

УДК 811.161 + 81.111

## THE COGNITIVE ESSENCE OF THE METAPHOR

**Roman Dudok**

*Lviv National University of Ivan Franko  
Department of Foreign Languages for Humanities  
41, Doroshenko Str., room 111, 79000, Lviv, Ukraine  
phone: 032 239 41 76  
e-mail: romandudok@ukr.net  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0976-1485>*

The article is devoted to the analysis of what the metaphor means, which stands for the words that they render in their literal form. It is proved that in the metaphor certain words take on a new, or as it is sometimes called, «advanced» meaning, which arises in the context and is separated from it implicitly. It is indicated that the metaphor provides a proper understanding of the text content, expressing the mental statement as precisely as the words in the original sense. The origin of the metaphor is sought in the creation of a language, that is, we mean a word that, due to its original metaphor, generates and continually feeds the linguistic world. There is often so-called basic metaphor in the heart of the statement, a language phenomenon that also needs to be explored and interpreted. Here it is necessary to more clearly define and distinguish the key concept of the metaphor itself, which can be imagined as a conscious transfer the name of a unified thought into another sphere – to another idea.

That is, the metaphor in the general sense is viewed not as a certain phenomenon of language, but as one of the constitutional conditions of the metaphor language existence, as one of the most fundamental forms of human thought, as the principle of mentality, which lies outside the language and requires a comprehensive linguistic analysis. We consider the metaphor of discourse as a semantic field, the characteristic feature of which is the affiliation to different terminology systems of the corresponding branch or science.

We consider, the metaphor as the embodiment of hidden senses, because the language of metaphors is a symbolic language of human communication and one of the important means in artistic discourse, it is this connecting link between different semantic spaces (in the cognitive aspect).

We can assert that the metaphor in the text accumulates a large charge of subjective perception, an individual's attitude, a personal system of values etc.

The metaphor is not limited only to the realm of language, that is, the domain of words: the very processes of human thinking, to a large extent are metaphorical. Metaphors as language expressions become possible only because there are metaphors in the human conceptual system. The metaphor for most people is a means of imagination and rhetorical prosperity – meaning more unusual than ordinary language. Moreover, the metaphor is usually viewed as a characteristic of the language itself; rather as a means of words than thought and action. The metaphor functions in a professional discourse like a living organism that has the properties of heredity and variability, interacts with the environment, that is, «evolves» and «survives» on par with other metaphors,

There are two approaches to the analysis of the metaphor, one of which can be called an approach from the object<sup>4</sup>, and the second – “the approach from the side of the language.” According to some researchers, the metaphor, so to say, “sets at once two ideas instead of one.” Others interpret metaphors as “importers”, which introduce “strange objects in a situation.” We note that the metaphor carries the cognitive contents that the author wants to pass, since the receiver must catch him, and only then he will understand the encoded messages. In order to understand the mechanism of “generation” of metaphorical senses, one must imagine that a metaphor is a certain collection of senses that denotes the class of objects, phenomena, actions on the general sign of the another nomination, similar to this class of objects or individuals.

Thus, in the process of metaphorization, we get more and more new meanings, where the metaphor in the language creates names that are capable of identifying existing objects. It is important to identify the patterns of transposition the concepts' meanings from one sphere to another, which is reflected in the changes of word-terms meaning. Thus, according to the classical understanding of metaphor researchers, this is a semantic transformation in which an image formed in relation to one class of objects is applied to another class, or to another class representative. We share the opinion of the scientists that for a full understanding of the metaphor, the words should be considered not in the space of meanings, but in the field of senses.

So, the metaphor as a linguistic and cultural phenomenon is the most important tool of self-knowledge and knowledge of the world as one of the most effective means of pragmatic influence on the recipient. The

future analysis of metaphor as interlanguage and intercultural phenomenon has further prospects for research in semantics (semasiology), terminology, invariantology and cognitive linguistics. It is concluded that the metaphor carries the cognitive content that the author wants to convey and the receiver to perceive, therefore this mechanism is achieved by understanding the inner potential of the language.

*Key words:* metaphor, literal metaphor, “erased metaphor”, paraphrase, metaphor of cognitive content, coded metaphor.

## DOI:

**Formulation of the problem.** Metaphor - (dreamwork of language) bears reflection and creator and interpreter, because any communication is the interaction of thought, elongated language. For the creation of metaphors, there is no indications that it “means” or “what reports” [1, c. 47]. An article dedicated to the analysis of the fact what metaphor means, and its main idea is that the metaphor is the only one (or no more), which means words that are literally in them. Here they are going to dispel the erroneous thinking, as a metaphor, together with the literal meaning, or the value endowed with some other content or value. According to Plato B. Weinreich and D. Lacoff’s opinion semantic metaphor acquires different forms - from the relatively simple Aristotle to the complex in M. Black. Some authors particularly emphasize that metaphor, in contrast to normal use, penetrates the essence of things, and it makes sense to hide deeper or skillfully covert. It is in this promising phenomenon that the metaphor has not yet been explored.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** We share the idea of scholars researching metaphor: Donald Davidson, Max Black, Paul Henle, Nelson Goodman, Monroe Birdsley [4]; [7]; [9]; [10]; [11], and others, that the metaphor may rephrase, and believe that this is not about the fact that the metaphor adds something completely new to a literal statement, and that simply does not overwhelm anything. Most domestic and foreign researchers agree that the metaphor as such does not reveal anything additional to its literal meaning.

**Identification of previously unsolved parts of common problems.** Some researchers deny that in the metaphor, in addition to the literal sense, there is a special cognitive content, that is, a metaphor that presents certain emotions in the language. If the metaphor has a special cognitive content, then why is it so hard, and sometimes it simply cannot be found it. In the perspective of this article, we seek to explain the metaphor to its hidden content, explicitly reveal its meaning. Undoubtedly, it is extremely difficult to perform the task, because of the concealment of the meaning lies in a metaphor.

**The purpose of the article** is to analyze the metaphor as the creative use of words closely related to the normal or literal meaning of words. Understand the metaphor, its “metaphorical truth” and explain that it is “metaphorical value” and inexhaustible sense creation.

**The body of the article.** First of all, - The essence of the idea is that in the metaphor certain words take on the new, or, as it is sometimes called, “advanced” meaning. For example, when we read in the Bible: the spirit of God moved on the face of the water “letters”, the spirit of God was worn over the man of water “(booth 1,2), we must consider the word of the face (letters) \ t.:”face “) which has an expanded value. This extension should be in the fact that philosophers are called expansion words (word extensions), that is, they refer to the class essence that this word causes [13, p. 193].

As we see in the above example the word “person” is added not only to people, but also

to the surface of water. The above explanation, in any case, cannot be considered completely, because if in the context of a word a person really corresponds to water, then the water actually has a person. If you believe that the words in the metaphor have direct references to the object, then it erases the difference between the metaphor and the introduction of new words in the vocabulary, thus, the metaphor - literally destroys it [2, p. 2].

In the process of review, the meaning of the metaphor remains original or literal, which means that it depends or does not depend on the metaphor of the new or extended meaning is a question, but the fact that it depends on the literal meaning does not call in question the following: an adequate idea of the notion of a metaphor must take into account that the initial or literal meaning of the word is effective in their metaphorical experience. Here we can explain the metaphor as the case of ambiguity in the context of the metaphor, certain words have a new one, and its initial value, the power of the metaphor simply depends on our uncertainty, on our fluctuations between these two meanings. Because of the multiplicity of words, if it arises in the usual context the word means one, and in the metaphorical, the other, but the metaphorical context does not require such oscillations.

Of course, we can change the choice of metaphorical interpretation of the number of possible, but we must always distinguish between metaphor and not metaphor. Sometimes so that the word in one context has two meanings, and we must also consider both. Or, if we believe that the word provides the identity of the value, one can say that on the surface, acts as one word, but in reality it is two words. Thus, the metaphor does not require doubling: what values did we fill with words and preserve in the general terms of reading [10, p. 27].

In the end, you can imagine literally hidden as something that we feel influencing us, not appearing in an open context, while figurative value is the main burden. Due to G. Frege, each reference term has two (or more) values, one of which captures it in normal contexts, and the other in special contexts. The rule that binds these two values can be formulated as follows: values in special contexts make references in these contexts identical to the meaning of words in normal contexts. [7, P.31-47].

Thus, the whole picture, in which the combined theory of G. Frege and with it follows a view of the metaphor: the word, in addition to the usual references for it, has two specific application areas: one for metaphor, another for contexts. This specificity revealed the contrast between the interpretation of the new use of the friend and the fact that it was known: in the first case, our focus is on the language, in the second - on what it describes. Metaphor, our deep faith associated with the second incident. This can be seen as an example of the so-called "erased metaphors".

Once, for a very long time, rivers and bottles would probably not have, as they are now, "mouths" (mouth-mouth, hole, letters: 'mouth'). As for modern use, it does not matter whether we will consider the word "mouth" to be multi-valued (as it concerns not only living organisms, but also rivers and bottles), or we will assume that there is only a broad field of word that covers all at once cases. It is important, but when the word for word was a metaphor, the media language really noticed the similarity between the mouth and the bottle. By the way, Homer still speaks of an open wound as a "mouth" [5, p. 79]. As in the modern use the word directly related to bottles, then no similarity will prove to be. One should not even look for this similarity, because it is that in two different cases the same word is used to expose the generalized sign of openness - the openness of something.

According to our considerations, if a metaphor, for example, a polysymbolic, had two meanings, then one would expect that we can describe its particular metaphorical value; we

---

just have to wait for the metaphor to “erase”: the creative value of the “living metaphor” will forever appear in the literal sense of “dead”. It should be added that you can learn a lot from the metaphor if you compare them with comparisons, because this comparison is simply to say that the metaphor only pushes. In fact, if we assume the literal meaning of the metaphor of the comparison value, in this case, the closure of access to what we previously understood under the literal meaning of the metaphor, but we are protecting from the very beginning the notion that this value determines the effectiveness of the metaphor that would not then be brought its under the guise of not literal, that is, form, value.

Due to our belief, no theory of metaphorical value or metaphorical truth can explain how a metaphor functions. What really distinguishes a metaphor - then, it is not value, but use, and in this metaphor, similar speech actions: statement, hint, lie, promise, expression of dissatisfaction and so on. The metaphor speaks only of what lies on its surface - usually an obvious lie or absurd truth. And this is obvious truth and it is not necessary to rephrase the lie - they are already given literally mean words. The question arises as we then with all the endless attempts of researchers to develop methods and methods of detecting the hidden metaphor of content? Psychologists Robert Verbruggen and Nancy McKerrell believe that “many metaphors draw attention to systemic similarities (common systems of relations) and transitions (general transformations) for which the identity of the compared members is secondary.” [12, p.34].

These researchers do not believe that there is a clear boundary between literal and metaphorical words, they believe that many words have “fuzzy” meanings that can be fixed by the context. As illustrated and explained, it is impossible to remove the difference between what is literally means suggestion this (in this context) and, therefore, the fact that it (and it fixed the context of the literal meaning) “attracts our attention.” M. Black says that the metaphor forces us to make “the system of common association” (the system of common places). This is a metaphor in the implicit form that includes such thoughts about the main themes, which, in the words of M. Wolff, which are usually added to support the subject. This metaphor chooses, illuminates and organizes some quite definite characteristics of the main subject and excludes the other “[4, p. 167].

According to the scientist, the paraphrases have almost always failed not that the metaphor does not have a special cognitive content, and “the metaphor has a special cognitive content,” why is it so difficult, but sometimes it cannot be found? “if, as A. Barfield claims, as a metaphor,” this is about one thing, and it means another “; then why, when we are clearly articulating. Does it mean that it does a much weaker effect? “, rephrase the metaphor, - says O. Barfield, - and all her uncertainty and fault disappears, and with her - and half of the poems” [3, p. 55]. In comparison, one speaks, but it means different, they do not express the assumption that the comparison means that everything else is beyond the surface. Comparison, as well as the metaphor, can make a deep thought of why then there is no saying about the “feature” of the cognitive meaning of “comparison”, finally, if the words in the metaphor matter how it can be so distinct. What is the meaning of words, when the metaphor is “erased,” that is, becomes part of the language? Why, say, saying that he burned down - “he broke (was burned down)” does not mean exactly the same thing that ever meant a living metaphor? [6,p.79]. Now this expression means only that the man was very angry. For this logic it turns out that in the usual view of the metaphor there is a certain “stretch”.

On the one hand, is the desire to think that a metaphor deserves something that

is impossible for the ordinary language, and on the other hand, the desire to explain the metaphor in terms of cognitive content. Here is the view that the metaphor is a certain content or has any meaning, in addition, of course, literal. Undoubtedly, the metaphor often helps us to see those properties of things, and objects that we have not yet noticed, of course, they reveal us front to all its deep potential [8, p. 66]. Metaphor generates or assumes an idea of an object, does not express it explicitly. Aristotle said that the metaphor helps “perceive similarity.” The researchers of Black and Richards note that the metaphor for “there” is a reaction: the listener, perceiving a metaphor, builds some systems of implications [4, p. 164].

How difficult it is to agree with Owen Barfield, who believes that in the metaphor “we are talking about one, but means another,” and M. Black, that the metaphor of the “penetration of the essence of things” (“insight”) metaphor is achieved because of the peculiarities of its meaning, that allow the metaphor of the claim or implicate complex content [3]; [4]; The mechanism of metaphor is not so, one cannot think that a metaphor achieves its goal only by passing a coded message.

**Conclusions and perspectives of further research.** Thus, the metaphor in our minds is almost inexhaustible. When we ask a question what a metaphor “means”, we understand that the answer may be uncertain. In fact, we rephrase the metaphor not to express our value, because it is so on the surface, we are more likely to try to find that the metaphor attracts our attention. Of course, you can, by agreeing to this, believe that only the restriction is to use the word “value”. As a conclusion, we note that the metaphor carries the cognitive content that the author wants to pass, since the receiver must catch him, and only then he will understand the encoded messages. Finally, he expresses the view of the infinite nature of the metaphor, arguing that he is trying to send us a logical conclusion, which may be the prospect of further research.

#### References

1. Aristotle. On the art of poetry. M., 1957 (translation of V.G. Apple Rota). Poetics. M., 1984. Vol. 4. (translation M.L. Gasparova). 95p.
2. Bain A. English Composition and Rhetoric. London : Longmans, 1887. 343 p.
3. Barfield O. Poetic Diction and Legal Fiction. *The Importance of Language*. ed. by M. Black, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice Hall. 1962. 295 p.
4. Black M. Metaphor. M.Black – see next collection. P. 153-172.
5. Cavell S. Must we mean what we say? NewYork, Scribner’s, 1969. 394 p.
6. Cohen T. Figurative Speech and Figurative Act. *The Journal of Philosophy*. 1975. Vol. 72. P. 79.
7. Davidson D. What do metaphors mean. *Critical inquiry*. 1978. Vol. 5. P. 31-47.
8. Empson W. Some Versions of the Pastoral. London : Chatto and Windus, 1935. 298 p.
9. Goodman N. Languages of Art. Indianapolis : Bobbs-Merrill, 1968. 290 p.
10. Henle P. Metaphor. *Language, Thought and Culture*. univ. Michigan Press. 1958. 177 p.
11. Murry J. M. Countries of the Mind. *Physiological Review*, 2nd series. Oxford University Pres. 1931. P.3.
12. Verbrugge R. R., McCarrell N.S. Metaphoric comprehension: studies in reminding andresembling. *Cognitive Psychology*. 1977, Vol. 9. P. 34-39.
13. Wittgenstein L. Philosophical Investigations. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1953. 220 p.

**КОГНІТИВНА СУТНІСТЬ МЕТАФОРИ****Роман Дудок**

*Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка  
кафедра іноземних мов для гуманітарних факультетів  
вул. Дорошенка, 41, кім.111,79000, Львів, Україна  
тел: 032 239 41 76  
e-mail: romandudok@ukr.net  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0976-1485>*

Статтю присвячено аналізу значення та смислів метафори, що позначає слова, які вони передають у своїй дослівній формі. Стверджується, що в метафорі певні слова набувають нового, або, як його іноді називають, «розширеного» значення, яке виникає в контексті та імпліцитно відокремлюється від нього. Зазначається, що метафора забезпечує адекватне розуміння змісту тексту, так само, як і слова в первинному значенні. Виокремлено ключове поняття самої метафори, яку можна уявити як свідоме перенесення назви єдиної думки в іншу сферу – до іншого поняття.

У статті наголошено на тому, що саме, термін метафора, у загальному розумінні, розглядається не як певний феномен мови, а як одна з конституційних умов існування мови метафори, як одна з найфундаментальніших форм людського мислення, як принцип менталітету, який лежить поза мовою і потребує усебічного лінгвістичного аналізу.

Доведено, що метафора як втілення прихованих смислів, є символічною мовою людського спілкування, один із важливих засобів у художньому дискурсі, є сполучною ланкою між різними семантичними просторами (у когнітивному аспекті). Метафора у тексті акумулює великий заряд суб'єктивного сприйняття індивідуального ставлення, особистісної системи цінностей тощо. Аргументовано, що метафора не обмежується лише сферою мови, тобто галуззю слів: самі процеси людського мислення, значною мірою, є метафоричними. Метафори, як мовні вираження, стають можливими лише завдяки наявності метафор у концептуальній системі людини, тому метафора функціонує у професійному дискурсі як живий організм, який має властивості спадковості та мінливості, взаємодіє із середовищем, тобто «розвивається» і «виживає» нарівні з іншими метафорами.

Зосереджено увагу на тому, що метафора несе в собі той когнітивний зміст, який хоче передати автор, оскільки реципієнт має вловити його і лише тоді він зрозуміє закодовані імпліцитні повідомлення. Висунуто ідею того, що для розуміння механізму «породження» метафоричних смислів, необхідно збагнути, що метафора — це певна сукупність смислів, яка вказує на групу предметів, явищ, дій за загальною ознакою іншої номінації, подібної до цього класу, предметів чи осіб.

Таким чином, у процесі метафоризації, ми отримуємо все нові й нові смисли, де метафора створює назви у мові, які здатні ідентифікувати наявні об'єкти та поняття. Наголошено на важливості виявлення закономірностей транспонування понять, значень з однієї сфери в іншу, що відображається у зміні смислів слів – термінів. Таким чином, згідно з класичним розумінням метафори, це семантична трансформація, у процесі якої, образ, сформований стосовно одного класу предметів, застосовується до іншого класу або до іншого представника класу. Акцентовано на тому, що для повноцінного розуміння метафори слова її належить розглядати не у просторі значень, а у сфері генерованих смислів.

Зроблено висновок про те, що метафора, як когнітивний феномен, є найважливішим інструментом самопізнання та пізнання світу, як найефективніший засіб прагматичного впливу на реципієнта. Підсумовано, що подальший аналіз метафори, як когнітивного та міжкультурного феномену, має подальші перспективи для досліджень у семантиці (семасіології), термінології, інваріантології та прикладній лінгвістиці, адже метафора несе в собі когнітивний смисл, який автор хоче передати, а одержувач сприйняти, тому такий механізм досягається розумінням внутрішнього потенціалу мови.

*Ключові слова:* метафора, дослівна метафора, «стерта метафора, значення, смисли, перефраз, метафора когнітивного змісту, закодована метафора.

*Стаття надійшла до редакції 05.08.2022  
доопрацьована 09.08.2022  
прийнята до друку 14.08.2022*