THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF METAPHOR

AND PRAGMATICS

Mullayeva Rayhona

Student of Samarqand State Institute of foreign languages

rayhonamullayeva13@gmail.com

Supervisor: Ablayeva L.O'.

ABSTRACT

This comprehensive article explores the intricate intersection of metaphor and pragmatics, offering an in-depth analysis of their theoretical foundations, historical evolution, and functional roles within human communication. The paper examines the generation, decoding, and contextual application of metaphorical expressions through the frameworks of leading pragmatic theories. Ultimately, the research highlights the indispensable role of context, speaker intention, and shared cognitive environments in deriving meaning from non-literal language.

Keywords: metaphor, pragmatics, cognitive linguistics, context, speech acts, conversational implicature, relevance theory, conceptual metaphor, literal meaning, multimodal pragmatics, visual metaphor.

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the extensive history of linguistics, philosophy, and literary criticism, the conceptualization of metaphor has undergone profound transformations. In classical antiquity, primarily articulated in Aristotle's

Poetics and *Rhetoric*, metaphor was predominantly categorized as a figure of speech—a deliberate deviation from ordinary, literal language used to embellish discourse and persuade audiences. For centuries, this "substitution theory" prevailed, suggesting that a metaphor simply replaces a literal word with a figurative one for aesthetic pleasure.

However, the mid-to-late 20th century witnessed a paradigm shift known as the "cognitive and pragmatic turn." Scholars such as Max Black introduced the "interaction theory," arguing that metaphor creates new meaning by forcing the cognitive interaction of two distinct domains. This laid the groundwork for modern pragmatics to completely redefine metaphor. Today, it is universally acknowledged that metaphor is not an exception to normal language use, but a core component of human cognition and everyday communicative strategy.

Pragmatics—the branch of linguistics that investigates how context influences meaning—shifts the analytical focus from the abstract definition of words (semantics) to the speaker's intended meaning in a specific situation. If semantics asks, "What does this sentence mean in isolation?", pragmatics asks, "What is the speaker attempting to achieve by uttering this sentence here and now?" From this perspective, metaphor and pragmatics are organically and inextricably intertwined. Metaphorical utterances often present overt logical absurdities when analyzed strictly on a literal level. Yet, embedded within a specific pragmatic context, they transmit precise, profound, and highly functional meanings. This article critically analyzes these processes through the lens of foundational pragmatic theories.

THE COGNITIVE FOUNDATION: CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR THEORY

To fully comprehend the pragmatic mechanics of metaphor, it is essential to establish its cognitive foundation. In 1980, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson revolutionized the field with their seminal work, *Metaphors We Live By*, introducing the "Conceptual Metaphor Theory" (CMT). They posited that metaphor is not merely a linguistic phenomenon but a fundamental structure of human thought and action.

Humans naturally understand abstract, complex, and subjective domains (such as time, emotions, or social organizations) by mapping them onto concrete, physical, and experientially grounded domains (such as physical journeys, spatial orientations, or objects).

Example of Conceptual Mapping: > Consider the conceptual metaphor "ARGUMENT IS WAR." > Because of this underlying cognitive structure, our everyday language is saturated with expressions like:

- "Your claims are *indefensible*."
- "He *attacked* every weak point in my argument."
- "I *demolished* his argument."
- "She *won* the debate."

From a pragmatic standpoint, these conceptual metaphors are crucial because they serve as the "common ground" or shared encyclopedic knowledge between communicators. Because speakers and listeners share these cognitive schemas within a given culture, the pragmatic process of encoding and decoding metaphorical messages occurs instantaneously. The pragmatist investigates how these pre-existing cognitive models are intentionally activated, modified, or extended in specific discourse situations to achieve particular communicative goals, such as persuasion, comforting, or clarification.

The modern pragmatic approach to metaphor heavily relies on the foundational work of philosopher Paul Grice. Grice viewed human communication as a fundamentally rational and cooperative enterprise. He formulated the **Cooperative Principle**, which dictates that participants in a conversation should make their contributions such as is required by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange. This principle is supported by four conversational maxims: Quantity (be as informative as required), Quality (be truthful), Relation (be relevant), and Manner (be clear and orderly).

According to Gricean theory, a metaphor represents a pragmatic phenomenon that arises from the deliberate and overt violation—or "flouting"—of the **Maxim of Quality** ("Do not say what you believe to be false").

The Pragmatic Mechanism of Gricean Metaphor:

1. ***The Utterance***: A speaker says, *"Juliet is the sun"* (Shakespeare's classic example).

2. ***The Clash***: The listener immediately recognizes that this statement is literally false; Juliet is a human female, not a celestial sphere of burning plasma.

3. ***The Assumption of Cooperation***: Despite the blatant falsehood, the listener assumes the speaker is still adhering to the Cooperative Principle and is not simply lying or speaking nonsense.

4. ***Deriving the Implicature:*** This assumption triggers a cognitive search for an underlying meaning—a **conversational implicature**. The listener extracts the relevant characteristics of the sun (warmth, necessity for life, brilliance, center of the solar system) and

maps them onto Juliet, successfully deriving the intended pragmatic meaning: *"Juliet is beautiful, radiant, and the center of my existence."*

Metaphor, therefore, is an indirect speech strategy where the speaker trusts the listener's pragmatic competence to bridge the gap between what is literally said and what is actually meant.

John Searle: Speech Act Theory and Metaphorical Interpretation

John Searle, a leading architect of Speech Act Theory, approached metaphor by differentiating between sentence meaning (the literal proposition) and speaker meaning (the intended message). Searle posed a critical question for pragmatics: *How is it possible for a speaker to say one thing and mean something entirely different, and how does the hearer manage to accurately interpret it?*

Searle argued that interpreting a metaphor is not a matter of applying a different set of semantic rules, but rather a computational, pragmatic strategy employed by the hearer. He outlined a rigorous three-step cognitive process:

- **Step 1: Defect Recognition (Identification).** The hearer analyzes the utterance and determines that its literal interpretation is defective. It may be obviously false, contextually inappropriate, or violating conversational norms.
- **Step 2: Strategy for Alternative Meaning.** Once the literal meaning is rejected, the hearer searches for salient similarities between the primary subject (the topic) and the secondary subject (the vehicle) of the metaphor. The hearer looks for properties of the vehicle that can be logically attributed to the topic.

- **Step 3: Meaning Construction and Verification.** The hearer selects the characteristics that make the most sense in the specific context and deduces the speaker's actual intended illocutionary force.

A Practical Application: If an employer says about an employee, *"Richard is a gorilla,"* the literal defect is obvious. The hearer must access the encyclopedic knowledge of a "gorilla." A gorilla can be fierce, strong, unyielding, or perhaps clumsy and aggressive. The pragmatic context dictates the final meaning. If the context is a discussion about Richard's aggressive negotiation tactics in business, the hearer selects the traits of "fierceness and dominance." If the context is about Richard accidentally breaking office equipment, the hearer selects "clumsiness and brute force." Context is the ultimate pragmatic filter.

Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson: Relevance Theory

While Grice and Searle require the hearer to first recognize a "defect" or "violation" before searching for a metaphor's meaning, Relevance Theory—developed by Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson—offers a radically different, highly influential perspective. They reject the notion that metaphor involves violating conversational rules or that literal meaning must be processed and subsequently discarded.

Relevance Theory is rooted in human psychology and cognitive efficiency. It posits that human cognition is biologically geared toward maximizing contextual effects while minimizing cognitive processing effort. According to this theory, every utterance carries a "guarantee of optimal relevance."

In this framework, there is no strict boundary between literal language and metaphor; rather, they exist on a continuum of "loose use" of language, alongside approximations and hyperbole.

When interpreting the metaphor *"The room was a refrigerator,"* the brain does not process the literal impossibility of a room being a kitchen appliance. Instead, the mind constructs an **"ad hoc concept"**. It automatically selects only those encyclopedic properties of a refrigerator that yield the maximum cognitive effect for the lowest effort in that specific context (specifically, the property of being uncomfortably cold). All other traits (having shelves, storing food, being plugged into a wall) are instantly ignored. Thus, metaphor is viewed as an incredibly efficient pragmatic tool that allows speakers to express complex nuances far more economically than literal descriptions would allow.

Multimodal Pragmatics: Visual and Commercial Metaphors

In contemporary linguistics, the study of pragmatics and metaphor has expanded significantly beyond textual and spoken discourse into the realm of **Multimodal Pragmatics**. Because human communication is heavily visual, metaphors frequently operate in non-verbal dimensions, particularly in visual arts, commercial advertising, brand identity design, and educational media.

Visual metaphors function using the same cognitive and pragmatic mechanisms as linguistic ones, but they rely on visual cues (color, shape, composition, typography) to create the conceptual mapping.

- *Commercial Branding and Advertising*: In high-end advertising, a product is rarely sold purely on its literal specifications. Visual metaphors are employed to pragmatically communicate complex brand values instantly. For example, a beverage label might utilize sharp,

aggressive typography and dark, high-contrast colors (like black and electric blue) to visually metaphorize "explosive energy" or "premium quality." Similarly, designing a brand identity system with a specific animal mascot (such as a strong, determined panda for a fitness or combat sports brand) is a visual speech act. The mascot serves as the metaphorical vehicle, transferring attributes of raw strength, agility, and combat readiness to the consumer's perception of the brand.

- *Educational Contexts*: In academic environments, visual metaphors are pragmatic tools for simplifying complex data. An educational poster might use the visual metaphor of a "tree" to explain historical timelines or hierarchical structures, relying on the viewer's pragmatic ability to map the branches of a tree to the divisions of historical eras.

In all these cases, the designer or content creator assumes the role of the "speaker," embedding pragmatic implicatures into visual assets, trusting the target audience to successfully decode the visual metaphor based on shared cultural and visual literacy.

Socio-Pragmatic Functions of Metaphor in Discourse

The operational mechanics of metaphor cannot be divorced from their social environment. Metaphors execute specific socio-pragmatic functions that maintain harmony, exert influence, or establish identity within human interactions.

- *Euphemism, Face-Saving, and Politeness*: When addressing taboo, sensitive, or distressing topics (such as death, severe illness, or financial ruin), literal language can threaten the social "face" of the interlocutors. Metaphors serve as a pragmatic shield, softening the impact. Uttering *"He passed away"* or *"She is fighting a battle with*

cancer" demonstrates high pragmatic competence, fulfilling the social requirement for tact and empathy.

- *Persuasion and Framing in Politics*: In political discourse, metaphors are potent tools for framing reality and manipulating public perception. A politician who describes an economic crisis as a *"storm we must weather together"* uses a meteorological metaphor to pragmatically frame the crisis as a natural, unavoidable phenomenon, subtly shifting blame away from human policy errors while simultaneously evoking a sense of unified survival.

- *Social Solidarity and In-Group Identity*: The use of specific, shared metaphors—such as in youth slang, internet culture, or professional technical jargon—serves a vital socio-pragmatic function. It establishes "in-group" intimacy and draws linguistic boundaries against outsiders. Sharing a complex, domain-specific metaphor is a pragmatic signal of belonging to the same community of practice.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the theoretical foundations of metaphor and pragmatics reveal that figurative language is far more than a mere literary embellishment; it is a structural pillar of human cognition and an indispensable strategy in dynamic communication. The intersection of pragmatics and metaphor illuminates the intricate, often subconscious ways in which we utilize language and visuals to convey complex thoughts, nuanced intentions, and deep emotions that transcend the rigid constraints of literal vocabulary.

Through detailed theoretical analysis, it becomes evident that successfully decoding a metaphorical message requires significantly more than grammatical proficiency or a broad vocabulary. It demands active, rational cooperation between the speaker and the hearer. It requires a shared

cultural, visual, and cognitive background. Most importantly, it requires the pragmatic ability to accurately assess the discourse context and infer human intentions.

Whether analyzed through the lens of Paul Grice's cooperative maxims, John Searle's structured computational steps, Dan Sperber's principle of cognitive relevance, or the modern frameworks of multimodal visual design, metaphor ultimately adheres to one universal pragmatic truth: human beings consistently strive to express their most complex mental representations as efficiently, impactfully, and relevantly as possible. Future research in the cognitive-pragmatic aspects of metaphor—particularly as communication becomes increasingly digital and visually driven—will undoubtedly continue to unlock the profound hidden mechanisms of the human mind and society.

REFERENCES

1. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.

2. Grice, H. P. (1975). "Logic and conversation". In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics: Vol. 3. Speech Acts* Academic Press.(pp. 41-58).

3. Searle, J. R. (1979). "Metaphor". In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and Thought* Academic Press. Cambridge University Press (pp. 92-123).

4. Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

5. Black, M. (1962). *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy*. Cornell University Press.

6. Forceville, C. (1996). *Pictorial Metaphor in Advertising*. Routledge.

7. Gibbs, R. W. (1994). *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*. Cambridge University Press.

8. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

9. Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

10. Safarov, Sh. (2006). *Pragmatik lingvistika*. Toshkent: O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi.