



<https://doi.org/10.70728/b.series.fil.v08.i08.033>

UDK 808.5

<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-3105-6352>

FUNCTIONAL LINGUISTIC AND THOUGHTRELATED ASPECTS OF METAPHOR

Abdusalomova Damira Abdufatoyevna

Trainee-assistant

Samarkand State Medical University

d.abdusalomova@mail.ru

Abstract. People invent metaphors to describe things and concepts in very vivid ways. When analysing organisations and systems we use them to provide novel insights and to solve problems. Metaphor is the interpersonal function of fostering intimacy between speakers and listeners (Cohen, 1979; Gibbs & Gerrig, 1989). In a theoretical way, metaphors depend upon mutual knowledge and conversational ground between speakers and listeners.

Key words: Metaphor, phenomena, cognition, knowledge, physical concept, conceptual schemes.

ФУНКЦИОНАЛЬНО-ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЕ И МЫСЛИТЕЛЬНЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ МЕТАФОРЫ

Аннотация. Люди создают метафоры для описания явлений и понятий в яркой и выразительной форме. При анализе организаций и систем они используются для получения новых инсайтов и решения проблем. Метафора выполняет межличностную функцию, способствуя установлению близости между говорящим и слушателем (Cohen, 1979; Gibbs & Gerrig, 1989). В теоретическом плане метафоры основаны на взаимных знаниях и общем коммуникативном фоне между участниками общения.

Ключевые слова: метафора, явление, когниция, знание, физическое понятие, концептуальные схемы.

METAFORANING FUNKSIONAL-LINGVISTIK VA TAFAKKURGA OID JIHATLARI

Annotatsiya. Insonlar metaforalardan narsa va tushunchalarni yorqin va obrazli tarzda ifodalash uchun foydalanadilar. Tashkilotlar va tizimlarni tahlil qilishda metaforalar yangi g'oyalar ishlab chiqish va muammolarni hal etishda muhim vosita bo'lib xizmat qiladi.

Metafora shuningdek, nutq jarayonida suhbatdoshlar o‘rtasida yaqinlikni shakllantiruvchi interaktiv (interpersonal) funksiyani bajaradi (Cohen, 1979; Gibbs & Gerrig, 1989). Nazariy jihatdan metaforalar suhbatdoshlar o‘rtasidagi umumiy bilim va kommunikativ muhitga asoslanadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: metafora, hodisa, kognitsiya, bilim, fizik tushuncha, konseptual sxemalar.

INTRODUCTION

Metaphor has long been regarded as one of the most powerful and multifaceted phenomena in human language and cognition. Traditionally viewed as a stylistic device confined to literary expression, metaphor has, in contemporary linguistic scholarship, evolved into a central subject of inquiry within Cognitive Linguistics, Psycholinguistics, and Discourse Analysis. Modern approaches, particularly those influenced by the conceptual metaphor framework developed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, emphasize that metaphor is not merely a decorative linguistic tool but a fundamental mechanism through which humans conceptualize abstract domains of experience.

From a functional linguistic perspective, metaphor plays a crucial role in structuring meaning, organizing discourse, and facilitating communication across different contexts. Within the framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics, metaphor is understood as a resource for meaning-making that allows speakers to encode experiential, interpersonal, and textual meanings in more flexible and nuanced ways. Functional approaches highlight how metaphor contributes to language economy, expressiveness, and adaptability, enabling speakers to convey complex ideas through familiar conceptual mappings.

Simultaneously, the thought-related (cognitive) dimension of metaphor underscores its role in shaping human reasoning, perception, and knowledge representation. Metaphorical thinking enables individuals to understand abstract concepts—such as time, emotion, and social relations—through more concrete and embodied experiences. This interaction between language and thought demonstrates that metaphor operates at the intersection of linguistic form and cognitive structure, reflecting both cultural patterns and individual mental processes.

In recent years, interdisciplinary research has further expanded the scope of metaphor studies by integrating insights from neuroscience, artificial intelligence, and cultural studies. These perspectives reveal that metaphor is deeply embedded in both individual cognition and collective discourse, influencing not only how people communicate but also how they interpret reality.

Therefore, the present study aims to explore the functional linguistic and thought-related aspects of metaphor by examining its dual role as a communicative tool and a cognitive mechanism. By synthesizing theoretical and empirical approaches, this research seeks to contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of metaphor as a dynamic and essential component of human language and thought.

G.Low focuses on the major functions of metaphor in terms of learning and communications. Low argues that, metaphor is significant:

1. To make it possible to talk about highly abstract or otherwise difficult concepts that otherwise might not be accessible to ordinary comprehension, as when musical pitch differences are described by spatial relationships, such as higher and lower pitches.
2. To demonstrate underlying connections among many different phenomena.
3. To extend thought as when we adopt the hologram as a metaphor for the brain in contrast to for example, a telephone network.
4. To prevaricate, as when metaphor becomes euphemism.
5. To insulate emotionally charged subjects, as is frequently done with references to death.
6. To compress an argument.

“Metaphor thus has the intriguing attribute”, Low concludes, “of having two central but opposing roles. On one hand it promotes greater clarity in what is said, while, on the other, it serves ... a shielded form of discourse”.

By shifting the focus from the central to the peripheral limits of language, metaphors can jockey around with established categories and rule governing procedures to allow new salencies to arise.

By dislodging us from fixed conceptual schemes, metaphors are prime for helping us place our impressions into newly fashioned units of meaning. To understand and appreciate the metaphor we have to (1) know about the cats and lost items, (2) notice some structural similarities between them, (3) identify significant correspondences between these structures, and (4) catch the connotation of giving in to fate: we cannot do much to control appearances or disappearances of either misplaced items or roving cats. Lakoff and Johnson have identified four elements in conceptual thinking which define the dynamics of metaphor:

1. Metaphors have relationships within their structures. For example, the properties of absorption, shape, and desiccation all show a relationship between the brain and a sponge. If you are unsatisfied with this metaphor, perhaps it is because the relationships break down. For example, the passivity of a sponge soaking up liquid may not agree with your notion of the selective activity of the brain.
2. Metaphors are defined in terms of our natural experiences. This definition differs from grounding in that these defining experiences are our most fundamental physical experiences starting from birth. They include perceptions, motor skills, cognition, and emotions. They are evoked by our interactions with the environment, such as movement, as in "exercise your prerogatives"; manipulating objects, as in "picking up someone's ideas"; and eating, as in "he was a voracious reader.”

The grounding of each metaphor in certain sets of experiences focuses on the quality of prior knowledge in understanding metaphors. For instance, if we speak of someone's personality as being as changeable and not stable as chameleon, those who have had

experiences with such persons and a chameleon- or at least having some information- will best appreciate the metaphor. Others who have been told about these things can understand, but may not be impressed. People from regions very cold, or in which such creatures do not live, may be quite puzzled.

Theorizing that metaphors depend more importantly upon the existence of mutual knowledge and the common ground between speakers and listeners in the conversational environment than literal language carries out. Form relates to the general commonality of the two concepts involved and is usually what immediately strikes one about a metaphor. For instance, in a comparison of the atom and a solar system, it is required that an overall object orbiting around a centre be held. The form may also be conceptual. The metaphor "iron curtain" requires a grasp of paradox, in that one term seemingly contradicts the other: iron is hard and inflexible, whereas a curtain is usually soft and pliable.

Correspondences occur within the form of the metaphor. They are the multiple points of comparison within the form and it is through these correspondences that we can comprehend the working of the metaphor. Pugh et al concisely delineate that "the more correspondences that we can perceive, more complex and convincing the metaphor". By this way, metaphor functions in a better manner. As an example, Howard A. Peele develops this metaphor for the term metaphors, which contains a number of correspondences:

Metaphors cultivate the mind. They prepare furrows for planting ideas, which in time grow the mature understanding. If climate is too arid for learning or if work has been neglected for too long, metaphors can break through an unreceptive crust to more fertile ground where the nutrients of teaching can be absorbed. 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.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

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 intophysical 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.

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 .

Gibbs states that image schemas emerge throughout “sensorimotor activity” 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. 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 up inside of him), people know that intense heat produces steam and this creates pressure in the container (e.g. He was bursting with 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.

It should be noted that contemporary metaphor theorists commonly use the term metaphor to refer to the conceptual mapping, and the term metaphorical expression to refer to an individual linguistic expression (like dead-end street) that is sanctioned by a mapping. In giving the correspondences, or mappings, the target-source order of the conceptual metaphors is reversed to yield source-target. This highlights the point that understanding typically goes from the more concrete to the more abstract concept. Notice this example of how correspondences or mappings make up a conceptual metaphor :

SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS ARE PLANTS.

He works for the local branch of the bank. Our company is growing.

They had to prune the workforce.

The organization was roofed in the old church.

There is now a flourishing black market in software there. Employers reaped enormous benefits from cheap foreign labour. This seems to be characterized by the following sets of mappings:

Source: PLANT

Target: SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

a)	the whole plant	the entire organization
b)	a part of the plant	a part of the organization
c)	growth of the plant	development of the organization
d)	removing a part of the plant	reducing the organization
e)	the root of the plant	the origin of the organization
f)	the fruits or crop	the beneficial consequences

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".

Nevertheless, it must be borne in mind that the mappings between A and B are, and can be partial. Just one part of concept B is mapped onto target and only a part of 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 of focus. Highlighting and hiding presuppose each other.

CONCLUSION

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.

In sum, metaphors have entailments that organise our experience, uniquely express that experience, and indeed create necessary realities.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Mirziyoyev Sh.M. PQ 2909 “On measures for further development of the Higher education system. “Xalq so’zi” newspaper, April 21, 2017.
2. Mirziyoyev Sh.M. PQ 5117 “On measures to bring the popularization of foreign language learning to a qualitative new level”. – Tashkent. May 19, 2021. – 5 p.
3. Aristotle. The art of rhetoric. William Heinemann Ltd. Translated by: J.H.Freese. – London: 1926. – 202 p.
4. Aristotle. The art of poetry. Translated by: I.Bywater. Oxford: OxfordUniversity Press. 1940. – 166 p.
5. Ashurova D.U., Galieva M.R. Stylistics of literary text. Tashkent, 2013. – 196
6. Steen G.J. Metaphor and discourse: Towards a linguistic checklist for metaphor analysis. In: L. Cameron and G. Low (eds), Researching and applying metaphor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2011. – 145 p.
7. Steen G.J. The paradox of metaphor: Why we need a three-dimensional model of metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 23(4). 2008. – P. 213-241.
8. Steen G.J. Finding metaphor in grammar and usage: a methodological analysis of theory and research. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 2007. – 177 p.
- 9 Tourangeau R., Sternberg R. J. Aptness in metaphor. *Cognitive Psychology* 13. 1981. – P. 27-55.