

## TRANSPOSITION: FUNCTIONAL-COGNITIVE AND DIGITAL APPROACH

*Kamala Malikli*

*Azerbaijan Tourism and Management University  
orcid.org/0000-0002-8890-6194*

**Annotation:** *The article investigates transposition within the framework of the functional-cognitive paradigm and states its role in the language system. At the same time, the study analyzes the cognitive mechanisms of transposition and the views of linguists. On the other hand, it is emphasized that the representational characteristics of language materials can be objectively determined using digital methods.*

**Keywords:** *transposition, functional-cognitive approach, cognitive mechanisms, cognitive linguistics, conceptual metaphor, digital approach*

**Introduction:** At the end of the 20th and beginning of the 21st centuries, functionalism and cognitivism held a leading position in linguistics. The focus of both linguistic research is on determining the function of language units, as well as the possibilities of reflecting reality through language. Formalism studies the formal aspects of language that do not have a communicative role. With the emergence of functionalism, the approach to language also changes. Functionalism emphasizes the role of communication and the fact that language cannot be meaningfully studied without function [18, p. 16]. Recently, digital methods have shown that transposition is not only a theoretical but also an empirically measurable and systematic linguistic phenomenon.

**Main part:** In the functional-cognitive paradigm, transposition is the use of a language unit (usually a word or construction) in a function that is not characteristic of it, while retaining or acquiring new semantic and cognitive properties.

Within the framework of the functional-cognitive approach, such cases are viewed not only as formal deviations, but also as ways of expressing new conceptual structures, changes in the profiling of categories, and centers of attention.

The functional-cognitive paradigm shows that language is not a formal system, it is both a reflection of cognition and a means of its expression. At the same time, within this paradigm, we see that meaning is more important than form. Syntactic constructions are studied through cognitive schemes and conceptualizations [9]. The phenomenon of transposition can be interpreted as a reflection of the dynamics of cognition, division into categories, and refocusing of attention.

In cognitive linguistics, transposition is the general name for the mechanisms of transformation and reorganization that occur at the formal, semantic, and conceptual levels of the language system; through these mechanisms, a language unit moves from its initial (genetic) grammatical function to a new functional position, and as a result, both its categorical affiliation and conceptual profile change.

As Charles Bally, who highlights the dual nature of the linguistic sign, points out, there is a constant dialectical tension between the discrete linear structure of the sign and its semantic integrity, and transposition can be understood as the driving result of this tension: while a change of place or function occurs at the formal level, a redistribution of shades, focus, and conceptual emphasis is observed at the level of meaning [2, p. 112].

From the perspective of cognitive linguistics, transposition is manifested not only in the structural system of language, but also in the organization of knowledge through language, that is, in the dynamics of conceptualization: thanks to transposition, the language user recodes various areas of reality in new frames, schemas, and constructions; thus, the change is realized not only at the morphological and syntactic, but also at the conceptual level [14; 7; 9].

From the point of view of cognitive linguistics, transposition is perceived as a transformation that occurs not only at the formal structure of the language, but also at its semantic and conceptual level. In the most general sense, this phenomenon is defined as the process by which a linguistic unit – a word, root or form – goes beyond its genetic function and performs the function of another part of speech or grammatical category. Transposition, which is the process of changing the original grammatical meaning of a linguistic form as a result of its use in another functional context, plays the role of a bridge between the principles of stability and variability of the language system.

According to the cognitive approach, in the process of transposition, the speaker of the language uses metaphorical and metonymic conceptual mechanisms. Metonymic transitions identify a certain part of the event with the whole event (for example, “to drive” → “a drive”), while metaphorical transitions create an associative connection between conceptual areas (to climb” → “a climb” where the action is perceived as both a process and a result).

A.Chenki considers conceptual metaphor to be a cognitive metaphor and notes that metaphor plays an important role in cognitive processes, as well as in human activity [8, p. 346]. A. Mammadov puts forward the idea that metaphors are related to cultural, political-ideological, and psychological conditions and create different impressions on the listener. According to the linguist, the impressions created are interpreted in accordance with the background knowledge and cultural frame of the recipient of the text. He also notes that all words have a metaphorical essence [1, p. 45]. G.Lakoff also states that people use metaphors a lot in everyday life. Metaphoric expressions arise from conceptual metaphors [12, p. 206].

S. Lin and W. Gao emphasize that conversion models in English are often based on idealized cognitive models (ICMs) and transposition is the actualization of these models at the lexical level [16, pp. 261-265]. This is one of the main mechanisms that ensure the cognitive flexibility and conceptual multiplicity of the language.

Modern cognitive linguistics studies evaluate transposition as the initial stage of the process of “constructionalization” – that is, the emergence of new language constructions [11, pp. 9-12; 19, pp. 257-270]. Thus, when a word changes its grammatical function in a context and this change begins to be repeated frequently, this structure becomes stable and enters the lexical system of the language. In other words, transposition is a dynamic mechanism that organizes the language itself and creates new semantic units.

These approaches show that transposition is a process that has deep roots not only in the formal system of language, but also in human cognitive structures. It redefines the boundaries of concepts, ensures the expansion of meanings and adaptability of language. Therefore, in cognitive linguistics, transposition is not only a grammatical and lexical phenomenon, but also a fundamental cognitive phenomenon that reflects the flexibility of human thinking and the conceptual universality of language.

We can include categorization or re-categorization to the cognitive mechanisms of transposition. Here we are talking about the semantic redirection of a unit that reflects a change in the conceptual scheme under a new syntactic category. Transposition allows us to profile not another change in the concept, for example, an action, but its result [6].

Transposition is often based on the mechanisms of metaphorization or metonymization. From the point of view of the cognitive mechanism, the motivation for transposition is multi-layered.

1. The first layer is prototypical organization: since categories are not built with rigid boundaries, but with typical cores and peripheries, the “slippage” of one unit to the periphery of another category is taken for granted; this slippage becomes stable as it is repeated in discourse and acquires the status of a norm.

2. The second layer is frame compatibility: if the unit that has moved to a new functional position can be interpreted in the appropriate conceptual framework (for example, “action”, “property”, “object”, “distance-time coordinate”), the transposition does not cause interpretive resistance.

3. The third layer is metaphorical and metonymic mapping: interdomain mappings (source → target) legitimize semantic transfer, in which case the change in the categorical status of the word becomes a lexical-grammatical manifestation of that transfer [7; 9].

4. The fourth layer is the construction-based network: in the tradition of R. Langacker, words, morphemes and syntactic schemes are considered nodes of a network as “symbolic units” [15]. Transposition within this network can be understood as the restructuring of relations and is realized through the insertion of new units into various slots of the same construction (constructional schemas).

The productivity and limitations of transposition are also measured by cognitive-functional factors. Productivity is assessed by the high frequency of repetition of one or another transition (for example, verb→noun, noun→verb) in the corpus, its use in different types of discourse (scientific, artistic, journalistic), stylistic range and polysemy.

The limitations are, on the one hand, typological-structural (rigidity of morphological markers, rigidity (precision) of word order), and on the other hand, semantic compatibility and interpretation: if frame inconsistency or high ambiguity arise, the transposition either becomes too dependent on the context or loses its chance of normalization [4, p. 152; 5, pp. 56-62]. This dialectic is also traced in the history of the language: some transitions live and die out as short-term stylistic fads, while others enter the system by entering a long-term trajectory of lexicalization and grammaticalization. The literary tradition plays an accelerating role here. For example, although not all discoveries of the type of W. Shakespeare are stabilized, they expand the field of possibilities of the language and create conditions for future normalizations [3; 17, p. 121]. W. Shakespeare's word games are still considered one of the sources that give vitality to modern English. Many of these words have even become so widespread in everyday language that they are perceived by language learners as words that have always been in the language. Words such as “to tongue”, “to season”, “to thunder” in English are words that were used occasionally even before W. Shakespeare, and were formed through conversion. However, thanks to the poetic language of the writer, such words are more widespread.

The analysis of transposition from a functional-cognitive perspective gives grounds to say that language units are evaluated not only as formal structures, but also as conceptual units. Therefore, transposition can be considered the result of the conceptualization process. This, in turn, occurs with the help of semantic reinterpretation.

In modern times, there has been an increased interest in studying many linguistic phenomena at the empirical level. While the founders of cognitive linguistics, G. Lakoff [13] and R. Langacker [14], provide a functional and cognitive explanation of transposition, D. Biber touches on its manifestation in authentic language materials. The study of transposition at this level leads to more objective results within the framework of corpus linguistics and digital analysis [10, pp. 24-30]. These methods are based on statistical analyses and provide for the study of linguistic phenomena, as well as transposition, on the basis of real texts. Thus, we can determine the cases of development of transposition, its conceptual features and functional load according to specific indicators.

With the statistical analyses used by D. Biber, a search is carried out for the use of a certain language unit in any text, and their performance in different functions within the text is determined.

Digital analyses can be used to solve the problem of direction in conversion, which is a branch of morphological transposition. In our opinion, it is important to conduct statistical frequency analyses to know which of the words involved in the conversion are the main ones and which are the result of the transition. Naturally, in this process, the word with the highest frequency of use will be the one that undergoes the transition in the conversion. For example, if we are investigating the use of the verb “to run” as a noun in different contexts in the English language corpus, we conduct a study on the use of this language unit in that corpus, determining in which cases it functions as a verb and in which contexts it functions as a noun. The specific figures we obtained as a result of the study not only determine the direction of the transition in the conversion, but also show the extent to which the transposition phenomenon is active in real language materials.

**Conclusion:** In conclusion, it should be noted that the study provided a general overview of the existing layers of the transposition phenomenon from both a functional and cognitive perspective. It was concluded that, despite the differences of opinion in the linguistic literature, transposition can be assessed as one of the internal development mechanisms of the language. The manifestation of this phenomenon at different levels of the grammatical system indicates that it plays an important role in expanding both the structural and functional capabilities of the language. At the same time, the combination of the functional-cognitive approach and the application of digital methods creates conditions for the complex study of transposition from both a theoretical and empirical perspective.

### References

1. Мəммəдов, А. Diskurs təhlilinin koqnitiv perspektivləri / А.Мəммəдов, М.Мəммəдов. – Вак: 2010. – 96 s.
2. Балли, Ш. Общая лингвистика и вопросы французского языка; пер. с франц. / Ш.Балли. – М.: Изд-во иностр. лит-ры, - 1955. – 416 с.

3. Есперсен, О. Философия грамматики / О. Есперсен. – М.: Эдиториал УРСС, - 2002. – 404 с.
4. Руберт, И.Б. Переход от синкретизма к дискретности как тенденция общеязыковых и внутритекстовых эволюционных аналитических процессов / И.Б. Руберт // Теория языка и практика преподавания. – Архангельск: Издательство Архангельского университета, 2001. – 269 с.
5. Соболева, П.А. Лексикализация множественного числа и словообразование/ П.А. Соболева. - Москва : Наука, -1979. - с. 47 – 85.
6. Соболева, П.А. О понятии парадигмы в формообразовании и словообразовании // Лингвистика и поэтика. – М.: Наука, 1979. – 139 с.
7. Фёдорова, Л. Л. Механизмы изменения дистанции в речевом взаимодействии // Московский лингвистический журнал, - 2003, выпуск 7. № 2
8. Ченки, А. Семантика в когнитивной лингвистике. В кн.: Фундаментальные направления современной американской лингвистики / А.Ченки. – Москва: МГУ, - 1997. – с. 340-369.
9. Ченки, А. Что такое когнитивная метафора? - 2019. - 4 p. URL: <https://research.vu.nl/en/publications/chto-takoe-kognitivnaja-metafora/>
10. Biber, D. Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use / D.Biber, S.Concrad, R.Reppen – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, - 1998.- 209 p.
11. Category change from a constructional perspective / K.V. Goethem, M. Norde, E. Coussé & Gudrun Vanderbauwhede – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, - 2018. – 314 p.
12. Lakoff, G. The contemporary theory of metaphor. Metaphor and Thought / G.Lakoff. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, - 1993. – p. 202-251.
13. Lakoff, G. Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind / G.Lakoff. – London: The University of Chicago Press, - 1987. – 614 p.
14. Langacker, R. W. Cognitive Grammar. A Basic Introduction / R.W.Langarker. – New York: Oxford University Press, - 2008. – 584 p.
15. Langacker, R. W. Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Standford: Vol. II Descriptive Applications / R.W.Langarker. – Standford University Press, - 1991. – 128 p.
16. Lin, S., Gao, W. A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis of Verb-to-Noun Conversion in English // - Journal of Literature and Art Studies, - 2022. Vol. 12 (3), - p. 261-267
17. Sweet, H. A Short Historical English Grammar / H.Sweet. - Oxford: Oxford University Press, - 1892. – 280 p.
18. Thomas, M. Formalism and Functionalism in Linguistics / M. Thomas. – NY: Routledge, - 2020. – 118 p.
19. Traugott, E.C., Trousdale, G. Contentful constructionalization // Journal of Historical Linguistics, - 2014. Vol. 4 (2), - p. 256-283.