

ünsiyyət nəzəriyyəsinin əsaslarını bilmək bir dilçi, tərcüməçi, xarici dillər müəllimi, habelə bu və ya digər şəkildə əcnəbilərlə ünsiyyət qurmalı, beynəlxalq danışıqlarda, söhbətlərdə, xarici dildə (və bu səbəbdən xarici mədəniyyət) auditoriyada mühazirələrdə iştirak etməli olan bir mütəxəssisin hazırlanmasının ayrılmaz hissəsidir.

ПРИМЕНЕНИЕ ТЕОРИИ МЕЖКУЛЬТУРНОЙ КОММУНИКАЦИИ В ДЕЛОВОМ ПЕРЕВОДЕ

Касимова Самира Фируддин кызы

Резюме

Межкультурная коммуникация – это особая часть общей теории коммуникации, теоретически и практически – исследует коммуникативное взаимодействие представителей разных культур. Данное учебное пособие призвано познакомить студентов с основами теории межкультурной коммуникации как особой области научных знаний и возможностями применения этой теории в реальной коммуникативной практике. Знание основ теории межкультурной коммуникации является неотъемлемой частью подготовки лингвиста, переводчика, учителя иностранного языка, а также специалиста, который должен так или иначе общаться с иностранцами, участвовать в международных разговорах, беседах, лекциях на иностранном языке (а значит, и иностранной культуре).

Rəyçi: f.f.d. dosent Rəhimov Mehdi Nizami oğlu

“Qrammatika və ingilis dilinin tədrisi” kafedrasının 02.07.2020 tarixli iclasın 18 sayılı protokolu

Daxil olma tarixi 03 mart 2021-ci il

UOT:811.

CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR AND METONYMY

Guliyeva Fazila Fazil

Azerbaijan State Agrarian University

fazilaguliyeva8826@gmail.com

Abstract: The paper deals with Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT). It should be noted that CMT met with severe criticism from psycholinguists. But the success of CMT has been overwhelming, both in CL and outside it. In CMT metaphor and metonymy are regarded as processes of thought, and not just a question of language. In other words, metaphors and metonymies are seen as basically conceptual processes, which subsequently find expression in a number of concrete forms, both verbal and non-verbal. Metaphor can be expressed, not only in language, but also in visual, audio or sensory-motor media such as drawing, painting, architecture, music, dance and gesture. It is ultimately grounded in the human perceptual system and experiential world. The perceptual system is based on a number of pre-conceptual, most of all spatial configurations which allow humans to react to, and manipulate the world around them.

Key words: Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), verbal and non-verbal, perceptual system, experiential world, spatial configurations.

Ключевые слова: Теория Концептуальной Метафоры (ТКМ), вербальное и невербальное, перцептивная система, эмпирический мир, пространственные конфигурации.

Açar sözlər: Konseptual Metafora Nəzəriyyəsi (KMN), verbal və qeyri-verbal, qavrayış sistemi, təcrübə dünyası, məkan konfigürasiyaları

How conceptual and how linguistic? To a large extent, CL owes its breakthrough to the innovative work by Lakoff and Johnson (9), which launched Conceptual Metaphor Theory

(CMT). This breakthrough is remarkable if one takes into account that, from early on, CMT met with severe criticism from psycholinguists (18, 53-76). But the success of CMT has been overwhelming, both in CL and outside it, even in many other sciences such as therapy and social studies. A positive evolution is found in the development of Conceptual Metonymy Theory (CMyT), which is now an equivalent partner of CMT. In CMT metaphor and metonymy are regarded as processes of thought, and not just a question of language. In other words, metaphors and metonymies are seen as basically conceptual processes, which subsequently find expression in a number of concrete forms, both verbal and non-verbal. From a linguistic viewpoint, however, the problem is that a given linguistic form is usually linked to various conceptual categories such that the form seems to trigger off or create the conceptual links between these categories, which might not be there without the linguistic form. In theory, one cannot fully ignore the impact of the linguistic form on the coherence between diverse metaphorical conceptualizations. At least, this holds for verbal metaphor, but perhaps far less so, or even not at all, for non-verbal metaphors.

Before going into a more detailed analysis of CMT, it may be appropriate to deal first with some of the criticism on the basic CMT claims. The priority attributed by CMT to the conceptual level has been criticized on the grounds that one first needs a literal linguistic expression and its semantic-conceptual domain, e.g. the fruit of a plant, before it can be mapped onto a different domain, e.g. the fruit of one's hard work (1;49-74; 19;113-130; 6;1123-1128). However, this criticism is rather vacuous, since metaphor can be expressed, not only in language, but also in visual, audio or sensory-motor media such as drawing, painting, architecture, music, dance and gesture. The mere existence of non-verbal or multimodal metaphors (4; 379-402) is a clear counterargument, since there is no reason why verbal or linguistic metaphors should be submitted to different conditions than non-verbal ones. The question is then rather: what exactly is the conceptual element in verbal or non-verbal metaphors according to CMT? Lakoff and Johnson (9) start from the assumption, fully spelled out in Johnson (8), that metaphor is ultimately grounded in the human perceptual system and experiential world. The perceptual system is based on a number of pre-conceptual, most of all spatial, configurations which allow humans to react to, and manipulate, the world around them. This assumption is basically in agreement with the phenomenologist views propounded by Merleau-Ponty and Violi. The perceiver imposes structure on the things perceived, as is clearly expressed in the following quotation taken from Violi (18; 53-76). According to Merleau-Ponty, meaning is in the first place articulated in our body, through perception. Also for the French philosopher perception is not merely the simple and passive record of an external world, already structured and pre-given in its configuration; perception is rather the active construction of a world already endowed with meaning and intentionality. The label Lakoff and Johnson coined for such perceptual configurations is image schemas (5), i.e. topological, pre-conceptual structures that encompass sensory-motor and visual schemas such as motion (animate, inanimate, caused or self-motion), containment/container, path (source-path-goal), link, part-whole, center-periphery, balance, contact, support, blockage, verticality (up-down), horizontality (front-back), and proximity-distance. As the human mind and language develop, image schemas serve as the basis for categorizing phenomena in the physical domain and, by means of metaphor, phenomena in concrete domains are used to come to terms with experiences in the more abstract mental domains. Thus we tend to conceptualize the emotion of anger as a heated substance via the conceptual metaphor (hence in upper case), love is a hot fluid in a container, which may be expressed in various linguistic metaphors such as *My blood was boiling*, *He was seething with anger*. Time is envisaged as motion in space, either as inanimate motion via time is a moving object (*The years flow by*) or as self-motion of an observer via time is an end point for a moving observer (*We are coming up to Christmas*). Events and states are captured in a complex event structure metaphor

consisting of various subtypes such as states, changes of state, causes, actions, purposes, means, and difficulties. All of these are conceptualized in terms of spatial image schemata: states are locations (be in doubt), change of state is change of location (get into trouble), action is self-propelled motion, purposes (of action) are destinations, means are paths (to destinations), and difficulties are impediments to motion or blockage. Lakoff and Johnson claim that such basic conceptual metaphors may well be universal since human bodily experience is basically the same all over the world.

Research on the universality of conceptual metaphor has been burgeoning within CL. Although first research results, for instance, on the spatialization of time seemed to confirm this universal tendency, it was soon found out that far more contrastive research was required: Marin (10; 37-52) for English and Spanish; Alverson for English, Mandarin Chinese, Hindi, and Sesotho (16). Even if the spatialization of time occurs in many cultures, there may be huge differences. Thus Boroditsky (2; 1-22) shows in empirical research that the Western concept of time as a “horizontal” time line and the Chinese as a “vertical” one influences the location of months before or after one another. Another remarkable difference in metaphorical conceptualization was found by Ning Yu (20) for the domain of emotion: whereas, according to Lakoff and Kovecses, English sees anger as a hot fluid in a “whole body” container, Chinese sees it as hot gases in smaller body-part containers called “belly fire,” “kidney fire,” “liver fire,” etc. Here traditional Chinese philosophy and medical practice leads to a far more concrete, bodily self-experience. The research by Boroditsky and Yu thus offers evidence both for the adequacy of Lakoff and Johnson’s universal claims at a fairly abstract level and for the great, colorful variation of culture-specific realizations of these putative universal conceptual metaphors. Although Lakoff and Johnson (9) did not neglect metonymy altogether, they defined it in terms of metaphor: metaphor was seen as a mapping, i.e. a set of correspondences across different conceptual domains, and metonymy as a mapping within one domain. However, their metaphor revolution received virtually all of the attention and it took almost another twenty years to fully redress the balance between metaphor and metonymy, a position that had already been defended some time before by Jakobson (7;54-82).

Ruiz de Mendoza and Otal (12;27–42,50–56) were the first to define metonymy fully independently from metaphor. Lakoff, Johnson, Turner, Radden, and others, see metonymy either as having a referential function, whereby one entity “stands for” another entity within the same cognitive domain, or else as serving as a reference point that offers access to the other entity. These approaches cannot, however, account for constraints on these referential functions. While it is not denied that these referential functions are often served by metonymies, it is not their essence. Ruiz de Mendoza and Otal (12) conclude this from the existence of predicate metonymies such as *Mary is a pretty face*, in which a pretty face does not “stand for” the person of Mary, but is rather a very salient feature that even serves to sum up the whole person. The authors do agree with Lakoff and Johnson’s domain criterion: in the case of a metaphor like *John is a pig* there are always at least two different domains involved (people are animals), whereas in metonymy only one domain is involved, usually a domain and a subdomain (people and their faces). Just like in metaphor source features are mapped onto target structures, also in metonymy we are dealing with mappings, i.e. conceived and imposed connections or correspondences between features in the source and the target. In metonymy, the salient features of the whole domain are mapped onto the subdomain or salient features of the subdomain are mapped onto the whole domain as in the above example: *Mary not only has a pretty face but she is a pretty face*. By saying this, the speaker identifies Mary as a pretty face: the beautiful and attractive features of the face dominate the person’s whole being. Unlike in CMT with its claim to one-directionality, i.e. from source to target, CMYT has, because of the domain/subdomain relationship, one more possibility. Thus, the pretty

face example is a source-in-target metonymy: the source, pretty face, is part of and maps onto the target, Mary. The target is the most encompassing conceptual structure, or matrix domain, and, as such, it is the only domain available for further reference, as in The pretty face is paying her bill. This remarkable potential is called “domain availability.” The opposite case is a target-in-source metonymy like *Bush attacked Iraq*, where “Bush” stands for “army.” Although traditionally examples like this have been seen as cases of part-for-part metonymy, Ruiz de Mendoza and Otal claim that this example is a wholepart metonymy. Our encyclopedic knowledge about Bush is such that it includes his being the president of his country, the commander-in-chief of the army, the leader of the Republican Party, etc. But the target, i.e. the referent that is meant in the sentence about attacking Iraq, is only the U.S. army. So the target (army) is a subdomain of the source (Bush), which now serves as the matrix domain. Bush as the source is mapped onto the army as target. In this target-in-source metonymy, the target is no longer available for reference, because it is encapsulated in the source and, hence, no anaphoric reference to the intended referent is possible: *Soon after Bush attacked Iraq, it (the U.S. army) took Bagdad*. In other words, the target in a metonymy is only referentially accessible if it is not encapsulated in some other subdomain. The newer CL approach to metonymy not only re-analyzes metonymy itself, but has also rethought some central aspects of pragmatics in a cognitive sense.

A pioneering effort in this respect is Thornburg and Panther's (17; 205-219) metonymic analysis of indirect speech acts. In their view, indirect speech acts of the types that Searle (15;1-29) calls directive, commissive, and expressive such as promises, offers, requests, suggestions, etc., can be described in terms of metonymic models. In other words, just as a speaker can refer to a person by mentioning a salient feature of that person, a speaker can perform a speech act by calling up an attribute of that speech act, e.g. the speech act participants' ability (Can you pass the salt?), their volition (Would you please sign here?), or the reason to perform the action (Why don't we stop here?). This approach works not only for overt speech acts, but also for other constructions such as hedged performatives (May I ask if you're married?) and sentences expressing sense perceptions (You can hear the motorway from here) and mental activities (I am thinking aloud now), all of which corroborate the hypothesis that speech act metonymies are just special applications of more general metonymic principles. In Panther and Thornburg (17) this insight is variously applied to pragmatic inferencing. The contributions to that volume aim to bridge the gap between CL and inferential pragmatics. Topics not only include the role of metonymically-based inferences in speech act and discourse interpretation, but also grammar itself. Further questions dealt with are: what is the pragmatic meaning of grammatical constructions, what is the impact of metonymic mappings on grammatical structure, and what is the role of inferencing in linguistic change? It may thus be useful to refer to all these connections with the label cognitive pragmatics, which is intended to capture all attempts to explain most, if not all, major pragmatic phenomena in terms of the standard conceptual tools provided by CL. The relevance-theoretic distinction between explicatures and implicatures is a clear case in point. Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez (13; 293-320) have made this inferential pragmatics distinction compatible with Lakoff's notion of idealized cognitive model. The explicatures of an utterance are the result of a number of cognitive operations like expansion or reduction, whereby, due to metonymy, the utterance meaning can be associated with “more” meaning (expansion) or with “less” meaning (reduction). Implicatures are enabled by the processes of correlation or resemblance, which are forms of metaphor. Another example of the power of the explanatory tools of CL is provided by Ruiz de Mendoza and Baicchi's (14; 95-128) study of illocutionary constructions in terms of form meaning pairings where the meaning part consists of high-level situational scenarios like the Cost-Benefit cognitive model and a specification of the conditions that allow metonymic access to such scenarios.

This brief survey has attempted to highlight the main areas of interest of the CL enterprise from the point of view of its unity despite apparent diversity and of its ability to interact in a fruitful way with different disciplines related to language, mind, and the social context. It has also put into focus the strong descriptive and explanatory potential of the different strands of CL, which, far from being mutually contradictory accounts of language, can be regarded as highly complementary.

References

1. Bartsch, Renate 2002 Generating polysemy: Metaphor and metonymy. In: René Dirven and Ralf Pörings (eds.), *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*, 49–74. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
2. Boroditsky, Lera 2001 Does language shape thought? Mandarin and English speakers' conceptions of time. *Cognitive Psychology* 43: 1–22
3. Dirven and Pörings (eds.), 2002, *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*, 41–47. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter
4. Forceville, Charles 2006 Non-verbal and multimodal metaphor in a cognitivist framework: Agendas for research. In: Gitte Kristiansen, Michel Achard, René Dirven and Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza (eds.), *Cognitive Linguistics: Current Applications and Future Perspectives*, 379–402. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter
5. Hampe, Beate (In cooperation with Joseph E. Grady) (eds.) 2005 *From Perception to Meaning: Image Schemas in Cognitive Linguistics*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
6. Heiser, Marc, Marco Iacoboni, Fumiko Maeda, Jake Marcus and John C. Mazziotta 2003 The essential role of Broca's area in imitation. *European Journal of Neuroscience* 17: 1123–1128
7. Jakobson, Roman 1971 *The metaphor*

ric and metonymic poles. In: Roman Jakobson and Maurice Halle (eds.), *Fundamentals of Language*, 54–82. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter

8. Johnson, Mark 1987 *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Reason and Imagination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
9. Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson 1980 *Metaphors We Live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
10. Marin, Juana I. 1996 To die, to sleep: a contrastive study of metaphors for death and dying in English and Spanish. *Language Sciences* 18: 37–52. Alverson, Hoyt 1994 *Semantics and Experience: Universal Metaphors of Time in English*. Baltimore/London: John Hopkins University Press.
11. Panther, Klaus-Uwe and Linda Thornburg (eds.) 2003 *Metonymy and Pragmatic Inferencing*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
12. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibañez, Francisco J. 2000 The role of mappings and domains in understanding metonymy. In: Antonio Barcelona (ed.), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the 66 René Dirven and Francisco Jose Ruiz de Mendoza Ibañez Crossroads. A Cognitive Perspective*, 109–132. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter
13. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibanez, Francisco J. and Lorena Pérez Hernández 2003 Cognitive operations and pragmatic implication. In: Klaus-Uwe Panther and Linda Thornburg (eds.), *Metonymy and Pragmatic*, 293–320. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter
14. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibanez, Francisco J. and Annalisa Baicchi 2007 Illocutionary Constructions: Cognitive Motivation and Linguistic Realization. In: Istvan Kecskes and Laurence Horn (eds.), *Explorations in Pragmatics: Linguistic, Cognitive, and Intercultural Aspects*, 95–128. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter

15. Searle, John R. 1979 A taxonomy of illocutionary acts. In: John R. Searle, Expression and Meaning 1–29. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
16. Taylor, John R. 1995a Linguistic Categorization: Prototypes in Linguistic Theory. 2nd Revised Edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press
17. Thornburg, Linda and Klaus-Uwe Panther 1997 Speech act metonymies. In: Wolf-Andreas Liebert, Gisela Redeker and Linda Waugh (eds.), Discourse and Perspective in Cognitive Linguistics, 205–219. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins
18. Violi, Patrizia 2008 Beyond the body: towards a full embodied semiosis. In: M. Frank, René Dirven, Tom Ziemke, Enrique Bernárdez (eds.), Body, Language and Mind. Volume 2: Sociocultural Situatedness, 53–76. Roslyn Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
19. Warren, Beatrice 2002 An alternative account of the interpretation of referential metonymy and metaphor. In: René Dirven and Ralf Pörings (eds.), Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast, 113–130. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter
20. Yu, Ning 1998 The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. A Perspective from Chinese: John Benjamins

КОНЦЕПТУАЛЬНАЯ МЕТАФОРА И МЕТОНИМИЯ

Гулиева Фазиля Фазиль кызы

Резюме

В статье рассматривается теория концептуальной метафоры (ТКМ). Следует отметить, что ТКМ встретила жесткую критику со стороны психолингвистов. Но успех ТКМ был ошеломляющим, как в когнитивной лингвистике, так и за ее пределами. В ТКМ метафора и метонимия рассматриваются как процессы мышления, а не только как вопросы языка. Другими словами, метафоры и метонимии рассматриваются в основном как концептуальные процессы, которые впоследствии находят выражение в ряде конкретных форм, как вербальных, так и невербальных. Метафора может быть выражена не только в языке, но и в визуальных, звуковых или сенсомоторных средствах массовой информации, таких как рисунок, живопись, архитектура, музыка, танец и жест. В конечном счете, она основана на человеческой системе восприятия и эмпирическом мире. Система восприятия основана на ряде предконцептуальных, прежде всего пространственных конфигураций, которые позволяют людям реагировать на окружающий мир и манипулировать им.

KONSEPTUAL METAFORA VƏ METONİMİYA

Quliyeva Fazilə Fazil qızı

Xülasə

Məqalədə Konseptual Metafora Nəzəriyyəsi (KMN) müzakirə olunur. Qeyd etmək lazımdır ki, KMN psixolinqistlərin sərt tənqidi ilə qarşılaşmışdı. Ancaq KMN-nın uğuru həm koqnitiv dilçilikdə, həm də onun xaricində çox böyük idi. KMN-də metafora və metonimiya yalnız dil hadisələri deyil, düşüncə prosesləri kimi qəbul edilir. Başqa sözlə, metafora və metonimiya verbal və qeyri-verbal formalarda ifadə tapan konseptual proseslər kimi qəbul edilir. Metafora yalnız dildə deyil, həm də rəsm, memarlıq, musiqi, rəqs və jest kimi vizual, səsli və ya sensor-motor kütləvi informasiya vasitələrində öz əksini tapır. Nəticədə o insanın qavrayış sisteminə və təcrübə dünyasına əsaslanır. İnsanların idrak sistemi onlara ətraf aləmə reaksiya göstərməyə və onu manipulyasiya etməyə imkan verən məkan konfigurasiyasına əsaslanır.

Rəyçi: dos. Həsənova Aida Musa qızı

ADAU-nun Dillər Kafedrasının 15 aprel 2021-il 08 sayılı iclas protokolu

Daxil olma tarixi 20 aprel 2021-ci il