

## PEJORATIVES AND COGNITIVE METAPHOR IN MODERN AMERICAN NOVEL

### ПЕЙОРАТИВ І КОГНІТИВНА МЕТАФОРА В СУЧАСНОМУ АМЕРИКАНСЬКОМУ РОМАНІ

Kulchytska O.V.,

[orcid.org/0000-0002-9575-8169](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9575-8169)

Candidate of Philological Sciences,

Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Languages for the Humanities  
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv

This article examines the models of metaphors formation in the frames of pejorative concepts. The scope of this study does not only focus on one approach: an analysis has been carried out from the standpoint of the theory of conceptual metaphor by J. Lakoff and M. Johnson and includes cognitive-discursive approach to the study of metaphorical models, namely the pejorative ones. Pejoration will always exist as long as humans are in contact with one another. Pejorative vocabulary affects the psychological and emotional state of the addressee and contributes to the realization of the speaker's intentions. Metaphorical pejorative models create a semantically differentiated language of feelings, emotions, attitude, linguistic behavior and affect the participants of a locutionary act. The collision of non-identical semantic spectra generates qualitatively new information that reveals previously unknown aspects of the content of pejorative concepts included in the structure of the metaphors. The mechanism for constructing metaphorical pejorative models is the transfer of various negative characteristics to the object. Metaphor can also be regarded as an additional factor of pejoration by comparing the concept of more valuable with the concept of less valuable. The metaphorical expressions under investigation have been taken from the novels by S. Meyer. Author uses cognitive pejorative metaphors as the most effective means for emotional influence on the reader, which are supposed to resonate in their hearts, to provoke emotional experience and create vivid images. The research results studies examined the most frequently used cognitive pejorative metaphors in the analysed corpus – the linguistic realisations of zoomorphic and anthropomorphic pejorative metaphors. Intensifiers have been detected as additional means of pejorative meaning creation.

**Key words:** pejoratives, cognitive metaphor, concept, mapping, metaphorical pejorative model.

Стаття присвячена проблематиці когнітивних метафор з пейоративним значенням. Дане дослідження не зосереджується лише на одному підході: аналіз проведено з позицій теорії концептуальної метафори Дж. Лакофа та М. Джонсона і включає когнітивно-дискурсивний підхід до вивчення метафоричних пейоративних моделей, адже у когнітивній лінгвістиці метафора трактується як ментально-мовне явище. Пейоративна ж лексика впливає на психологічний та емоційний стан адресата і сприяє реалізації мовних намірів мовця. Виокремлено аспекти, що впливають на формування метафоричних пейоративних моделей. Розглянуто основні напрямки дослідження когнітивних метафор та визначено, що розглянуті підходи доповнюють та розширюють межі дослідження когнітивної пейоративної метафори. Метафоричні пейоративні моделі створюють семантично диференційовану мову почуттів, емоцій, ставлення, мовної поведінки та впливають на учасників мовного акту. Зіткнення неоднакових семантичних спектрів породжує якісно нову інформацію, яка розкриває невідомі раніше аспекти змісту пейоративних понять, що входять до структури когнітивних метафор. Механізмом побудови метафоричних пейоративних моделей є передача об'єкту різноманітних негативних характеристик. Метафора також є додатковим фактором пейоративності, адже вона порівнює поняття більш цінного з поняттям менш цінним. Досліджувані метафоричні вирази взяті з сучасного американського роману на прикладі романів С. Майер. Автор використовує когнітивні пейоративні метафори для створення яскравого емоційного фону та передачі внутрішнього світу героїв. Результати дослідження показали, що найбільш часто вживані авторкою романів є концептуальні пейоративні метафори зооморфної та антропоморфної структури. Окреслено роль інтенсифікаторів як додаткового засобу творення негативного значення пейоративних метафор.

**Ключові слова:** пейоратив, когнітивна метафора, концепція, проектування, метафорична пейоративна модель.

**Introduction.** A paper published recently in the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* reports on the metaphors affecting how people respond to the world around them and how they interact with others. The author pointed out that metaphors evoke vivid images and allow us to "see" things from a new perspective. Every single day people use metaphors in their everyday communication. Metaphor is a part of conceptual system which structures our thoughts and deeds, and conceptual system is not something we are aware of, as most of things we think and do everyday occurs automatically. Thus,

we share a viewpoint on a metaphor as something that can be automatic and not only conscious but unconscious as well [16].

From a purely linguistic perspective, metaphor is the use of language to refer to something other than what it was originally applied to. Linguistic metaphor serves as linguistic means of realizing pejoration. Pejoratives are lexemes that possess negative, emotionally-loaded expressive evaluation and create preconditions for the achievement of a communicative goal. Pejorative vocabulary has a complex, conceptual structure and is characterized by a

strongly marked contextual component. Pejorative effect can be enhanced by a variety of ways, e.g. there are graphic, phonetic and stylistic means of pejoration, which do not have a pejorative meaning, but only make it stronger [6]. However, a linguistic metaphor is not the same as what is termed conceptual or cognitive metaphor. But what is important is that linguistic metaphors are said to realize cognitive metaphor. In our paper, metaphor is not studied merely as the use of language or parts of figurative language, but mostly as the use of language related with cognition. Although, metaphors involve language, they are viewed as 'a kind of thinking or conceptualization, not limited to language; however, language provides a convenient way to observe how metaphor works'. Concepts and meanings are lexicalized and verbalized through metaphorical models. Metaphor creates multi-sense words that can have different meanings. One of the ways to perceive it is to observe our language [13]. In our paper we have done it on the example of modern American novels by Stephanie Meyer.

**The relevance of the research topic** is determined by the growing interest in the study of cognitive mechanisms in various fields of humanities and the continuing interest in the study of metaphors as linguistic phenomena of both, language and thought. Apart from that there is a need in the study of cognitive mechanisms from the perspective of various fields of humanitarian knowledge. As we focus our study on metaphorical pejorative models, we found out that in scientific studies the mechanism of metaphorization, as well as the system of metaphorical models, is presented insufficiently. Last but not least, modern authors do actively use cognitive metaphors for conceptualization of those concepts which possess pejorative meanings, emerging from the postulate that concept, unlike a lexical unit, is a unit of consciousness, a mental lexicon and that any metaphor exists simultaneously on several levels – in a certain context, text, discourse [5].

Both, recent and time proven traditional **scientific researches** became the methodological basis of the study. The general theoretical ideas in the field of semantics and lexicology, which were developed in the works of Y.D. Apresyan, N.D. Arutyunova and V.N. Telia are at the core of an analysis. The work has been carried out in line with the semantic-cognitive direction and cognitive linguistics principles. An analysis has been carried out from the standpoint of the theory of conceptual metaphor by J. Lakoff and M. Johnson and includes some elements of the cognitive-discursive approach to the study of metaphorical models, namely pejorative ones.

We share E. Derman's viewpoint that theories tell you what something is. Models tell you merely what something is partially like. Models are metaphors, relative descriptions of the object of their attention that compare it to something similar already better understood via theories [11]. In her book published in 2002, Daniela M. Bailer-Jones states that metaphorical models are 'new vocabulary in terms of which empirical data can be described'. The task of, e.g. scientific models, is to facilitate (perceptual as well as intellectual) access to phenomena. While metaphors may also facilitate access to phenomena, their main characteristic is not this, but a transfer of at least one part of an expression from a source domain of application to a target domain. The implication is that the use of the expression in the source domain may be more familiar and/or better understood than its use in the target domain [10]. Thus, our work combines the methods of structural semantics, cognitive and discursive analysis as well as modern approaches to the study of metaphors.

O.D. Makedonova focused her study on a problem of metaphor models formation which showed that mechanism of metaphor models formation is transfer of different people and animals' characteristics on product and service in advertisements. She stated that metaphor process in, e.g. anthropomorphic projection, happens according to some characteristics like function, social status, external features, attribute and quality [7]. All in all, concepts are represented by anthropomorphic, naturomorphic, zoomorphic, physical, abstract-philosophical, emotional-psychological, social and other cognitive metaphorical models [4].

**The purpose of this work** is to determine the dominant means of metaphorical verbalization of pejorative concepts in modern American novels by Stephanie Meyer and to describe the most frequent metaphorical pejorative models. For this purpose, the following tasks must be solved: 1) to identify those cognitive metaphorical models on the basis of which pejoratives are verbalized as components of pejorative concepts 2) to conduct the mapping of cognitive pejorative metaphors; 3) to highlight the characteristics by which the process of metaphorization takes place 4) to conduct an analysis of metaphorical pejorative models that underlie the metaphorical verbalization of pejorative concepts in contemporary works of art on the example of modern American novels by S. Meyer.

**Results and discussions.** In modern linguistics, among traditional disciplines, metaphor is primarily in the focus study of stylistics, lexicology and lexicography, which consider it as the main, along

with metonymy, means of secondary nomination. However, if metaphor is the main means for creating imagery for stylistics, then lexicology and lexicography consider metaphor as one of the ways to develop the meaning of a word, which serves as a means of replenishing the vocabulary of the language. Metaphor is not only a means of figurative, poetic speech. Metaphor is by nature inherent in human thinking and cognition, and human thinking itself is already metaphorical in its essence [15, p. 6]. The system of concepts begins to form in the mind of a person before mastering the language, at the stage of non-verbal thinking, which once again confirms their mental nature and proves the need to describe concepts as mental formations [3, p. 6]. Concepts are formed in the minds of people on the basis of their sensory experience (as a result of the perception of the surrounding world by the senses), in the course of subject-practical, experimental-cognitive and theoretical-cognitive (scientific), mental activity, as well as in the process of verbal and non-verbal communication [2]. Lakoff and Johnson stated that abstract concepts of communication and ideas are understood via a cognitive metaphor through the perspective that: ideas are objects, language is a container for idea-objects, communication is sending idea-objects in language-containers. This notation from Lakoff and Johnson characterizes a conceptual mapping from a "source domain" frame for sending objects in containers to a "target domain" frame for communicating ideas via language. Mapping here is regarded as a process that involves a set of stable systematic correlations between the spheres of source and purpose, in other words, mapping is a cognitive projection [15]. Baranov noted that the word "sphere" means "conceptual sphere" or actually "concept" [1].

Conceptual metaphor is based on two conceptual realms, in which one realm is understood in terms of the other realm. A conceptual realm is any holistic organization of experience [14, p. 4]. O. Jäkel described *Model Hypothesis* as one of the central tenets of the cognitive theory of metaphor and stated that 'quite often, conceptual metaphors form coherent cognitive models: complex gestalt structures of organised knowledge as pragmatic simplifications of an even more complex reality. These idealized cognitive models, which can be reconstructed by means of cognitive linguistic analyses of everyday language, are regarded as cultural models likely to unconsciously determine the world view of a whole linguistic community' [12].

According to M.V. Pimenova 'a cognitive model is understood as a certain stereotypical image with the help of which experience is organized' [8]. One

cognitive model covers a certain set of lexemes that, according to this scheme, connect the target and domain spheres. If the connection between the two spheres is associated with metaphorical rethinking, then the metaphorical model is realized [5].

A metaphorical model is a scheme of communication existing or developing in the minds of native speakers of a language between two conceptual spheres, which can be represented by a certain formula: 'X is Y' [9]. Let us examine this on the following example:

*So how come Riley gives you such a long leash?" I asked, wondering about the relationship there* [20, p. 12].

The relationship between the components of the formula is understood not as a direct identification, but as a similarity- 'X is like Y'; 'give someone a long leash' is the same as 'to be free'. Pejorative sense is realized through a perspective of a lexeme 'leash' that means 'a strap, chain, etc., fastened to a dog or other animal, esp. at its collar, in order to lead or control it'. Thus, if to 'give someone a long leash' in metaphorical transfer describes the conceptual sphere of "freedom", then the mapping 'give someone a long leash is freedom' is realized reflecting the 'qualities and properties' of a described object. It is an example of emotional-psychological metaphorical model with pejorative meaning.

To go into more detail, it is important to take into account the following statement: cognitive metaphor refers to the understanding of one idea (conceptual domain) in terms of another:

*I had a hive of angry bees around me ...* [18, p. 575].

Metaphorical mapping here is: source domain – *Insect*; target domain – *People*. The formula for the metaphorical projection with pejorative meaning (due to the intensifier with negative meaning – 'angry') is '*Insect (bee) is Human*' (due to an external pejorative characteristic of a bee – small and unimportant) – conceptual domain can be any mental organization of human experience. These similar characteristics become the basis of the zoomorphic metaphorical pejorative model. Let us consider another example:

*"...How does a three-inch-long worm fall in love with ..."* [18, p. 142].

In this example there is a metaphorical mapping, where source domain is *Insect* and target domain is *Human*. When we say 'a person is an insect', we are really saying 'this person is like an insect', which means that we are taking all the characteristics of a person and all the characteristics of an insect, comparing them in order to identify highlight differences or similarities. Another zoomorphic metaphorical pejorative model:

*Erward growled. "Watch yourself, mongrel"* [17, p. 401].

the formula for the metaphorical projection with pejorative meaning is '*Animal (mongrel) is Human*' and its mapping applies to the conceptual knowledge about the image. The meaning of a lexeme *mongrel* is '*a dog of mixed or indeterminate breed, any cross between different things, especially if inharmonious or indiscriminate*'. Definitely not a pleasant one. This zoomorphic metaphorical pejorative model expresses evaluating and expressing functions. The collision of non-identical semantic spectra generates qualitatively new information that reveals previously unknown aspects of the content of concepts included in the structure of the metaphor. Such metaphors let the reader see in a new light the object of interest:

*My bladder was so full it was a constant pain, impossible to ignore. But to parade right through the middle of the hive of angry killers?* [18, p. 152].

Here, a metaphor performs expressive and evaluating functions aiming at focusing on the specific detail that attracts the most attention and is of fundamental importance in a given situation. Metaphor, as cognitive mechanism, by which one experimental domain is partially "mapped" (projected) to another empirical domain, realizes (partially) the second domain within the first one. The domain that is projected – a source domain, in the given example is *Killer*; the domain in which the source domain is projected, that is a target domain, is *People (or human)*. So, when we say '*a person is a killer*', we are really saying '*this person is like a killer*', which means that we are taking all the characteristics of a *human* and all the characteristics of a *killer*, implying that *killers* are deceitful and manipulative people with lack of empathy and remorse, people with antisocial and predatory behavior. Another example:

*A human was on trial for trying to kill an alien. This had to be a horrible day for all of them* [18, p. 328].

is completely opposite to the previous one, as here, vice versa, the source domain is *Human* and the target domain is *Killer*. The implementation of the anthropomorphic model, with the source domain *Human* and is based on the selection, rethinking and transferring of characteristics from a human to object (human as well). In other words, the anthropomorphism of the object is manifested in the fact that it is endowed with pejorative human features, which are explained by linguistic means. In the structure of the following projection there is another anthropomorphic metaphorical model, but what makes it interesting for a linguistic analysis is its sense:

*"Ian is... Ian believes me. He watches over me. He can be so very kind... for a human."* [18, p. 334].

Source domain here is *Kind*, and target domain is *Human*; but this cognitive metaphor is used sarcastically, so in fact the real mapping is *Unkind is Human*. Pejorative effect of this metaphor is enhanced by such intensifier as ellipses. The process of metaphorization within the anthropomorphic model can be based on rethinking human actions and transferring of these functions to the object of interest:

*But I didn't care. She didn't care what she had done to me – letting herself be slaughtered like an animal* [17, p. 329].

This pejorative metaphor performs expressing and evaluating functions. Metaphorization happens here due to the transfer of signs of human action towards an object. Metaphorical mapping here is: source domain – *Slaughter*; target domain – *Human*. Objects can be endowed with a variety of features – emotions, appearance, physical, moral and psychological traits, and other signs of evaluation:

*The anger flashed hot inside me. "I hate them!"* [19, p. 409].

Pejorative semantic varieties of introducing elements of such figurative thinking into the texts of the studied novels with the help of conceptual metaphor can be traced in the author's description of various emotional states, in this case – anger (*Anger is Human*). Such emotional states have a negative meaning in the human system of values and are combined in metaphors with concepts that characterize moral and physical world. And it is a human who becomes the basis for the characterization of those abstract entities that have a negative meaning in the universal system of values, making the nature of pejorative cognitive metaphor anthropomorphic.

**Conclusion.** Metaphorical thought arises independent of language. Cognitive metaphors seem to root themselves deep into the subconscious where they reshape human conscious and unconscious language use. Pejorative vocabulary affects the psychological and emotional state of the addressee and contributes to the realization of the speaker's intentions. Metaphorical pejorative models create a semantically differentiated language of feelings, emotions, attitude, linguistic behavior and affect the participants of a locutionary act. They are important to discourse due to their functions – explaining, clarifying, describing, expressing, evaluating, entertaining and others.

It was revealed that pejorative concepts are complemented by negatively evaluative pragmatically loaded meanings aimed at causing a variety of reader's emotions and feelings, shaping their attitude towards an object of interest. Concepts with pejorative meaning can be represented by anthropomorphic, physical, abstract-philosophical, emotional-psycho-



logical, and some other cognitive metaphorical models, among which anthropomorphic and zoomorphic are dominant in the studied corpus. Modern novels serve as a good source for this purpose as they are not only a fiction, but a part of our life – how characters think and act are represented in the language.

The collision of non-identical semantic spectra generates qualitatively new information that reveals previously unknown aspects of the content of concepts included in the structure of the metaphors. The mechanism for constructing metaphorical pejorative models is the transfer of various negative characteristics to the object. A diverse degree of the usage of metaphorical pejorative models has been detected. The following metaphorical constructions turned out to be the most frequent in the studied novels: zoomorphic, the source sphere of which is an *Animal/Insect* and anthropomorphic, the correlate of

which is *Human*. Intensifiers (like adjectives, punctuation) enhance emotional meaning of an utterance. The process of metaphorization in the structure of zoomorphic pejorative models – the mapping – happens due to a transfer of behavioral and external characteristics of insects/animals to a referent. Within the boundaries of anthropomorphic pejorative models the projection happens according to such aspects as actions, emotions and psychological characteristics. Cognitive pejorative metaphor compares the concept of more valuable with the concept of less valuable and performs a number of functions, among which are emotional and evaluative stylistic functions.

Based on the conclusion above we outline the prospects of the future studies in the nature of a cognitive metaphor, especially within the boundaries of its models and functions.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Баранов А. Н. Дескрипторная теория метафоры. Москва : Языки славянской культуры, 2014. 632 с.
2. Болдырев Н. Н. Когнитивная семантика: Курс лекций по английской филологии. Тамбов: Издательство Тамбовского государственного университета, 2001., с. 24-25.
3. Глоссарий к краткому словарю когнитивных терминов / Е.С. Кубрякова и др. Москва: Издательство Московского государственного университета, 1997., с. 6.
4. Грущак О. М. Метафоричне представлення концепту life в англomовній афористиці. Дрогобицький держ. педагогічний ун-т ім. Івана Франка. «Молодий вчений», № 4.3 (44.3), 2017. с. 62-65
5. Киселёва С.В. Очерки по когнитивной теории концептуальной метафоры. *Учёные записки. Том 19: Современные проблемы филологии, межкультурной коммуникации и перевода*. Спб.: ИВЭСЭП, 2012. с. 33-42.
6. Кульчицька О. В. Мовні засоби реалізації пейоративності в романах С. Майєр : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04 – германські мови ; Львівський ун-т ім. Івана Франка. Львів, 2019. 22 с.
7. Македонова О. Д. Концептуальна метафора у сучасному рекламному дискурсі США. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія». Серія: Філологічна*, 2015. Вип. 58. с. 107-109.
8. Пименова М. В. Типология структурных элементов концептов внутреннего мира (на примере эмоциональных концептов). *Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики*, 2004. № 1. с. 82-90.
9. Чудинов А. П. Очерки по современной политической метафорологии: Монография / Урал. гос. пед. ун-т. – Екатеринбург, 2013. с. 64.
10. Daniela M. Bailer-Jones. Models, Metaphors and Analogies. *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Science*. Malden: Blackwell, 2002. pp. 108-127.
11. Derman, E. Metaphors, models & theories. 2010. Retrieved February 10, 2022, from [https://www.edge.org/conversation/emanuel\\_derman-metaphors-models-theories](https://www.edge.org/conversation/emanuel_derman-metaphors-models-theories)
12. Jäkel, O. Hypotheses revisited: The cognitive theory of metaphor applied to religious texts. 2021. p. 21. Retrieved February 21, 2022, from [https://www.metaphorik.de/sites/www.metaphorik.de/files/journal-pdf/02\\_2002\\_jaekel.pdf](https://www.metaphorik.de/sites/www.metaphorik.de/files/journal-pdf/02_2002_jaekel.pdf)
13. Knowles, M., & Moon, R. *Introducing metaphor*. London: Routledge, 2006.
14. Kovecses Z. *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford University Press, 2002.
15. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. *Metforas de la Vida Cotidiana*. Ciedra. 1980.
16. Lailiyyatuz Z. An analysis of metaphor and metonymy on Stephenie Meyer's novel *Breaking dawn*. English letters department, Letters and Humanities faculty, State Islamic University "Syarif hidayatullah". Jakarta, 2001. 81 p.
17. Meyer S. *Breaking Dawn*. Great Britain: Atom, Palimpsest Book Production Limited, 2009. 697 p.
18. Meyer S. *The Host*. Great Britain: Atom, Palimpsest Book Production Limited, 2010. 656 p.
19. Meyer S. *New Moon*. Great Britain: Atom, Palimpsest Book Production Limited, 2009. 497 p.
20. Meyer S. *The Short Second Life of Bree Tanner. An Eclipse Novella (The Twilight Saga)*. Great Britain: Atom, Palimpsest Book Production Limited, 2010. 178 p.