Grazhdankina O.S.
Student,
Uzhhorod National University

METAPHORS AS COGNITIVE TOOLS IN ADVERTISING

The overall aim of this article is to provide a cognitive analysis of conceptual metaphors, and their possible interaction in magazine advertising in order to confirm the assumption that advertisers employ the same cognitive instruments such as metaphor as people use in everyday communication.

The cognitive analysis was based on empirical data extracted from advertisements of four women's magazines issued monthly in the period from 2010 to 2017. The selected magazines were Vogue, Marie Claire, Cosmopolitan, Elle. The selected magazines are fashion and lifestyle women's magazines, which consist of advertisements of a wide range of products and services. These magazines were chosen due to their popularity among the audience, availability and high number of contained advertisements.

The initial material included 84 magazines. During the searching process, it was necessary to exclude some magazines for several reasons. A lack of advertisements containing the required empirical evidence. The second reason was that the same advertisements appeared in several different magazines.

The basis for the cognitive analysis was the classification of conceptual metaphors provided by Lakoff and Johnson (1980); developed by Radden and Kövecses (1999). Analysis is backed by relevant examples extracted from selected advertisements from British women's magazines. The aim of the research is to describe possible ways of understanding conceptual metaphors.

The term *metaphor* is derived from the Greek word *metaphora* and is composed of *meta-*, which means *beyond* and *–phora*, which means *to carry* (Taverniers 2002: 1). Metaphor is traditionally defined as a trope or expression of figurative language in which a phrase or word is shifted from its ordinary usage to a context where it invokes new meaning (Preminger & Brogan 1993: 760).

The multifaceted nature of metaphor is reflected in the different types of classifications of metaphor which have been provided within various scientific disciplines such as linguistics, literature and philosophy. These classifications are developed according to different dimensions such as metaphor's status vs. the lexico-grammatical system of language, the scope of metaphor, and

encoding or lexico-grammatical realization of metaphor, as well as the meanings included as source and target domains (Taverniers 2002: 11). There are many ways to classify metaphors; however, the following subsection are mainly focused on the classifications of metaphors which are based on criteria such as conventionality, cognitive function and the nature of metaphors, due to their relevance to the cognitive linguistic view on metaphor.

Many of theorists held that metaphor is a device of poetic or rhetorical language and a matter of extraordinary and not ordinary language, but still some theorists (e.g. Richards 1936; Black 1962) have considerably contributed to recent cognitive approaches to metaphor. For example, Black (1962 quoted in Ungerer & Schmid 1996: 118) suggests that metaphors function as a 'cognitive instrument' in a pre-cognitive context; meaning that metaphors are not only a way to assert ideas with language but are also a way in which we conceptualize things.

As already pointed out, in 1980 Lakoff and Johnson, in their book Metaphors we live by, first suggested the conceptual theory of metaphor. This theory represents the revolutionary idea that metaphor is not just an ornament of language but that human thought is metaphorically constructed (Lakoff & Johnson 2003 [1980]: 3). In order to provide an idea of what it means for a concept of our thought to be metaphorical and how this cognitive phenomenon structures our daily activity, Lakoff and Johnson (2003 [1980]: 5) investigated the concept of argument and the metaphor argument is war.

They suggest that this metaphor is manifested in our daily communication in a range of expressions, such as the following (2003 [1980]: 5):

I've never won an argument with him.

You disagree? Okay, shoot!

If you use that strategy, he'll wipe you out.

He shot down all of my arguments.

Based on these examples, we can conclude that actions which we undertake during an argument, and our understanding of such actions, are to a certain extent constructed in terms of the war concept (Lakoff & Johnson 2003 [1980]: 5). As mentioned before, Lakoff and Johnson (2003 [1980]: 6) point out that "the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another". Therefore, arguments do not represent a subcategory of war because arguments and war are different categories (Lakoff & Johnson 2003 [1980]: 7).

Another example of a metaphorical concept used to show how a metaphorical expression employed for everyday communication can help us to understand the nature of metaphorical concepts as well as the metaphorical nature of our activities is that of time is money. This claim is based on the following linguistic evidence (Lakoff & Johnson 2003 [1980]: 8-9):

You're wasting my time.

This gadget will save you hours.

I don't have the time to give you.

The conceptual metaphor, time is money, is based on the fact that we are paid according to the hours of our work and that we act as if time is something valuable and limited (Lakoff & Johnson 2003 [1980]: 9). Therefore, the expression time is money represents metaphorical concept because we conceptualise time as a limited and valuable resource by using our daily experience with money (Lakoff & Johnson 2003 [1980]: 9).

Metaphor within the field of cognitive linguistics are considered conceptual processes that are used by people in different areas of everyday life. With the development of marketing and the media, advertising has become an efficient device for promoting products. Advertisers employ metaphor as powerful cognitive tools for advertising purposes. The detailed cognitive analysis of conceptual metaphors in British magazine advertising confirmed the background assumption that advertisers use the same cognitive tools (metaphors) as people employ in everyday communication.

All three kinds of conceptual metaphors (structural, ontological, orientational) suggested by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) were identified in the selected advertisements.

The cognitive analysis of structural metaphors showed that the concept of light is frequently employed in the advertisements. The explanation for the predominant use of the concept of light in advertisements is that the advertisers are trying to deliver the message to customers that their products bring positive effects. In some cases, the advertisers also used a promoted product as a target domain in order to bring a product closer to the customers.

The main orientational metaphors defined are "more is up", "less is down", "good is up", "conscious is up", "having control is up". In the same way as structural and orientational metaphors ontological metaphors, such as entity, substance and container metaphor, are also often used as cognitive tools in advertisments.

References:

1. McQuarrie, Edward F; Phillips, Barbara J. 2005."Indirect persuasion in advertising – how consumers process metaphors presented in pictures and words". Journal of Advertising 34 (2), 7-20.

2. Müller, Friedrich Max. 2013 [1864]. Lectures on the science of language. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

3. Nerlich, Brigitte. 2010. "Metaphor and metonymy". In Jucker, Andreas H.; Taavitsainen, Irma (eds.). Historical pragmatics. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 193-218.

4. Nerlich, Brigitte; Clarke, David D. 2001. "Serial metonymy: a study of reference-based polysemisation". Journal of Historical Pragmatics 2 (2), 245-272.

5. Nerlich, Brigitte; Clarke, David D.; Todd, Zazie. 1999. "Mummy, I like being a sandwich: metonymy in language acquisition". In Panther, Klaus-Uwe; Radden Günter (eds.). Metonymy in language and thought. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 361-384.

6. Norrick, Neal R.1981. Semiotic Principles in Semantic Theory. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

7. Nunberg, Geoffrey. 1978. The pragmatics of reference. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

8. Nunberg, Geoffrey. 1979. "The non-uniqueness of semantic solutions: polysemy". Linguistics and Philosophy 3 (2), 143-184.

9. Ortony, Andrew (ed.). 1993 [1979]. Metaphor and thought. (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Labunets Y.O.
Student,
Uman State Pedagogical University named after Pavlo Tychyna;
Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Senior Lecturer,
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University

LINGO-PRAGMATIC CHARACTERISTICS OF "TROLING" PHENOMENON AS FORMS OF INTERNET-INTERACTION

The tendencies of communicative Internet interaction, which causes interest in the conditional diversity of the world, representatives of other cultural and conditional preferences, intensifies the development of musical-speech abilities, become increasingly relevant. At the present stage of dynamic and permanent development of foreign communication, cooperation and general communication, one of the urgent problems that require new ways of