

Cognitive derivation at formation of political phraseological modernisms

Gulnara Abildaevna Omarbekova¹ and Dolores Abildaevna Nurgaliyeva²

¹Kazakh State Women's Pedagogical University, Aiteke bi str., 99, Alma-Ata, 090000, Republic of Kazakhstan

²Almaty State Pedagogical University named after Abai, Dostyk Avenue, 13, Almaty, 050010, Republic of Kazakhstan

Abstract. In this article, phraseological modernisms in politics created by using conceptual metaphors are the subject of the research. The article studies the method of cognitive derivation of political phraseological modernisms. The objective of this article is to reveal the methods of cognitive derivation of phraseological modernisms and to describe the models of the conceptual metaphor, using which new words are built. The article uses comprehensive methodological paradigm that also includes the cross-disciplinary, anthropocentric, and cognitive principles. The methods applied in this work are: modeling, conceptual analysis, the model of conceptual metaphor in its function as a method of cognitive derivation. The following results were obtained in the process of the research: the models of conceptual metaphor used as the main method of cognitive derivation were revealed and described; it was stated that phraseological modernisms can be created by means of both secondary naming and cognitive derivation; the sub-types of ontological conceptual metaphor were identified, such as personification (the anthropomorphic model, the zoomorphic model).

[Omarbekova G.A., Nurgaliyeva D.A. **Cognitive derivation at formation of political phraseological modernisms.** *Life Sci J* 2014;11(11s):516-521] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 117

Keywords: modeling, conceptual metaphor, schematic pattern, phraseological modernism, secondary naming

Introduction

Since recently, the processes of derivation have been being studied more and more intensively within the framework of cognitive linguistics: a new branch of this science is being created – the cognitive derivation; its metalanguage is being formed; the mechanisms of cognitive derivation are being studied in many researches. Special literature considers schematic patterns and schemes of construction, which are standard patterns for complex symbolic structures, i.e. schematic patterns and schemes of construction. "While mastering a language and speaking a language, one can meet quite a large variety of nominalizing transformations; some of them are remembered as lexical items. When a pattern is formed, i.e. when a certain number of expressions is created similarly, the speaker, probably, identifies a schematic pattern based on them; thus, he creates linguistic representation of their similarity" [1]. R. Langacker believes that schematic patterns exist in cognitive linguistic representations along with formations, which have the status of conventional units. Schematic patterns are used by speakers for creation of new expressions or subjective evaluation of their orthodoxy. On the one hand, speakers having identified a certain pattern as a rule do not forget about particular units created according to this schematic pattern. On the other hand, the ability to operate this pattern does not prevent the speakers from perceiving and remembering words and expressions of the same

structure as conventional units without creating them every time anew. For example, such models as USE AS INST, AS MEANS, PUT IN TO PLACE, DOAS can be considered cognitive models. They help creating new derivative words. Such cognitive models or schematic patterns co-exist in cognitive linguistic representation with the formations, which have obtained the status of conventional units [2].

Body of the work

Derivatives are created using the *conceptual metaphor* and *cognitive metonymy* models. These mechanisms are based on using the *donor's area* and the *recipient's area* that are related to cognitive prerequisites. E.S. Kubryakova also relates the *donor's area* and the target *recipient's area* to them. In this relation, the *recipient's area* has the status of a sub-category, into which certain intervals of the cognitive structure of the *donor's area* are transferred. At activation of proposition, it focuses the necessary attribute, which is the base of the future linguistic unit, and the target "space determines the general categorial meaning of the derived name" [3]. The ontological model of conceptual metaphor includes the *donor's area* and the target *recipient's area*; and the *conceptual metaphor* model generally assumes understanding of one area through the other in the course of human cognition process. According to J. Lakoff, metaphorization assumes transfer from the "source area to the target area" of the cognitive structures, in the terms of which the experience

relating to the source area has been being structured. If comparing to the target area, the source area is usually a specific knowledge acquired by a human in the course of direct experience of interaction with the reality [4]. Ontological metaphor is used for creation of the conceptual metaphor model required for conceptual revising of the text [5]. The term *ontology* is used for description of the process of conceptualization at multiple usage of an information resource [6]. Combination of the structure of the donor and the target results in creation of the blending, which is an integral unit. According to J. Fauconnier, parts of a structure or a frame, which contain information about the real-world items, acquire a meaning of affectation when they get into the game zone [7]. Such *blending* or a conceptual whole is formed at creation of phraseological modernisms, as various models of conceptual metaphor are often used at their derivation: the ontological, structural, orientational, and other models. In this case, metaphorical models act as schematic patterns. The secondary phraseological naming is carried out based on these schematic patterns. Following the idea of V.N. Telia, emergence of phraseological signs takes place by way of secondary naming, when the means existing in the language are used in a function that is new for them – the appellation [8]. Secondary naming includes two types of naming: the direct and indirect naming. V.N. Telia said: "Indirect naming is formation of a new linguistic entity in the nominative context, which points explicitly or implicitly at its indirect relation to the reality; indirect naming is carried out by two-dimensional mediation of attribution of the linguistic form secondarily acting in the role of a name to the reality – through revising of its meaning and through the influence of the base name significatum, which sets the conceptual content and predetermines the sphere of denotation of the revised name" [9]. Indirect naming is one of types of naming in the sphere of secondary naming. Its other type is indirect naming, the idea of which resides in indirect representation of an extra-linguistic item, which representation is mediated by the previous meaning of the word. The attributes of the previous meaning play the role of an internal form; they are conveyed to the new semantic content. The second type of nomination is associated with phraseology. And in this case, linguistic naming is based on the special linguistic combinatory-synthesizing technique: with regard to naming, there are two or three names here: the base naming and the indirect naming. At the secondary phraseological naming, a new derivative phraseological meaning of the word is formed. In this case, we can use the term *phraseosememes*. N.Z. Kotelova in her classification of new words speaks

about new *neophrasemes*. Her classification is based on various aspects of new words: 1) by the species diversity of linguistic units; 2) by the degree of novelty. By the type of linguistic units, modernisms are broken down into *neolexemes*, *neophrasemes*, and *neosememes* (words and phraseological units) [10]. *Neolexemes* are borrowings from other languages, e.g. *slogan*, *image*, *charisma*, *paparazzi*. *Neophrasemes* are new phraseological units and set expressions with forming idiomatic semantics, e.g., *ridiculous prices*, *dark horse*, *lame duck*, etc. Speaking about updating of the general figurative meaning of phraseological units at derivation of neophrasemes, N.Z. Kotelova meant the method of secondary indirect naming. Meanwhile, in view of the cross-disciplinary approach, it is more reasonable to mention cognitive derivation at building neophrasemes. Understanding of the phenomena of secondary naming within the framework of the cognitive approach has contributed to studying the conceptual derivation in its function as the cognitive base of derivation. At that, derivative dictionary acts as the generative environment, which provides speakers with schemes of conjunction of certain structures of knowledge with certain word-formative constructs, mechanisms of derivative modeling and strategies of retrieving semantics from its items, procedures of processing new data, etc. [11]. Phraseological neosememes act as derivatives, created at cognitive derivation, when the new structure of the knowledge appears as a result of association of the source and target concepts into a single conceptual structure based on certain conceptual characteristics, which make them closer to each other and allow entering into word-formative relations. In the course of conceptual derivation, according to L.V. Babina, association of source concepts into conceptual structures, inside of which they act as arranged with each other by certain conceptual characteristics, takes place. Having received linguistic representation, the concepts that emerge in the course of the cognitive activity become an integral part of the conceptual system and in their turn create the base for its further development keeping derivative links to the source structures [12].

The conceptual derivation provides for association of concepts into a conceptual structure that is the basis of the semantics of the derivative word and has the form of proposition. In this case also, "the word-formative models of different types can be treated as formulas of regular resultants of the propositional structure" at its actualization by individual derivative words [3]. For example, conceptualization of the reality at derivation of new signs of secondary naming is accomplished in the process of metaphorical modelling of a fragment of the reality and its subjective re-conceptualization in

the discourse of the speaker, when the speaker in any situation can expose to re-conceptualization any word combination related to the situation based on finding similarity with the situation, its designation with the signs of secondary naming based on revealing the similarity with a certain item or a phenomenon, and then, to join the sphere of the source (situation, original word phrase related to the situation) and the sphere of the target, to which the attribute of the source is transferred, into an integral unit using associative links in the process of linguistic creative thinking. As a result of derivation by the conceptual metaphor model, a new figurative meaning of word phrases is formed, and a phraseological unit appears. V.G. Gak noticed that in such cases, first a certain "prototypical situation" occurs in the world, which corresponds to the "literary" meaning of the phraseological unit. Then, certain content is assigned to it, which is later re-conceptualized, i.e. a representation of the phraseological unit is formed based on the original meanings of word phrases in the prototypical situation. Those primary words keep their meaning in the representation. Thus, the internal form of a word appears, which contains main information associated with the culture [13]. In this situation, the mechanism of re-conceptualization is the conceptual metaphor, which in its function as an associational and representational scheme ensures, first of all, occurrence of a new derivative figurative meaning, and, secondly, affinity of the source area (the prototypical situation) and the target area. Thus, the ontological metaphorical model contributes to representation of abstract concepts through particular representations; for example, the English expression *dark horse* is a phraseological modernism, which came to the Russian language as a result of calquing. It was created in the English language by the *ontological conceptual metaphor* model, when the particular concept *tyomnaya loshadka* (*dark horse*) acts as the source area, and the abstract concept unknown quantity acts as the target. In this case, the abstract concept *value* is expressed through a particular word phrase *tyomnaya loshadka* (*dark horse*). This word phrase comes from professional slang of jockeys and has been used in the meaning *a horse that they bet on without knowing whether it will win or not*. In the political language, this phraseological modernism means *a candidate for a certain political office holding a pre-election campaign and having poor chances to win*. Phraseological dictionaries provide the following meaning for it: *“For many people he is an unknown quantity, a dark horse, thrust into lime-light only now*. In the political language, also such phraseological units as *straw man* (*dummy, fictitious, negligible candidate proposed with the purpose of*

deflecting attention from another candidate), *solomennoye chuchelo* (*straw man*), *melkaya soshka* (*small plow*) are used. The phraseological unit *melkaya soshka* (*small plow*) means *a person with a negligible social status*. In the political sphere, it belongs to the synonymic row of phraseological units with the meaning *“a negligible character that is not paid attention to”* and replaces the phraseological units: *straw man, dark horse, solomennoye chuchelo* (*straw man*). At application of the ontological conceptual metaphor, the interaction by analogy takes place between the source (basis) of the derivation and the object of matching (the target area). In the process of metaphorization, the following operation are carried out: 1) selection of the most expressive analog (*horse, dark, plow, dummy, small*); 2) transfer of a respective part of knowledge or a part of an empirical object from the source area to the area of the object of cognition and naming (to politics); 3) formation of the new sense. Before, particular concepts, e.g. *chuchelo* (*a shape that looks like a human*); *soshka* (*a device for plowing*), *melkaya* (*incapable, insignificant*): *shallow galoshes, shallow stream, shallow lagoon; usaq adam, ulken emes, birkelki tuirshikter, melkaya soshka* (*small plow*), *neznachitelny chelovek* (*insignificant person*), *shallow man*. As a result of cognitive idiomatization, new phraseosemes, new figurative meanings appear, which express ideologized senses and acquire political content in the sphere of politics, where they describe a person who does not play any significant role in the policy. Also, such phraseological expressions function in the political sphere as: *word helper man, hang-dog politician, paper tiger*, which designate minor politicians, hangers-on, minions, who do not have any political heft. The phraseological units *melkaya soshka* (*small plow*), *lame duck, shallow man, sajasi tajaz adam* (*politically illiterate person*) obtain the status of political phraseological items as a result of re-categorization (transfer from the category *human temper* to the category *political heft, image of politicians*). In this case, phraseological units acquire new meaning, distinct from the social one; however, the emotional and evaluative attitude expressing subjective attitude to these persons remains in the politics, as phraseological units are able to convey emotional and evaluative attitude of the speakers to a certain fact, that is they express the evaluative reality, which is understood as a link established between the value-related orientation of the speaker and the listener and designated with reality (more specifically, with a certain property are aspect of consideration of this reality), evaluated positively or negatively by certain reason (emotional, ethical, utilitarian, etc.) according to a standard of the

existence of things or status quo in a certain worldview, which is the basis of the normative evaluation [9]. The value orientation of the speaker can be both positive and negative. In these phraseological units, the negative value orientation to the object is expressed implicitly. Beside expression of the evaluative modality, phraseological units have idioethnic markedness, because the elements of the phraseological unit's structure are allocated among the three blocks, which correspond to the three elements of human thinking – the language, the thinking, and the objectified world. In the specified blocks, the idioethnic traits revealed by us manifest themselves: a) by way of studying the national specificity of the system of the given language on the lexeme, combinatory, and semantic levels; b) by means of selective reflexion of cultural and historical facts; c) by means of studying the linguistic consciousness of its native-speakers. The idioethnic features of phraseological units in their function as units of the certain language's system, first of all, manifest themselves in the fact that they figuratively reflect the existence of a nation, traditions, figuratively express representations of a certain ethnos, related to the system of ethnic constants, with the mentality in its function as a property of ethnic consciousness of a nation reflecting a certain ethnic worldview. Secondly, selective reflection of cultural history facts manifests itself in selection of phraseological units according to the value-related orientations and the sociocultural mindset of the nation that have been being framed in the course of accumulation of certain experience in the circumstances of living in a certain environmental niche. The selectivity of phraseological units resides in orientation at selection of nationally important phraseological tools, in which the unique social and historical experience of a certain national community is stated, which is supported by the phraseological units. The ethnocultural specificity of the linguistic consciousness is determined by the fact that, while focusing on the most important aspect of the mental operation of a human, it is formed within the framework of a particular society, the members of which along with development of the speech and the language also form their mental functions. At that, linguistic consciousness has a broad referential area, which includes two species of it: the dynamic one (verbal expression of consciousness) and the structural one (created by linguistic structures, including the phraseological ones). Because in the course of socialization in a society, a human assimilates and adopts the culture of this society, including the language. And these structures of the language contribute to the formation of linguistic consciousness, because mental structures are

verbalized through linguistic units. In their turn, linguistic structures are formed in the result of mental experience of an individual and his consciousness. For example, the idioethnicity of political phraseological units – the modernisms – manifests itself in the selective picking of the significative descriptor. The significative descriptors in their function as a source of the ontological metaphor are taken from the areas that have cultural valence, and the bodies of the linguistic signs contain their mental representations. For example, elements of phraseological units and the phraseological units themselves *melkaya soshka (small plow)*, *solommenoye chuchelo (straw man)*, *dark horse*, *at aryltu (ride down a horse)*, (*soshka, chuchelo, dark horse, at arylty*) are associated with the mental representations that express the cultural and value-related dominants of nations. For example, *soshka (small plow)* is an agricultural tool. It represents the idea about the peasants' way of living in Russia before the Revolution. *Chuchelo (dummy)* is a concept associated with the Maslenitsa ceremony. *Solommenoye chuchelo (straw man)* was specially made by the last day of Maslenitsa out of straw and cloth pieces. The phraseological unit *tyomnaya loshadka (dark horse)* is associated with horseracing. Horseracing (steeplechase, etc.) is held at hippodromes. During the races, people place bets on horses. The played horse can lose because there is no information about it. In fiction, it is used in the same meaning: *Miss Benson, have you ever heard what it is to bet on a dark horse? – A dark horse? Yes, I have heard something about it, but I don't know what it is. – Let me explain it to you, - say Biard. – It means that you have only one chance to survive depending on whether there is one person among these fifty-six passengers on board of this plane who not only can land this plane, but also did not eat fish for dinner. (A. Haily. Runway Zero-Eight)*. In the Russian culture, the term *seraya loshadka (grey horse)* is usually used in the meaning “a negligible person” and is treated negatively: “The ring in the head was becoming even louder. Lapin squeezed his temples with palms. – This can't be! Just can't be! For all my life, I have been nothing – a grey horse, no one has ever cared of me, and no one has ever helped me”. The phraseological unit *at arylty (ride down a horse)* is used in the Kazakh culture in the meaning *an unlucky person who has not achieved any success despite his efforts*. He cannot win in the Baiga (horseracing) and Kokpara (racing with a goat) competitions. The subjective emotional attitude of the speaker or the ethnos, expressed in the phraseological unit, is also negative. The conceptual metaphor *personification* is applied in the case if the source area is a person whose properties are conveyed to the

target area. For example, personification is observed in the phraseological units *green power*, *Aq orda* (previously, the word *orda* was used in the meaning *Khan's headquarters*). Being formed as phraseological modernisms, these expressions acquire the capability of expressing negative attitude to the specified subjects. In some cases, the negative evaluation is exaggerated, for example, the ruling elites – *the authorities* – are called *Aq orda*. In this phraseological modernism, negative attitude to the ruling elites is expressed. What is *Aq Orda* going to undertake now in order to correct their political good name in the opinion of the world community and its own population after such a slap? It is hard to say as our legislative system does not function, and, therefore, Kazakhstan is unpredictable. The authorities can take review against the judgment of the Vienna Court. The zoomorphic code is also used in conceptual metaphor, when the properties and the behavior of animals are associated with a human. In the phraseological units *gus lapchaty* (*a webbed goose*), *strausinaya politika* (*ostrich policy*), *snezhny bars* (*snow leopard*), *aziatskiye moski* (*Asian small dogs*), *diplomatiichesky zubr* (*a bison in diplomacy*), *ogiz ajaq* (*ox-like step*), *innen shikkan suyr dai* (*as a marmot that has come out of water*), *like a duck in a thunder storm*, *at a snail's gallop*, *set the wolf to keep the sheep*, *pustit shchuku v reku* (*let a pike into a river*), and *pustit kozla v ogorod* (*let a goat into the garden*), animals act as the significative descriptors. These phraseological units use the model of personification, but a reverse one, when properties and behavior of animals are applied to a human. In this case, the zoomorphically personified model is applied. For example, the political phraseological unit *lame duck* means *a president whose term is ending*. The idioethnicity of these phraseological units manifests itself in the fact that national phraseological representations are used as the significative descriptors. In the course of modeling the zoomorphic metaphor, various differences in emotional-evaluational associations are observed, which are associated with certain animals, which are traditionally used as the basis for metaphors, and in cognitive metaphor – as the significative descriptor. For example, the image of a loser is represented with zoomorphic phraseological units in the English language (*lame duck*, *like a duck in a thunderstorm*, *stalking horse*), in the Russian language (*kak mokraya kuritsa* (*as a wet chicken*)), and in the Kazakh language (*innen shikkan suyr dai* (*as a marmot that has come out of water*), *at aryltty* (*an unlucky person who has not achieved success despite all his efforts*)).

Summary

Thus, the analysis of the *conceptual metaphor* model indicates that it is one of efficient tools of cognitive derivation, which assumes formation of a new phraseological modernism through schematic patterns, i.e. standard patterns used for building complex structures – the cognitive phraseological derivatives. In the course of implementation of the *ontological conceptual metaphor* schematic pattern, a complex conceptual whole (blending) appears, which combines in itself the donor's area (the source area) and the recipient's area (the target area), which contributes to appearance of a new phraseological neosememe.

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Omarbekova Gulnara Abildaevna
Kazakh State Women's Pedagogical University
Aiteke bi str., 99, Alma-Ata, 090000, Republic of Kazakhstan

References

1. Langacker, R.W., 1987. Foundations of cognitive Grammar. Vol. 1: Theoretical Prerequisites. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp: 650.
2. Langacker, R.W., 1991. Concept, Image and Symbol: The cognitive Basis of Grammar. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp: 383
3. Kubryakova, E.S., 2004. Language and Knowledge: On the way of learning the language. Parts of speech with cognitive perspective. The role of language in understanding the world. Moscow: Languages of Slavonic Culture, pp: 345.
4. Lakoff, G. and M.E. Johnson, 1999. Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought. New York, N.Y.: Basic Books, pp: 624.
5. Lakoff, G., 1987. Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal About the Mind. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp: 614.
6. Cruber, Th.R., 1995. Toward Principles for the Design of Ontologies Used for Knowledge Sharing. International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, Vol. 43, 5-6(Special issue: the role of formal ontology in the information technology): 907-928.
7. Fauconnier, G., 1997. Mappings in Thought and Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp: 205.
8. Teliya, V.N., 1977. Secondary nomination and its types. Language Destinations: types of names. Moscow: Nauka, pp: 129-221.

9. Teliya, V.N., 1986. Cognitive aspect of semantics of nominative units. Moscow: Nauka, pp: 143.
10. Kotelova H.3., 1988. Theoretical aspects of lexicographic description of neologisms. Soviet lexicography. - M., pp. 46-63.
11. Kubryakova, E.S., 2004. Language and Knowledge: On the way of learning the language: Parts of Speech from the cognitive point of view. The role of language in knowledge of the world. Russian Academy of Sciences. Institute of Linguistics. Moscow: Culture of Slavic Languages, pp: 560.
12. Babina, L.V., 2009. Conceptual Foundations of word formation. Cognitive Studies of language. IV Release. Conceptualization of the world in the language. Moscow: Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Tambov: Publishing House of the TSU after G.R. Derzhavin, pp: 128-150.
13. Gak, V.G., 1998. Language conversion. - M.: School "Languages of Russian Culture", pp: 768.

7/8/2014