

nauky (movoznavstvo). — Kirovograd : RVV KDPU, 2008. — Vyp. 75 (4). — S. 242–246.

4. *Popova Z. D.* Kognitivnaya lingvistika [Cognitive Linguistics] / Z.D Popova, I.A. Sternin. – Moskva: AST Vostok-Zapad, 2007. – 314 s.

5. *Yerina A. M.* Teoriya statistiki: [Theory of Statistics] [praktikum] / A. M. Yerina, Z. O. Palyan. — K. : Znannya, 2009. — 255 s.

*Kraievska Olha
Vinnytsia*

THE EVOLUTION OF CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT RESEARCH ANALYSIS

The pioneers of cognitive linguistics George Lakoff and Mark Johnsen claimed that human conceptual system is fundamentally metaphorical in nature in terms of both thoughts and actions. The scientists stated that concepts govern our thoughts and everyday functioning, as well as structure perception of the world and relation to it and thus define people's everyday reality. It is important to take into account that human conceptual system is only partially conscious and one of the ways to examine one's system is to study the language. George Lakoff and Mark Johnsen, in their fundamental work "Metaphors we live by", proved that language is an important source of evidence for the conceptual system research and human conceptual system is largely metaphorical [1].

According to Michiel Leezenberg, the research paradigm of cognitive linguistics has seen tremendous growth over the past three decades. Characteristic of this paradigm is a fruitful interdisciplinary cooperation characterized by a remarkable one-sidedness to this interdisciplinary blossoming. Michiel Leezenberg sees little if any substantial exchange or collaboration between cognitive linguistics and the social sciences, which is all the more surprising as at first metaphor appeared to become the master trope of symbolic and cognitive anthropology [2]. Culture and communication are mutually effected and language is the means and medium of their coexistence. It describes and fixes a wide range of communication processes and possible problems. The social context of the modern global world consists of individuals of different ethnic, religious, social and educational background. Myron W. Lustig and Jolene Koester emphasize that cultural differences and intercultural communication are among the central aspects of modern life. It is also noted that there are forces which encourage and discourage understanding and accommodation among people who differ from one another [1: 1].

Studying methodological assumptions of cognition and culture, Michiel Leezenberg proves that culture does not loom large in “Metaphors we live by” as cognitive processes are implicitly assumed to be universal. The concept of culture plays no major explanatory role in George Lakoff and Mark Johnsen theoretical framework and culture is not a supporting member of the theoretical architecture of cognitive linguistics [2].

However this approach has not proved to be effective recently, since we face serious challenges which are inseparable from concepts embodied in cultural differences. One of the major steps in the evolution of conceptual metaphor is connected with cultural influence on its formation and perception, which was not always noted and acknowledged.

First cultural variation was perceived as a surface phenomenon that had no significant influence on cognitive processes as researchers argued that, despite the different values attached to *MORE-LESS*, *UP-DOWN* and other orientations, both the experiential base and the metaphorical processes involved in cognition are cross-culturally identical, it was assumed that cultures operate in terms of shared conceptualizations and shared norms and values [2: 141].

Raymond W. Gibbs proves that cognition arises from interaction between embodied mind and a cultural world, the scholar argues that cognitive linguistics should be extended to accommodate these cultural aspects. Raymond W. Gibbs comes to the conclusion that cultural factors, interacting with embodied cognition, are at least partly constitutive of this process [4].

Mark Turner presents cognitive linguistics as a foundational auxiliary science for the social sciences, providing interpretive approach to anthropology which employs concepts and methods from literary theory and philosophy, especially in particular semiotics and hermeneutics [5]. Different scholars argue that human behaviour is a form of symbolic action; the anthropologist's or sociologist's task is to explicate the social meanings of the symbols involved. Mark Turner argues that these cultural meanings are generated by the basic cognitive operation of what he calls blending. He claims that “social science looks at meanings all the time, but not at the problem of meaning” [5: 10]. Social science presumes the existence of meaning as an explanatory entity, rather than exploring how it comes about as a feature of people's biological, cultural, and social makeup. It is noted that cognitive linguistics can help as it accounts for meanings as the result of basic mental operations. It is significant that he identifies blending, rather than the earlier notions of conceptual metaphor and conceptual mapping, as the central and universal process generating the meanings involved in social action [5].

There is a certain decrease in the study of metaphor and, according to many scholars it has disappeared quite suddenly from anthropology. This disappearance is believed to have happened in conjunction with the gradual

eclipse of cognitive and symbolic approaches. Like symbolic anthropology, the cognitive linguistic paradigm takes cultures as systems of knowledge or as scripts or texts to be executed or implemented. In recent years, cognitive and symbolic approaches have largely been sidelined by what Michiel Leezenberg calls a “practical turn”. Embodied public practices are studied more than embodied private mental processes [2].

The process of conceptual metaphor evolution in the light of recent research shows that language is an integral part of cognition and it reflects the interaction of cultural, psychological, and communicative factors which can only be understood in the context of a realistic view of conceptualization and mental processing. Despite the fact that the blueprints of language are wired genetically into the human organism, their elaboration into a fully specialized linguistic system during language acquisition, and their implementation in everyday language use, are clearly dependent on experiential factors and inextricably bound up with psychological phenomena that are not specifically linguistic in character. There is no valid reason to anticipate a sharp dichotomy between linguistic ability and other aspects of cognitive processing. For this reason, cognitive linguistics strives to integrate the findings of linguistics and cognitive psychology.

The cognitive-linguistic theory of metaphor envisages thought/cognition and metaphor/language as the two sides of a single indivisible structure that is grounded in the preconceptual structures of our bodily experience and which gives rise to varieties of metaphorical expressions, conventional as well as novel. Immergence and use of novel metaphorical expressions in modern informational era has been the focus of attention in the recent years.

According to cognitive linguists, metaphor is not just a matter of language as human thought processes in general are metaphorical. Human conceptual system is largely metaphorical, that is why it is reasonable to talk about metaphorical concepts or conceptual metaphors. Conceptual metaphors are perceived today as set linguistic expressions which constitute a person’s conceptual system and predetermine his/her attitude and actions towards an object or phenomena [1, p. 4]. Since the solution of dramatic and global communicative problems is given a high priority in the information era, the research of conceptual metaphors’ influence on intercultural communication and information warfare has become even more significant and urgent.

Modern cognitive linguistics has proven to be effective in studying and dealing with modern communication issues as it concentrates on language as a means of organizing, processing and conveying information as well as studies human experience and understanding reflected in language, questions the meaningfulness of human experience and means of its expression.

Communication is studied by numerous disciplines under different angles for its importance has proved to be vital in the recent decades. The key concepts of this phenomenon have become the agenda of cognitive linguistics as it mostly deals with world perception and reflection.

The analysis of conceptual metaphor evolution shows that modern trends of conceptual metaphor study in cognitive linguistics are connected with interdisciplinary approach to conceptual metaphor influence on cognitive processes, communication and intercultural interplay by means of conceptual metaphors, as well as its close relation to conceptual therapy.

Modern problems in intercultural communication emphasize the importance of critical thinking approach to conceptual metaphors perception, since it is essential to make common human values the basis of world perception and conceptualization. The search for a common intercultural mental space is believed to be an effective framework for intercultural communication structuring and resistance to information war conceptual systems, propaganda and other destructive phenomena.

REFERENCES:

1. *Lakoff G., Johnsen M.* Metaphors we live by / George Lakoff and Mark Johnsen. – London: The university of Chicago press, 2003 – 276 p.
2. *Leezenberg M.* From Cognitive Linguistics to Social Science: Thirty Years after “Metaphors We Live By” [Electronic resource] / Michiel Leezenberg – Journal of Cognitive Semiotics, Volume 5, 2014. – Mode of access: www.cognitivesemiotics.com.
3. *Lustig M.* Intercultural competence: interpersonal communication across cultures/ Myron W. Lustig, Jolene Koester – Boston: Pearson Education, 2010 – 395 p.
4. *Gibbs Jr. R.W.* Taking metaphor out of our heads and putting it into the cultural world / Raymond W. Gibbs – Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999 – 226 p.
5. *Turner M.* Cognitive Dimensions of Social Science / Mark Turner – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012 – 192 pages.

*Лісовська Анастасія, Проценко Ігор
Вінниця*

СТИЛЬОВІ ПРИНЦИПИ УІЛЬЯМА ФОЛКНЕРА

Уільям Фолкнер (1897-1962) зробив вагомий художньо-творчий внесок в американську та світову літератури, який було відзначено Нобелівською премією в 1949 році. Досі існує проблема визначення