

THE MENTAL SPACES AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF MEANING

Ghassan Ibrahim Mohammad Alshamary
IRBID NATIONAL UNIVERSITY- Faculty of arts
albarakat63@hotmail.com

Abstract

This research is devoted to one of the most important theories of cognitive significance: the theory of mental spaces, as developed by G. Fauconnier (, 1984, 1986, 1994, 1997) in particular. It is a theory that language is concerned with the building of meaning directly in context; that is, sentences cannot be analyzed in isolation from speech. The semantics, traditionally considered to be concerned with the meaning of sentences in context, cannot be separated from pragmatics, which means the contextual sense of sentences, and the building of meaning is context-driven and therefore subject to the information of a particular situation. Meaning is essentially a conceptual process. This theory also takes into account the processes and general cognitive principles that contribute to the building of meaning.

Keywords: cognitive, language, mental space, context, construction.

الفضاءات الذهنية وبناء المعنى

غسان إبراهيم الشمري
جامعة إربد الأهلية - كلية الفنون
albarakat63@hotmail.com

المخلص

نخصص هذا البحث لنظرية من أهم نظريات الدلالة المعرفية هي نظرية الفضاءات الذهنية، كما طورها جيل فوكونيه (1984, 1986, 1994, 1997) خاصة. وهي نظرية تعتبر أن اللغة تتعلق ببناء المعنى مباشرة في السياق؛ أي أن الجمل لا يمكن تحليلها بمعزل عن الخطاب. ذلك أن الدلالة، التي اعتبرت، تقليدياً، معنية بمعنى الجمل في استقلال عن السياق، لا يمكن فصلها عن الذريعات، (pragmatics) التي تعنى بمعنى الجمل التابع للسياق. فبناء المعنى يقوده السياق، ويخضع، تبعاً لذلك، للمعلومات الخاصة بوضع معين. وبما أن بناء المعنى يعتبر عملية تصورية أساساً، فإن هذه النظرية تأخذ أيضاً بعين الاعتبار العمليات والمبادئ المعرفية العامة التي تساهم في بناء المعنى.

كلمات مفتاحية: الفضاءات الذهنية؛ بناء المعنى؛ السياق؛ اللغة والمعرفة.

Introduction

In this research, we attempted to focus on the mechanisms of meaning construction within the framework of one of the most important theories of cognitive significance, the theory of mental spaces, as developed by French linguist Fauconnier, especially in the 1980s (Fauconnier & Turner, 2002; Fauconnier, 1985, 1997).

This theory considered language is concerned with the construction of meaning directly in context; and sentences cannot be analyzed in isolation from text. The semantics that were traditionally considered as independent from the context cannot be separated from constitutions that concern the sense of contextual sentences (Evans, 2012).

The construction of meaning is context-driven and, accordingly, is subject to information on a given situation. Since the construction of meaning is essentially conceptual, this theory also takes into account the processes and general cognitive principles that contribute to the construction of the meaning that is largely "behind the scene". Language does not symbolize thought in its comprehensiveness and complexity; it merely symbolizes partial instructions to create richer and more mature ideas. Because the principles and strategies that lead to the construction of perceptions are largely invisible, this has allowed the emergence of simplistic situations of meaning, such as those that it considers to be constructed only by "decoding" the inherent meaning of the language. While the language we use is not, in Fauconnier's perception, only the apparent head of the iceberg that represents the complex cognitive construction. We have shown that one of the most prominent mechanisms of this construction is the two processes: building mental spaces as partial structures that arise when thinking and speaking. Accurate divisions in our cognitive and rhetorical structures are updated; and a link between these spaces is led by the context of speech, because the construction of meaning is always tied to context (Carbon, 2014).

1. Language and knowledge

Contrary to the significance of the conditions of objectivity which are based on the fact that the language represents an external world of an objective nature, the cognitive significance is that how we represent the external reality is the experience embodied. Hence, the meaning is built not on the juxtaposition of the sentences with objective reality, but on the basis of linguistic expressions that call for complex conceptual processes to adopt meanings based on highly complex thematic knowledge. The semantic structure, according to this view, is the usual picture taken by the conceptual structure when symbolized by the language, and represents a balance of stored knowledge that the language only reflects. But this "coding" relationship between language and knowledge needs some clarification (Ellis, 2005).

1.1. The conceptual structure is richer than the linguistic meaning

The "encoded" meanings of language (semantic representations associated with linguistic units) are partial and incomplete representations of the conceptual structure that derive support from information derived from broader cognitive processes, including sensory and causal experience (Löbner, 2011). While the representation of this experience, which constructs our conceptual pattern (which includes entities such as conceptual frameworks, areas, conceptual models, conceptual metaphors, etc), is considered to be little in detail compared to the cognitive experience itself, represented by the semantic structure is less rich. Moreover, conceptual representation is ultimately perceived as cognitive in nature. It is a consideration dictated by the cognitive simulations permitted by the conceptual structure, as in our ability to simulate the stages of any composite act. In contrast, semantic representation is expressed in

symbolic form (Vosgerau, 2007). This means that linguistic format, represented by spoken, written or indicative symbols, "wastes" a large part of the richness of conceptual representation with multiple cognitive resources. Although the semantic structure symbolizes the conceptual structure, the form of the semantic structure ensures that the language enables only a minimum of signals to represent the reality of the mental representation with which it is intended to speak. In other words, language symbolizes "meaning", but this meaning is impoverished because of the constraints of symbolic pattern and is used as a promoter for building a richer conceptual representation of the hearer (Haggard & Whitford, 2004).

1.2. No separation in the meaning and context of discourse

The idea of the context when Westerners addressed it in the twentieth century was not entirely new. It was a continuation of the efforts of the linguistic lesson, and of the ancient Arabs, of the interpreters, fundamentalists and linguists, who were already in this field. In general, the context of the situation is the basic idea of understanding the linguistic structures and their theoretical dimensions (Fargha, 2007), and therefore the context of the situation was of particular importance to the grammarians, and their perceptions agreed, in general principle, to the authoritative hypothesis defended today by the most important semantic theories. Based on such assets, there are many terms related to the context where this concept is mentioned between the term context, the context of the situation, the situation, the situation and others. The concept of context was addressed at Sibweh by recognizing the use of contextual or grammatical guidance, and the extent to which speech is subject to external influences, where many examples of the context are presented. The book of Sibweh contains many of the themes that reflect the idea of the sanctity (Fargha, 2007). The presence of the idea of sanctity or consideration of the objector or purpose may also have arisen when Al-Jahiz confirmed the relation of speech to the denominator. If these words were not used by the people of this language and the opinion was not uttered, it was not for the first. It is meaning only in error, but in the firmness and maintenance of this language to raise these names of them (Fauconnier, 1985). Abdul Qahir al-Jarjani, who dealt with the concept of application of the context in research and study, during his talk about systems theory, where he referred to "the individual vocabularies as the language situations" (الجاحظ, 1965), was not placed to know their meanings in the words themselves, but when joined together, the meanings are clear (Krostovic, 1999). Thus, therefore, we note that the context of the case has varied; and the grammarians discussed it and demonstrated its importance in different grammatical sections.

It is difficult in this article to present the context of the case from such assets addressed to the term of the areas of interest of ancient Arabs, but we devoted our talk about the mechanisms of building meaning in the framework of the theory of mental spaces, which assumes that the construction of perceptions led by the context of discourse, which is an integral part of the process of constructing meaning. Thus, while the knowledge of instinct may be qualitatively different from semantic knowledge (i.e., the fragmentary information that the language symbolizes), the latter is meaningless only in context.

The cognitive signifies that the construction of perceptions stems from the use of language in context. This results in the absence of a *prima facie* distinction between significance and authority. The theory of mental spaces assumes that the construction of perceptions is led by the context of speech, which is an integral part of the process of building meaning. Thus, while the knowledge of instinct may be qualitatively different from semantic knowledge (ie, the

fragmentary information that the language symbolizes), the latter is meaningless only in context (Katz, 2008).

Knowledgeable semanticists reject the existence of separate "grammatical" and "semantic" phases in the construction of meaning, and reject a boundary between these two types of knowledge; they are both manifestations of one knowledge, encyclopedic knowledge. This means that meaning is built at the conceptual level, or is concerned with conceptual construction, which is an active process in which linguistic units represent the starting point for a class of conceptual processes and the use of encyclopedic knowledge (Guanrino, 1992).

1.3. Building perceptions is complex process

The construction of perceptions is based on complex conceptual processes and projections, such as conceptual and constructional metaphors, visual calligraphy, and visualization. This is an example of so-called cognitive linguistics, a visual representation, one of the ways in which physical experience produces meaningful perceptions. While the perception of the vessel is based on the direct physical experience associated with interaction with limited spaces, the conceptual structure of the picture calligraphy can also produce more abstract patterns of meaning. The meaning is not a stored and pre-existing knowledge that is represented by language, and the perception that the words are "pot" of meaning and the language is considered a channel to convert or extract is a false perception (Guanrino, 1992). But the construction of meaning is a complex and compound process that takes place at the conceptual level. Words and grammatical constructs are only partial stimuli of highly complex cognitive processes that produce richer and more elaborate conceptual constructs. The theory of mental spaces, then, is that much of the construction of meaning is "behind the scene"; that language does not symbolize thought in its comprehensiveness and complexity; it merely symbolizes partial instructions to create richer and more mature ideas. Because the principles and strategies that lead to the construction of perceptions are largely invisible, this has allowed the emergence of simplistic positions of meaning, such as those that it considers to be constructed only by "decoding" the inherent meaning of the language. While the language we use is not, in Fauconnier's perception, only the apparent head of the iceberg that represents the cognitive construction (Krostovic, 1999).

2. Meaning construction

Knowledgeable semanticists were very much interested in the active character of the meaning-construction. The most important of whom is Fauconnier (1984) and (1997), who explained this through the concept of mappings, in which he means a pattern of interconnectedness between separate mental spaces upon which the process of meaning construction is based. Mind, and connect these mental spaces. It is a connection relationship driven by the context of speech, because the construction of meaning is always tied to context. Fauconnier defines mental spaces as partial structures that are created when thinking and speaking, and it introduces subtle divisions in our cognitive and rhetorical structures (4). One of the basic principles of the theory of mental spaces is that these spaces divide the meaning into different conceptual areas. The mental spaces within the conceptual space include specific patterns of information. It is based on linguistic, cultural and cultural strategies to collect information. But as long as the mind spaces are constructed in a synchronous or instantaneous manner, they result from a unique and temporary "part" of the conceptual structure, formed according to the needs of the instantaneous discourse. The principles of the formation of mental

spaces and the relations between them possess the ability to produce endless meanings. To illustrate this, consider the following example:

(1) If I were your father, I would slap you

This sentence allows several interpretations or construction of several mental spaces depending on the context. Suppose that the caregiver, Hind said this sentence to the bothering child, Zaid. Let us look at three of its possible interpretations, and how they are monitored within the framework of the theory of mental spaces:

a. The tolerant father's interpretation: "Your father must be stricter". In this interpretation, Hind considers that the father of Zaid must show greater authority and punish his son with slapping. Given the connections between reality (space I) and the opposite reality (space II), this interpretation is derived by Hind with her stricter position, which "compensates" the father of that tolerant attitude. This connection is considered partial in that the father remains as he is with regard to his other manifestations: such as being a bishop, for example, owning a car, living in a suburb, etc. What has changed in the second space is that the father is less forgiving with the bothering child and slapped him. One of the consequences of this interpretation is that the father, in fact (the first space) contained in the opposite reality (the second space), equates, in a way, with the speaker Hind. Because the caregiver would slap the child, it means that the father is considered to be a nuisance because he does not. Hence, the contrary reality has consequences for our perception of the father and his position on paternity in fact.

b. The strict father's interpretation: "You are lucky; I am not as strict as your father".

In this interpretation, unlike the previous one, the father, with the strict position, is the one who compensates the caregiver of Hind. That is, Hind warns the child that he is lucky because she is facing him now and not his father, or else he would have slapped him. In this interpretation, the father is strict and Hind is indeed tolerant; it is the father who replaces Hind in the opposite reality (the second space). This opposite reality (space two) in relation to reality (first space) implies that, while the father will slap the child, Hind expresses greater tolerance. This interpretation can mean a positive compliment to hind in the role of a child-friendly educator.

c. **Interpretation of the role:**

"The only reason that makes me not slap you is that I am not allowed to do so". In this interpretation, Hind says that if she were to play the father role, the child would be slapped. This interpretation does not mean anything about the father who can (or cannot) actually slap the child. On the other hand, it compensates for the role of father by Hind. In this opposite reality, Hind - as a father - would slap the child. This interpretation of the reality requires commenting on the role of Hind and the limits that it should not exceed: the role of the caregiver of children prevents her from slapping them. One of the conclusions that can be inferred from the consideration of some of the sentence:

- One sentence can be the result of a number of different interpretations, each of which results in a different connection between the reality (or first space) and a different reality (or second space) being built.
- Each of the linking processes has different obligations on how we perceive the participants in the event actually expressed.
- The meaning is not "in the words", but is related to conceptual processes that establish associations between real and assumed situations. These processes result in

representations of the compatibility of the motives associated with the linguistic term, but these motions only partially qualify the representations (Evans & Green, 2006).

3. Engineering of mental spaces

We have seen above that linguistic expressions are the cause of richer processes of meaning-building; that is, linguistic expressions have possible connotations. Instead of "symbolizing" the relevant linguistic expressions, they represent partial building instructions, which are followed by the construction of mental spaces. The actual meaning of a linguistic term is always considered to follow the context of the speech in which the phrase is taken; this means that the possible meaning of any language is used in different ways of context. Here are some aspects of the cognitive geometry underlying this process of meaning-building.

1.3. Construction units of spaces

The theory of mental spaces assumes that when we think or speak we build mental spaces. This is done by space building units; linguistic units that create a new space or shift attention forward or backward between the previously constructed mental spaces. These spacecraft units can be letters or situational, or links such as:

- In 2007...
- In the cafe...
- In the mind of Zaid...
- From the point of view of Amr ...
- Probably...
- Actually...
- Theoretically ...
- So..... So...
- Either.... or...

It can be a combination between an act and an actor followed by an integrated sentence such as:

- Zaidthinks ...
- Hindwishes ...
- Amr intends to ...

They can also be units of a variety of other styles. The spatial characteristics of these space units require that the hearer to construct scenarios outside "here" and "now"; whether these scenarios reflect a past or future reality, a reality, a presumed reality, a reality related to beliefs or ideas, And so on.

2.3. Elements of mental spaces

Mental spaces are temporary conceptual domains constructed during the discourse. Spaces include elements that may be entities that are built in synchronous ways or entities that exist in the conceptual pattern. From the linguistic expressions that represent the elements, the names towards: Zaid and Amr, and descriptions such as: King and the Prime Minister, and a white mask, and the African elephant; and pronouns such as He, She, They...etc. The names may have an identified interpretation such as: the black cat, Entara bin Shaddad; or a unknown explanation such as: a black cat, cats. Misleading names are usually used to introduce new elements into discourse, i.e. unfamiliar or previously unknown elements, such as: I bought a new book today! Identified names are often used as requirements because they require prior

knowledge. This means that they refer to elements that are within the reach of the speaker and the hearer or are part of the exchange of words, such as:

I lost the new book.

3.3 Characteristics and Relationships

In addition to building the mind spaces and the new or existing elements within them, the construction of the meaning also requires processing of information about how objects are attached within the mental spaces. The space-based units therefore define the characteristics assigned to the elements, as well as the relationships between these elements within the same mental space. Consider the following example:

In this play, Othello is jealous. لا يوجد مرجع بالعربية.

The structural unity is the composite: in this play, which builds a mental space in a play, in which we show that the mental space represents the "world" within the play. The name: Othello is entered as an element of mental space. The phrase "jealous" is assigned a property to this element. Let us now look at the sentence: In the painting, charming phoenix rides. This shows that the mental space relates to the "world" that is inside the painting. Two new elements have been introduced: a witch and a charming, and they are new in the speech, because they have a misinterpretation. A component of the phrase: charming, representing the element of the phrase: Phoenix. So far, mental space is only a partial representation of the sentence, because although it states that the painting contains a witch and a charming, it does not help us with the relationship between them and their nature. The mental spaces are built internally through existing cognitive structures, frames and idealized cognitive models. The structural units, the elements that enter the mental space, the characteristics and the relationships are all motivated to operate these knowledge structures already in existence. The two elements activate the frames of witchcraft, witchcraft and superstitious creatures such as the phoenix. The expression "ride" expresses a relationship between the two elements and is transmitted to the riding frame. The passenger frame highlights two participant roles, the role of the passenger and the role of the flyer. The role of the passenger is connected to element which is entered by the phrase: witch; and connects the role of the plank element which is entered by the phrase: Phoenix. Thus the relationship between the two elements in the mental space is established.

3.4. Network of mental spaces

When the construction of any mental space is completed, it connects with the other mental spaces built during the speech. At any point in the flow of speech, a space is a base; it is the space that remains within reach to build a new mental space. During the flow of speech, the intellectual space is a problem of a network based on connections and operational relationships between these spaces.

3.5. Interviews and links

Connections are made between the different mental spaces through the connection that can be made between the elements belonging to the spaces. This linkage is done by means of connectors that establish relationships between component interviews. Interviews are based on a pragmatic function. When elements belonging to different mental spaces are associated with a particular pragmatic function, they are considered interviews. One of the prominent pragmatic functions is the matching function (or assignment). For example, James Bond, in Jan Fleming's novels, is the name of the fictional British spy, and 007 is the code name used by the intelligence service to identify this spy. The cross-entity function assigned to the two entities in James Bond and 007 is the function of subscribing or matching. In other words, the expressions refer to the

same individual and form a chain of reference. Elements belonging to different mental spaces that are involved in the assignment (that is, interviews are bound by congruence) are considered to be connected by corresponding links. The links are conceptual principles that express, from a psychological point of view, the tendency of speakers to identify the interrelationship between certain entities or to establish relationships between things of a different nature that enable them to refer to something through something else that is appropriately related to the former. One example of Fauconnier (1984) regarding progressive principles, which he calls "open links" in contrast to the non-progressive principles (or "closed bonds"), is the general canonical principle which he calls the principle of "appointment".

Principle of appointment

If two things (in the broader sense): A and B are linked by a function of pragmatic: the function (b = function (a)), the description A can fit to assign the corresponding A

3.6. Roles and values

One of the salient features of the theory of mental spaces is the treatment of nominal compounds with defined meanings. They are nominal compounds that include the names of common nouns, such as: the president, and nouns, such as: Zaid. The theory of mental spaces is that nominal compounds with defined meanings cannot have a continent, i.e. they may or may not refer to one assignee. Fauconnier (1994) therefore represents the following examples:

- A. The president changes every seven years.
- B. Your car is always different.

The two sentences are considered. (a). means that the appearance of the person of the President changes in a certain way every seven years, such as falling hair or becoming a drinker, etc. It may also mean that the person who serves as president changes every seven years. (b). means that the appearance of your car may be different as we see it, for example, the wheels are different, there is an increase or decrease, etc. It means you're in a new car whenever we see you. This kind of ambiguity shows that the nominal compounds with the defined interpretation can have, according to Fauconnier, read the role or read the value. The reading of the role in the compound: the president, related to the position of the president regardless of who is in this site (i.e. the second interpretation). The reading of the value relates to the individual who plays the role (i.e. the first interpretation). The roles and values together bring the elements into the mental spaces, but each of them can be from different contexts. This is illustrated by the following example:

Tony Blair is the Prime Minister. Margaret Thatcher believes she is still prime minister and that Tony Blair is the leader of the opposition. The base has the following elements: Tony Blair, the Prime Minister and Margaret Thatcher. These elements are already present in discourse or in encyclopedic knowledge. This indicates that they have a referral of knowledge, which means they have not been adopted as new but already existent elements. In the space of the base, Tony Blair is the element of value attached to the role element: the prime minister. In other words, a role is associated with a value that links the two elements involved in the assignment. This relationship can be based on encyclopedic knowledge, but in the example, it is clearly mentioned in the first sentence. The second sentence, in the example, adopts a new mental space based on the spatial unity of space: Margaret Thatcher believes ... In the mental space that Thatcher posits, conscientiousness agrees: (attached to Margaret Thatcher by a link of match or assignment) Role: Prime Minister. While Tony Blair agrees with the element of value tied to the role element: the leader of the opposition.

3.7. Applications on the construction of mental spaces

Let us take from the short text in the following example an area for the application of some mechanisms of building mental spaces as we explained in the previous paragraphs. Despite the simplicity of the text in question, it requires processes to build the meaning of the complexity:

Fido saw a turtle, chased it. He thought the tortoise was slow. But it is fast. The turtle may actually be a cat.

We have seen that the construction of mental space always begins with the establishment of a base that represents the starting point for any stage of discourse. The "stages" of the speech can be considered as axes of dialogue. The elements in the base are entered by undefined descriptions; they are assigned as pre-existing by defined descriptions or by non-language factors such as those provided by the context, such as when the speaker is referred to something visible or familiar to the speaker and the hearing together:

Give me scissors

Or, if the speaker refers to something that has already been discussed with the hearer about:

I found the book

The first sentence introduces an identifier: Fido, in a manner that suggests that the element: Fido is in the context of the discourse. Let us note that we can say this regardless of our knowledge of the context of the previous discourse. If, for example, Fido is part of an oral story, we will undoubtedly know Fido.

But if Fido is the beginning of a written narrative, we "build" this back context.

Therefore, this element is built: Fido in the space of the base as part of the background knowledge. In addition, Fido is a name, and we know through the background knowledge that this name is usually called a dog, so we concluded that the term refers to a dog.

There is also an undefined description in this sentence: Turtle. The unidentifiable description introduces a new element into discourse, built into the space of the base. The verb evaluates a relationship between the two elements, based on the vision framework that requires at least two participative roles: seer and sawn. This frame is linked to the base space, linking the role of the seer to the Fido, and the visual role of the turtle.

3.8. Conceptual blending

Conceptual Blending Theory emerged from two directions in the research within the cognitive connotation, the Conceptual Metaphor Theory and the theory of mental spaces. The theory of conceptual blending in terms of its geometry and central concerns is related to the theory and extension of mental spaces. This is due to its special attention to the active manifestations of the construction of the meaning and to its dependence on the mental spaces in its geometry (Evans, 2006). One of the most prominent principles of the theory of conceptual blending is that the construction of meaning requires a structural blending (or integration) that produces a greater amount of meaning than the parts that make up the process. The followers of the theory suggest that this conceptual blending process is a basic, general and central knowledge process in the nature of human thinking. For example, the statement of pampered fish, as we saw in a previous paragraph, is not just a simple intersection between the pampered and the fish; it is a combination of some of the characteristics of the two sources to produce a new saying with its distinctive internal structure; In this application, the researchers deduce that it is related to various phenomena in addition to linguistic significance, such as literary

discourse, mathematics, music, cognitive and social psychology, anthropology and computer science. The theory of conceptual blending is based on Fauconnier and Mark Turner's research (2002). While Fauconnier, as we saw in the previous paragraphs, developed a number of traditional problems related to meaning-building, Turner attempted to address the construction of meaning from the angle of literary constructs. The researchers met to conclude that the construction of meaning is derived in many cases from a structure that is not provided by linguistic or conceptual structures that serve as an input to the construction of meaning. Hence, the theory of conceptual blending was developed. An example of the phenomena that formed the basis for the conception of this theory is the following metaphorical example, which cannot be observed directly in the framework of the theory of metaphorical metaphor: (Evans, 2006).

This butcher is a surgeon.

In this last theoretical framework, the example is interpreted on the basis of the projection of the source domain to the target area, whereby the objective is understood through the projected projection structure, i.e., the target area: a surgeon understood through the source field: butcher. The area of origin includes butcher, knife and animal meat cut by the butcher. The target area includes a surgeon, a patient and a sick person in the case of unconsciousness, in which the surgeon undergoes surgery.

However, the difficulty of the theory of metaphorical metaphor for the monitoring of the example in question is that, in fact, it requires a judgment of negative value. Although the butcher profession requires high skill and knowledge, the butcher's conception of a butcher contains a negative judgment on the surgeon (weakness and lack of skill). Hence, the theory of metaphorical metaphor does not monitor the derivation of this negative judgment from the source domain: butcher. This example refers to fundamental aspects of human knowledge. Language and thought are not syntactic in the cumulative sense of merely adding an element to another element. In other words, the construction of meaning is not based on simple projections that capture a conceptual area through another conceptual field, as in conceptual metaphors, or construct links between interviews belonging to mental spaces, as seen in the preceding paragraphs. One of the most striking additions to the theory of conceptual blending is that it monitors the emergence of such meanings as the preceding example requires, by assuming that the construction of the meaning requires the emergence of a new semantic structure, more meaning than merely combining component parts. The observation of these phenomena in the theory of conceptual blending is based on the following steps: A: The merge network (or mix) contains two (or more) elements linked by projection. As long as the construction of meaning requires fusion networks, their multi-space entities, the theory of conceptual blending connects the two inbound spaces through a common space containing common information between the two. What distinguishes the integration network is that it is based on a fourth space that is a blending space. It is the space that contains the new semantic structure; that is, the information that is not present in any elements.

Thus, the mixing space inherits elements of the two inputs, but it is derived from a semantic structure in which there are no semantic structures (Culicover, 1999).

Conclusion:

In this research, we attempted to abstract some of the most important theoretical and methodological principles and principles of Fauconnier's theory of mental spaces, with their developments in Fauconnier and Turner's theory of conceptual blending. Despite the multiplicity of these formulas and their different conceptual and conceptual systems in dealing

with the mental spaces of Fauconnier, pathways leading to the components of the theoretical and methodological. basis common to this theory, which also takes into account processes and general cognitive principles that contribute to the construction of the meaning, which is a large part of the "behind the scene." It is also that the language does not symbolize thought in its comprehensiveness and complexity; it only symbolizes partial instructions to create richer and more mature ideas. Thus, the theory of mental spaces assumes that the construction of perceptions is led by the context of discourse, which is an integral part of the process of constructing meaning. Thus, while the knowledge of instinct may be qualitatively different from semantic knowledge (i.e., the fragmentary information that the language symbolizes), the latter is meaningless only in context. We have seen that the construction of mental space always begins with the establishment of a base that represents the starting point for any stage of discourse. The "stages" of the speech can be considered as axes of dialogue.

Arabic References

الجاحظ، أبو عثمان عمر بن بحر (1965). *الحيوان*، ج3، تحقيق: عبد السلام محمد هارون، مطبعة مصطفى الباني، مصر، ط2

References:

- Carbon, C.-C. (2014). Understanding human perception by human-made illusions. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 8(566). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00566>
- Culicover, P. W. (1999). *Syntactic nuts: Hard cases, syntactic theory, and language acquisition*. Oxford Univ. Press.
- Ellis, N. C. (2005). At the interface: Dynamic interactions of explicit and implicit language knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27(02). <https://doi.org/10.1017/s027226310505014x>
- Evans, V. (2012). Cognitive linguistics. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews. Cognitive Science*, 3(2), 129–141. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1163>
- Evans, V., & Green, M. J. (2006). *Cognitive linguistics: An introduction*. Edinburgh University.
- Fauconnier, G. (1984). Y a-t-il un niveau linguistique de représentation logique?. *Communications*, 40(1), 211-228. doi:10.3406/comm.1984.1602
- Fauconnier, G. (1985). *Mental spaces: Aspects of meaning construction in natural language*. MIT Press.
- Fauconnier, G. (1994). *Mental spaces*, Cambridge University Press.
- Fauconnier, G. (1997). *Mappings in thought and language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fauconnier, G., & Dugas, A. (1986). Espaces mentaux aspects de la construction du sens dans les langues naturelles. *Revue Québécoise de Linguistique*, 15(2), 315-319. <https://doi.org/10.7202/602574ar>
- Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (2002). *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. Basic Books.
- Guarino, N. (1992). Concepts, attributes and arbitrary relations: Some linguistic and ontological criteria for structuring knowledge bases. *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, 8(3), 249-261. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-023X\(92\)90025-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-023X(92)90025-7)
- Haggard, P., & Whitford, B. (2004). Supplementary motor area provides an efferent signal for sensory suppression. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 19(1), 52-58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogbrainres.2003.10.018>

- Katz, G. (2008). Manner modification of state verbs. In *Adjectives and Adverbs* (pp. 220–248). Oxford University Press.
- Krostovic, J. (1999). *Classical and medieval literature criticism (Vol 33)*. Cengage Gale.
- Löbner, S. (2011). Concept types and determination. *Journal of Semantics*, 28(3), 279-333. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffq022>
- Vosgerau, G. (2007). Conceptuality in spatial representations. *Philosophical Psychology*, 20(3), 349-365. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s027226310505014x>