# Motivational Typology in Conceptual Metaphor Theory

*Xayrullayeva Gulasal Farhodovna*
*BuxDU Ingliz tilshunosligi kafedrasi o'qituvchisi*

**Abstract**. *Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) has undergone significant development since its early formulation, leading to more refined accounts of how and why metaphors emerge in human cognition. One of the most influential advances is the introduction of motivational typology, which explains the cognitive and experiential grounding of metaphorical mappings. This article examines motivational typology within conceptual metaphor theory, focusing on empirically grounded distinctions such as correlation-based and resemblance-based motivation, as well as later extensions incorporating cultural, pragmatic, and discourse-based factors. Drawing on the works of Joseph Grady, Zoltán Kövecses, Raymond Gibbs, Gerard Steen, and N. D. Arutyunova, the study analyzes how different motivational mechanisms contribute to metaphor formation and why these mechanisms complicate attempts at systematization. The article argues that metaphorical concepts cannot be classified solely by structural or semantic criteria, as their motivation reflects dynamic interactions between embodied experience, cognition, culture, and discourse.*

**Key words**: *conceptual metaphor theory, motivational typology, metaphor motivation, correlation-based metaphor, resemblance-based metaphor, cognitive linguistics.*

Within contemporary cognitive linguistics, metaphor is widely recognized as a central mechanism of conceptualization rather than a peripheral rhetorical device. As research progressed beyond early structural classifications of metaphors, scholars increasingly focused on the question of **why particular metaphors arise** and what motivates the mapping between source and target domains. This shift led to the development of **motivational typology**, an approach that explains metaphor formation in terms of cognitive, experiential, and cultural grounding rather than purely linguistic form.

Motivational typology addresses a critical limitation of early conceptual metaphor analyses: the tendency to treat metaphors as static domain correspondences without sufficiently accounting for their origins. By examining motivation, researchers aim to explain not only how metaphors are structured, but also why specific conceptual mappings recur across languages and cultures, while others remain marginal or context-bound. This article explores motivational typology as a key dimension of conceptual metaphor theory and demonstrates its importance for understanding the systematization of metaphorical concepts.

## 2. Conceptual Metaphor Theory beyond Structural Classification

Later developments in CMT emphasize that metaphorical mappings are not arbitrary but grounded in **cognitive experience and conceptual organization**. Kövecses (2002, 2010) argues that conceptual metaphors are motivated by multiple interacting factors, including bodily experience, perception, emotion, social interaction, and cultural models. These factors influence which metaphors become conventional and how they are interpreted in discourse.

Unlike purely structural classifications (e.g., orientational or ontological metaphors), motivational analysis investigates the **conceptual rationale** behind metaphor formation. This approach recognizes that similar metaphorical expressions may arise from different motivational sources and that identical source–target mappings may be motivated differently across cultures. Consequently, motivation becomes a crucial variable in metaphor analysis and a major reason why metaphorical concepts resist rigid systematization.

### 3. Joseph Grady's Motivational Typology

A foundational contribution to motivational typology is **Joseph Grady's distinction between correlation-based and resemblance-based metaphors** (Grady, 1997; 1999). Grady argues that not all conceptual metaphors are motivated in the same way and that failure to distinguish motivational types leads to analytical oversimplification.

### 3.1 Correlation-Based Motivation

Correlation-based metaphors arise from **recurrent experiential correlations** between two domains. These metaphors are grounded in embodied experience, where two aspects of experience regularly co-occur. For example, metaphors linking **quantity with verticality** (MORE IS UP) are motivated by repeated experiences of accumulation leading to increased physical height.

Grady emphasizes that such metaphors are cognitively primary because they emerge directly from sensorimotor experience rather than abstract analogy. As a result, correlation-based metaphors tend to be highly conventional and cross-linguistically widespread. Their motivation is empirical and experiential, which explains their stability but also complicates classification, since similar experiential correlations may support multiple overlapping metaphors.

### 3.2 Resemblance-Based Motivation

In contrast, resemblance-based metaphors are motivated by **perceived similarity** between domains rather than direct experiential correlation. These metaphors involve analogical reasoning and are often more context-dependent. For instance, metaphors comparing intellectual activity to light or vision rely on abstract similarity rather than bodily co-occurrence.

Grady demonstrates that resemblance-based metaphors are less entrenched and more variable than correlation-based ones. Their interpretation depends heavily on cultural knowledge and discourse context, which makes them difficult to integrate into universal metaphor taxonomies. This distinction shows that metaphorical concepts differ not only structurally but also in their cognitive motivation.

### 4. Extended Motivation: Culture, Context, and Emotion

Building on Grady's work, Kövecses (2015, 2020) expands motivational typology by introducing **cultural and contextual motivation**. He argues that while some metaphors are grounded in universal bodily experience, others are shaped by **culture-specific models, ideologies, and emotional practices**. For example, emotion metaphors often vary across cultures despite shared physiological experiences. Kövecses demonstrates that cultural norms influence which aspects of experience become metaphorically salient. This means that metaphor motivation cannot be reduced to embodiment alone; it also involves social values and collective cognition. This expanded view of motivation further complicates systematization. If metaphorical concepts are motivated differently depending on cultural and contextual factors, then any classification system must remain flexible and probabilistic rather than categorical.

### 5. Discourse and Usage-Based Motivation

Another important dimension of motivational typology is introduced by **usage-based and discourse-oriented approaches**. Steen (2007, 2011) argues that metaphors function differently at the levels of **language, thought, and communication**, and that motivation may vary accordingly. Some metaphors are conceptually motivated but not consciously processed in discourse, while others are deliberately employed for rhetorical or persuasive purposes. Similarly, Gibbs (1994, 2008) emphasizes the role of **psycholinguistic evidence** in determining metaphor motivation. Experimental studies show that metaphor comprehension is influenced by familiarity, context, and pragmatic goals, suggesting that motivation is not a fixed property of

metaphorical concepts but an emergent feature of use. These findings challenge static typologies and demonstrate that motivational factors operate dynamically across cognitive and communicative levels.

## 6. Semantic Persective: Arutyunova's Contribution

From a semantic and philosophical standpoint, **N. D. Arutyunova (1990)** provides an important complementary view. She treats metaphor as a form of **secondary nomination**, where meaning emerges through semantic reinterpretation in discourse. Arutyunova emphasizes that metaphorical meaning is not stored as a stable unit but is constructed through interaction between lexical meaning and context.

This perspective aligns with motivational typology by showing that metaphor motivation is closely tied to **interpretive processes** rather than fixed conceptual structures. Since meaning is contextually generated, motivation cannot be fully captured by universal classifications. Arutyunova's work thus reinforces the idea that metaphorical concepts are inherently resistant to rigid systematization

## 7. Implications for Systematization of Metahorical Concepts

The diversity of motivational mechanisms explains why metaphorical concepts cannot be organized into closed, hierarchical systems. Correlation-based, resemblance-based, cultural, emotional, and discourse-driven motivations interact in complex ways, producing overlapping and shifting metaphor networks. Rather than seeking absolute classification, recent research suggests adopting **multidimensional models** that account for degrees of motivation and contextual variability. Motivational typology thus represents a shift from static taxonomy toward dynamic conceptual modeling.

Motivational typology has become a central component of contemporary conceptual metaphor theory. By distinguishing between different sources of metaphor motivation, scholars have demonstrated that metaphorical concepts are grounded in embodied experience, analogical reasoning, cultural models, and discourse practices. This multiplicity of motivations explains both the productivity of metaphor and the persistent difficulty of systematizing metaphorical concepts. Future research should continue integrating cognitive, cultural, and empirical approaches to develop more flexible and explanatory models of metaphor motivation.

## References

1. Arutyunova, N. D. (1990). *Teoriya metafory*. Moscow: Progress.

2. Gibbs, R. W. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

3. Gibbs, R. W. (2008). *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

4. Grady, J. E. (1997). *Foundations of meaning: Primary metaphors and primary scenes* (Doctoral dissertation). University of California, Berkeley.

5. Grady, J. E. (1999). A typology of motivation for conceptual metaphor: Correlation vs. resemblance. In R. W. Gibbs & G. J. Steen (Eds.), *Metaphor in cognitive linguistics* (pp. 79–100). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

6. Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

7. Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A practical introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

8. Kövecses, Z. (2015). *Where metaphors come from: Reconsidering context in metaphor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

9. Steen, G. J. (2007). *Finding metaphor in grammar and usage*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

10. Xayrullayeva G.F. The Metaphorical Landscape Of Enemy In Shakespeare's Hamlet. SCIENTIFIC REPORTS OF BUKHARA INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY AND FOREIGN LANGUAGES scientific and practical journal. № 1, 2025. –P.242-246.

11. Xayrullayeva G.F. Akademik maqsadlar uchun ingliz tilida konseptual metafora nazariyasining roli. 2025-1/3 Xorazm Ma'mun akademiyasi axborotnomasi. –B.143-146.

12. Xayrullayeva G.F. Metaphorical Framing Of The Enemy: Power, Morality, And Identity In Discourse. Materials Of International Scientific And Practical Conference «Pragmalinguistics, Functional Translation And The Integration Of Language Teaching Processes». 2025.-P. 258-260.