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ABSTRACT

In any lingual interaction between the speaker and listener or writer and reader, language’s signs are the main part of concept transmission. Concepts which are selected by the speaker/writer are perceived during the complex mental process. Human cognitive mind is formed based on the metaphor, applies various and different metaphorical usages to transmit the chosen concepts. These metaphorical usages are devised rooted in cognitive linguistic signs. By conduction of these concepts, during a process, communication is done. The purpose of this paper is to analyze these signs and peruse their various usages in Persian which include everyday and literary language contents. In general, we tried to find a new process to show conversion of a simple exterior concept to a complex cognitive sign.
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1. Introduction

Lingual relations play a key role in social relationships (i.e., a man by own language transmits his purpose to others). Any linguistic relation is based on a linguistic sign and people exchange meaning among each other, and hence according to Pearce (1931) that there is only way to think and it is through the signs, so for transferring of ideas, the main part is sign. Signs are not to be made and also to be understood till we interpret them as the signs (ibid.).

The Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure believed that the signs have two parts: signified (concept of sign) and signifier (sound pattern of sign) Saussure (1983). He stated that the relationship between signified and signifier is arbitrariness (ibid.). This means that any concept of outside world can choose arbitrary form and also each signifier can potentially implies to signified, as also it was noted by Peirce as a symbolic mode in contrast to:

1. Iconic mode which shows its theme via resemblance.
2. Indexical mode which is connected to its subject in real Peirce (1931).

What he called symbol was due to lack of similarity between signifier and signified which communicate only with optional contract. Because of these types of signs are arbitrary, so people who use them should have a thorough understanding of the link. If members of the same linguistic community do not understand one of the components of the contract (signified or signifier), the relationship is formed incomplete. Dialogue between two people, for instance, that the relationship is formed incomplete:

A. Bring me Partitur (score) of pomegranate on the desk in my room.

B. What is that?

It is clear that B does not understand the meaning of Partitur, so communication is occurred imperfect. There are three reasons:

1. It is possible that B knowing concept of note, but he doesn't know the arbitrary form which is selected for written notes of a piece of music (Partitur).

2. It is possible that B hearing the form of Partitur, but he doesn't know its concept.

3. It is possible that B doesn't know both form and concept of Partitur.
The above three reasons show that because the person is unable to establish a relationship between the signifier and signified, he doesn't perceive Partitur word. It shows that signs should be learned because people participate in daily connections that the most word-using in connections- are arbitrary. Therefore, crossing from form to achieve meaning is possible just by full understanding of the signifier and the signified. Achieving the meaning is complicated when we encounter cognitive linguistic signs.

From the perspective of Cognitive theory, semantics is based on meaning and usage, in this way which the meaning is formed in daily usages as Lakoff and Johnson (1980) point out humans are exposed to different experiences in outside world. These experiences are formed in conceptual domain- set of knowledge regularize the experiences. For example, our experience about the place is scattered, then it is regularized in conceptual domain and we thereupon have thorough understanding of the place. After that they express conceptual metaphor theory: understanding abstract concept (hence AC) in the form of objective concept (OC) (ibid.). They argued that the metaphor is not only for linguistic uses but also system of human thinking is formed on the basis of metaphor. So metaphor is pattern in man's cognitive mind which we see its linguistic expression. The analysis that Lakoff and Johnson (1980) expressed is that the mind only simplifies the ACs by OCs to understand them.

In this paper, we intent to describe cognitive linguistic signs and cognitive usages are taken from them. We will show ways to reach the meaning from the form. This paper will discuss that there are people who use various application of outside concept (not only concepts among individuals in everyday language but also include literary language concepts). They also have conceptual pattern in their mind (as well their mind is metaphorical) but they use various methods to convey meaning.

Contrary to opinion of Lakoff and Johnson (1980) (using OCs to simplify ACs) people for various purposes- Linguistic or literary- use different ways to say them, not just one way. We try to illustrate them with model which includes different cognitive usages. Because the poets, authors same a commons, have metaphorical mind that they apply the language for their own purposes.

The reminder of this paper is organized as follows:

In section 2 material and methods are explained. Purpose of section 3 is twofold: to show cognitive semiotics and various cognitive usages of concepts. In section 4 we express results and discussions that we reach and find them in this paper. Finally, section 5 concludes the paper.

2. Material and Methods

In this study, data is chosen from Persian content (literary and everyday languages). Data of literary type is given from Persian poets such as: Hafez, Jalal ad-Din Muhammad Rumi and Attar of Nishapur and also the date of everyday type is given from Persian newspaper. Then we try to find different concepts from them which they form various simple and cognitive usages. Then by making a theory, the ways of cognitive transmission of these concepts is made known. We show the process of conversion of concepts to their usages (simple and cognitive) in tree diagram.
3.1 Cognitive semiotics

The human mind as a cognitive device which provides his subjective intentions in various ways to the addressee, has a system and structure which conceptualization occurs there as a process. Conceptualization is the same as semantic symbol (any sign contains semantic and phonetic symbol) which is continuously taking place. But the question is that how does conceptualization actually occur? Human perceives concepts by means of interaction with outside world experiences. Human perceptions of outside world emerge in the mind as the symbols of perception which they are abstract or objective. Johnson (1987) believed that people use embodied experiences to express ACs and also he points out image schemata to mean embodied structure from human experimental senses which are resulted by movement of the human body. It is true that individuals prefer to use OCs to transfer ACs because they simplify more understandable the meaning, but the reverse applies. Examples of below shows two reason:

A. The owners of visual Ads are not interested that their addressee understands them by linguistic phrases. They use static or animated images (without any written phrase) to show Ads. It is clear to simplify Ads interpretation, they can use written phrases but most of them do not do that. They believe that images will impact on the human mind more than written text while pictures engage individuals mind and ease of interpretation of them is not the same as written text. This relative difficulty challenge the person's mind, they are much harder to understand and time of symbol's discovery increases but the final influence is greater. The transmission of concepts is the same. Sometimes description of OC by AC has no influence of other description. If we want to describe AC, for instance, by using other AC, understanding and decoding of it for individual is very difficult but the same as Ads when the mind understands meaning, it will have a greater impact on the individual.

B. Another reason is understanding aesthetics. According to the theory of aesthetics, its information targets human emotions and conveys aesthetic linguistic message which in addition to containing speaker purposes, challenges the mind of the listener and compels it to make image schema. Satisfying the aesthetic sense of a person occurs when challenged mind of him is succeeded in discovering a relative order. So there are two ways to express intention:

B1 Expression based on aesthetics.

B2 Expression devoid of aesthetics.

Assume that a man has an expression in his mind based on relationship of two person are complicated. He can express it by two different methods:

1. Their relationship has fallen in a puddle.

2. Their relationship is disrupted.
The question now arises: whether use of aesthetics (using the OC to describe AC) is employed only to describe ACs or not? Assume that a man has an expression in his mind based on weakening of individual legs. He can express it by two different methods:

2. His legs are frozen.
2. His legs haven't power.

In each of the above examples, the legs are OC that is employed other OC to describe it. So we can make use of various ways to describe different concepts.

By Cognitive semiotics term, we want to demonstrate a range of usages of concepts in the form of cognitive linguistic signs (hence CLS). CLS is produced when cognitive usage is taken from a concept (as a linguistic sign) by using metaphorical mapping. In the next section, we analyze various usages of CLS.

3.2 Various cognitive usages

Signs which are used by anyone are taken from AC or OC. According to existence or absence of them in outside world, a variety of usages can be obtained from both concepts. First, we will investigate the usages of ACs:

3.2.1.1 Objective usage of AC: AC which is embodied by metaphorical mapping

The above usage is Lakoff and Johnson (1980) opinion that a man creates embodied structures by exposure to surrounding world and interaction with it. In other words, a man by using of OC describes AC. Therefore, AC is more understandable. For each usage two examples are given. First one from everyday language (hence EL) and the second one from literary language (hence LL):

3.2.1.1.1 EL: Oil prices go up

In the above example, price is AC which is described by go up (OC).

3.2.1.1.2 LL: انده بی توکوه بی قرار است سودای تو بحر بی کران است

\[\text{بهار.ش do kuh.ش bi qærar æst sodaye to bahr.š bi kæræn æst}\]

Meaning: Your grief is restless mountain your love is Boundless sea

In each of above hemistich, there is AC which is described by OC. In the first hemistich, the OC of mountain describes the AC of grief and in the second hemistich, the OC of sea describe the AC of love. That is concepts of grief and love are understood by concepts of mountain and sea.

3.2.1.2 Abstract usage of AC: abstract description of AC by metaphorical mapping
The above usage points out that there is another way to describe AC. Abstract description help us to perceive one AC by another. This usage confirms that native speakers not only use OC to describe AC but also they use AC to describe it:

3.2.1.2.1 EL: Life has started torment of me

The above example torment is AC which is described the life AC. It shows that we can apply AC in order to perception of other AC. These two concepts are formed this metaphorical mapping: life is hell. Both of them are abstract which we use one property of them to describe other. But why it is used? There are many reasons. One of them, as we have seen before, is aesthetic utilization.

This usage also is used in literature:

3.2.1.2.2 LL: یا رب چه کسی که در دو عالم کس قیمت عشق تو ندانست
Ya ræb d3e kasi kə daer do alæm  kæs qeymat.ə e jəq,ə to nädanest
Meaning: O God, no one in both universes Know the price of your love

In the second hemistich of above verse, we face with two ACs which are formed the metaphorical mapping of love is precious. So poet uses AC (price) to describe another AC (love).

3.2.1.3 Abstract usage of AC: only abstract usage without any metaphorical mapping

In this usage, one AC is used on his own. All ACs (that is not described by other concepts) place in this category.

We will now examine the usages of OC:

3.2.2.1 Abstract usage of OC: abstract description of OC by metaphorical mapping

3.2.2.1.1 EL: His statement had price

In this example, the AC of price describes OC of statement in metaphorical mapping of utterance is worthwhile.

3.2.2.1.2 LL: ای جان چو رو نمودی جان و دلم روبودی چون مشتری تو بودی قیمت گرفت کالا
Ey jan d3o ru nemudi jan va delam robudi  d3un moštari to budi qeymat gereft kala
Meaning: mistress robs my heart when she is apparent commodity prices up because you are a customer

In the second hemistich of above verse, OC of commodity is described by AC of price in this metaphorical mapping: commodity is valuable.

3.2.2.2 Objective usage of OC: objective description of OC by metaphorical mapping

3.2.2.2.1 EL: cinema has grown
In this example, OC of cinema is described by OC of has grown in this metaphorical mapping: cinema is animate

\[ Jemalæt aftab.ə har næzær bad ə xubi ruye xubæt xubtær bad \]

Meaning: your face is sun for every eye your good face gets better from goodness

In the first hemistich of above verse, OC of sun describes OC of face in this metaphorical mapping: face is sun

3.2.2.3 Objective usage of OC: only objective usage without any metaphorical mapping

In this usage, one OC is used on his own. All OCs (that are not described by other concepts) place in this category.

4. Results and Discussions

All data which was collected showed us that arbitrary signs included two kinds of concepts: ACs and OCs. In accordance with nature of each concept, whether it had objective case of outside world or not, concepts were divided into two categories. Each group comprised two cognitive set: one of them was objective usage and another was abstract usage. These cognitive usages were created by metaphorical mapping. We named produced sign as cognitive linguistic signs (i.e. when we were taken cognitive applications from different concepts by metaphorical mapping). It had many reasons such as expression based on aesthetics, deeper understanding of meaning or challenging the mind and complicate the meaning.
The practical cognitive semiotics process is shown in below hierarchy:

```
Practical Cognitive Semiotics
    Arbitrary Signs
    |________________________|
    |                          |
    | Existence of External Case |
    | Objective Concepts        |
    |________________________|
    |                          |
    | Lack of External Case    |
    | Abstract Concepts        |
    |________________________|
    |                          |
    | Abstract Cognitive Usage |
    | Object Usages            |
    | Abstract Usage of Objective Concept |
    | Objective Usage without Metaphorical Mapping |
    | Abstract Usage of Objective Concept |
    | Objective Usage without Metaphorical Mapping |
    | Abstract Usage of Abstract Concept |
    | Objective Usage of Abstract Concept |
```

The production process of cognitive linguistic signs
5. Conclusion

We explored new model for all chosen concepts which were passed from cognitive process in the mind to form as cognitive linguistic signs (i.e. we studied human cognitive mind to convey OCs and ACs). This theory was efficient to analyze all linguistic signs (consist of everyday and literary language). We found that human metaphorical mind put to use metaphorical mapping to form different kinds of cognitive linguistic signs. We discovered diverse cognitive usages of them in six types which we revealed them by samples of everyday and literary language. We named this theory as practical cognitive semiotics.
References