

UDC; 81'373.612.2

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/57-2-30>**Dilbar ORUJOVA,**

orcid.org/0000-0002-4401-3220

Researcher at the Department of English Language and Methodology

Nakhchivan State University

(Nakhchivan, Azerbaijan) [dilber\\_orucova@mail.ru](mailto:dilber_orucova@mail.ru)**RELIGIOUS METAPHOR AND METANOMY IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE**

*During the cognitive analysis of metaphor models, elements belonging to different lexical-semantic groups and parts of speech are considered. Not only metaphorical expressions, but also other types of metaphors are involved in the study. Metaphorical epithet, metaphorical comparison, hyperbole, litota, personification, etc. is one of those metaphors. Context often reveals the meaning of a metaphorical expression. However, context is the primary level in determining metaphorical meaning. It is clear that the participants of political communication, more precisely, the addressee, or the addressee, do not conduct such an analysis or interpretation in order to understand the metaphorical meaning. Because the political discourse continues and the speaker does not stop his thoughts and opinions, does not focus the attention of the addressees on the meaning of the metaphorical expression.*

*The conceptual metaphor model is distinguished by its openness and expands by adding new components. It is possible to determine the direction in which the concrete model should be expanded. The metaphor used in the political discourse above expands in the direction of the religious metaphor. Religion is the way of holiness, sacredness, purity, faith, belief. People's struggle for freedom and Motherland is also considered sacred. In the period of war and conflicts, the functionality of religious metaphors such as martyr, innocent person, veteran attracts attention in political communication. In general, when abstract concepts such as faith, truth, and purity are used in political discourses, religious sources and foundations are referred to. A political discourse fragment opens and closes a microtopic. From a conceptual point of view, status is the core of the microtheme. In order to understand its essence, it is necessary to use background knowledge. The application of cognitive linguistics methods, which study the issues of conceptualization and categorization of the world in language, as well as the use of mental mechanisms for the purpose of interpretation and explanation of political discourse text, creates a complex cognitive phenomenon.*

**Key words:** *metaphor, discourse, metonymy, conceptual, cognitive, communication, extralinguistic, politics, religion, context.*

**Ділбар ОРУДЖОВА,**

orcid.org/0000-0002-4401-3220

науковий співробітник кафедри англійської мови та методики

Нахічеванського державного університету

(Нахічевань, Азербайджан) [dilber\\_orucova@mail.ru](mailto:dilber_orucova@mail.ru)**РЕЛІГІЙНА МЕТАФОРА І МЕТАНОМІЯ В ПОЛІТИЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ**

*Під час когнітивного аналізу моделей метафори розглядаються елементи, що належать до різних лексико-семантичних груп і частин мови. У дослідженні беруть участь не тільки метафоричні вирази, а й інші види метафор. Метафоричний епітет, метафоричне порівняння, гіпербола, літота, персоніфікація тощо є одними з таких метафор. Контекст часто розкриває значення метафоричного виразу. Однак контекст є первинним рівнем у визначенні метафоричного значення. Зрозуміло, що учасники політичної комунікації, точніше адресат, чи адресат, не проводять такого аналізу чи інтерпретації, щоб зрозуміти метафоричний зміст. Тому що політичний дискурс триває і мовець не зупиняє своїх думок і думок, не акцентує увагу адресатів на значенні метафоричного вислову.*

*Концептуальна модель метафори вирізняється своєю відкритістю та розширюється шляхом додавання нових компонентів. Можна визначити напрямок, у якому слід розгорнути конкретну модель. Метафора, використана в політичному дискурсі вище, розширюється в напрямку релігійної метафори. Релігія – це шлях святості, сакральності, чистоти, віри, віри. Священною вважається також боротьба народу за волю і Батьківщину. У період війни та конфліктів у політичній комунікації привертає увагу функціональність релігійних метафор, таких як мученик, невинний, ветеран. Загалом, коли в політичних дискурсах використовуються такі абстрактні поняття, як віра, істина та чистота, маються на увазі релігійні джерела та основи. Фрагмент політичного дискурсу відкриває і закриває мікротему. З концептуальної точки зору статус є стрижнем мікротемі. Для того, щоб зрозуміти його суть, необхідно скористатися попередніми знаннями. Застосування методів когнітивної лінгвістики, які вивчають питання концептуалізації та категоризації світу в мові, а також використання ментальних механізмів з метою інтерпретації та пояснення тексту політичного дискурсу, створює складний когнітивний феномен.*

**Ключові слова:** *метафора, дискурс, метаномія, концептуальний, когнітивний, комунікаційний, екстралінгвістичний, політика, релігія, контекст.*

**Introduction.** Although discourse is a term used earlier in linguistics, researches related to it started in the second half of the last century. Discourse is a complex communicative event and covers the entire process of speech activity. Discourse includes extralinguistic factors other than the text. In order to understand the discourse, it is important to consider the extralinguistic factors involved in its course.

E. Benvenist noted the formation of discourse on the basis of large units, and said that it finds its expression in the process of learning communicative speech (Benvenist, 1974: 312). After this opinion of E. Benvenist, the studies on discourse and its research have increased considerably (Literature). However, the discourse still attracts attention as an object of serious scholarly debate. In modern humanities, the relationship between discurs is ambiguous. It is difficult to review the definitions and explanations of discourse in chronological order. Because the number of definitions given to him is quite large and it is not easy to determine their exact dates. In fact, there is no need to consider such a chronological sequence. In our opinion, it is appropriate to comment on the definitions and explanations that are the focus of attention in the more widespread, mainstream scientific literature, and to define the concept of political discourse by adopting one of these definitions.

It should also be noted that according to M. Hou's calculations, 5,000 scientific articles and up to 200 books were published in the world in 1981 alone (Nouy, 1991: 131; Zalojnyx, 2017: 1). Approaching the discourse from a linguistic point of view, studying it as a linguistic phenomenon, is more widespread. Noting the active participation of four scientific schools – French, German, Anglo-American and Russian scientific schools – in the study of discourse, V. Y. Chernyavskaya also tried to reveal the specific aspects of the approach to discourse for these schools. According to him, the representatives of the French school (M. Foucault, P. Serio, L. Althusser, etc.) are moving away from linguistic principles by preferring to study the political-ideological, historical and socio-cultural aspects of the discourse. The representatives of the German school take as a basis the methods of analysis of the written text. English-American discourse analysis is based on the study of communicative speech (Chernyavskaya, 2013: 8). Russian scientists' research on discourse analysis is mainly based on the methods of the German and Anglo-American schools.

**Discussion.** The definition of the concept of discourse often attracts attention from the meaning of this word. This word of Latin origin is polysemous and has 8 main meanings as a term (Tiger et al.,

2017: 46). In all these explanations, the meaning of speech, conversation, exchange of speech products is expressed. In this respect, discourse gives meaning to speech in action. In general, in the explanations, interpretations and definitions of the discourse, the issue of speech in action or the exchange of speech acts is raised in one way or another.

T. van Dijk presented the discourse as a text within the context, an empirically described event. Taking discourse as an activity is one of the important points in his research. «Discourse is a stream of speech, language in continuous action. At this time, both the individual and social characteristics of the communication participant, as well as the communicative conditions in which the communication takes place, the historical period are manifested in an active form» (Dake, 1998). In the explanation of T. van Dijk, it is necessary to understand the phenomenon described empirically in the sense of the discourse construction process. Communication is a complex process, and this complexity comes from the organizers active during communication. If we formally describe the process of communication between two people, we must first of all take into account the presence of two participants. Of course, these participants are from different subjects, they have different knowledge, thinking, thoughts, outlook. These participants have certain statuses. Status separates or identifies participants. The doctor is the dominant position in the communication between the doctor and the patient. The patient is a scientist, statesman, general, prosecutor, etc. its presence does not ensure its dominance in communication. Because communication is about illness. During the conversation on this topic, the doctor has knowledge and experience. There is status equality in the conversation between two friends about ordinary everyday life. The theologian is in a dominant position when talking about religion. However, if the second participant also has special knowledge about the religious topic in such a discursive process, there is a struggle to take the dominant position in the communication process. The parties try to protect their position and point of view in the interpretation of a specific religious topic. The mentioned covers only some conditions and conditions of discursive activity. Time, space, conditions, attitude and many other extralinguistic factors also play their role in communication and influence the formation of discourse. In addition to confirming the complexity of the discursive activity, the above-mentioned also clarifies the description of the event in Van Dijk's explanation of the discourse.

V. Demyankov noted that the discourse is an arbitrary fragment of the text larger than a sentence and is gathered around a certain supporting concept and creates a general context (Demyankov, 1982: 7). The context in the explanation provided by the author includes all external organizers of the discourse, extralinguistic factors. A close attitude to this can be observed in V. Y. Chernyavskaya's explanation of the discourse. According to him, discourse is a text that is closely related to the situational context. Discourse is a communicative process that creates a certain formal structure of the text (Chernyavskaya, 2013: 104). In fact, the author presented the discourse as a communicative process. Since communication or communication takes place through speech, it forms a certain text. In contrast to V. V. Demyankov, in this definition, an arbitrary fragment of the text larger than a sentence is not declared discourse.

During the comparison of the text and the discourse, the theme-rheme relationship, microtheme and macrotheme issues that are characteristic for the text emerge. In our opinion, V. Demyankov intended the completed fragments of the text in the form of microthemes. It follows that the discourse is divided into micro and macrodiscourses.

Text is the result of discourse. That is, the text is created in the discursive process. The starting point of the discourse does not exactly coincide with the beginning of the text. Before that, the discourse participants are preparing for communication. Of course, in most cases, preparation is conditional. This process is cognitive. There are extralinguistic factors that prompt the addressee to enliven the speech act. For example, if the addressee asks the addressee for directions to the post office, his request to go to the post office prompts him to do so. Obviously, in some cases any first question can also have the purpose of communicating. That is, the addressee addresses the addressee with a question in order to involve him in communication. A.A. Kibrik's «Discourse is both the process of language activity and the text that is its result» (Kibrik, 2002: 307) does not find the expression of a cognitive mechanism that activates language activity in the definition. At the same time, it should be noted that it is not language activity, but the occurrence, continuation and termination of communicative activity. Text is the result of the communication process. It should also be taken into account that communication does not necessarily require the addressee to react with a speech act. For example, a presenter talking about religion on television does not expect a response from the audience.

As mentioned, there are many definitions and explanations given to discourse. The information

about some definitions above allows us to generalize the attitude towards discourse.

Discourse, formed under extralinguistic influences, is a communicative process that includes the speech process in action. Communication covers a certain topic and topics. Thematics play a leading role in the differentiation of discourse types. The modern socio-cultural environment gives reason to talk not only about discourses in different languages, but also about their types. However, the typology of discourse is approached differently. First of all, oral and written discourses are distinguished. Types of discourse are determined by the field of study. The classification of discourses is not limited to this, new divisions are presented based on various criteria. There are classifications by participants, ideological affiliation, communicative purpose, communicative role and its change, tonality and other criteria. For example, V. I. Karasik chose the tonality of communication as a criterion and distinguished 12 types of discourses (informative, phatic, ideological, manipulative, ceremonial, etc.) (Karasik, 2007: 350). In terms of field of study or belonging to the field, the discourse is domestic, political, military, medical, legal, religious, media, pedagogical, etc. there are types. Each of these types has specific features. Special attention is paid to the study of these species (Literature). Political discourse occupies a special place among the mentioned types.

Political discourse is a process of political communication. Politics plays an extremely important role in modern society. In fact, politics ensures the functionality of society. Politics establishes the activity of sustainable social processes in society, regulates and expresses society. Interpersonal and interstate relations are also regulated by politics. The political structure of each society ensures the integration of its policies in separate areas (foreign, economic, social and cultural) into a single system. The main features of political communication are the mass, unidirectionality of the speech from the addressee to the mass addressee, changeable and unstable composition of the addressee. The mentioned aspects are manifested in the political leader's monologue addressed to a large audience. Such speeches and speeches form the main part of political discourses. Another genre of political communication is when a politician answers questions in interviews, briefings and press conferences.

In fact, such situations and communicative processes have not been taken into account and little studied during the definition of dialogue. In general, other genres of political discourse are also recorded. Candidates' debates are similar to dialogic

speech, but they are different in nature. Although communicators refer to each other's speech acts in debates, their communication does not proceed in the order of stimulus → reaction → stimulus → reaction, and the participants in the debate mainly direct their speech acts to the audience. Political discourse is distinguished by its imagery, abundance of facts, comparison, argumentation, and richness of metaphors.

Political metaphors have attracted more research in recent times. Various aspects of the influence of such metaphors on public consciousness and political life are focused on. The increase in interest in political communication, the expansion of information exchange, the increase in the range of activities of the mass media, is connected with the participation of a large part of the population in the political life of the country and society. Politics covers all areas of social life, and the activities in each area are closely related to the others and are combined with the political landscape of the country as a whole, as well as the world. On the basis of the great importance of political discourses addressed to a wide audience, the effect of metaphor on the mood of listeners increases. Studying the features of using metaphors in political discourses helps to reveal the purposes of their use. It should also be noted that metaphor has a primary connection with politics in terms of political reasoning, or reasoning in general, argumentation. Ancient rhetoric was also focused on persuading large audiences. Currently, political metaphor is closely related to cognitive linguistics, discourse analysis and rhetoric as a separate scientific direction.

J. Lakoff considered the presentation of an event, the essence of the subject by replacing it with the essence of another one, metaphorization, and in this process, the transfer of the source area to the target area, called metaphor (Lakoff, 1990: 48). Presented concept of conceptual metaphor and its analysis is currently applied in various fields of human activity, including the field of political discourse. In fact, the application of conceptual metaphor theory to political discourse is associated with the name of J. Lakoff (Lakoff, 1991). He investigated the use of war metaphors in political discourse.

The approach to the nature of language from a cognitive perspective creates a mental image of the world view in human thinking, and at the same time organizes one's ideas in a certain order, establishes their logical sequence (Kudryakova, 1997: 7). Existing cognitive structures are representative. They not only reflect received information, but also serve as a tool for structuring knowledge about the world. That is why it is predetermined by the cognitive

structures in one's thinking in order for a person to understand this or that event or situation. As a result, people do not make decisions based on facts, but based on their perceptions of the world. Man creates the world with his psyche. Reality undergoes certain changes and transformations in the speaker's interpretation. Therefore, the state or quality of one object is described by the state or quality of another object. This process is the realization of metaphorical transfers, replacing each other. Metaphorization is a complex process. Sorting, replacing and interpreting metaphors in the speech of every speaker does not take place. For this, strong creative thinking, prior knowledge, and deep imagination are essential conditions. The mentioned features are more obvious in political leaders. At the same time, when the political discourse is addressed to the masses, a wide audience, metaphors, especially cognitive metaphors, create difficulty in understanding by the listeners. It follows from here that the speaker explains and interprets the metaphor created by the speaker in the political discourse. In the example, the interpretation of the metaphor of the party being a living organism with a certain activity (the party watches, filters, sifts) originates from this.

One important feature of political discourse is its connection to the struggle for power. In the process of political communication, the speaker either involves the other side in such a struggle, or convinces him of the correctness of the implemented policy. Political discourse is institutional and has such forms. For example, a report, a party program, a decree, an order, an appeal regarding the current situation, a note to another state, etc. The policy covers activities at two levels. According to the first level, politics includes certain types of activities for the distribution of power and economic resources in a country or between countries. The second level is the personal level. At this time, the first level of politics is actualized in individual consciousness. When the issue is approached from this point of view, the first level is implemented by institutional communication, and the second level by non-institutional communication

**Conclusion.** It should be taken into account that the speaker in the institutional political discourse can make the transition to the non-institutional political discourse. If the decree, order, statement, note has a special form and structure, the report report, the party leader's speech has a free character at certain points. At this time, the speech does not have a concrete plan framework, the speaker gains opportunities to limit and expand the scope of the topic. The speaker can transfer his thoughts from one conceptual area to another.

Conceptual metaphor is located in the metaphorical frame in the memory lexicon. The formal side of the metaphorical frame is a grid with a structured outline. Structured contours are semantic vertices (real denotation, false denotation, condition model), arcs (comparison of one denotation with another, comparison of one event with another event), level

and sublevels (lexical, grammatical, pragmatic, semantic), nests (derivative indirect, conceptual metaphor, concepts) (Vejbitskaya, 1997). The mentioned structures open the way for the application of conceptual metaphor in a wide range at different levels, and this type of application is quite visible in political discourse texts.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Hoey. *Ilha do Desterro. A Journal of English language. Literatures in English and Cultural Studies.* 25/26. 1991. Pp. 131–150.
2. Lakoff, G. *Metaphor and war. The metaphor system used to justify war in the Gulf / G.Lakoff. Hallet B. Elgulfed in war, just war and the Parsian Gulf Honolulu, 1991.*
3. Lakoff, G. *The invariance hypothesis is abstract reason based in image – schemas? Cognitive Linqistics.* 1990. Vol. 1., № 1.
4. Дейк ван Т. А. К определению дискурса. Лондон, 1998 URL: <http://www.nsu.ru/psych/internet/bits/vandijk2.htm>
5. Демьянков, В.З. *Англо-русские термины по прикладной лингвистике и автоматической обработке текста. Тетради новых терминов.* Москва: ВСП, 1982. Вып. 2. 90 с.
6. Карасик, В.И. *Языковые ключи/ Волгоград: Парадигма, 2007.*
7. Чернявская, В.Е. *Лингвистика текста. Лингвистика дискурса* Москва: Флинта: Наука, 2013. 208 с.
8. Шейгал Е.И. *Семиотика политического дискурса.* Волгоград: Перемена, 2000. 368 с.

#### REFERENCES

1. Hoey. *Ilha do Desterro. A Journal of English language. Literatures in English and Cultural Studies.* 25/26. 1991. Pp. 131–150.
2. Lakoff, G. *Metaphor and war. The metaphor system used to justify war in the Gulf B. Elgulfed in war, just war and the Parsian Gulf Honolulu, 1991.*
3. Lakoff, G. *The invariance hypothesis is abstract reason based in image – schemas? Cognitive Linqistics.* 1990. Vol. 1., № 1.
4. Dejk van T. A. *K opredeleniju diskursa [To the definition of discourse] London, 1998 URL: <http://www.nsu.ru/psych/internet/bits/vandijk2.htm> [in Russian]*
5. Dem'jankov, V.Z. *Anglo-russkie terminy po prikladnoj lingvistike i avtomaticheskoy obrabotke teksta [English-Russian terms in applied linguistics and automatic text processing] Notebooks of new terms.* Moscow: VSP, 1982. Issue. 2. 90 p. [in Russian]
6. Karasik, V.I. *Jazykovye kljuchi [Language keys] Volgograd: Paradigm, 2007. [in Russian]*
7. Chernjavskaia, V.E. *Lingvistika teksta. [Linguistics of the text] Moscow: Flinta: Nauka, 2013. 208 p. [in Russian]*
8. Shejgal E.I. *Semiotika politicheskogo diskursa [Semiotics of political discourse] Volgograd: Change, 2000, 368 p. [in Russian]*