ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES VOLUME 2 | ISSUE 6 | 2021
ISSN: 2181-1385
Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF) 2021: 5.723
DOI: 10.24412/2181-1385-2021-6-1100-1106

THE NOTION OF STYLISTIC DEVICES FROM THE POSITION OF COGNITIVE STYLISTICS

Mahliyo Otkirovna Ortikova

Teacher at Department of Practical Disciplines of English Language,
Uzbekistan State University of World Languages

ABSTRACT

The author of the article defines the notion of stylistic devices from the position of cognitive stylistics. Stylistic device is regarded as a cognitive model, means of transmitting the conceptual information of the text in cognitive stylistics. Cognitive metaphor is a new term in cognitive linguistics. According to George Lacoff and Mark Johnson defined cognitive metaphor as not only a stylistic device but also as a cognitive model, mechanism of cognition and a way of thinking. George Lacoff and Mark Johnson wrote the book “Metaphors we live by” in which the theory of Conceptual Metaphor was first introduced. This theory was studied by other scholars such as scholars as E. S. Kubryakova, Mc. Cormack, Reddy, Turner, A. Richards, Gibbs, M. Black and many others. Conceptual metaphor theory consists of two domains. The first one is called *target domain which* is considered to be more abstract than the source. Second domain is called *source domain which* is more concrete and describes the target domain making understanding easier. Besides cognitive metaphor, the author of the article defines some essential principles and notions of cognitive linguistics such as knowledge structures, the principle of iconicity and linguistic economy. Knowledge structures can be defined as blocks of information and knowledge obtained during the process of human’s cognitive activity and presented in the mind as a regulated system. Iconicity is the principle that requires some kind of conformity between the world perception and its language representation in the text. Linguistic economy refers putting as much information as possible using the smallest parts of linguistic units.

Keywords: cognitive metaphor, conceptual metaphor, target domain, source domain, knowledge structures, iconicity, linguistic economy.

ISSN: 2181-1385
Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF) 2021: 5.723
DOI: 10.24412/2181-1385-2021-6-1100-1106

INTRODUCTION

Stylistic devices are traditionally regarded as stylistically marked units in texts and always serve to convey additional connotative information. The theory of Stylistic Device was very well elaborated by Galperin. According to him, "Stylistic Device is a conscious and intentional intensification of some typical structural or semantic property of a language unit (neutral or expressive) promoted to a generalized status and thus becoming a generative model". Typology of Stylistic Devices is based on the principle of interaction of meanings in Lexical Stylistic Devices and syntactical structure in Lexico-Syntactical Stylistic Devices. For example, stylistic devices such as metaphor, metonymy and irony are based on interaction of dictionary and contextual meanings. Epithet, oxymoron and hyperbole are based on interaction of logical and emotive meanings and so on. Thus, from the traditional point of view Stylistic Devices are regarded as linguistic units built according to some semantic and structural model. However, with the development of Cognitive Linguistics the traditional approach to Stylistic Devices has been completely reconsidered and renewed. In cognitive stylistics stylistic device is regarded as a cognitive model, means of transmitting the conceptual information of the text. To illustrate, we should refer to some examples of stylistic devices from the position of cognitive stylistics. Cognitive Metaphor is the best example.

METHODOLOGY

Metaphors had been studied for over 2000 years. Since the ancient times, many philosophers and philologists have attempted to define this term. Since the time of Aristotle metaphor had been identified as implicit comparison. Metaphors can be defined as transference of some quality from one object to another or a figure of speech in which an implicit comparison is observed between two different phenomena (things, events, actions, etc) that have something in common. With the emergence of new

ISSN: 2181-1385
Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF) 2021: 5.723
DOI: 10.24412/2181-1385-2021-6-1100-1106

sciences such as cognitive linguistics and stylistics, new terms and notions came to existence. These new notions changed the traditional view on metaphor. One of the new terms in Cognitive Linguistics is called ***"Cognitive Metaphor".*** It was emerged at the beginning of the eighties. George Lacoff and Mark Johnson wrote the book "Metaphors we live by" in which the theory of Conceptual Metaphor was first introduced. According to this framework, metaphor is identified as not only a stylistic device but also as a cognitive model, mechanism of cognition and a way of thinking. Special attention of Lacoff and Johnson to cognitive metaphor gave inspiration to other scholars to study and develop this theory. It is worth mentioning the names of such famous scholars as E. S. Kubryakova, Mc. Cormack, Reddy, Turner, A. Richards, Gibbs, M. Black and many others. Lacoff and Johnson state that metaphor operates at the level of thinking as "our conceptual system is largely metaphorical and our ordinary conceptual systems, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature" (Lacoff, Johnson, 1980:3). D. U. Ashurova takes the view that Cognitive Metaphor is one of the fundamental processes of human cognition, a specific way of conceptualizing reality based on the mental process of analogy and knowledge transfer from one conceptual field into another (2016). Cognitive metaphors help us to perceive the world to conceptualize the information. According to Lacoff, (1993) conceptual metaphors reveal habitual way of thinking in which people metaphorically construe abstract concepts (time, emotion, feeling in terms of more concrete concepts). There distinguished two kinds of domains in conceptual metaphor theory: *the target domain* and *source domain.* ***The Target domain*** is considered to be more abstract than the source. ***The Source domain*** is more concrete and describes the target domain making understanding easier. Kovecses (2002: 20) maintains that "target domains are abstract, diffuse, and lack clear delineation; as a result they "cry out" for metaphorical conceptualization".

ISSN: 2181-1385
Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF) 2021: 5.723
DOI: 10.24412/2181-1385-2021-6-1100-1106

RESULTS

To express conceptual metaphors usually “A IS B” format is used. Conceptual metaphor “PROGRESS THROUGH TIME IS FORWARD MOTION” can serve as an example. In this example, “progress through time” is an abstract concept and constitutes the target domain and “forward motion” is more concrete and constitutes the source domain.

According to Lakoff (1993) the relationship between the two domains of a conceptual metaphor as a ‘function’ and in this function specific properties of the source domain are ‘mapped onto’ the target domain. Now, let us analyze conceptual metaphor given above, PROGRESS THROUGH TIME IS FORWARD MOTION, special properties (it might be fast or slow, difficult or easy, straight or winding,) of the source domain, FORWARD MOTION are mapped onto the target domain of ‘PROGRESS THTOUGH TIME’. This conceptual metaphor entails some metaphorical expressions such as ‘time passing very quickly’, ‘having a supremely difficult time’, or a ‘time horizon’ (Bank of English examples). Thus, The relationship between two domains is one way system. That means progress through time is regarded as forward motion, however, forward motion cannot be treated as progress through time. In other words we conclude that the source domain cannot be described in terms of the target domain while the target domain is described in terms of the source domain. This peculiarity of conceptual metaphor is called the “unidirectionality” of conceptual metaphor. Metaphors map structure from the source domain to a target one, but not from the target domain to the source one. Let’s analyze another example by Lacoff and Johnson “LOVE IS JOURNEY”. LOVE can be conceptualized in our minds in terms of JOURNEYS, while JOURNEYS cannot be structured in terms of LOVE. The reason is that travellers are not conventionally regarded as “lowers”. But lowers can be regarded as “travellers”. That’s way, the target and source domain are characterized by the unidirectionality of mapping.

ISSN: 2181-1385
Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF) 2021: 5.723
DOI: 10.24412/2181-1385-2021-6-1100-1106

Proceeding with the topic of cognitive approach to stylistic devices, we should discuss the problem of knowledge structures and their verbalization with the help of stylistic devices.

As it is known one of the essential notions of cognitive linguistics is knowledge structures.

Knowledge structures regarded as blocks of information and knowledge obtained during the process of human's cognitive activity and presented in the mind as a regulated system (D.U.Ashurova). This means that knowledge is structured as result of the human's thinking process.

DISCUSSION

Different types of knowledge structures can be differentiated: ***linguistic knowledge*** to which we refer lexicon, grammar, word-formation, phonetics, semantics, etc. ***Encyclopedic knowledge*** includes world knowledge, history, politics, economics, etc. ***Communicative knowledge*** embraces communicative aim and intentions, situation, conditions, strategies and consequences. The analysis of language material has shown that there are some stylistic devices which are aimed to represent certain knowledge structure. For example: allusion, antonomasia, symbols, euphemism, etc.

Another cognitive principle of representing information in the text is the principle of iconicity. ***Iconicity*** is the principle that requires some kind of conformity between the world perception and its language representation in the text. D. U. Ashurova says that it concerns not only chronological, but also spatial, causative, socially-conditioned regularities of the text elements reflecting the development of events in reality. For example:

He came, he saw, he conquered.

Another principle of cognitive stylistics is the principle of economy. ***Linguistic economy*** refers putting as much information as possible using

ISSN: 2181-1385
Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF) 2021: 5.723
DOI: 10.24412/2181-1385-2021-6-1100-1106

the smallest parts of linguistic units. Redundancy can be understood as the repetition of some linguistic units throughout the whole text. There are some Stylistic devices which are based on the principle of redundancy. For instance, repetition, periphrasis, synonyms and words belonging to the semantic and thematic groups are used to express the principle of redundancy.

CONCLUSION

Summing up, the following conclusions can be made. At the present stage of modern Linguistics under the influence of Cognitive Linguistics Stylistics undergoes a lot of changes, new approaches, revision of many notions and assumptions. Stylistic Device from the position of Cognitive Linguistics is regarded as a mechanism of cognition, a way of thinking, a cognitive model. Categorization of stylistic devices is based on cognitive principles such as cognitive principle of iconicity, representation of knowledge structures and redundancy.

REFERENCES

1. Ashurova D.U. Stilistika teksta v paradigme kognitivnoy stilistiki // Filologiya masalalari. Tashkent, 2003. – No 1.

2. Galperin A.I. Ocherki po stilistike angliyskogo yazika. - Moskva, 1981.

3. Djusupov N.M. Lingvokognitivniy aspekt issledovaniya simvola v xudojestvennom tekste.

4. Dusabayeva A.A. Lingvokognitivnaya i intertekstualnaya sumnost allyuzii v angliyskom yazike Avtoref. dis. kand. ... filol. nauk. - Samarkand, 2009.

ISSN: 2181-1385
Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF) 2021: 5.723
DOI: 10.24412/2181-1385-2021-6-1100-1106

5. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphor we Live by.- Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

6. Кубрякова Е. С. Категоризация мира: пространство и время: материалы научной конференцию- Москва: Диалог-МГУ, 1997.