use metaphors to group kinds of experience (my consciousness was raised), to orientate ourselves (life is a war), to convey expression through the senses (my head was electrified by her eyes), to describe learning (it had a germ of truth in it), etc. Even ideas are commonly pictured as objects (I just can't swallow that claim), as containers (We couldn't get anything out of that conversation), or as things to be transferred (he got the idea across). Moreover, this schema helps motivate some of the complex ways that people structure single abstract concepts [2]. For instance, the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS HEATED FLUID IN A CONTAINER takes the image schema for CONTAINMENT as part of its source domain and maps this image-schematic structure onto anger. Thus, people know that when the intensity of anger increases, the fluid in the container rises (e.g. The manager's pent-up anger welled lip inside of him), people know that intense heat produces steam and this creates pressure in the container (e.g. He was bursting anger), and people know that when the pressure of the container becomes too high, it explodes (e.g. The boss blew up at me).

If metaphors were merely linguistic expressions, we would expect different linguistic expressions to be different metaphors. Thus, "We've hit a dead-end street" would constitute one metaphor. "We can't turn back now" would constitute another, entirely different metaphor. "Their marriage is on the rocks" would involve still a different metaphor and dozens of examples. Yet we don't seem to have dozens of different metaphors here. We have one metaphor, in which love is conceptualized as a journey.

Considering this case, constituent elements of plants correspond systematically to constituent elements of social organizations, such as companies, and the words that are used about plants are employed systematically in connection with organizations. In the light of this, when we know a conceptual metaphor, we use the linguistic expressions that reflect it in a way that we do not violate the mappings that are set for the linguistic community. As Kövecses Z. points out "not any element of B can be mapped onto any element of A. The linguistic expressions used metaphorically must conform to established mappings, or correspondences, between the source and the target" [3].

Nevertheless, it must be borne in mind that the mappings between A and B, and can be partial. Just one part of concept B is mapped onto target and only a part target A is involved in the mappings from B. In case a source domain is applied to a target domain, not all aspects of the target but some parts of the target are brought into focus. For example, THE MIND IS A BRITTLE OBJECT metaphor the expressions "The incident shattered her", "We have to handle him with a care due to his wife's death" or "he has cracked up" the centre attention is on the aspect that it may be called, as Kövecses illustrates, "psychological strength". That is, when a metaphor focuses on one aspect of a target concept, it highlights that or those aspect (s), and the other aspects of the same concept are hidden that is, it becomes out or focuses. Highlighting and hiding presuppose each other [3].

How a metaphorical concept can hide an aspect of our experience can be seen in what Michael Reddy called the "conduit metaphor. Reddy observes that our language about language is structured roughly by the following complex metaphor [7]:

IDEAS (or MEANINGS) ARE OBJECTS,
LINGUISTIC EXPRESSIONS ARE CONTAINERS,
COMMUNICATION IS SENDING.

Conduit metaphor can precisely be said of any sentence, yet there are some cases that context does matter. As an example, a famous record in an actual conversation by Pamela Downing may be given:

"Please sit in the apple-juice seat"

Independently this sentence is not of meaning at all, since the expression "apple juice seat" is not a conventional way of use. But the sentence makes a good sense in the context where it is

used, Your guest is ready for breakfast. There are four place settings, three with orange juice and just one with apple juice. It is clear what the apple-juice seat is. These examples display that the metaphorical concepts given provide with a partial understanding, and this metaphorical structuring is partial not total; if it were so one concept would actually be the other, not solely be understood in terms of it. On the other hand, metaphorical concepts in the form of figurative, poetic, or ornamental etc. can be extended beyond the literal way of thinking and use. That is why, a concept is structured by a metaphor, the way it IS partially structured and that it can be extended in some ways.

As Kovecses points out the metaphorical expressions are regarded as the linguistic realizations or manifestations of underlying conceptual metaphors. Nevertheless, conceptual metaphors may be realized in diverse ways, not only in language but also in many human experiences such as literature, movies,

symbols, advertisements, and politics or in social institutions etc. [3].

However, the question arises whether all conceptual metaphors are like the ones that have been scrutinized so far. There are different kinds of conceptual metaphor and it is possible to subsume metaphors in different ways. These include classifications according to the conventionality, function, nature and level of generality of metaphor. It is indeed possible to classify metaphors in several other ways but these ways are of a special importance in the cognitive linguistic vi

Conclusion. 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
3. own intuitions? *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 4, 2006. – P. 135-152.
4. Kövecses Z. *Metaphors of anger, pride, and love: A lexical approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 2003. – 197 p.
5. 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.
6. Кубрякова Е. С. Об установках когнитивной науки и актуальных проблемах когнитивной лингвистики // *Известия АН. Серия литературы и языка*, том 63, № 3, 2004.
7. <https://sites.google.com/site/derzispit/6-speak-on-the-stylistic-analysis-on-the-graphic-level>
8. <http://www.etymonline.com>