

**CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR AS A LINGUOMENTAL TOOL OF REALITY
KNOWLEDGE: IDENTIFICATION PROBLEM**

***METÁFORA CONCEITUAL COMO FERRAMENTA LINGUOMENTAL DE
CONHECIMENTO DA REALIDADE: PROBLEMA DE IDENTIFICAÇÃO***

***LA METÁFORA CONCEPTUAL COMO HERRAMIENTA LINGUOMENTAL DEL
CONOCIMIENTO DE LA REALIDAD: PROBLEMA DE IDENTIFICACIÓN***

Tetiana VILCHYNSKA¹
Halyna BACHYNSKA²
Oksana VERBOVETSKA³
Iryna BABII⁴
Nina SVYSTUN⁵
Mariana SOKOL⁶

ABSTRACT: The article investigates conceptual metaphor as a linguo-instrumental tool by which a person is able to know, evaluate and transform the world. The history of metaphor study has been considered in detail, from its complete denial to understanding as a mechanism of objective reality cognition, and it has been found that most approaches to the interpretation of metaphor were demonstrated in the twentieth century. In particular, it has been considered as a means of forming concepts, and as a semantic-two-dimensional, clearly connoted unit, and as a figurative structure of language, as a marker of idiosyncrasy, and as an object of linguistic and cultural research etc. The twentieth century witnessed the emergence of new scientific linguistic directions, which laid the foundations for understanding the conceptual metaphor associated with understanding the processes of transformation of mental categories into the language during cognition of the world, interpretation of metaphorical meaning, mechanisms of metaphorical renaming and suggestion, and manipulative potential of metaphor, etc. Within different scientific approaches a metaphor is considered as a mental phenomenon, an important way of creating concepts in the language world, which contributed to the emergence of new

¹ Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University (TNPU), Ternopil – Ukraine. Professor of the Department of General Linguistics and Slavic Languages. Doctor of Philological Sciences. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4881-6132>. E-mail: vilchynska@tnpu.edu.us

² Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University (TNPU), Ternopil – Ukraine. Assistant Professor of the Department of General Linguistics and Slavic Languages. PhD in Philology. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6901-613X>. E-mail: bahynska@tnpu.edu.us

³ Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University (TNPU), Ternopil – Ukraine. Professor of the Department of General Linguistics and Slavic Languages. PhD in Philology. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3142-364X>. E-mail: verbovetska@tnpu.edu.us

⁴ Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University (TNPU), Ternopil – Ukraine. Assistant Professor of the Department of General Linguistics and Slavic Languages. PhD in Philology. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1568-7920>. E-mail: babiy@tnpu.edu.us

⁵ Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University (TNPU), Ternopil – Ukraine. Assistant Professor of the Department of General Linguistics and Slavic Languages. PhD in Philology. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0398-8803>. E-mail: svystyn@tnpu.edu.us

⁶ Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University (TNPU), Ternopil – Ukraine. Professor of the Romanic-German Philology Department. Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3876-026X>. E-mail: sokol@tnpu.edu.us

theories of cognitive study of metaphors as descriptive theory blends, metaphorical modelling, cognitive-onomastic analysis, etc. Further study of the conceptual metaphor, primarily on specific textual material, will reveal the cognitive-linguistic mechanisms of a person, taking into account national specifics, to identify the deep links between the language of the people and its intellectual heritage.

KEYWORDS: Linguística cognitiva. Metáfora cognitiva. Metáfora conceitual. Instrumento linguístico de cognição.

RESUMO: *O artigo pesquisa metáforas conceituais como uma ferramenta lingüo-instrumental pela qual uma pessoa é capaz de conhecer, avaliar e transformar o mundo. A história do estudo da metáfora tem sido considerada em detalhes, desde sua completa negação até a compreensão como um mecanismo de cognição objetiva da realidade, e descobriu-se que a maioria das abordagens para a interpretação da metáfora foram demonstradas no século XX. Em particular, foi considerada como um meio de formar conceitos, e como uma unidade semântica bidimensional, claramente conotada, e como uma estrutura figurativa da linguagem, como um marcador de idiosincrasia, e como um objeto de pesquisa linguística e cultural, etc. O século XX testemunhou o surgimento de novas direções lingüísticas científicas, que lançaram as bases para a compreensão da metáfora conceitual associada à compreensão dos processos de transformação de categorias mentais na linguagem durante o conhecimento do mundo, interpretação do significado metafórico, mecanismos de renomeação e sugestão metafórica, e potencial manipulador da metáfora, etc. Dentro de diferentes abordagens científicas, uma metáfora é considerada como um fenômeno mental, uma forma importante de criar conceitos no mundo da linguagem, o que contribuiu para o surgimento de novas teorias de estudo cognitivo de metáforas como misturas de teorias descritivas, modelagem metafórica, análise cognitivo-onomástica, etc. Um estudo mais aprofundado da metáfora conceitual, principalmente sobre material textual específico, revelará os mecanismos cognitivo-linguísticos de uma pessoa, levando em conta as especificidades nacionais, para identificar as profundas ligações entre a linguagem do povo e sua herança intelectual.*

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Linguística cognitiva. Metáfora cognitiva. Metáfora conceitual. Instrumento linguístico de cognição.

RESUMEN: *El artículo investiga la metáfora conceptual como herramienta lingüística-instrumental mediante la cual una persona es capaz de conocer, evaluar y transformar el mundo. Se ha considerado en detalle la historia del estudio de la metáfora, desde su completa negación hasta su comprensión como mecanismo de cognición de la realidad objetiva, y se ha encontrado que la mayoría de los enfoques de la interpretación de la metáfora se demostraron en el siglo XX. En particular, se ha considerado como medio de formación de conceptos, y como unidad semántica bidimensional, claramente connotada, y como estructura figurativa del lenguaje, como marcador de idiosincrasia, y como objeto de investigación lingüística y cultural, etc. El siglo XX fue testigo de la aparición de nuevas direcciones lingüísticas científicas, que sentaron las bases para la comprensión de la metáfora conceptual asociada a la comprensión de los procesos de transformación de las categorías mentales en el lenguaje durante la cognición del mundo, la interpretación del significado metafórico, los mecanismos de renombramiento y sugestión metafórica, y el potencial manipulador de la metáfora, etc. Dentro de los diferentes enfoques científicos, la metáfora se considera un fenómeno mental, una forma importante de crear conceptos en el mundo del lenguaje, lo que ha contribuido a la*

aparición de nuevas teorías de estudio cognitivo de las metáforas, como la teoría descriptiva de las mezclas, el modelado metafórico, el análisis cognitivo-onomástico, etc. Un estudio más profundo de la metáfora conceptual, principalmente sobre material textual específico, revelará los mecanismos cognitivo-lingüísticos de una persona, teniendo en cuenta las especificidades nacionales, para identificar los vínculos profundos entre la lengua del pueblo y su patrimonio intelectual.

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Lingüística cognitiva. Metáfora cognitiva. Metáfora conceptual. Instrumento lingüístico de cognición.*

Problem statement in general

Interest in metaphor as a universal tool and way of human thinking and the processes of its verbalization in the modern scientific paradigm today is not weakened, but rather stimulates the expansion of new research aspects. Changing worldview paradigms in the twentieth century expanded the scope of the metaphor and led to its rethinking. The concept of metaphor began to be understood not only as a figurative structure but also as a powerful linguistic instrument with which a person can know the world and which, according to its main function, has been called cognitive. Cognitive background and specific features characterize the conceptual metaphor. Given the heuristic, figurative, dynamic potential of such a metaphor and given the fact that through it objectified results of human cognitive activity, especially its expression in a word, the study remains a relevant conceptual metaphor. Because it will reveal the cognitive-linguistic mechanisms of a person.

Research analysis

As it is known, the study of metaphor began in ancient times and is characterized by heterogeneity and contradictory approaches: from its complete denial (T. HOBBS, M. MUELLER, B. RUSSELL) to understanding as a mechanism of cognition of objective reality (J. LAKOFF, M. JOHNSON, M. TURNER, J. FAUCONNIER). This ambivalent understanding of metaphors is caused by the influence of various philosophical paradigms that are essential to understanding the language and mental phenomenon in a certain historical period. Thus, the works of ancient and medieval scholars served as the basis on which later linguistic studies of metaphor, including conceptual have been developed and where the principles of understanding this multifaceted phenomenon as a transfer based on conceptual relations - categorical or by analogy have been outlined.

Increased interest in metaphor marked by the XIX century, when it began to be considered in connection with the peculiarities of the national language and folklore (F. BUSLAEV, O. VESELOVSKY, O. POTEBNYA). The metaphor has been associated with the processes of cognition, recognizing its ability to meet human needs for new knowledge, which testified to the dynamic nature of metaphor and later made it possible to understand it as a linguistic, cultural, cognitive mechanism.

However, the twentieth century demonstrates the most approaches to the interpretation of metaphor. It is considered both as a means of forming concepts (A. BARANOV, Y. KARAULOV, E. MAK-KORMAK), and as a semantically two-dimensional (N. ARUTYUNOVA, V. RUSANOVSKY, O. TARANENKO), clearly connoted unit (M. BLEK, H. DATSYSHYN, V. TELIA), and as a figurative structure of language (M. BASILAYA, V. VOVK, I. MURZIN), a marker of idiostyle (S. YERMOLENKO, L. KRAVETS, A. MOISIENKO, L. PUSTOVIT), and an object of linguistic and cultural research (R. KIS, N. SUKALENKO, O. SPIVAK).

Traditionally, metaphors take an important place among the semantic and stylistic means of language and are studied mainly in lexical, semantic and linguistic, and stylistic aspects, hence its widespread interpretation as a figurative means (O. BALABAN, N. BOYKO, T. VILCHYNSKA, L. STAVYTSKA, O. TYSHCHENKO, V. CHABANENKO) as an expressive structural-grammatical category (I. BABIY, V. KONONENKO, G. SYUTA, B. TOSHOVYCH).

At the same time in the linguistics of the twentieth century together with the analysis of structural-semantic and functional features of metaphor, interest in issues related to the transformation of mental categories into a language in the process of cognition of the world, interpretation of metaphorical meaning, mechanisms of metaphorical renaming, the suggestive and manipulative potential of metaphors, which are differently defined on a variety of theories and approaches. Before dwelling in more detail on the features of the conceptual metaphor, consider it appropriate to describe these new scientific linguistic areas, which laid the foundation for its understanding.

The pragmalinguistic approach is functionally oriented, aimed at solving problems related to the role of metaphor in communication, determining its suggestive and manipulative potential in various spheres of human life. This approach is implemented in the works of both foreign (D. DAVIDSON, J. MILLER, E. ORTONI, J. SÖRL) and domestic scientists (S. BRONIKOV, L. ILNITSKA, O. RUDA, I. SHKITSKA). Representatives of this approach emphasize that the interpretation of metaphors depends on the speech and thinking activities of

their creator and recipient (D. Davidson) (ARUTYUNOVA, 1990, p. 187), that the metaphorical context in cognitive terms expresses much more than descriptively (C. Stevenson) (ARUTYUNOVA, 1990, p. 295), and propose to highlight in the structure of the text the reference concept in question, and the relay concept with which the referent relates, and the interpretation of the metaphor is interpreted in three stages, merging into one mental act – recognition (consists in the divergence of the textual concept of the reader with knowledge of the real world), reconstruction (through imaginary comparison sets a possible situation in the real world, which justifies the use of metaphor) and interpretation (involves finding the true basis for assimilation and appropriate classes of referents and correlates) (J. Miller) (ARUTYUNOVA, 1990, p. 251).

The neurolinguistic approach to the study of tropes, namely neurolinguistic programming takes into account the function of the influence of metaphor on human behaviour (D. GORDON, G. OLDER, N. SLUHAJ, D. TRUNOV, B. HEATHER). The functional purpose of metaphors, in particular therapeutic ones, according to the representatives of this direction, is determined by the fact that they reveal and actualize hitherto inaccessible resources of the listener, stimulate thinking, sometimes appeal directly to the subconscious, excite the imagination, and act as a tool to achieve certain pragmatic goals. In a complex mental process that is trying to connect through the subconscious current problems and difficulties with any of the events of life, act as communication, the catalyst association "resonator". In communication, they are also used to simplify, depersonalize, and awaken creativity, awareness of the character of the interlocutor, adjustment, personification, attracting attention, and overcoming resistance, creating vivid memories, introspection and enlightenment, identifying problems, providing certain emotions (OLDER; HEATHER, 2001). It should be noted that most developers of therapeutic metaphor doctrine focus on its suggestive potential. At the same time, it should be emphasized that the effect of such a trope on the addressee is largely due to its expressive content and reveals the universal possibilities of analog human thinking, which, of course, brings it closer to the conceptual metaphor.

Moreover, the anthropocentric paradigm of linguistic research has led to the active development of various linguistics branches. This in turn affected the understanding of metaphors. In particular, it is actively studied from a position of ethnolinguistics (I. GOLUBOVSKA, V. ZHAYVORONOK, M. ZHUIKOVA, V. YEVTUKH, N. CHENDEY). One of its tasks is to study tropeistics in terms of linguistic objectification of information about the historical and cultural development of the population. Thus, according to Zhuykova (2009, p. 7), "especially brightly national-cultural originality is reflected in the processes of secondary

nomination, in the creation of figurative means of language, which in their semantics consolidate the results of cognitive activity of a particular national team". Appropriate terms to denote the trope as a special conceptual carrier of ethnocultural meanings, containers of concepts traditional for folk psychology appear. They are "ethnic metaphor" (V. YEVTUKH), "expressive metaphor", "expressive-evaluative metaphor" (I. GOLUBOVSKA), "mental metaphor" (N. Magas).

The logical-linguistic approach demonstrates a change in approaches to metaphor analysis. It operates with such concepts as "pseudo-identity", "similarity", "analogy", "association", and "adjacency". Proponents of this approach consider the metaphor as a basic trope on the axis of pseudo-identity, i.e., identity, which is the basis for the transfer of the sign (N. ARUTYUNOVA, T. OKHRIMENKO, N. SLUHAJ, O. MYSYK).

But the cognitive approach caused the greatest change in scientific ideas about the ontology of metaphor. According to which it is considered primarily as a mental phenomenon, an important way to create new concepts in the linguistic picture of the world. A systematic description of metaphor as a cognitive mechanism was presented by Lakoff and Johnson (2004, p. 25-27) in "Metaphors as We Live", called the "Bible of the cognitive approach to metaphor", where it denies its belonging exclusively to the linguistic sphere of fiction because it is realized in thinking and everyday human activity, arguing that the metaphorical nature of human thinking is an instrument of knowledge of the world, the conceptualization of phenomena. "Our everyday conceptual system, within which we think and act, is metaphorical in nature," – has been said by scientists. And therefore, it is the metaphor that largely determines the thinking, experience, behavior of a person, while language opens access to metaphors that structure perception, thinking, and action.

While some of the theory of J. Lakoff and M. Johnson led the discussion by A. Baranov, O. Paducheva, J. Fokonye, and others, it has contributed to the emergence of new theories of metaphors cognitive study, including descriptor (Yu. KARAULOV), blends theory (L. BELEKHOV), metaphorical modeling (A. Chudinov), cognitive-onomastic analysis (O. SELIVANOVA) and others.

Cognitive metaphor is defined as a mental operation, a way of cognition, categorization, conceptualization, evaluation, and explanation of the world, as an instrument of cognitive processes of forming new mental categories, the formation of new conceptual systems, generation of new knowledge, and its two main characteristics are mental nature and cognitive potential (SHTERN, 1998, p. 219). Regarding the process of metaphorization, which is the interaction of different structures of knowledge (frames, conceptspheres, etc.), it is defined by

the term "mapping" (mapping). It is interpreted as a projection of knowledge structures from one conceptsphere to another, analog mapping of features and properties of the essences of source realm on ontologically related essences of goal realm. The first entities are understood as the sphere-source, the conceptual correlate, the donor zone, the source of metaphorical expansion, the second – as the mental sphere-target, the conceptual referent, the recipient zone, the direction of metaphorical expansion (BELEKHOVA, 2002, p. 22). Thus, cognitive metaphor is given a central place in the cognition and structuring of reality.

The aim and objectives of the proposed research are to clarify the status of the conceptual metaphor, the problem of its terminological identification, and prospects for development.

Research methods and methodology

The interpretative method is considered as the main method that allows tracing the ontology of the notion of conceptual metaphors. The article also used general scientific methods (analysis, synthesis, generalization) and special linguistic, such as methods of definition and conceptual analysis.

The main material of the research

M. Black is considered the founder of the cognitive direction in the study of metaphor. The author argued that in the process of metaphORIZATION there is an interaction of two conceptual systems, resulting in a new meaning, different from the meanings of both objects involved in the metaphORIZATION. On this basis, the scientist motivates the use of the term "conceptual metaphor" to denote the metaphorical units that shape thinking (ARUTYUNOVA, 1990, p. 153-160).

Proposing a new approach to the study of metaphor, Lakoff and Johnson (2004) also define the conceptual metaphor. It correlates not with individual lexical meanings, but with concepts and allows conceptualizing life experience, emotions, qualities, problems, and the thought itself (KNOWLES; MOON, 2006, p. 32-33). The presence of such metaphors in a language is due to their existence in the conceptual system of a person, and they should be understood as metaphorical concepts (concepts) (ARUTYUNOVA, 1990, p. 390).

It should be noted that in modern linguistic studies, the terms "cognitive metaphor" and "conceptual metaphor" are often used interchangeably. Although the first one is more related

to the concept of cognitivism, while the second is related to the terms "conceptualization" and "concept". Therefore, on the one hand, conceptual metaphor means, following other scientists, a unified cognitive structure that connects mental representations with the sensory sphere, in the formation of which an important role is played by previous human experience and cultural environment. And on the other - units that involve the transfer of conceptualization of the thought space, which is known, to the unknown, which is conceptualized and included in the general conceptual system of a particular language community.

It is known that the conceptual system of man is metaphorical in nature: in the mind there are deep structural relationships between groups of concepts, which allow structuring some concepts in terms of others, thus ensuring the pervasive nature of metaphor in language and speech. Based on this understanding of the conceptual metaphor, Kravets (2012, p. 32) interprets it as "a linguistic phenomenon that has a cognitive basis and is the use of the linguistic sign of one conceptual sphere to denote a component of another, which is due to associations of similarity or contrast". Because metaphor reveals the semantic content of the concept associatively, through certain descriptors endowed with a certain paradigm of meanings and ideas, it often provides an emotional and evaluative connotation of the concept, revealing new conceptual features. A similar opinion is expressed by Nikonova (2007, p. 277), who defines the conceptual metaphor as an image-associative layer of the concept.

The issue of conceptual metaphor identification actualizes the problems of their formation, typology, functioning, connections with other types of metaphorical units, culture, etc. According to the theory of Lakoff and Johnson (2004), in the conceptual metaphor, like any other, there must be a donor zone (what is compared with the meaningful) and the recipient (what is compared is made meaningful). According to the first, there are such metaphorical models as anthropomorphic, sociomorphic, zoomorphic, phytomorphic, artifact, etc., according to the second - such can be the conceptspheres a person, nature, objects, etc. "Stable correspondences between donor and recipient zones, recorded in the linguistic and cultural traditions of the ethnos, are called conceptual metaphors" (KRAVETS, 2012, p. 33).

The problem of a typology of such metaphors is relevant. In modern linguistics, the classification according to the words that denote the donor or recipient zone to certain semantic groups (mentioned above) and the classification in the functional aspect, where, among others, cognitive and generalizing metaphors are distinguished (as the final result of cognitive) are popular (ARUTYUNOVA, 1990). In Ukrainian studies, the classification performed in the cognitive-onomasiological aspect has been proposed by Selivanova (2012). The author, taking into account the basis of metaphorical transference, distinguishes the following types of

cognitive (conceptual) metaphor: structural (based on the integration of the recipient and donor zones is one common cognitive feature); diffuse (integration of zones is based on a common scenario or complex of associations formed in ethnic consciousness); gestalt (recipient zone is denoted by the donor "based on stereotypical assimilation of visual, auditory, odorative, tactile, taste gestalts"); sensory (basically cognitive operation of synaesthesia); archetypal (archetype is taken into account as the basis for combining knowledge structures); axiological (signs of spatial orientation indicate the assessment) (SELIVANOVA, 2012, p. 207-208).

Typological principles on conceptual metaphor, as mentioned, have been proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (2004). Subsequently, this above-mentioned classification has been developed by O. Laguta, V. Petrov, M. Pimenova, O. Chadyuk, and others. In particular, M. Pimenova and Kondratieva (2011, p. 83-84) draws attention to such types of conceptual metaphors as: structural (where one concept is metaphorically structured in terms of another); orientational (organize a system of concepts relative to another system, mostly related to spatial oppositions top-bottom, right-left); ontological (appear based on understanding the experience of interaction with material objects and present ways of perceiving events, activities, emotions, ideas, etc. as discrete entities and substances); metaphors of the communication channel (represent the process of communication as the movement of meanings through the channel that connects the speaker and the listener); construction, or metaphors of construction (demonstrate meaning as a large "construction" consisting of smaller "blocks" of meanings); container metaphors (present meanings as filling specific language units like a heart filled with emotions).

In Ukrainian studies, Nikonova (2007, p. 285) distinguishes between structural, orientational, and ontological metaphors.

It is important to outline the functions of conceptual metaphors, which should not be confused with their functioning in texts of different styles and genres. If American scientists, the founders of the doctrine of conceptual metaphor, emphasized primarily in the everyday sphere of their existence (LAKOFF; JOHNSON, 2004, p. 237), then it turned out that they are actively used in scientific, journalistic, artistic styles (I. KOBOZEVA, O. OPARINA, V. TELIA). As for the functionality of conceptual metaphors, they also depend on their use in texts of different styles. For example, in the artistic style, the priority will be the aesthetic function, while in the scientific style it will be a heuristic one. At the same time, there is reason to believe that all conceptual metaphors perform a cognitive function. The cognitive function provides an understanding of a new concept that represents in our minds the image of the reality fragment, which is objectified by the sign of indirect nomination and is not rigidly structured logical connections formation.

Researchers of metaphor have been trying for a long time to systematize various information about it. Thus, the specificity of the conceptual metaphor, according to Chenki (2002, p. 352-354), is determined, first, by the fact that the donor zone, compared to the recipient, is clearer, more specific, easier to pass from person to person; second, that the spheres associated with such a metaphor are asymmetric, for example, abstract concepts are understood through physical phenomena, but not vice versa; third, that the conceptual metaphor is paradoxical because it selectively highlights aspects of comparison; fourth, that such metaphors are of a high level of generalization, i.e. universal, used in different languages and cultures, and culturally specific.

Similar maxims are found in the works of other researchers of conceptual metaphor. However, most of them in different ways to develop the theory of Lakoff and Johnson (2004) such as that conceptual metaphor simultaneously profiles one aspect of the conceptual sphere and obscures others; that metaphorical concepts only fragmentarily structure habitual concepts; that such metaphors are able not only to provide a conceptualization of existing reality but also to create a new reality; that the system of generally accepted conceptual metaphors is mostly unconscious, automatic, etc.

Thus, the conceptual metaphor presents a shifted vision of the world, serves as an instrument of thought, through which it is possible to reach the most remote parts of the conceptual and connotative field, being involved in conceptualization, creating a national picture of the world.

Differential features of a conceptual metaphor allow comparing it with other metaphorical units - basic metaphors, metaphorical archetypes, etc., but most often the conceptual metaphor is projected on the artistic one. It has been agreed with Kravets (2012, p. 44) that artistic metaphors are derived from conceptual ones. But at the same time, they have many distinctive features, namely: if conceptual metaphors are designed primarily to provide understanding, then artistic are ambiguous and often complicate it; while the use of the former resembles a regular chain reaction, the latter are often devoid of automatic creation and appear unexpectedly; context is not so important for conceptual metaphors as for artistic ones; and although both metaphors are characterized by imagery, the conceptual constantly tries to "get rid" of it, while the artistic, on the contrary, associated with emotions, expressive, original (KRAVETS, 2012, p. 47-48).

Nikonova (2007, p. 303) emphasizes the occasional metaphor, which she considers "the conceptual basis of verbal poetic images created by the author to structure the conceptual space of tragic and aesthetic impact on the addressee".

The question of its connection with culture is important in the theory of conceptual metaphor, the answer to which, according to Lakoff and Johnson (2004, p. 231), involves two aspects. The first is that the most important cultural values that actually exist and are deeply rooted in culture are consistent with the metaphorical system. And the second actualizes the problem of conceptual metaphors universality, in particular, these are the basic metaphors, and the others are based on them, characterized by features related to the worldview of a particular linguistic and cultural community.

Conclusions and further prospects of the study

The problems raised in the proposed research testified to the prospects for the study of conceptual metaphor in modern linguistics. It has been proved that it is one of the mechanisms of understanding and reality structuring, an instrument of mental activity and cognition, reflects fundamental cultural values, as it is based on the national-cultural worldview. The conceptual metaphor also plays an important role in the integration of mental and sensory systems of a person, the formation of a personal model of the world, and the processes of language categorization, thinking, and perception. It exposes new associative-figurative connections and actualizes traditional ones, so its comprehensive analysis within different linguistic approaches will help to better understand various aspects of its functioning. The study of conceptual metaphor in literary texts will trace its features as a representative of one of the fragments of reality conceptualization, formed as a result of the interaction of individual and national, emotional, and rational factors in the mind of the writer.

Further study of the conceptual metaphor, especially on a specific textual material, will allow revealing the cognitive-linguistic mechanisms of a person taking into account the national specifics, to reveal the deep connections of the language of the population with its intellectual heritage.

REFERENCES

ARUTYUNOVA, D. **Theory of metaphor**. Society. Moscow: Progress, 1990. 512 p.

BELEKHOVA, L. I. **Verbal poetic image in the historical-typological perspective: linguocognitive aspect (on the material of American poetry)**. Kyiv: Iyelandnd, 2002. 367 p.

CHENKI, A. **Semantics in cognitive linguistics**. Modern american linguistics: fundamental directions. Moscow: URSS Editorial, 2002. 480 p.

KNOWLES, M.; MOON, R. **Introducing metaphor**. London: Routledge, 2006. 180 p.

KRAVETS L. **Dynamics of metaphor in the ukrainian poetry of the XX century**: monograph. Kyiv: Academia, 2012. 416 p.

LAKOFF, J.; JOHNSON, M. **Metaphors we live by**. Moscow: URSS Editorial, 2004. 256 p.

NIKONOVA, V. G. **Tragic picture of the world in Shakespeare's poetics**. Dnepropetrovsk: DUEP Publishing House, 2007. 364 p.

OLDER, G.; HEATHER, B. **NLP: a complete practical guide**. Introductory course. Kyiv: Sofia, 2001. 384 p.

PIMENOVA, M. V.; KONDRATIEVA, O. N. **Conceptual research**. Introduction: textbook. allowance. Moscow: Flint; Science. 2011. 176 p.

SELIVANOVA, O. **Cognitive mechanisms of metaphorization**. Slavic collection: coll. Science. Kyiv Avenue: Dmytro Bury Publishing House, 2012.

SHTERN, I. B. **Selected topics and lexicon of modern linguistics**: encyclopedic dictionary. Kyiv: ArtEk. 1998. 336 p.

ZHUIKOVA, M. V. **Genesis of figurative predication in ethnolinguistic aspect**. Kiev, 2009. 36 p.

How to reference this article

VILCHYNSKA, T.; BACHYNSKA, H.; VERBOVETSKA, O.; BABII, I.; SVYSTUN, N.; SOKOL, M. Conceptual metaphor as a linguoamental tool of reality knowledge: identification problem. **Rev. EntreLinguas**, Araraquara, v. 7, n. esp. 3, e021064, set. 2021. e-ISSN: 2447-3529. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29051/el.v7iesp.3.15735>

Submitted: 10/01/2021

Required revisions: 20/03/2021

Approved: 23/06/2021

Published: 01/08/2021