



SEMANTIC AND COGNITIVE APPROACHES TO THE ANALYSIS OF METAPHORICAL MODELS

Kamienieva Iryna

PhD in Philology, Doctor,

ORCID ID: -0000-0002-5013-3210

Wyższa Szkoła Turystyki i Języków Obcych,

Aleja Prymasa Tysiąclecia 38, 00-999 Warszawa

Abstract. *In modern human-oriented linguistics, the research of the national metaphorical system and its elements is carried out in many directions. The problem of the linguistic world-image is closely connected with the problem of the metaphor as one of the ways of its creation. The metaphor is the best way to explain and to understand abstract concepts. The article is about two main approaches to learning of metaphors, metaphorical models which determine the nature of metaphor and mechanism of formation. There are many directions of metaphor analysis. Theoretical studies have shown that metaphor is considered as language and cognitive phenomenon.*

Keywords: *semantic and cognitive approaches, metaphor, metaphor modeling, concept.*

Introduction

The analysis of works related to the problem of metaphorical modeling showed that two main approaches to modeling the process of metaphorization have been formed. They are cognitive (A.N. Baranov, E.V. Budaev, I.M. Kobozeva, A.P. Chudinov, etc.) and semantic (L.A. Kudryavtseva, O.N. Laguta, M.N. Lapshina, O.B. Ponomareva, G.N. Sklyarevskaya and others), according to which the metaphor is considered respectively as a cognitive and semantic model. A lot of works are devoted to the description of metaphorical models in texts, among which are studies of such linguists like T.S. Vershinin, R.D. Kerimov, E.V. Kolotnina, Yu.V. Kravtsova, A.B. Ryaposova, Yu.B. Fedeneva, I.A. Filatenko, O.M. Chadyuk and others), but many questions remain debatable.

Semantic and cognitive approaches to the analysis of metaphorical models have common points: the unity of the basic concepts of metaphorical modeling, the use of the term «metaphorical model», commonality in identifying the original and new spheres of model metaphorization.

There are many terms for designating metaphorical models that figuratively represent one or another denotative (conceptual) sphere. To designate such modeling, linguists use the terms «archetype» or «metaphorical archetype» (Panchenko, Smirnov), «conceptual metaphor», «basic metaphor» (Lakoff, Johnson), «mental model» (Johnson-Laird), «metaphorical model» (Baranov, Karaulov), «model of regular polysemy» (Shmelev; Chudinov), «metaphorical modeling» (Kravtsova), etc. All these terms have a different internal form that emphasizes the linguistic, general philological, psychological or cognitive aspects of the phenomenon under consideration, reflect the traditions of various scientific schools.

It should be noted that this is primarily due to the fact that the term «metaphorical model» itself is understood by researchers ambiguously. Therefore, there are discrepancies in the principles of classification, description of models. But when describing a metaphor as a cognitive model, such mandatory parameters as the



sphere-source, sphere-target are distinguished, and when characterizing a metaphor as a semantic model, the semantic spheres of producing and derived meanings are distinguished. The understanding of metaphor as a cognitive model is based on the idea of it as «a mental formation that reflects the process of cognition of the surrounding world and is explicated in the language» [5, 35]. These approaches are united by the presence of transference, the transfer of a name based on associative similarity.

Under the metaphorical model we mean «the scheme of verbalization of correlative concepts in the analogous associative plan that exists in the minds of native speakers, which is a three-component structure that includes the original and new denotative-conceptual spheres and a semantic-cognitive formant (associative feature), which is interpreted as a conceptual-associative a semantic element that integrates different entities that are similar in some respect» [5, 129]. The semantic-cognitive formant, which the linguist uses when describing a metaphorical model, reflects the systemic relations of cognitive and linguistic structures, emphasizing the essence of metaphor as a phenomenon of language and thinking.

In traditional linguistic semantics, to designate a semantic component, linguists use various terms for the linking generating and derived meanings of an element: «associative element» (Shmelev), «associative feature» (Novikov), «semantic formant» (Tropina). In our opinion, the term «associative feature», interpreted as a «general content-conceptual component» [8, 203-204] and is an essential motivating feature underlying the metaphorical projection. The study of associative features contributes to a deep understanding of the principles of the formation of lexico-semantic paradigms.

In the monograph by A.P. Chudinov «Metaphorical Mosaic in Modern Political Communication», the following definition of a metaphorical model is given: «A metaphorical model is an existing and emerging in the mind of a native speaker of a connection scheme between conceptual spheres, which can be represented by a certain formula «X is Y» [3, 70]. We will say in our study that X is represented as Y based on a certain associative feature.

The founders of cognitive linguistics J. Lakoff and M. Johnson proposed to consider one of the varieties of the cognitive model, namely the metaphorical model, as the main cognitive operation, the most important way of knowing the world by transferring a concept from a specific sphere to an abstract one. As a result, the structure of the original sphere is transferred to the system of the sphere subjected to metaphorical expansion.

Scientists have also identified several types of metaphorical models based on the relationship between source and target areas, among which a special role is assigned to ontological metaphors. Such metaphors identify human experience with objects or substances. One of the most obvious cases of ontological metaphor is personification. In each such case, the inhuman acquires the properties of the human. The peculiarity of personification is the fact that that in each specific case of metaphorization, different properties of a person are used. Thus, personification is a general category that includes a wide range of metaphors, each of which is based on specific human properties [7, 49–60].



According to A.P. Grishchenko, G.N. Sklyarevskaya, A.P. Chudinov, if we take as a basis the conceptual differentiation of the source areas of metaphorical modeling, we can distinguish five main types of models that are updated in the study, that is, the study of the metaphorization of the concepts of natural phenomena on the material of a poetic text: anthropomorphic, zoomorphic, phytomorphic, naturomorphic and artifact (objective) metaphors [4, 141–145], [Sklyarevskaya, p. 45–60], [3, 238]. These models are cognitive structures of a higher order and are detailed already in specific metaphorical expressions.

In creating poetic texts, it is important not only to convey the subjective worldview embodied in metaphor, but also to include metaphor in the fabric of the work, the compatibility of metaphor. A.N. Baranov argues that the compatibility of metaphorical models is not only a feature of style, but also some patterns of linguistic and cognitive semantics, manifested in the types of compatibility [2, 73–74]. At the level of lexical semantics, lexical and semantic compatibility (according to Yu.D. Apresyan) can serve as an analogue of the joint compatibility of metaphors, and at the cognitive level - the interaction of cognitive structures – knowledge structures. The types of compatibility are explained on the basis of semantic and cognitive principles that affect the formation of thematic fields.

Thematically related fields are «metaphorical models». [2, 77]. Metaphorical models, being more general, can include narrower models, which allows, in the process of metaphorization, to reveal narrower meanings of the phenomenon in question in a poetic text. So, in different metaphorical models of poetic texts, the same associative feature is observed. This is explained by the fact that «the degree of opposition between the linguistic and mental systems in different cases is different and is determined by the number of intermediate associations necessary for the perception of the combination, and the complexity of their formation» [11, 66]. The presence of the same associative feature allows us to talk about the intersection of thematic fields.

Metaphorization is based on metaphorical motivation, which is understood by the author as the ratio of primary meaning and secondary meaning, based on the commonality of the associative feature of different objects of reality, similar in analogous associative terms.

The transfer of associative features in the language takes place through the prism of specific meanings, formed as a result of direct observation and sensation of objects and phenomena associated with them.

In cognitive studies of metaphor, the emphasis is on psychological factors, among which a significant role belongs to associative links.

An analysis of metaphorical nominations built on the basis of the actualization of the associative potential of lexemes reveals the internal mechanism for organizing units in the structure of basic conceptual metaphors, which J. Lakoff and M. Johnson wrote about. In the structure of the basic metaphor, the base of metaphorical association (source area) and the base of the associative figurative potential of the corresponding concept (target area) are metaphorically associatively correlated.

The metaphor actualizes the associative links within the source area of metaphorical naming and makes it possible for basic language metaphors to act as



key text metaphors. On the one hand, the key text metaphor is a variant of the implementation of the basic language metaphor, embodying part of its figurative potential in specific lexical representations. On the other hand, the complexity of the basic metaphor allows the text metaphor to perform the functions of structuring the meaning of either the entire text as a whole or its fragment.

It is important to note that the metaphorical structuring of conceptual areas is not global, not complete, but partial [7, 33]. Human consciousness brings two entities closer together on the basis of some common feature or features caused by associations.

An associative sign or a set of signs that create a single impression, serving as the basis for the process of metaphORIZATION, N.G. Sklyarevskaya calls the transfer symbol. The transfer symbol is defined as «a connotative feature of the original word, transformed in the process of metaphORIZATION into a defining feature of the metaphor» [10, 57–65]. The linguist connects the subject and object of metaphor and presents them as a unity.

Cognitive representations of reality based on the idea of the metaphorical transfer are realized in specific linguistic forms that have certain semantic, emotional, informational and stylistic statuses in the sentence and their own functional characteristics.

Linguist O.N. Laguta, highlights the main features underlying metaphORIZATION: formative; color; taste; weight; sound; temporary; temperature; tactile; consistency; functional; implemented; characterizing the manifestation of the object; dynamic; quantitative; relational; subjective-psychological [6, 137]. In our opinion, this classification reflects the associative links of generating and derived meanings in the case of ordinary metaphORIZATION, which is based on several motivating features, and therefore we will rely on it in the analysis of metaphorical models.

The analysis of the specifics of the metaphorical modeling of a literary text is built on the correlation of the artistic structures of the work and the cognitive potential of the metaphorical nomination: since the metaphorical meaning is always based on a sensual component that works on an unconscious level, a metaphorical expression is able to convey the content by relying on a visual-sensory image. Researcher T.V. Meshchankina shows how a metaphorical model that implements associative-sensory images makes it possible to «compact» the virtual space of the text, to make it more realistic [9, 106–117; 34–37]. It follows from this that the identification of a metaphorical fragment of the language picture of the world was the basis for subsequent studies of basic language metaphorical models conditioned by cognitive specification. The analysis of metaphorical modeling of texts, on the one hand, deepens and expands knowledge about the potential of linguo-cognitive models of metaphor formation, on the other hand, is a contribution to the development of the theory of cognitive modeling.

Taking as a basis the method of constructing metaphorical models by Yu.V. Kravtsova [5], we propose the following cognitive procedure: 1) analysis and systematization of the corpus of metaphorical contexts; 2) construction of basic metaphorical models; 3) definition of associative features; 4) comparison of metaphorical models, identification of patterns of metaphorical modeling; 5)



establishment and description of key metaphorical concepts.

The use of a linguocognitive approach in the analysis of metaphorical models suggests that a metaphor is understood as a mental operation that combines two conceptual spheres. This allows you to use the possibilities of structuring the source sphere when conceptualizing a new sphere. Thanks to the semantic analysis of the metaphor, the basis of metaphorization is established, and the cognitive analysis determines the conceptual spheres involved in the metaphorical projection. A metaphor is a secondary meaning created on the basis of certain associative features. According to the cognitive approach, when analyzing a metaphor, conceptual convergence is perceived as an important factor. For the purpose of an integrated analysis of metaphorical models, the linguocognitive approach is the most appropriate, since due to the combination of semantic and cognitive analysis, uniform modeling parameters and principles for classifying metaphorical models are established.

Conclusion

Consideration of poetry from a cognitive point of view, according to J. Lakoff and M. Johnson, led to the need to study conceptual metaphor and metaphorical conceptual systems in a poetic text, emphasizing that the language of poetry, as well as everyday language, belongs to the spheres of functioning of cognitive metaphor. The study of philosophical lyrics in this aspect will make it possible to identify the features of the functioning of a cognitive metaphor in a poetic text, and will also provide an opportunity to present the subjective worldview of a poet.

References

1. Apresyan Yu.D. Lexical semantics. Volume 1. M.: School «Languages of Culture», 1995. 472 p.
2. Baranov A.N. A cognitive theory of metaphor almost 20 years later. M.: Editorial URSS, 2004. P. 7–21.
3. Chudinov A.P. A Cognitive Study of Political Metaphor (1991 – 2000): Monograph. Ural. state ped. un-t. Yekaterinburg, 2001. 238 p. Glazunova O.I. The logic of metaphorical transformations. St. Petersburg. 2000. 190 p.
4. Grishchenko A.P. Contemporary Ukrainian literary language. K.: Vishcha shkola, 1997. P. 141–145.
5. Kravtsova Yu.V. Metaphorical modeling of the world in a literary text: semantic-cognitive analysis. K.: M.P. Dragomanova Publishing house of NPU, 2014. 320 p.
6. Laguta O.N. Metaphorology: theoretical aspects. Novosibirsk. 2003. Part I. 114 p.
7. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live by. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. 237 p.
8. Novikov L.A. Antonymy. Semantic analysis of opposites in vocabulary. M., 1973. 155 p.
9. Meshankina N.A. Metaphorical models of sound in the Russian language picture of the world. Metaphorical Fragment of the Russian Linguistic Picture of the World: Key Concepts. Voronezh, 2003, pp. 76–144.



10. Sklyarevskaya G.N. *Metaphor in the system of language*. St. Petersburg, 1993. 152 p.

11. Stepanchenko I.I. *Functionalism as an alternative linguistic paradigm (based on literary texts)*. Kyiv: «Ukrainian Vidavnitstvo», 2014, pp. 66–67.