

Novichkov P.Yu.

**METAPHORIZATION AS A CURRENT PROBLEM IN
MODERN LINGUISTICS**

The article considers mechanisms of metaphorization as a practical linguistic tool of studying lexical semantics ie uncovering and analyzing figurative meanings of words which at times differ greatly from their literal meanings. All theoretical deliberations are facilitated by examples of English and Russian verbs with the common figurative meaning "to feel / inflict pain".

One of the urgent problems considered in modern linguistics is the mechanisms of metaphorization. Metaphorization usually means the use of a word in a figurative meaning, which arose on the basis of associations by similarity (compare: circles under the eyes). What happens when metaphorizing, for example, a verb? Each verb, like any word, has a direct meaning, which is formed by a certain taxonomic class of words used with a given verb. For example, the verb to put has a direct meaning "to place in a standing position", compare: Vasily Petrovich put a sack of potatoes on the ground. In the given example, the verb has three arguments: the subject Vasily Petrovich, the direct object bag, the circumstance of the place on the ground. But when we say: Vasily Petrovich gave Fedya a two, we express a completely different idea. According to the same dictionary,

Note that the meaning is transformed due to a change in the taxonomic class of the arguments of a given verb: it is clear that the deuce is an object belonging to a different taxonomic class than a bag, and it is impossible to put it in the meaning of "standing in a standing position". The new taxonomic status of the name requires a new meaning of the verb.

Now let's apply the same reasoning, for example, to the English verb feel. In its direct use, it is a transitive verb with the meaning "to touch, to touch." As an addition, a specific object of the outside world is used: The blind felt the letters in the book (The blind felt the letters in the book). Usages like I feel music (I feel the music) or He felt the truth of what was said (He was aware of the correctness of what was said) are interpreted as metaphorical, because they describe not a physical, but a mental action as a direct complement they no longer have a concrete, but an abstract object ... A change in taxonomic class again dictates a change in meaning. The metaphor can also be labeled syntactically: for example, in contexts like to feel well / unwell with the meaning "to be in some state,

The semantic field of English pain verbs is a very interesting object of linguistic description. First, you need to define the scope of this semantic field. According to the International Association for the Study of Pain, pain is an unpleasant physiological and emotional sensation associated with actual or potential tissue damage or described in terms corresponding to such damage [8].

The analysis of a large number of examples obtained from electronic databases (British National Corpus), reference publications and interviews with informants allows us to obtain interesting data on the meaning and functioning of painful verbs.

Our research indicates that the world's languages are designed in such a way that they have very few (usually one or two) painful verbs proper - such as Russian to hurt (the leg hurts). In English, in fact, there are only three main verbs of pain semantics in their direct meaning: hurt, ache, pain. In order to express more detailed oppositions, English, like other languages, borrows verbs from other semantic fields [2].

The main borrowings of this kind in English are the verbs of burning (burn, sear etc), sound (buzz, click etc), movement (surge, run etc.), tool impact (cane, bite etc.), verbs of soft deformation (pull, lock etc.). It is noteworthy that in the Russian field of verbs of pain, similar processes are observed, and borrowings are carried out from the same semantic fields - burning (it burns in the side, bakes the head, etc.), sound (feet buzz, buzz in the head, etc.)

etc.), movement (belly twists), tool impact (pricks in the side, knocks at the temples, etc.), soft deformation (presses on the chest) and others.

If you break Russian and English verbs into pairs according to the similarity of their meaning, you get the deceptive impression that English words equivalent to Russian are their full synonyms. However, upon closer inspection, everything turns out to be much more complicated.

As an example, consider the pain zone for the so-called "instrumental" verbs. An interesting subgroup stands out in it, which includes verbs that express the processes performed by a real tool (cut or saw), as well as parts of the body of an animal or person - claws, teeth, beak, sting (scratch, peck, bite, sting). Using such verbs (they could be called "quasi-instrumental") in their figurative "painful" meaning, in Russian we say: pulls the throat or bite socks, describing the zone of pain.

In English, several quasi-instrumental verbs can be distinguished, acquiring the semantics of pain in their indirect meanings: sting (sting), bite (biting a mustache), gnaw (gnawing), scar (scratching) and nibble (pinching, biting). The most common of these are sting and bite. We will consider them as an example.

By analyzing the original meanings of the Russian sting and bite and the English sting and bite as conjugated pairs, one can trace the differences and similarities in their meanings. Consider the subject of the action indicated by the verbs of interest. At first glance, it is easy to draw a border here: it is either a "toothy" animal (for example, a dog), or a poisonous insect (for example, a wasp, bee, scorpion, and the like). Indeed, in both languages, a dog (and others like it) bites - bite, and a wasp stings - sting. However, in Russian, about a wasp, you can say not only a wasp stings, but also bites, while in English the use of the verb bite will be incorrect. It turns out that there are significant discrepancies between Russian and English in this zone: the noun snake, which in Russian is used with the verbs to bite and sting (like the noun wasp), in English, it is semantically combined only with the verb bite. That is, in English, the lexeme is built on the fact that in terms of the action performed, the snake looks more like a wasp than a dog.

If we proceed from the well-known hypothesis about the motivation of the linguistic behavior of vocabulary [6, 7], then such compatibility differences are due to semantic differences: this means that there is a difference between Russian to bite and English to bite, on the one hand, and Russian to bite and English sting, on the other ... Then it would be interesting to build a semantic model of these tokens. Below is one of the variants of such a model.

For the English sting, in contrast to the Russian sting, it is important with what tool the damage is inflicted - this is a special sting in the form of a thorn that pierces a part of the body, therefore in English the snake will only bite (bite), and the wasp will only sting (sting). In the Russian language, the focus of our attention is on the idea of introducing poison into the body, and not on exposure to a sharp tool - so in Russian, a snake, and not just a wasp, can also sting.

Followt also note that in the Russian linguistic picture of the world the idea of introducing poison into the organism of a living creature as a whole (sting) to causing damage to a specific fragment of its body (biting) is lexically opposed. In Russian we say: I was stung by a wasp. However, in Russian it is not available: * the wasp stung (my) hand (cf. more acceptable: stung my hand) and in general it is impossible to sting my hand: sting as a direct addition requires a noun denoting a living being, and does not allow nouns with the meaning "part body". This is another indirect evidence in favor of the fact that the verb to sting means "to introduce poison into a living organism in general."

The English sting does not have such a restriction on the object as the Russian sting: in English you can say both a bee stung me (the bee stung me), and a bee stung my leg, (literally: the bee stung my leg). The fact is that in addition to the idea of "injecting poison", sting has another, stronger, component of meaning: "pierce with a sting" - it is he who provides this opportunity for sting.

Now let's turn to the figurative meanings of these verbs, which are associated with pain

in a person. Here Russian and English are very different. The Russian metaphorical system of the verbs under consideration is very poor: to sting does not mean pain at all, and to bite describes weak unpleasant sensations on the body from coarse (usually woolen) material, cf. socks bite.

The English system of expressing painful meaning is richer primarily due to the sting verb; bite is less frequent in this meaning and is usually synonymous with sting.

Most often, the painful sensation described by this verb is caused not by gross matter, but by an aggressive environment - caustic liquids:

(1) This antiseptic stings a little [5].

(2) Chopping onions makes my eyes sting [5].

(3) The wound on your leg will start stinging if you go swimming in the sea. [5]

It is curious that the sensations that a person experiences in the situations described in these examples, although they are best conveyed in Russian, apparently by the verb pinching, are very similar to tingling. This, in principle, corresponds to the idea expressed in the previous section that "piercing" / "piercing" (sting) is central to the semantics of English sting.

Another group of metaphorical use is associated with unpleasant painful sensations caused by the manifestations of bad weather: heavy rain, hail, wind:

(4) My bare feet felt like blocks of ice in the mud, and the rain was stinging my face (in the sharpening wind) [5].

(5) The wind was stinging my eyes and the tears were freezing on my face as I hiked down to a village. (The wind pricked [as if stinging] my eyes, and tears froze on my face as I went down to the village) [5].

Here a parallel arises with the Russian, in which this kind of "piercing" wind is described by the adjective piercing, and the snow - thorny. It seems that this adjective can give a key to understanding the figurative meaning of the verb sting in English: "sting", the wind, first of all, "pierces" (or "pierces") a person through and through, as if pierces with a sting - this is in a sense mechanical the component of the painful meaning of this verb is the main one for sting. Compare with the English expression stinging wind: They set off through the stinging wind. (They set out on a journey against the piercing wind) [5].

The literal picture of the comparison of Russian and English gives a not quite the same result: the Russian metaphor of unpleasant, almost painful sensations from a strong wind originates only from the instrumental verbs themselves: in the original meaning, only a person can pierce or pierce something or someone, using a dagger for this, spear, knife and similar sharp objects. The English language also offers a metaphor from another source: the starting point for it is the quasi-instrumental situation of using a sting by an insect. But this expansion of the range of sources becomes possible because the verb sting itself (in contrast to its Russian analogue to sting) turns out to be semantically not so far from the instrumental zone itself. That is, both the similarities and differences in this fragment of the Russian and English worldview are fully motivated.

Another indirect linguistic evidence for this is provided by the so-called secondary metaphors. By "secondary" we mean in this case the transfers of "physical" verb meanings not into ("primary", physiological, the area - the area of pain), but into the area of emotional or mental sensations. If we return to the verb sting, then the most common phrases are where this verb is used with the noun words (words):

(6) My father usually didn't let criticism from the media affect him very much, but those words stung him (My father usually didn't pay attention to offensive criticism of the media, but these words hurt him to the core) [5].

(7) The words stung because they implied that the immigrant did not truly belong in Britain. [5]

We are talking about an unpleasant emotional impression, which, again, can be translated into Russian as a prick. I must say that the Russian sting, without having a primary (painful) one, has a secondary (mental-emotional) metaphor, compare: this thought stung me (literally: the thought stung / pierced me).

But in this case, we mean a completely different situation - not a reaction to an external

irritation (injection), but a more general suddenly arisen internal state, and due to internal stimuli - one's own thought, memory, etc.

However, even more interesting is another group of secondary metaphors of the English verb sting, which do not carry the semantic load of "emotional offense", but convey an urge to action. Example:... and it seemed as if they had been stung into action by the criticism leveled at them (... and it seemed that the criticism leveled at them prompted [stung] them to action) [5].

Note that in these cases, the management model changes: the sting verb acquires a new argument expressing the action-goal; it is introduced by the preposition into. The interpretation of this metaphor can also serve as a confirmation of our hypothesis about the importance of the "mechanical" component in the semantics of sting - as if from some external prick a person jumped up and began to do something.

In conclusion, I would like to once again emphasize the relevance of the study of polysemy and lexical metaphorization in order to obtain the most adequate understanding of the linguistic picture of the world. From a linguistic point of view, a deep analysis and constant contextual comparison of the meanings of the respective lexical units of the English and Russian languages makes it possible to more accurately establish the semantic appearance of the studied language material.

LITERATURE

1. Arutyunova N.D. *The proposal and its meaning*. - M., 1976.
2. Bonch-Osmolovskaya A.A., Rakhilina E.V., Reznikova T.I. *Conceptualization of pain in Russian: a typological perspective // Computational linguistics and intellectual technologies: Proceedings of the international conference "Dialogue 2007" (Bekasovo, May 30 - June 3, 2007) / Ed. L.L. Iomdina, N.I. Laufer, A.S. Narinyani, V.P. Selegia*. - M., 2007. S. 76–82.
3. Ozhegov S.I., Shvedova N.Yu. *Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language (S – Z)*. - http://lib.misto.kiev.ua/DIC/OZHEGOW/ozhegow_s_q.txt1
4. E.V. Paducheva *Dynamic models and processes in the language*. - M., 2004.
5. Wierzbicka A. *Lexicography and conceptual analysis*. - Ann Arbor, 1985.
6. Wierzbicka A. *The Semantics of Grammar*. - Amsterdam, 1988.
7. *British National Corpus*. - <http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/>
eight.
international Association for the Study of Pain. - [http://www.iasp-pain.org/AM/](http://www.iasp-pain.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Home)
Template.cfm? Section = Home