







## Cognitive (conceptual) metaphor in the Ukrainian poetic discourse

Larysa V. Kravets <sup>a1</sup> , Halyna M. Siuta <sup>b</sup> , Lyubov V. Struhanets <sup>c</sup> ,  
Yuriy B. Struhanets <sup>d</sup> 

<sup>a</sup> *Ferenc Rakoczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian College of Higher Education, Beregovo, Ukraine*

<sup>b</sup> *Institute for Ukrainian Language of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine*

<sup>c,d</sup> *Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University, Ternopil, Ukraine*

### APA Citation:

Kravets, L.V., Siuta, H.M., Struhanets, L.V., & Struhanets, Yu.B. (2021). Cognitive (conceptual) metaphor in the Ukrainian poetic discourse. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(Special Issue 2), 1308-1319.

Submission Date: 04/01/2021

Acceptance Date: 15/03/2021

### Abstract

Modern metaphor theory considers a metaphor as an important mental operation, and way of knowing, categorising, conceptualising, evaluating and explaining the world. This study aims to clarify the specifics of cognitive (conceptual) metaphor and determine the role of cognitive (conceptual) metaphor in the poetic discourse on the example of works by Ukrainian poets. The research objectives are achieved through the range of approaches, namely the cognitive approach to the study of metaphor, as well as linguistic analysis, which allows to explore the metaphor in several aspects. The article considers the history of the concept of “cognitive” and “conceptual” metaphor, as well as a comparative analysis of views on the interpretation of these concepts through the scope of different linguistic schools – foreign and domestic. The analysis results show that foreign scholars distinguish the concepts of cognitive and conceptual metaphor, while domestic researchers identify these terms. Ukrainian poetic discourse was also analysed in order to identify the peculiarities of their use of cognitive (conceptual) metaphor. The research concludes that metaphor, as the most productive means of cognition and enrichment of a language, is an indicator of the development of Ukrainian poetic language thinking, which is becoming more emotionally associative and at the same time directed to the rational plane. The practical significance of the study is to use the scheme of the analysis in further research on similar topics.

© 2021 JLLS and the Authors - Published by JLLS.

*Keywords:* linguistics; metaphor; conceptual metaphor; poetic discourse; linguistic and thought processes.

## 1. Introduction

Metaphor is one of the most common ways to enrich a language, which has long attracted the attention of philosophers, logicians and linguists (Farshi & Afrashi, 2020). For a long time, it was considered a figurative means based on the figurative use of words and designed to enrich the artistic text and ensure the success of its impact on a recipient. Intellectual development of mankind in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and changes in worldview paradigms have expanded the scope of

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [l-kravets5945@tanu.pro](mailto:l-kravets5945@tanu.pro)

metaphor and led to a rethinking of its role in linguistic and thought processes. Metaphor is not always a phrase (Zhuravel, 2020; Dibavar, et al., 2019). In fiction, there are examples of works in which one metaphor is developed in the text. For example, in Ukrainian poetry it is “The sick wind blows verse ...” by O. Oles, “Fluctuated as flutes” by P. Tychyna, “Yellowed leaves fall from trees” by E. Pluzhnyk, “Gospel of fields” by E. Malanyuk, “Savage autumn” by L. Kostenko, “U-RA-NA” by Yu. Tarnavsky, “Life of Garlic” by I. Malkovych and others. Metaphor, on the one hand, is a means of cognition, it determines perception and understanding of the world, everything that surrounds, and on the other – expresses the inner world of the author. Accordingly, a change in perception of the world depends on a change in the metaphor that describes it. The metaphorical description is a kind of way to transform extralinguistic reality into a world of culture, organised and interpreted in accordance with the spiritual needs of a particular ethnic group. A change in the cultural paradigm is always accompanied by a change in the conceptual metaphor. The essence of the conceptual metaphor is that people perceive one conceptual sphere through another based on their real or imaginary similarity (Parrilla Sotomayor, 2018).

That is, if there is, for example, an abstract concept, it can be transmitted through specific concepts from other spheres of life. The theory of conceptual metaphor of George Lakoff and Mark Johnson changed the scientific understanding of the ontology of metaphor and its epistemological potential and formed the basis of the philosophical system of cognitive study of metaphor (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). In their work, the authors emphasised that metaphor is an integral part of human lives, or rather human language. Conceptual metaphor shapes not only communication, but also the way of thinking (Gibbs Jr., 2018).

Metaphors differ in content, structure, functions. This leads to the emergence of numerous classifications of metaphors on different principles. Metaphors can be classified on this basis alone. Since the Aristotle times, four types of metaphorical transferences have been known, namely from genus to species, from species to genus, from species to species, and by the principle of proportional analogy. In modern linguistics, the division into conceptual and artistic metaphors is relevant. Conceptual metaphors are divided into structural (one concept is structured by analogy to another), orientational (related to orientation in space) and ontological (based on the experience of interaction with material objects and present different ways of perceiving the world). Among artistic metaphors, there are individual and traditional metaphors (Piata & Pagán Cánovas, 2017, Rasse et al., 2020, Szeliid & Kövecses, 2018). Individual metaphors convey the author's understanding of the signified and exist only within a certain context. Traditional metaphors are enshrined in the linguistic and cultural traditions of the ethnos. They have a stable form of implementation and retain imagery, expressiveness (Rédey, 2018).

The laws of poetic discourse do not deny the use of conceptual metaphors. In addition, the conceptual metaphor has significant expressive potential. It consists of the power of structuring, the power of reasoning, the power of automation and the power of evaluation (Lakoff, 1989). This specificity of the conceptual metaphor contributes to the realisation of creative ideas of artists, the manifestation of their talent. Metaphorically expressed opinion has a significant impact on a reader. It not only gives aesthetic pleasure, but also determines the ways in which a person comprehends reality. The purpose of the article is to determine the role of cognitive (conceptual) metaphor in the poetic discourse on the example of works of Ukrainian poets.

## 2. Method

Metaphor as a multifaceted linguistic phenomenon has long been carefully studied by linguists. The subject of study was the peculiarities of the formation of metaphorical expressions in the

Ukrainian poetic discourse of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the scope and content of the concept of metaphor, the nature of language mechanisms underlying metaphorisation, cultural and specific features of metaphorical units, functions and functional characteristics of metaphor and other aspects of this phenomenon. In modern linguistics in recent decades, the study of metaphor has acquired a cognitive direction. In the light of these scientific ideas, metaphor is seen not only as a linguistic phenomenon, but also as a means of conceptualising reality, as an epistemological mechanism, a means of reflecting new knowledge in the language. Scientists have focused on the modelling function of metaphor, because metaphor not only forms an idea of an object, it also determines the way and style of thinking about it.

The cognitive approach to metaphor involves identifying the features of the process of forming new concepts through the forms and images of simple and familiar entities, as well as the study of universal and culturally specific speech features, which are contained in a condensed form in metaphors. This approach to metaphorical activity has led to the creation of the theory of conceptual metaphor, which is one of the most actively used methods of conceptual analysis in modern cognitive research. In this study, this approach is the basis for the analysis and interpretation of metaphor in the poetic discourse of Ukrainian literature. According to cognitive theory, metaphor is a way of representing one abstract and less familiar area through another, more mastered in empirical experience, more familiar and more accessible to perception. Thus, there is the projection of knowledge from one conceptual area to another by metaphorical transfer of meaning. Therefore, the analysis of metaphors in the study of concepts is usually based on clarifying the relationship between these two phenomena, which are compared in conceptual areas (Awadh & Khan, 2020). These areas were considered by different researchers and had different names, such as parameter words and semantically keyword or target-domain and source-domain.

The authors also used linguistic analysis. The linguistic analysis was aimed at identifying the linguistic features of metaphors, their structure and meaning, their role in the language system and their functioning. In the general theory of language metaphor is studied in lexicology, poetics and pragmatics. As in the case of emotional vocabulary, which does not fit into the framework of linguistic description, a complete description of the metaphor requires consideration of data from various sciences. Linguo-cognitive analysis of key metaphors of scientific paradigms and directions helped to identify something significant in the relevant theoretical constructions. Linguistic analysis of a text is not only an interesting, but also an extremely useful type of work, in which a functional and systematic approach to language learning is carried out, and in this process interdisciplinary connections are revealed. Working with a text through linguistic analysis significantly deepens the semantic and stylistic perception of language units and the text in general. The method of linguistic analysis of the text was first proposed by K.D. Ushinsky in his “Initial Practical Grammar” (Ushinsky, 2019). In it he used a universal way of forming linguistic thinking – observation of phenomena that organically coexist in the text. This method includes a comprehensive study of the lexical meaning of words, syntactic constructions, word classes, their structural, morphological and phonetic properties, so the authors chose this type of analysis, because it allows comprehensively considering the linguistic phenomenon and identifying its features.

### **3. Results**

The terms “cognitive” and “conceptual” metaphor came into use by domestic linguists in the mid-'80s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century long before the widespread recognition of the cognitive paradigm and the conceptual metaphor theory by J. Lakoff. The general spread of the terms was greatly facilitated by the translated works of foreign authors on metaphors in the field, which later became known as the “first stage of cognitive linguistics” (about 1960-1980, before the work of J. Lakoff and M. Johnson

“Metaphors We Live By”) (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). The ideas of cognitive semantics became revolutionary for American linguistics, which had previously been influenced by structural linguistics. Cognitive research has found a response in the domestic environment. Thus, the idea of metaphor as the ideal essence (cognitive phenomenon) realised in linguistic form resonated with Soviet and Ukrainian linguists. Their thinking in terms of language and cognition was accustomed by linguistic traditions and materialistic ideology.

The cognitive direction of domestic linguistics at the present stage has significant differences both from the research of the American school of cognitive linguistics (where this direction originated and took shape) and from European works. An explanation of the reasons for the differences and the essence of the direction itself can be found in the work of T.G. Skrebtsova, who writes, “domestic linguists ... due to lack of awareness ... often distorted the essence of this area”, this fully applies to the metaphor (Skrebtsova, 2011). Today in Ukraine there are fundamental domestic works performed within the framework of the actual cognitive paradigm, they are in many respects based on the postulates of cognitive metaphor and correspond to the stated issues. On the other hand, many valuable works have been accumulated, created in the precognitive period within the framework of the traditional theory of metaphor. Their authors, authoritative researchers, also used the terms “cognitive” and “conceptual” in relation to metaphor, but gave them a different meaning. Finally, there are works that synthesize both directions. Thus, there is a clash of two paradigms of linguistic knowledge, in which the same terms have different meanings. There is a situation when the fact of calling a metaphor cognitive or conceptual is a reason to classify linguists who use this term as supporters of the cognitive direction.

The authors will consider the essence of understanding these two terms in Western and domestic linguistics in the late 1970s – in the 1980s (the beginning of the actual cognitive period abroad), to show that the use of the terms “cognitive” and “conceptual” does not indicate about the unity of the theoretical platform of researchers. Cognitive linguistics in the form in which it originated in California in the studies of linguists from Berkeley and San Diego, gives metaphor, according to M. Johnson and J. Lakoff, the leading role of the primary cognitive mechanism that organises and structures human thinking and experience, forms abstract thinking. It is argued that metaphor defines thinking, behaviour, scientific knowledge and is most clearly expressed in language and speech, this is its ubiquity (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). Metaphor in cognitive linguistics is considered as a phenomenon, first of all, ideal (as opposed to material manifestations in language/speech), it received the terminological names “cognitive metaphor” and “conceptual metaphor”.

According to J. Lakoff, metaphor is “a cognitive tool for understanding abstract concepts and abstract thinking”; “one of the leading cognitive mechanisms of understanding one through another.” The term “conceptual metaphor” J. Lakoff refers to mental projections between the conceptual areas of source and purpose. The conceptual area of the goal is represented by concepts that require comprehension; the area of the source consists of concepts by which the comprehension of the new takes place. Metaphor is recognised cognitive and conceptual because it is “a reality of either a neural or conceptual level.” From the above, it can be concluded that these terms refer to two levels of brain function (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). Cognitive metaphor as a mechanism correlates with the processes that take place at the level of activation of neural connections (level of neurophysiological activity in the language of neuropsychology), conceptual metaphor – with the level of human thinking in concepts, judgments, inferences. The “habitat” (locus) of the first is the neurophysiological substrate of the brain, the locus of the second – conceptual thinking, mental activity. A conceptual metaphor is objectified in language and speech by a linguistic metaphor, not the other way around. Due to the linguistic metaphor, it is possible to indirectly judge the metaphor in thinking and the actions of cognitive metaphorical processes. Metaphor – first arises in thinking, and then used in practice,

including language. This understanding of metaphor – cognitive and conceptual – is common in American cognitive linguistics and beyond the United States among followers of the cognitive direction.

The same terms can be found in the works of linguists N.D. Arutyunova (1978, 1990), V.M. Telia (1988), E.O. Oparina (1988), later in O.Yu. Buinova (2001). The domestic interpretation of cognitive metaphor at that time differed significantly from the American school of cognitive science. Cognitive and conceptual metaphor in domestic works of that time was only a name, but not program goals and research methods. The common denominator of domestic researchers with foreign colleagues-cognitive scientists was the recognition of the connection and interdependence of language and thinking. If for Americans this idea was a revolutionary achievement that marked the transition from generative grammar to cognitive semantics, domestic linguistics prioritised recognising the connection between language and thought, as well as the development of many issues of semantics (although scientific achievements of the Soviet period did not go outside the country). The essence of the interpretation of these terms by linguists who have made a significant contribution to the development of domestic metaphor will be considered.

Cognitive metaphor in N.D. Arutyunova (1990) is one of the functional types of language metaphor, along with such metaphors as the nominative (name transfer), figuratively identifying (transition of descriptive meaning to predicate) and generalising. N.D. Arutyunova considers generalising ones the end result of the development of cognitive metaphor. Cognitive metaphor serves to create new meanings. According to N.D. Arutyunova, the main purpose of cognitive metaphor is to create new meanings. Thus, she writes, “[And] from the means of creating an image metaphor is transformed into a way of forming meanings absent in language. Metaphor – a tool not only for the name of the sign, but also for the very selection of the sign. Metaphor both creates meaning and gives it a name.” “Secondary predication is aimed at achieving epistemological goals.” “The predicate metaphor <...> serves the task of creating a characteristic vocabulary of the “invisible worlds” of the spiritual dimension of human” (Arutyunova, 1990).

Thus, the characteristic features of cognitive metaphor, according to Arutyunova, are the following: 1) metaphorisation of the predicate meaning of sign words; 2) creation of new meanings (concepts) in the course of metaphorical transfer; 3) the role of the instrument of cognition (epistemological role). The authors agree with N.D. Arutyunova that the cognitive metaphor is, first, a metaphorical transfer in the field of predicate words, accompanied by the emergence of new meanings; secondly, the result of such a transfer (the cognitive metaphor is understood as an ancient symbol, the second time filled with new meaning) (Arutyunova, 1990).

Understanding of the cognitive metaphor of V.N. Telia is similar to the understanding of N.D. Arutyunova that cognitive metaphor is recognised as a linguistic metaphor. Typology of metaphor for the function performed in V.N. Telia includes: identifying (or indicative), predicative, evaluative, emotional (evaluative-expressive) and figurative (Telia, 1988). The researcher believes that some of these types “lead to the formation of a new meaning”, i.e. have a “cognitive function”, she calls them cognitive. In another work by V.M. Telia, indicative, conceptual, evaluative, and emotional metaphors are called “different functional types of metaphors”, that is, another ordering principle is applied, and this combination of metaphors does not claim the role of classification. In addition, the term “conceptual” is used instead of the term “cognitive”. The differences between indicative and conceptual metaphors become almost imperceptible, especially if the function is understood as the syntactic functioning of a unit in language and speech (this function, according to V.M. Telia, combines types of metaphors). Thus, the cognitive (also conceptual) metaphor, according to V.N. Telia, is one of the functional types of linguistic metaphor, able to form “new concepts in the field of non-objective reality”. It is significant that the reasoning of V.N. Telia about cognitive metaphor

became the point of growth of new knowledge, which needed a different paradigm, without which it was incompatible with her functional-structural and semiotic views of metaphor, hence the contradictions. Time has shown that cognitive metaphor should be considered in a number of other objects and from other methodological positions (Telia, 1988).

The postulation of the epistemological role of cognitive metaphor determined its main place of residence in the language of scientific description, where cognitive metaphor became synonymous with scientific metaphor and conceptual metaphor, and where it was given the role of an instrument to overcome the limitations of linguistic resources in describing scientific phenomena, “The place and role of metaphor in the linguistic design of new meaning are considered in the context of philosophical problems associated with the study of the process of verbalisation of conceptual content.” As follows from the last quote of V.N. Telia in the above text, the term of “conceptual” appears instead of the term “notional”: cognitive = conceptual = notional. Later, when talking about cognitive metaphor and new concepts, linguists increasingly refer to the terms “concept” and “conceptual” (Telia, 1988).

E.O. Oparina uses the term “conceptual” instead of “cognitive” also on the ability of metaphor to generate new meanings. She transfers the name “conceptual” in contiguity from the function to the metaphor itself (Oparina, 1988). Following the views of V.M. Telia, E.O. Oparina eliminates the contradiction of the concept of V.M. Telia in the question of identifying metaphors. The fact of the duality of some identifying metaphors that can act as cognitive, she explains that “[in] metaphors denoting non-objective essences (circle of concepts, the grain of truth), the focus on the formation of concepts determines the combination of functions: reader’s and conceptual.” E.O. Oparina managed to eliminate the contradiction of the concept of V.M. Telia by returning metaphor to traditional linguistics. Thus, in domestic linguistics, the understanding of the cognitive function of metaphor as the ability to form a new meaning, and in science – the term (or concept), led to a number of associatively related terms: “cognitive function of metaphor” (transfer by similarity), “cognitive metaphor” (scientific metaphor), “conceptual metaphor”.

Decades later, there is a slightly different interpretation of concepts, but it is still the same within the linguistic theory of metaphor. O.Yu. Buinova proceeds from the dichotomous opposition of metaphors: metaphor in language and metaphor in the world (Buinova, 2001). Metaphor in language creates new shades of meaning and acts as a mechanism for the development of the semantic structure of the word. Metaphor in the world, for which it offers an alternative name “conceptual metaphor”, creates new concepts and images. At the initial stage, such a metaphor is perceived as a semantic phenomenon. It seeks to get rid of the image, over time it is erased, and the value tends to generalise. Buinova uses the term “cognitive metaphor” synonymously with the term “conceptual metaphor” (Buinova, 2001).

As a result, the terms "cognitive metaphor" and "conceptual metaphor" introduced in the last decades of the 20th century in Ukrainian linguistics had an only formal correlation with their foreign counterparts. First of all, they were used as synonyms. Secondly, they were perceived as tools to overcome the limitations of language resources to express new concepts, especially scientific. Thirdly, the nature of metaphors was previously recognised as *linguo-cognitive* due to the tradition of domestic linguists and thinking. For foreign linguists – followers of J. Lakoff – cognitive metaphor is a mechanism of activation of neural connections (neurophysiological level of brain functioning), and conceptual metaphor is a projection between conceptual areas (level of conceptual thinking).

#### 4. Discussion

The image is one of the central *linguo-poetic* concepts, which provides the necessary connection between the level of linguistic expression and the artistic content of a work. The verbal poetic image

can be defined as an indirect, associative expression of one object or phenomenon in terms of another corresponding to the global aesthetic idea of an author. This conditionality of the author's global idea is an essential factor in understanding the essence of the image and distinguishes it from the path or figurative expression. Identifying the image with the paths would simplify this concept, as the image is not just the use of the word in a figurative sense, but an indirect, associative way of expressing some artistic content. It can be assumed that poetic images are not created anew every time, but represent an abstract model or analogy, but in an individual author's embodiment. Poets and writers use existing models, or paradigms, adapting them to their artistic goals.

According to the definition by N.V. Pavlovich, the paradigm of the image is an invariant of similar images, which consists of two stable meanings, interconnected by the comparison of identification (Pavlovich, 2004). According to Pavlovich, who studied a large amount of poetic material, each poetic image has an invariant, i.e. implements a paradigm (Pavlovich, 2004). This invariant of the image exists, so to speak, in the poetic conceptual picture of the world. In this regard, it is worth turning again to the already mentioned work of American scientists J. Lakoff and M. Johnson, which suggests that metaphors permeate human lives and are manifested not only in language but also in thinking and in actions. The very processes of human thinking are largely metaphorical (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). The everyday conceptual system of the human is mostly metaphorical, and he does not even notice it. In this case, metaphors as linguistic expressions are possible precisely because there are metaphors in the conceptual system of humans.

In addition to structural metaphors, when one concept is structurally arranged in terms of another, Lakoff and Johnson also consider orientation metaphors, where the whole system of concepts is organised on the model of some other system. This is directly related to how human body exists in the physical world. As well as the whole range of human sensory orientation perception of the environment, based on oppositions such as top and bottom, inside and outside, front and back, deep and small, central and peripheral. Based on this theory, which applies to everyday language, it is logical to assume that the same thing happens in poetic language. By analogy with conceptual metaphors, in everyday language, cognitive (conceptual) metaphors in poetry can be distinguished (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). In poetry, there are a number of stable analogies in which images are created, for example, life can be interpreted as a road, travel, theatre, game, light, etc., the sun is identified with gold, the moon with silver, old age with autumn, spring-flowering with snow, etc.

Dynamics of conceptual metaphor in the Ukrainian poetic discourse of the 20<sup>th</sup> century are implemented in several ways. First of all – the design of previously untapped qualities and features of the donor zone on a recipient, due to the fact that the structure of the donor zone provides possible options for the definition of the recipient zone, “suggests directions for language forms, focuses on the conceptual (semantic) area from which language signs can be borrowed”. For example, in the metaphor *human* → *wind*, the donor zones are the cognitive structures of the HUMAN conceptsphere, which have a high degree of conceptualisation and contain characteristics of the human body, personality, interpersonal relations, socio-economic activities and so on. The properties of the human organism, features of its structure, physiological processes, physical features, etc. are projected on the recipient zone with the use of appropriate language signs.

Associating the *wind with man*, Ukrainian poets of the 20<sup>th</sup> century comprehend it as having a head (*wind, raving head, // teach me not to miss* (M. Lukiv)); *hair* (*wind hair* (V. Vovk)); *eyes* (*wind opened the eyes on the onion* (M. Vingranovsky)); *lips* (*and the wind // opens hot lips* (E. Malanyuk)); *throat* (*wind throat dries // from thirst and anxiety* (I. Zhilenko)); *chest* (*on the path the wind overtakes me: // admirable chest* (B. Oliynyk)); *hands* (*wind-giant's hand* (O. Oles)); *palms* (*wind palms* (I. Kalinets)); *fingers* (*with blue fingers wind // knocks on windows*) (V. Sosyura)); *shoulders* (*on a broad shoulder of the wind* (O. Zabuzhko)); *feet* (*under the feet of the wind* (A. Moisienko)); *knees* (*will lie*

on the knees of the wind (A. Moisienko)). On the recipient zone *wind*, the properties and states of a person to love were projected (*the wind loves, // caress the world, // embraces, // flows with a stream, // whips as silk, // makes noises, // dries dew, // he does not know // what he loves* (O. Oles)); *to cry* (*the wind cried in the grove* (V. Sosyura)); *to mourn* (*ah, the wind itself mourns over the city* (M. Draikhmara)); *to be evil* (*the wind is evil, frantic, // angry, mad // whistles, plays, // spells* (G. Chuprynska)); *to laugh* (*the dark wind laughed at us* (V. Sosyura)); *to forget* (*forgot about the morning // restless wind* (G. Chubach)); *to speak* (*and only one sleepy wind // speaks in a whisper to me* (V. Vovk)), etc.; and also *to breathe* (*quietly, quietly the wind breathes* (G. Chuprynska)); *to drink* (*when the wind has not yet finished the dew* (E. Pluzhnik)); *to sleep* (*the wind sleeps still in the mist of trees* (V. Gerasimyuk)); *to yawn* (*the wind yawned* (I. Zhilenko)); *to sit down* (*unless the wind, a quiet wind // will sit down on a grass in the morning* (G. Chubach)), *to walk* (*at night // the wind goes here, and bridges squeak* (O. Zabuzhko)), *to run* (*barefoot the violent wind ran on a ford, // tramples wet pods with his feet* (B.-I. Antonych)), etc. As a result of designing one or another property of the donor zone on the recipient zone, different properties of the recipient zone are profiled each time. The choice of a certain feature, the quality of the donor zone for design is due to the interaction of the principles of determinism, probability and randomness (Selivanova, 2004).

The level of conceptualisation of the donor zone *human* is significant and diverse, so there are many options for filling conceptual gaps (unsteady metaphorical projections within the conceptual metaphor). The possibility of a wide choice of one of them helps a writer to identify the originality of poetic linguistic thinking, despite the usual conceptual scheme, to show the unknown facets of what is described. In particular, a certain social characteristic of a person (social status, family ties, economic or professional activity, etc.) can also be projected on the recipient zone *wind*, which is confirmed by the metaphors of Ukrainian poetic discourse of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In the studied texts, the *wind* is depicted as an *exile* (G. Chuprynska), then as a *stranger* (I. Muratov), then as a *beggar* (L. Kostenko), then as a *thief* (L. Kostenko). Poets call him a *brother* (O. Oles, M. Johansen, G. Chuprynska, I. Drach) or nominate him as a representative of a certain profession: *watchman* (P. Filipovich), the *postman* (B. Rubchak), *janitor* (B.-I. Antonych, V. Vovk), *cornet* (M. Johansen), most often a *musician* (B. Lepky, B.-I. Antonych, V. Sosyura, M. Bazhan, O. Teliga, D. Pavlychko, L. Kostenko and others) (Selivanova, 2004).

Designing the same property of the donor zone on the recipient does not mean automatic reproduction of the standard form. For example, the *wind* is associated with the musician in the works of many poets of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, but artists imagine his playing on various instruments: *the winds play the harp* (P. Tychyna), *a drunken piano on a grass piano // the wind played* (B.-I. Antonych), *the north wind plays the bagpipe* (V. Svidzinsky), *the winds raised a million trembits // over Cheremosh* (A. Malyshko), *somewhere the wind plays the cello* (V. Symonenko) and others. Metaphors based on musical associations activate visual or acoustic perception. In P. Tychyna, as evidenced by the broader context, rye, swaying in the *wind*, resembles the strings of a harp; in B.-I. Antonych's grass swaying in the *wind* is like a piano key. V. Svidzinsky, A. Malyshko and V. Symonenko build metaphors on impressions from the sound perception of the wind. These impressions are different, because the sound of bagpipes, trembitas and cellos are different. Accordingly, in each metaphor different sound characteristics of the wind are profiled. However, even when the instrument played by the wind-musician is the same for different artists, the textual realisations of the metaphorical model, the properties and content profiled in it differ: *on the birch violin the wind played* (B.-I. Antonych), *the winds galaxy – eternal violinists* (L. Kostenko), *the wind under the window – a beggar-violinist* (D. Pavlychko) (Selivanova, 2004).

The design of new known qualities and features of the traditional donor zone is seen, for example, in individual-author metaphors formed on the basis of the conceptual metaphor *movement* (*road*) →



*life*: in the poetry of B.-I. Antonych's "Great Journey" actualises such a means of transportation as a *train*, and in one of the poems in the collection "Rubais" by D. Pavlychko – an escalator that carries someone up and someone down: *on the escalator of life – // some go down, others up*. Changes in conceptual metaphors are regulated by the principle of invariance, which limits the design of the properties of the donor zone to the recipient. The projection takes place in the presence of ontological correspondences in the knowledge structures of the donor and recipient zones. Violation of this principle leads to the appearance of paradoxical metaphors or absurd phrases.

The manifestation of the dynamics of a conceptual metaphor is the deployment of a basic metaphorical model within a single text (construction metaphor). In such cases, the language signs of the donor zone are reproduced to denote the recipient zone. Most large-scale Ukrainian poetic discourse of the 20<sup>th</sup> century acquire anthropomorphic metaphors are indicated in the Table 1. Metaphors of other types, for example, zoomorphic ones, are less frequent: *pigeon* → *evening*; *bull* → *thunderstorm*, *snakes* → *lightning*; *sheep* → *clouds*, *dog* → *train*; phytomorphic: *flower* → *autumn*; *tulip* → *sun*, *plant* → *language*; artifacts: *construction* → *poetry* (Selivanova, 2004).

**Table 1.** Examples of anthropomorphic metaphors in the works of various Ukrainian poets

Anthropomorphic metaphor	Author
<i>human</i> → <i>autumn</i>	B. Lepky, V. Svidzinsky, E. Pluzhnyk, A. Malyshko, L. Kostenko, O. Zabuzhko
<i>human</i> → <i>wind</i>	O. Oles, M. Rylsky, V. Symonenko, L. Kostenko, V. Vovk
<i>human</i> → <i>night</i>	B. Lepky, O. Oles, M. Zerov, V. Sosyura, V. Vovk
<i>human</i> → <i>evening</i>	M. Johansen, B.-I. Antonych, M. Semenko, P. Tychyna, L. Kostenko, I. Drach
<i>woman</i> → <i>earth</i>	B. Lepky, T. Osmachka, M. Rylsky, E. Malanyuk, A. Malyshko, I. Kalinets
<i>human</i> → <i>rain</i>	V. Svidzinsky, M. Rylsky, L. Pervomaisky, A. Malyshko, E. Andievska
<i>human</i> → <i>day</i>	P. Tychyna, M. Johansen, M. Semenko, V. Stus

The essence of the contamination of metaphorical models is that in the process of poetic creativity there are associatively complicated metaphors, which arose on the basis of one or more basic metaphorical models. For example, M. Vingranovsky by contaminating the basic models of *water* → *sky* and *water* → *dream* created an associatively complicated metaphor *splashing the sky of his dreams*. The key conceptual features of *water*, *sky* and *dreams*, implied in it, were purity, pleasure, changeability, dynamics, as well as the idea of the sky as something high, elusive, but desirable. The chain of author's associations was continued by the archetypal model of the *road* → *life*, represented by the token *path*: *I splashed the sky of my dreams // on your maiden path* (Selivanova, 2004).

In the language of Ukrainian poetry of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, numerous associatively complicated metaphors were recorded, in which the intermediate links of poetic associations were omitted: *harps*, *harps – // golden, loud groves sang, // self-ringing: // spring is coming // fragrant, // flowers-pearls // mowed* (P. Tychyna), *hand embraces the cold veins of the work* (M. Bazhan), *faceted spears of rhymes* (M. Bazhan), *shaky shadows of ancient towers // keep you on the surface of the word, // shallow and shiny* (I. Rymaruk). The dynamics of the metaphor is due to the use of new donor zones to define the traditional recipient zone. The impetus for this is the general civilisational dynamics of mankind, which is manifested in the change of human thinking and the emergence of new realities of

life. Knowledge of these realities becomes new donor zones in the understanding of traditional for poetry recipient zones.

For example, the use of a new donor zone is recorded in the poem “Silent Brother” (1965) by I. Drach, in which the archetype of the *tree* is interpreted in connection with the realities of scientific and technological progress: *accumulators of terrible prominences, // noisy trusts of young oxygen, // crown hetmans of a resounding chlorophyll, // silent brother of vocal poets: // in the lines of your green palms // a great mystery of human mystery – // poets and trees have defenceless hearts, // only when they burn, they serve the sun.* The dynamics of metaphor in the language of Ukrainian poetry of the 20<sup>th</sup> century enables the involvement of new recipient zones in the processes of metaphorisation, for the understanding of which traditional donor zones are actualised. Thus, A. Malyshko traditionally understands *nuclear war* as a *blizzard: an atomic blizzard*, and *the atomic nucleus* personifies: *and the atomic nucleus asks the grass for mercy* (Selivanova, 2004).

Processes of metaphorisation in the Ukrainian poetic discourse of the 20<sup>th</sup> century are subject to the laws of wave-like development: periods of active metaphor formation are replaced by periods of decline, which is manifested in a return to traditional models. Activation of metaphorisation processes in the language of Ukrainian poetry is observed in the 10-20s, 60s and 80s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, i.e. those periods when social processes intensify, artistic consciousness changes, new aesthetic paradigms appear. At other times, in metaphor formation, as in the language of poetry in general, the influence of tradition prevails (Demir, 2018). Metaphor, as the most productive means of language enrichment, is an indicator of the development of Ukrainian poetic language thinking, which during the 20<sup>th</sup> century becomes more and more emotionally associative and at the same time directed to the rational plane.

## 5. Conclusions

To conclude, metaphor as a way of transforming thought and word is an indicator of the intellectual dynamics of poetic discourse. This idea correlates with the cognitive (conceptual) theory of metaphor. The cognitive properties of metaphor, although they were noticed long before the formation of cognitive linguistics, only now receive a reasoned and detailed description. The essence of the cognitive concept of metaphor is that it is recognised by humans as a fundamental tool for conceptualising reality. The key thesis of this theory is the assertion that the very conceptual system in which people think and act is fundamentally metaphorical in nature, and only because, and not vice versa, metaphor exists in language, behaviour and our actions.

Metaphor is one of the basic methods of human cognition of the objects of the surrounding reality, their nomination and creation of artistic images, as well as the generation of new meanings. It not only exhibits in linguistic form the results of figurative cognition of reality but also influence its further development and makes it possible to construct a new reality. Anthropocentric and cognitive approaches to the interpretation of linguistic phenomena help to better understand the essence of the process of metaphorical transference. The cognitive approach to metaphor analysis occupies a leading position in modern metaphor, but many aspects of cognitive theory still remain controversial. The theory proposed by J. Lakoff and M. Johnson has gained wide recognition worldwide and has found wide application in practical research, however, this theory is actively developed and interpreted in many scientific schools and areas, gaining new impetus to evolution within different methodological settings.

Studies of metaphor have gone beyond so-called internal linguistics and use data from other sciences. Due to the wide nature of metaphors, the authors believe that the field for the study of conceptual metaphor is quite large, because the study of this phenomenon will provide results that will expand the knowledge of the human conceptual system.

## References

- Arutyunova, N.D. (1978). Functional types of a language metaphor. *Izvestiya AN SSSR*, 7(4), 333–343.
- Arutyunova, N.D. (1990). *The theory of metaphor*. Moscow: Progress.
- Awadh, A., & Khan, A. (2020). Challenges of translating neologisms comparative study: Human and machine translation. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(4), 1987–2002.
- Buinova, O.Yu. (2001). *Universal and specific features of the metaphorization process*. Dubna: Phoenix +.
- Demir, C. (2018). Are the ELL students aware of their 21st century skills? *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 14(4), 74–92.
- Dibavar, S.S., Abbasi, P., & Pirnajmuddin, H. (2019). The metaphorical stage of J. M. Coetzee's waiting for the Barbarians. *Research in African Literatures*, 50(4), 87–107.
- Farshi, V., & Afrashi, A. (2020). The differences and similarities of the conceptualization of sadness in poetic and non-poetic language: A cognitive and corpus-based study. *Language Related Research*, 11(1), 193–217.
- Gibbs Jr., R.W. (2018). Words making love together: Dynamics of metaphoric creativity. In E. Winter-Froemel & V. Thaler (Eds.), *Cultures and traditions of wordplay and wordplay research* (pp. 23-46). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Lakoff, G. (1989). *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Oparina, E.O. (1988). *Conceptual metaphor*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Parrilla Sotomayor, E.E. (2018). Argumentation and conceptual schemes in poetry. *Literatura y Linguística*, 37, 329–353.
- Pavlovich, N.V. (2004). *Language of images*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Piata, A., & Pagán Cánovas, C. (2017). Powerful rhyme and sluttish time: A cross-linguistic study of time personification in poetic discourse. *Language and Literature*, 26(1), 18–33.
- Rasse, C., Onysko, A., & Citron, F.M.M. (2020). Conceptual metaphors in poetry interpretation: A psycholinguistic approach. *Language and Cognition*, 12(2), 310–342.
- Rédey, Z. 2018. Metaphor in modern and contemporary poetry and its possible interpretations. *World Literature Studies*, 10(3), 5–18.
- Selivanova, O. (2004). *Essays on Ukrainian phraseology (psychocognitive and ethnocultural aspects)*. Cherkasy: Brama.
- Skrebtsova, T.G. (2011). *Cognitive linguistics*. Saint Petersburg: Saint Petersburg State University.
- Szelid, V., & Kövecses, Z. (2018). Metaphor universals in literature. *Magyar Nyelv*, 142(3), 452–478.

- Telia, V.N. (1988). *Metaphor as a model of meaning production and its expressive-evaluative function*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Ushinsky, K.D. (2019). *Native word*. Moscow: Yurayt.
- Zhuravel, O.D. (2020). To the study of visual poetics in the old believer literature of the 18th century. *Kritika i Semiotika*, 2020(1), 249–262.

## Ukrayna şiirsel söyleminde bilişsel (kavramsal) metafor

### Özet

Modern metafor teorisi, metaforu dünyayı bilmenin, sınıflandırmanın, kavramsallaştırmanın, değerlendirmenin ve açıklamanın bir yolu olarak önemli bir zihinsel işlem olarak görür. Bu çalışmanın amacı, Ukraynalı şairlerin eserleri örneğini kullanarak bilişsel (kavramsal) metaforun özelliklerini netleştirmek ve bilişsel (kavramsal) metaforun şiirsel söylemdeki rolünü belirlemektir. Hedefe ulaşmak için, metafor çalışmasına bilişsel yaklaşımın yanı sıra metaforu çeşitli yönlerden keşfetmeyi mümkün kılan dilbilimsel analiz gibi uygun biliş araçları kullanıldı. Makale, "bilişsel" ve "kavramsal" metafor kavramlarının ortaya çıkış tarihini ve bu kavramların yorumlanmasına ilişkin görüşlerin çeşitli dilbilimsel okulların - yabancı ve yerli - bakış açısından karşılaştırmalı analizini incelemektedir. Yabancı araştırmacılarının bilişsel ve kavramsal metafor kavramlarını paylaştığı, yerli araştırmacıların ise bu terimleri belirlediği sonucuna varıldı. İçlerinde bilişsel (kavramsal) metafor kullanımının özelliklerini belirlemek için Ukrayna şiir söyleminin bir analizi de yapıldı. Analiz sırasında, dilin tam da biliş ve zenginleştirilmesinin bir aracı olarak metaforun, giderek duygusal olarak ilişkisel ve aynı zamanda daha da duygusal-çağrışımlı hale gelen Ukrayna şiirsel dilbilimsel düşüncesinin gelişiminin bir göstergesi olduğu sonucuna varıldı ve bir yandan rasyonel düzleme doğru yöneldi. Araştırmanın pratik önemi, benzer konularda daha fazla araştırmada yürütülen analiz şemasının kullanımında yatmaktadır.

*Anahtar sözcükler:* dilbilim; metafor; kavramsal metafor; şiirsel söylem; kültürel ve düşünce süreçleri.

### AUTHORS BIODATA

**Larysa V. Kravets** – Full Doctor in Philology, Professor, Department of Philology, Ferenc Rakoczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian College of Higher Education, Beregovo, Ukraine. Research interests: linguistic stylistics, cognitive poetics, linguocultural studies, language culture, text theory.

**Halyna M. Siuta** – Full Doctor in Philology, Senior Researcher, Department of Stylistics, Language Culture and Sociolinguistics, Institute for Ukrainian Language, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine. Research interests: problems of theoretical and historical stylistics (the influence of the language of fiction on the development of literary language, stylistic artistic norms, the ratio of linguistic, stylistic and idiostyle norms, the writer's linguistic portrait), linguopoetics, lexical semantics, intertextuality, receptive poetics and recipes, language culture.

**Lyubov V. Struhanets** – Full Doctor in Philology, Professor, Head of the Department of Ukrainian Language and Methods of Teaching, Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University, Ternopil, Ukraine. Honored Worker of Education of Ukraine. Research interests: language culture, sociolinguistics, lexicology and stylistics of the Ukrainian language, methods of teaching in universities.

**Yuriy B. Struhanets** – Ph.D. in Philology, Lecturer, Department of Ukrainian Language and Methods of Teaching, Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University, Ternopil, Ukraine. Research interests: lexicology, terminology and stylistics of the Ukrainian language.