UDK: 81'25 + 81'373.612.2

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN METAPHOR AND CONCEPTUAL DOMAINS IN COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS

Turamuratova Iroda Ilkhombaevna
Doctor of Philosophy of Philological Sciences (PhD), Head of Department of Theoretical Sciences of Spanish Language, Uzbekistan State University of World Languages,
Email:iroda1983@gmail.com
i.turamuratova@uzswlu.uz

Abstract: This article explores the intricate relationship between metaphor and conceptual domains within the framework of cognitive linguistics. Drawing upon contemporary theories of conceptual metaphor, we argue that metaphor is not merely a rhetorical device but a fundamental cognitive mechanism through which abstract concepts are understood and structured in terms of more concrete, experientially grounded domains. We delve into how source domains provide the scaffolding for target domains, shaping our understanding of everything from emotions and time to scientific theories. Through an examination of various linguistic examples and theoretical perspectives, this article illuminates the pervasive influence of metaphorical mapping in human thought and language.

Keywords: Cognitive Linguistics, Conceptual Metaphor, Conceptual Domains, Metaphorical Mapping, Embodiment, Cognitive Semantics

Introduction: The study of metaphor has undergone a radical transformation within the past few decades, moving from a peripheral concern of literary analysis to a central tenet of cognitive science. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's groundbreaking work, Metaphors We Live By (1980), inaugurated a paradigm shift, demonstrating that metaphor is not just a figure of speech, but a fundamental aspect of human cognition. This cognitive turn posits that we understand abstract concepts by mapping knowledge from concrete, often bodily, experiences. This process, known as conceptual metaphor, highlights a profound and systematic relationship between two distinct areas of experience: a source domain and a target domain.

Relevance of Work: Understanding the relationship between metaphor and conceptual domains is crucial for several reasons. Firstly, it offers profound insights into the nature of human thought. By revealing the underlying metaphorical structures that shape our conceptual systems, we gain a deeper appreciation for how we make sense of the world, acquire knowledge, and communicate meaning. Secondly, this understanding has significant implications for various fields, including education, where it can inform more effective teaching methodologies; artificial intelligence, by providing models for how machines might process and understand abstract information; and communication studies, by shedding light on persuasive language and cross-cultural understanding. Furthermore, it contributes to a more nuanced appreciation of linguistic diversity, as different cultures may employ distinct conceptual metaphors to structure similar experiences.

Purpose: The primary purpose of this article is to delineate and elaborate upon the systematic relationship between metaphor and conceptual domains in cognitive linguistics. Specifically, we aim to:

1.　　　Explain the theoretical foundations of conceptual metaphor theory and its core tenets.

2.   Illustrate how various abstract concepts are understood through metaphorical mappings from concrete source domains.

3.   Discuss the cognitive implications of these mappings, particularly regarding embodiment and experiential grounding.

4.   Provide linguistic examples to demonstrate the pervasive nature of conceptual metaphors in everyday language.

5.   Highlight the ongoing scholarly debates and future directions in the study of metaphor and conceptual domains.

Materials and Methods of Research: This article is based on a comprehensive review of extant literature in cognitive linguistics, particularly focusing on conceptual metaphor theory and related conceptual blending theory. The primary "materials" are theoretical frameworks, empirical studies, and linguistic analyses found in academic journals, books, and conference proceedings. The "methods" employed in this research are primarily analytical and interpretive. We engage in:

- **Theoretical Synthesis:** Integrating insights from key scholars in the field to present a cohesive understanding of the relationship between metaphor and conceptual domains.

- **Linguistic Analysis:** Examining a range of linguistic examples (idioms, everyday expressions, grammatical constructions) to demonstrate the manifestations of conceptual metaphors. This involves identifying recurrent patterns of mapping between source and target domains.

- **Conceptual Explication:** Defining and clarifying core cognitive linguistic concepts such as source domain, target domain, mapping, and embodiment.

- **Critical Evaluation:** Considering different perspectives and ongoing debates within cognitive linguistics regarding the precise nature and scope of conceptual metaphor.

Results and Discussion: The core finding of cognitive linguistics concerning metaphor is that it is not merely a linguistic flourish but a pervasive cognitive mechanism. We consistently understand abstract concepts in terms of more concrete, often physical, experiences. This is exemplified by numerous conceptual metaphors, such as:

- **ARGUMENT IS WAR:** We "win" or "lose" arguments, "attack" points, and "defend" positions. The concrete domain of war provides the structure for understanding the abstract domain of argument.

- **TIME IS MONEY:** We "spend" time, "waste" time, and "save" time. This mapping structures our perception of time as a valuable commodity.

- **UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING:** We "see" a point, "shed light on" an issue, or have a "hazy" understanding. The visual experience of seeing provides the framework for cognitive comprehension.

- **AFFECTION IS WARMTH:** We speak of "warm" feelings, "cold" shoulders, and "lukewarm" responses. The physical sensation of temperature maps onto emotional states.

These examples illustrate how source domains (war, money, seeing, warmth) provide the conceptual scaffolding for target domains (argument, time, understanding, affection). The mappings are systematic, meaning that not just individual words, but entire inferential structures from the source domain are transferred to the target domain.

Furthermore, the concept of embodiment is central to this relationship. Our physical interactions with the world and our sensory experiences form the basis of many of our conceptual metaphors. This suggests that cognition is not disembodied, but deeply rooted in our physical existence.

While the fundamental role of conceptual metaphor is widely accepted, ongoing discussions include: the degree to which these metaphors are universal versus culturally specific; the role of novel metaphors in extending our conceptual systems; and the interplay between conceptual metaphor and

other cognitive processes like conceptual blending. Some scholars argue for a more nuanced view of the directionality of mapping, while others explore the neural underpinnings of metaphorical thought.

Conclusion: In conclusion, cognitive linguistics has profoundly reshaped our understanding of metaphor, revealing it to be a fundamental mechanism by which we structure and comprehend abstract conceptual domains. Far from being a mere decorative feature of language, metaphor is deeply embedded in our cognitive architecture, allowing us to make sense of the world through systematic mappings from more concrete, experientially grounded source domains. This pervasive cognitive process underpins our understanding of emotions, time, knowledge, and even abstract scientific principles. The ongoing study of the intricate relationship between metaphor and conceptual domains continues to yield crucial insights into the nature of human thought, language, and the embodied mind, highlighting the power of metaphorical thinking in shaping our conceptual reality.

References:

1. Evans, V., & Green, M. (2006). Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction. Lawrence Erlbaum.
2. Gibbs, R. W. (1994). The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding. Cambridge University Press.
3. Lakoff, G. (1993). "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor". In A. Ortony (Ed.), Metaphor and Thought (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
4. Jo'raqulov, B. (2005). Tilda metafora: nazariy va amaliy masalalar. Toshkent: O'zbekiston fanlar akademiyasi nashriyoti.
5. Karimov, A. (2012). O'zbek tilidagi metaforalarning kognitiv xususiyatlari. Filologiya fanlari nomzodi dissertatsiyasi. Toshkent.
6. Boboxonov, Sh. (2018). "Kognitiv lingvistika va til metaforalari". Filologiya masalalari jurnali, №1.
7. Salomov, A. (2008). Tilda obrazlilik va uning ifoda vositalari. Toshkent: Fan nashriyoti.
8. Yoqubov, S. (2020). "Metaforik tasvir va uning tilda aks etishi". O'zbek tili va adabiyoti jurnali, №3.