GENERAL DIRECTIONS OF METAPHORIZATION ASSOCIATED WITH FIGURATIVE WORLDVIEW

Karjawbaev Orazali Esbosin uli
Karakalpak state University named after Berdakh, Bachelor degree of the faculty of English linguistics 2-nd year student.
Scientific advisor: **Toleubayeva A.O**
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10878706

ABSTRACT

This article argues that a more precise definition of the subject of study would be beneficial for metaphor research. There are three distinct ways to do metaphor research: as a component of grammar or use, as a component of language or cognition, or as a component of sign systems or behavior. Eight separate study domains that each have their own assumptions about metaphorical meaning and their own implications and repercussions for the goals and assessment of research arise when these three dimensions are crossed. These distinctions are supposed to make statements regarding the use of conceptual metaphor in language more credible.

Introduction: Aristotle is responsible for one of the most important linguistic discoveries in history. He used the term metaphor (derived from the Greek words meta, which means "beyond," and pherein, which means "to carry") to describe a phenomenon that was intuitively understood in his time but had not yet been formally identified. Before Aristotle, authors and philosophers merely thought that some words may be employed to add "figurative" (decorative) flourishes to straightforward literal conversation, and that this usage was the domain of poets and orators rather than a natural part of daily linguistic communication.

Metaphor, or figurative language in general, is still viewed by many people today as an ornamental type of language that is employed to make statements more vibrant, elaborate, or otherwise idiomatic. Nonetheless, studies on metaphor and metaphorical language in general conducted in the 20th century have made it abundantly clear that such language is not at all idiomatic; rather, it is as systematic as any regularly used discourse element.

Fundamentally, verbal metaphors are directing. People frequently describe social relationships in terms of temperature (e.g., "She is a warm person"), but we seldom use the converse metaphor, when we describe social relationships in terms of temperature. Its directionality is attributed by Conceptual Metaphor Theory [2:99] to an underlying unidirectional "conceptual mapping" between the relevant domains that is based on our physical experience. Recent psychophysical studies, however, have demonstrated that these conceptual linkages are

bidirectional: The opposite is also true, as thinking about a friendly or unfriendly social situation can change an individual's perception of room temperature. Not only can manipulations of an individual's experience of physical warmth affect that individual's judgment of another person or situation as friendly or unfriendly. The assumption that we frequently think figuratively as well as communicate metaphorically has emerged as a result of the extensive usage of metaphorical language in our daily interactions. A variety of conventionalized metaphorical systems of concepts, sometimes known as conceptual metaphors, have served as the foundation for this theory of metaphor. Such conceptual analogies are fundamental to human language and thinking about time, causality, the mind, the self, and morality, as demonstrated by Lakoff. [2:103] For example, time is typically thought of in terms of space in many languages and cultures, allowing us to anticipate the future, reflect on the past, and so on. Even film names with puns, like Back to the Future, are now possible.

With a focus on the following four themes: Metaphor and Linguistic Diversity, Metaphor and Cognition, Metaphor and Communication, and Metaphor and Creativity, The Metaphor Compass:

Directions for Metaphor Research in Language, Cognition, Communication, and Creativity offers a road map for navigating the most recent discoveries and cutting-edge research on metaphor conducted worldwide. The study in this book makes use of a range of empirical techniques, including computer modeling, corpus analysis, behavioral experiments, and neuroimaging. It is divided into four sections and includes a variety of educational materials, such as tasks to help readers retain the concepts covered in each chapter, at the end of each section.

For anyone interested in learning more about figurative language and creativity, this is a great resource for students, researchers, and academics in the fields of linguistics, communication, anthropology, psychology, and cognitive science.

Other aspects of knowledge and understanding are, according to most versions of the theory, grounded indirectly through a chain of metaphors that connect very abstract concepts with increasingly concrete ones: Once a domain of knowledge becomes well known, it can itself serve as a source domain (basis) for understanding more novel concepts. [1: 209]

Naming of Parts

But soft, what light through yonder window breaks?

It is the east and Juliet is the sun!

(William Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet, 2. 2. 2–3)

—History, Stephen said, is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake.

(James Joyce, Ulysses, chap. 2)

A work is a death mask of its conception.

(Walter Benjamin, Einbahnstraße)

When we resort to metaphor, we contrive to talk about two things at once; two different and disparate subject matters are mingled to rich and unpredictable effect. One of these subject matters is already under discussion or at least up for consideration when a speaker resorts to metaphor in the first place. This is the metaphor's primary subject or tenor: the young girl Juliet in the case of Romeo's metaphor; history, Ireland's history or the world's, in the case of Stephen's; works, prose writings in general, in the case of Benjamin's. The second subject matter is newly introduced with an eye to temporarily enriching our resources for thinking and talking about the first. This is the metaphor's secondary subject or vehicle: the sun; nightmares from which one tries to awake; death masks, i.e., death masks in general. The primary subject of a metaphor may be a particular thing, or it may be a whole kind of thing, and likewise for the secondary subject—with the result that the metaphor itself may take the verbal form of an identity statement (X is Y) as with Romeo; a predication or membership statement (X is a G) as with Stephen Daedalus; or a statement of inclusion (Fs are Gs) as with Benjamin.mask of its conception.

(Walter Benjamin, *Einbahnstraße*)

When we resort to metaphor, we contrive to talk about two things at once; two different and disparate subject matters are mingled to rich and unpredictable effect. One of these subject matters is already under discussion or at least up for consideration when a speaker resorts to metaphor in the first place. This is the metaphor's *primary subject* or *tenor:* the young girl Juliet in the case of Romeo's metaphor; history, Ireland's history or the world's, in the case of Stephen's; works, prose writings in general, in the case of Benjamin's. The second subject matter is newly introduced with an eye to temporarily enriching our resources for thinking and talking about the first. This is the metaphor's *secondary subject* or *vehicle:* the sun; nightmares from which one tries to awake; death masks, i.e., death masks in general. The primary subject of a metaphor may be a particular thing, or it may be a whole kind of thing, and likewise for the secondary subject—with the result that the metaphor itself may take the verbal form of an identity statement (*X is Y*) as with Romeo; a predication or membership statement (*X is a G*) as with Stephen Daedalus; or a statement of inclusion (*Fs are Gs*) as with Benjamin.

Metaphor is only one of numerous methods, both known and unknown, for comparing things verbally. In what is referred to be a simile, we may use an explicit comparison of one object to another, based around like, as, or any other explicit comparative construction:.

One walking a fall meadow finds on all sides
The Queen-Anne's lace lying *like* lilies on water.
(Richard Wilbur, "The Beautiful Changes")

He looked about *as* inconspicuous *as* a tarantula on a slice of angel food.
(Raymond Chandler, *Farewell, My Lovely*, chap. 1)

Nonetheless, certain metaphors are explicit in the sense that they use locutions frequently seen in overt literal affirmations of identification, membership, or inclusion to compare one or more named things or types to one or more other named things or kinds:[4:72]

I am a moth and you are a flame.

I, Ahab, am a speeding locomotive.

In conclusion:

The metaphorical phrase indicates, suggests, initiates, or conjures up a (potential) game of make-believe (in its context). The statement may be a vocal act of involvement in the implied game or it could just be the utterance of a sentence that could be utilized in the game. The speaker discusses items that are or would be used as props in the supposed game when she says what she does. In advantageous circumstances, it could be conceivable to reasonably paraphrase what she says about them. If the speaker's speech is an act of verbal participation in a game, the paraphrase will usually indicate characteristics of the props by virtue of which it would be fictitious in the implied game if the speaker spoke honestly.

References:

1. Aitchison, Jean. (1999). Linguistics. 5th ed. London: Teach Yourself Books.
2. Branden, John. (2009). "Metaphor and Context: A Perspective from Artificial Intelligence." In Metaphor and Discourse, ed. Andreas Musolff and Jorg Zinken. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
3. Martinich, A.P., 1984, "A Theory for Metaphor," *Journal of Literary Semantics*.
4. Montague, Richard, 1974, *Formal Philosophy; Selected Papers of Richard Montague*, Richmond H. Thomason (ed.), New Haven: Yale University Press.
5. Moran, Richard, 1989, "Seeing and Believing: Metaphor, Image, and Force," *Critical Inquiry*.