

THEORETICAL BASIS OF METAPHOR RESEARCH IN METHODOLOGICAL DISCOURSE

Haieva P. O.

INTRODUCTION

The problem of learning foreign language as a means of communication acquires a special importance in modern society. In the era of globalization, an increased interest in the method of teaching foreign languages is associated with the fact that “multilingual is one of the common factors of integration in a single educational space”.

Since the technique of teaching foreign languages is actively developing the field of knowledge, her conceptual device needs ordering. Modern linguistics suggests learning the language in conjunction with the person, his mind, and his activity. Anthropocentric direction of linguistics puts its task of studying the speech activity of a person when it is included in any special (professional, recognizable) activity. As a lynch work object, allowing for a single study of speech and professional activity, there is discourse. The discourse is widely understood, on the one hand, is considered as activity, on the other hand, as the solubility of texts. In the discourse, the concept is formed as a conjunction of all varieties of special knowledge. Since the metaphor, being a lingual single, represents the special knowledge, the postulation of the peculiarities of metaphorical models and the dynamics of metaphorization in methodological discourse in the competing aspect is relevant.

1. Cognitive-discursive aspect of the study of metaphor

At the present stage of the development of linguistic science, which is characterized by the consideration of linguistic phenomena in connection with man, his activities and thinking, the concept of metaphor receives a special interpretation. Studies devoted to the problem of metaphor emphasize its important role in building the conceptual and verbal systems of man, her active participation in the categorization of language, processes of thinking and perception¹ a cognitive-discursive

¹ Alekseeva L.M. Term and metaphor: semantic justification of metaphorization. Publishing house of technical training college, 1998. 250 p.

approach to the study of metaphor relies on a large theoretical experience in the study of metaphor. In this regard, it seems advisable to consider the most significant concepts of metaphor, on the basis of which one can trace the evolution of views on metaphor from the study of it as a separate phenomenon (within the semantics of the word) to the comprehensive study of metaphORIZATION as a universal mechanism for creating discourse. During the study of generalizing works on the problems of metaphor, it was revealed that most of them studied the semantic aspect of metaphor. The development of semantic concepts in modern metaphor theory is indicated by L.M. Alekseyev, identifying several variant types of concepts: concepts that analyze only the new, portable meaning of the word natural language; concepts aimed at establishing commonality between direct and portable values; concepts that assert the desirability of studying only the old (direct) meaning as the basis for creating a “portable” meaning; “paradoxical” concepts that consider the semantic similarity of the referent simultaneously as their inconsistency².

2. Cognitive concepts of the study of metaphor

The main prerequisites of a cognitive approach to the study of metaphor were the provision on its mental nature (ontological aspect) and cognitive potential (epistemological aspect). Among the particularly conceptually relevant provisions based on the cognitive approach to metaphor, the following research programs should be distinguished: the concept of prototypes developed by E. Roch and her colleagues, the concept of inter-frame communication by M.L. Minsky, frame semantics by C. Fillmore, the theory of J. Janes, the cognitive grammar of R. Langacker, the conceptual theory of metaphor by J. Lacoff and M. Jonson, the theory of the embodied meaning of M. Jonson, the theory of the cognitive metaphor of McCormack, the theory of the structural mapping of D. Gentner, the theory of conceptual integration of M. Turner and J. Fokionier, the theory of metaphor E. Kittey, the concept of “double coding” A. Pivio, cognitive semantics of M.V. Nikitin, studies of metaphorical models and the principles of their combination by A.N. Baranov, studies of the Russian political metaphor A.N. Baranov and Yu.N. Karaulov, studies of the metaphor in the political discourse A.P. Chudinov, studies of metaphor in medical discourse S.L. Mish-

² Alekseeva L.M. Problems of a term and terminoobrazovaniye. Perm : Publishing house of technical training college, 1998. 120 p.

lanova, theory of terminological metaphorization L.M. Alekseeva, development of conceptual and terminological apparatus of modern cognitive-discursive paradigm of research of language phenomena E.S. Kubryakova and N.N. Boldyrev.

The theory of metaphor “cannot achieve a goal without using processes of imagination and sensation, that is, without attributing a semantic function to what seems rather to be psychological characteristics”³.

In the semantic theory of metaphor, P. Riker introduces the concept of an image, or imaginary, determining the status of the sensory, non-verbal factor – “sensation” in its connection with the “meaning”, trying to represent this connection in terms of semantic theory. Imagination plays a big role in creating metaphorical meaning, according to P. Riker. Presenting one thought with another, the metaphor shows, makes the first one visible, in order to get a more lively idea of the second⁴. “To explain the metaphor is to list the meanings within which the image is seen as meaning”⁵.

“See how” is the sensory, sensory-perceived side of the metaphorical language – half-thought, receiving, providing an intuitive connection between the meaning and the way connecting the clarity of thought with the completeness of the image. Nonverbal and verbal are closely related – within the figurative function of the language. In addition to the role of the “bridge” between verbal and quasi-visual, “vision as” creates tension between some terms of metaphorical utterance, which is supported by contradiction at the level of literal meaning. It is this tension that makes up the essence of metaphorical meaning, consisting in the partial abolition of literal correctness and the establishment of new semantic coordination by merging meaning and image⁶.

Speaking about the role of imagination in the process of creating and interpreting (understanding) the metaphor, P. Riker goes beyond the semantic approach, considers the problem, turning to the basics of thinking, where the metaphor relates to the form of organization of thought. In addition, Ricker sees in the metaphor the way in which human thinking learns the world around us, considering the metaphor as a model of “changing our way of looking at things, ways of perceiving

³ Riker P. Metaphorical process as knowledge, imagination and feeling. Theory of a metaphor. Moscow : Progress, 1990. P. 416–434.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

the world”. That is, the metaphor interprets cognitive reality, spelling it out at the conceptual level, attempting to understand it. The power of metaphor, according to Ricker, lies in its ability to break the existing categorization in order to “build new ones on the ruins of the old logical borders”⁷.

This approach to the problem of metaphor demonstrates the need to take the analysis of this phenomenon to a different level, where the emphasis is on the relationship between language, thinking and cognition. The metaphor permeates our entire lives and manifests itself not only in language, but also in thinking, defining our actions and actions, since the conceptual system of man is essentially metaphorical⁸.

Cognitive theory is characterized by a wide approach to the isolation of metaphor by formal and meaningful features. While a number of theories clearly distinguish between comparison (in which there is a formal measure of comparability) and metaphor, in a cognitive approach, both of these varieties are considered as a metaphor understood in a broad sense.

Even less important for the cognitive direction is the distinction between verb and name, predicative, adjective and other types of metaphor, allocated on the basis of the language features themselves. Since language, according to the general ideas of cognitive linguistics, is thought of as a single continuum of symbolic units, not naturally divided into lexicon, phraseology, morphology, syntax, then “semantic use is considered as a factor much more important than level or structural differences”⁹.

According to N.D. Arutyunova, a metaphor in the broad sense “can be called any method of indirect expression of thought”¹⁰.

With a wide understanding, not only comparison, but also other phenomena with the element of comparativity are considered as a metaphor: metamorphoses, hyperbole, some periphrases, phraseologies, etc. Moreover, a metaphor in cognitive linguistics refers to both the mechanism, the process, the result in a single and generalized form,

⁷ Ricker P. Metaphorical process as knowledge, imagination and feeling. Theory of a metaphor. Moscow : Progress, 1990. P. 416–434.

⁸ Lakoff. J Metaphors which we live. Moscow : Editorial of URSS, 2004. 256 p.

⁹ Chudinov A.P. A metaphorical mosaic in modern political communication. Yekaterinburg, 2003. 248 p.

¹⁰ Arutyunova N.D. Metaphor and discourse. Theory of a metaphor. Moscow : Progress, 1990. P. 5–32.

and the form of thinking. The theoretical development of the cognitive foundations of metaphor theory belongs to J. Lakoffu.

The theory of conceptual metaphor is based on the following provisions:

- 1) metaphor is an important mechanism by which we understand abstract concepts and talk about them;
- 2) a metaphor by nature is not a linguistic, but a conceptual phenomenon;
- 3) metaphorical language is a superficial manifestation of a conceptual metaphor;
- 4) metaphorical concept is based on non-metaphorical concept, i.e. on our sensorimotor experience;
- 5) the metaphor is based more on correspondences in our experience than on similarities¹¹.

The main provision of J. Lakoff's theory that the conceptual system of an individual is inherently metaphorical is based on linguistic material. J. Lakoff and M. Jonson note "metaphor penetrates into everyday life, and not only into language, but also into thinking and acts. Our ordinary conceptual system, in whose language we think and act, is essentially metaphorical... Since communication is based on the same conceptual system that we use in thinking and activity, language is an important source of data to determine what this system is"¹².

Thus, it is through language that we have access to metaphors that structure our perception, our thinking and our actions. A. Chenki ranks among the most important the following features of conceptual metaphors:

1. Metaphors are a bridge from the familiar to the unfamiliar, from the obvious to the less obvious. Compared to the target region, the source region is usually: intuitive, more specifically, known most likely through direct physical experience, known in more detail, more easily transmitted by one person to another.
2. The regions associated with the metaphor are asymmetric, unequal. The metaphor "Love is a journey" is common in a number of cultures, and "Journey is love" is not found, since physical events are not understood through abstract concepts.

¹¹ Chenki A. Semantics in cognitive linguistics. Modern American linguistics: the fundamental directions / under the editorship of A.A. Kibrik, I.M. Kobozeva, I.A. Sekerina. Prod. the 2nd. Moscow : Editorial of URSS, 2002.

¹² Lakoff J. Cognitive modeling. Moscow, 1996. P. 143–184.

3. Metaphors contain a paradox, arguing that $A = X$ and at the same time X is not equal to A . They focus on selected aspects of comparison.

4. Metaphors function at different levels of specificity, some at the highest, more general level, and others at a more specific level. High-level metaphors enjoy greater universality, manifest in different languages and cultures, and lower-level metaphors, rather culturally specific¹³.

The essence of the metaphor is to understand one region in terms of another. The metaphor mechanism is to move from the source domain to the target domain. The basic source of metaphors is the physical experience of human interaction with the outside world. It is in physical experience, according to J. Lakoff, that an organizing beginning of categorization processes is concluded. This experience is fixed in the form of cognitive structures – schematic images. In the process of transferring a metaphor, it projects a schematic shaped structure (relationships of figure and background, causes and consequences, movement, etc.) of the region onto the region, thereby structuring the latter. The concept is metaphorically structured, the activity is metaphorically structured and, therefore, the language is metaphorically structured. Metaphors as language expressions become possible precisely because there are metaphors in the human conceptual system. Therefore, language metaphors are secondary manifestations of the basic mechanism of metaphor formation. Metaphor (both conceptual and linguistic) has not only unlimited heuristic capabilities, it also structures the entire cognitive system of the individual as a whole, including language. The pervasive nature of the metaphorical mechanism is ensured by its general cognitive systemic nature. The shortcomings of the conceptual theory of metaphor include the fact that the authors of this theory do not take into account the context, the linguistic side of metaphorization, but consider only the conceptual side of the metaphor. Many modern linguists suggest going not from conceptual metaphor to language expression, but vice versa from language to conceptual metaphor.

¹³ Chenki A. Semantics in cognitive linguistics. Modern American linguistics: the fundamental directions / under the editorship of A.A. Kibrik, I.M. Kobozeva, I.A. Sekerina. Prod. the 2nd. Moscow : Editorial of URSS, 2002.

3. Linguocognitive concepts of the study of metaphor

In the light of linguo-cognitive concepts, metaphor is studied as a means of knowing reality and verbalizing knowledge. The Pragglejaz group, created in 2007 and named after the first letters of the names of ten leading metaphor specialists from the USA, Hong Kong and European countries, studies metaphor in different discourses, choosing a more reliable path from language to conceptual metaphor. The most significant concepts, from the point of view of the presentation of the cognitive mechanism of the metaphor, are pointed out by S.L. Mishlanova: the identification of the metaphor with the mechanism of mediated thinking about the world and the mechanism of obtaining inferential knowledge by relying on the signs of signs; an important role is played by non-rigid (prototypical) categorization; the cognitive foundations of metaphorization allow us to consider it as a cognitive mechanism of communicative processes, i.e. a cognitive-communicative phenomenon. A significant contribution to the cognitive theory of metaphor was made by the work of E. Machormak, in which the role of metaphor in thinking processes is determined. To explain the metaphor as some cognitive process, he uses the concept of “deep” structures, considered as “a device that gives rise to; his language”. The metaphor is the result of two processes – cognitive and semantic, “the metaphor is the result of a cognitive process that involves two (or more) referents, usually unrelated, which leads to a semantic conceptual anomaly, the symptom of which is usually a certain emotional tension”¹⁴.

Cognitive-discursive studies of metaphor are represented by works in which different types of discourse become the object of study: poetic, political, legal, medical, pedagogical and others. The findings suggest that the cognitive-discursive approach allows us to explain the patterns of metaphorization and discourse based on the theory of conceptual integration, authored by Marc Turner and Gilles Fauconnier. Their concept of metaphor is based on the fact that the process of metaphor formation is not limited by the projection from the source region to the target region, it is only one of the options for the process of creating metaphor. The proposed alternative theory of metaphor is based on the concept of mental space. Mental spaces are areas that are used to store and generate information. Mental spaces are peculiar models of situations, the image of how a person usually thinks and talks about

¹⁴ McCormack E. Cognitive theory of a metaphor. Theory of a metaphor. Moscow : Progress, 1990. P. 358–386.

certain things. These stored models are related to the experience of the individual. Mental spaces consist of certain content elements and are structured by frames and cognitive models. In the course of communication, the mental spaces of the interlocutors undergo constant transformations, the result of which is the appearance of new spaces. New mental spaces are connected in a certain way with old ones that already exist in the mind, while the old ones are pushed to the background. J. Fokonye identifies the following types of connections that characterize the interaction between spaces: analogical, metaphorical and metonymic types of connection, the connection of a function and its values, as well as the inclusion of one space in another. It is the description of the mechanism of interaction between mental spaces that is the theory of conceptual integration of J. Fokonye and M. Turner. Instead of the two-component model of metaphor formation of J. Lakoff and M. Johnson, a multi-component model is proposed, including at least four mental spaces: two initial spaces (input spaces), common space (generic space) and mixed space. The common space contains the most abstract elements (roles, frames, and schemas) inherent in both original spaces, that is, it acts as the basis for metaphorization at the abstract level itself. In the blend, the details of the original spaces are “mixed”, as a result of which a qualitatively new conceptual structure is formed which no longer depends on the initial spaces and has its own potentials for further development¹⁵.

In the theory of blending, the process of conceptual integration takes place in 3 stages: composition (composition), completion (completion) and development (elaboration). In the composition step, the content of the starting spaces is projected into the mixed space. In design, mixed space is perceived as a long-term unified conceptual structure that can be endlessly modified and developed at the final stage. When analyzing metaphors, blending researchers often have to encounter integration networks, which include several (more than two) source spaces with different types of projection (for example, metonymy and metaphor). Metaphor is a special case of conceptual integration. We find traces of the thought process in the text. Based on the analysis of network structures, M. Turner and J. Fokonye developed the following principles of optimality of integration networks.

¹⁵ Budayev E.V, Chudinov A.P. A metaphor in a political interdiskurs. Yekaterinburg, 2006. 208 p.

1. Principle of integration. Mixed space should create a tightly integrated environment that can be operated as one.
2. The principle of the network. Blend manipulation should maintain a network of appropriate links to the source spaces without additional observations or calculations.
3. Unpacking principle. Blend should allow you to reconstruct the original spaces, the cross-domain projection, the common space and the network of connections between all spaces.
4. Principle of topology. Each element in a blend must function according to the structural relationships inherent in its original space.
5. The principle of the right basis. If an item appears in a blend, you need to find significance for that item. Significance includes relevant links to other spaces and relevant functions involved in the blend.
6. The principle of reducing the metonymic distance. If one element is projected from the original space to the blend, and the other element from the same space is projected due to the metonymic connection with the first, then the metonymic distance between both elements is shortened in the blend¹⁶.

It is important to keep in mind that blending is understood quite broadly and is not at all limited to the study of metaphorization processes. Blending is “a cognitive mechanism covering many (possibly all) cognitive phenomena, including categorization, hypothesis construction, interference, origin and combination of grammatical constructions, analogy, metaphor and narrative”¹⁷.

As can be seen from the definition, in the theory of blending, metaphor occupies the place of only one of the cognitive mechanisms, more precisely, it is a type of universal mechanism of conceptual integration. With this approach, there is a need to explain how metaphorical blending differs from other types of blending. In the most general form, it is proposed to consider metaphorical such a mixed space in which conceptual integration is accompanied by a mixture of elements of the original spaces. In order to study the metaphor, describe its functions, role and influence, it is necessary to first correctly identify the metaphor in order to create a reliable basis for its study.

¹⁶ Chudinov A.P. A metaphorical mosaic in modern political communication. Yekaterinburg, 2003. 248 p.

¹⁷ Fauconnier, G. Conceptual blending and analogy. 1999. URL: <http://www.wam.umd.edu/~mtum/WWW/blending/html>.

The first approach (deductive) is less reliable, since other metaphors present in the context are ignored, and it is not clear what criteria researchers are guided by when WAR, SPORT, GAME, etc., see the source for the “dispute” metaphor. However, the second approach is also not devoid of shortcomings, for example, some researchers may consider some kind of language expression to be a metaphor, guided only by intuition. In light of cognitive theories, “the verbalization of knowledge is represented by completely new linguistic mechanisms for the restructuring of the semantics of language units, the main of which is metaphorization. Thanks to them, a person who knows reality adapts his language to an adequate way of reflecting this reality. The formation of a conceptual system, i.e. a system of redesigned knowledge of the world and knowledge of the pillars – external and internal – for access to the information base and extraction of “inferred” knowledge necessary to solve problems arising in the process of activity, takes place in the discourse”¹⁸.

The cognitive mechanism of discourse is realized as obtaining inferential knowledge, contributing to the improvement of activities, supporting the system of interaction of a person with the world. At the same time, an important role in the formation of discourse belongs to the processes of conceptualization and categorization, which determine the solution of the tasks of processing “new” information with the involvement of an individual conceptual system, using supports and inference knowledge in the process of meaning formation. In addition, developing the theory of discourse as a landmark activity, S.L. Mishlanova assigns a priority role to the metaphor in terminology. Metaphor is understood as a sequence of manifestations of the functioning of the cognitive mechanism of the communicatively mediated process of the development of the language sign at different stages of discourse, at different stages of speech activity¹⁹.

This work emphasizes that “due to the ambiguity of the term” metaphor, “which relates both to the general mechanism of discourse and to the internal mechanism of each stage, and to the name of each stage, and to the process carried out at each stage, and to the result of each stage, all data can be collected and arranged in an orderly manner in the process of functioning of the discourse mechanism. The concept of

¹⁸ Mishlanova S.L. A metaphor in a medical discourse. Perm : Publishing house of technical training college, 2002. 160 p.

¹⁹ Ibid.

“discourse” allows us to overcome the opposition of a “conceptual/linguistic” metaphor, since it covers the entire continuum of landmark activity”²⁰.

4. Conceptual Analysis and Metaphorical Modeling

Modern experts consider verbal metaphor as a linguistic representation of extremely important analogue processes, emphasizes its active participation in the formation of a personal model of the world, an important role in the integration of verbal and sensual human systems. At the same time, metaphor is recognized as a key element of conceptualization, categorization and assessment of the world in language, thinking and perception.

The study of metaphor in connection with the problems of verbalization of the concept is one of the most relevant areas in modern cognitive linguistics. Works of N.F. Alefirenko, N.D. Arutyunova, A.N. Baranova, I.M. Kreveva, E.S. Kubryakova, N.A. Kuzmina, V.A. Maslova, M.V. Nikitina. One of their important issues addressed through a cognitive-discursive approach is the representation of special knowledge. The question of in what form there are representations in the memory of a person was always relevant. As E.S. Kubryakova notes, three problems are associated with the knowledge and representation of the world: the problem of perception of the world (formation of mental representations), the problem of understanding the perceived (conceptual structuring) and the problem of language design (verbal representation). Thus, in terms of the acquisition, processing, storage, extraction and use of knowledge, several forms of representation are expected to exist simultaneously. From the point of view of the cognitive-discursive approach, the representation operates with both verbal and non-verbal signs and, using a sign expression, conveys knowledge of a particular object or phenomenon of reality. Modern linguistics considers language as “the most important cognitive ability of a person, closely related to the features of his thinking and activity”²¹.

In line with the anthropocentric direction of linguistics, the task of studying the development of linguistic signs (metaphors) in human speech can be set. Since the speech activity itself, as a rule, is included in any special (professional, scientific) activity, and the language mark

²⁰ Mishlanova S.L. A metaphor in a medical discourse. Perm : Publishing house of technical training college, 2002. 160 p.

²¹ Golovanova E.I. Introduction to a cognitive terminovedeniye. Moscow : Science, 2011. 222 p.

develops in a certain professional sphere (from the stage of its formation to the modern state), since the priority in the study of the metaphor belongs to the cognitive-discursive direction. Central to our dissertation is the concept of conceptualization. In the present work, the process of conceptualizing reality means a certain way of generalizing human experience, which the speaker implements in a specific statement. “The situation can be the same, and a person can talk about it in different ways, depending on how he currently represents it – and these ideas are just called conceptualization”²².

E.S. Kubryakova considers the goal of the conceptualization process “understanding all sensations, all information coming to a person as a result of the work of the senses and assessing this reality in terms of concepts”²³.

Among the discussions so far is the question of determining the content of this, one of the key terms of cognitive linguistics. According to some researchers, “this is primarily due to its status as a general scientific term used in various fields of scientific knowledge (in philosophy, logic, mathematics, psychology, psycholinguistics, cultural studies) related to its various interpretations”²⁴.

All human cognitive activity (cognition) can be considered as a developing ability to navigate the world, and this activity involves the need to identify and distinguish objects. Concepts arise for the provision of operations of this kind. Since the concept is the result of cognition, the variety of forms of ordinary cognition (cognition) determines different ways of forming concepts in the human mind.

1) On the basis of sensual experience, i.e. as a result of the perception of the surrounding world directly by the sensory organs: through vision, hearing, sense of smell, touch. It is enough to see a particular object so that in the mind there is a certain idea of it, an visual image, on the basis of which the corresponding concept is formed.

2) On the basis of the practical activity of a person, i.e. as a result of his actions and operations with various subjects.

²² Rakhilina E.V. Cognitive analysis of subject names: semantics and compatibility. Moscow : Russian dictionaries, 2000. 416 p.

²³ Kubryakova E.S. Language and knowledge: On the way to obtaining knowledge about language: Parts of speech from a cognitive point of view. The role of language in the knowledge of the world / Grew. Academy of Sciences. In-t linguistics. 2004. 42 s.

²⁴ Topazova V.M. Conceptual parameters of semantic abstraction. *Questions of cognitive linguistics*. 2004. № 2–3. P. 178–181.

3) Based on experimental-cognitive and theoretical-cognitive (scientific) activity.

4) On the basis of cogitative activity, i.e. as a result of reasonings, conclusions, conclusions, on the basis of cogitative operations with already known concepts.

5) On the basis of verbal and non-verbal communication, when one person transmits, reports, explains to another person a concept using language means or other means of communication: gestures, conditional signs, pantomime²⁵.

The conceptualization process is closely related to the categorization process, which is a classification activity. The two processes differ in outcome and/or objective. “The first is aimed at distinguishing certain minimum units of human experience in their ideal meaningful representation, the second is at combining units that show similarity in one way or another or are characterized as identical into larger categories”²⁶.

The process of conceptualization is aimed at highlighting the minimum content units of human experience, knowledge structures, and the process of categorization – at combining similar or identical units into larger categories²⁷.

The modern approach to categorization is characterized as prototypical, it is believed that “categories are blurred, do not have clear boundaries... The word is a naming of a thing not absolutely, but only to some extent. People form a specific or abstract thought image of objects belonging to a certain category. This image is called a prototype if with its help a person perceives reality: a member of the category closer to this image will be rated as a better sample of the whole class or a more prototypical instance than everyone else”²⁸.

Thus, the concept is multidimensional, it can distinguish both rational and emotional, both abstract and concrete, both universal and ethnic, both national and individual. The concept can be represented as a complex structure, the elements of which will be concepts and images

²⁵ Boldyrev N.N. Cognitive semantics: A course of lectures on the English philology. Tambov : Tamb publishing house. State. Un-ta, 2000. 172 p.

²⁶ Kubryakova E.S. Short dictionary of cognitive terms. Moscow : MSU publishing house, 1996. 248 p.

²⁷ Boldyrev N.N. Cognitive semantics: A course of lectures on the English philology. Tambov : Tamb publishing house. State. Un-ta, 2000. 172 p.

²⁸ Kubryakova E.S. Short dictionary of cognitive terms. Moscow : MSU publishing house, 1996. 248 p.

enshrined in the semantic structure of words denoting these images and concepts, and a feature of a special concept is the presence of a metaphorical way of reflecting reality. The complex nature of the structural organization of the concept suggests that behind it can be knowledge of different degrees of abstraction, that is, different formats of knowledge. A concept can be “a separate meaning and a whole conceptual structure that includes other concepts and defines other concepts of abstraction”²⁹.

Concepts as elements of consciousness are completely autonomous from language. Our thinking is non-verbal in nature. Most people, according to numerous studies, do not use words in the process of thinking. Language means convey only part of the concept with their meanings, which is confirmed by the existence of numerous synonyms, different definitions, definitions and text descriptions of the same concept. “The meaning of the word is only an attempt to give a general idea of the content of the expressed concept, to outline the known boundaries of representing its individual characteristics with this word”³⁰.

In addition, they denote concepts such as representations, schemes, concepts, frames, scripts, gestalts, as well as verbalized and non-verbalized, universal and national, group and individual, abstract and specific³¹.

The variety of typologies of concepts is apparently caused by the fact that the classifications proposed by different researchers are based on different principles. As follows from the typologies presented, many researchers propose designing the concept in the form of a frame. The concept of “frame” was introduced into linguistics by C. Fillmore, who formulated the fundamental ideas that the meaning of a word is not the sum of the components into which it can be divided, but “a conceptual structure that is a collection of knowledge known to the speaker and listener, and at the same time a scheme for interpreting experience”³².

²⁹ Boldyrev N.N. Cognitive semantics: A course of lectures on the English philology. Tambov : Tamb publishing house. State. Un-ta, 2000. 172 p.

³⁰ Boldyrev N.N. Cognitive semantics: A course of lectures on the English philology. Tambov : Tamb publishing house. State. Un-ta, 2000. 172 p.

³¹ Popova Z.D. Cognitive linguistics. Moscow : ACT the East – the West, 2007. 314 p.

³² Fillmore Ch.J. An Alternative to Checklist Theories of Meaning. BLS. 1975. Vol. 1. P. 123–131.

This opinion was held by Marvin Lee Minsk, the creator of the theory of frames. This theory is based on the fact that “a person, trying to know a new situation for himself or in a new way to look at things that are already familiar, chooses from his memory some data structure (image), in such a way as to make it suitable for understanding a wider class of phenomena or processes by changing individual details in it”³³.

M. Minsky just called this data structure a frame. Frame, according to M. Minsky, is the structure by which a person’s thinking usually interprets the material given in sensation and perception. In structure, a frame is similar to a network consisting of nodes and links between them. Each node represents a certain concept. “Upper levels of the frame are clearly defined, since they are formed by concepts that are always fair to the intended situation. At lower levels, there are many special vertices or “cells” that must be filled with specific examples or data. Each terminal can set conditions that its tasks must meet. Simple conditions are determined by markers, for example, in the form of a requirement that the terminal job be a subject, or an object of suitable dimensions, or a pointer to a subframe of a certain type”³⁴.

Thus, semantically close frames are combined into a frame system, which is a hierarchically ordered structure consisting of subframes, frames and superframes. Frame systems are connected to each other by a so-called search network. “If the proposed frame cannot be adapted to the actual situation, that is, if it is not possible to find such terminal tasks that meet the conditions of the corresponding tokens, the information search network allows you to select a frame more suitable for this situation”³⁵.

The set of explicitly defined nodes-concepts forms the basis for “understanding” any particular situation from a class of situations defined for a given frame. “Understanding” takes place by specifying terminals and harmonizing the concepts possible for each of them with a well-defined, existing environment in the outside world. The central point is the use of the same terminals by different frames, which allows the coordination of information collected from different sources. Groups of interconnected frames are combined into systems that can reflect actions, causal relationships, changes in the conceptual point of view, etc. There are even more complex systems of frames in their structure,

³³ Minsk M. Frames for representation of knowledge. Moscow, 1979. P. 152.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid.

which M. Minsky calls families of interconnected frames. “For example, if the situation corresponds to a frame of type A suggests B and B assumes C, then a simple” offset “from one frame to another makes it possible to reinterpret the situation as A assumes C”³⁶.

M. Minsky believes that the basis of such a connection between frames is an analogy. Each individual has its own methods of establishing inter-frame connections. “Such analogies – along with the ability to apply them – are one of the most powerful tools of thinking. These analogies sometimes give us the opportunity to see some subject or idea as if “in the light” of another subject or idea, which allows us to apply the knowledge and experience gained in one field to solve problems in another field. It is in this way that knowledge is spread from one scientific paradigm to another”.

According to M. Minsky, the process of thinking is a change of frames. One of the mechanisms that ensures the change of frames, the establishment of new inter-frame connections, is a metaphor. M.L. Makarov under the frame understands “the cognitive structure in the phenomenological field of a person, which is based on probabilistic knowledge of typical situations and the expectations associated with this knowledge regarding the properties and relationships of real or hypothetical objects. According to its structure, the frame consists of a vertex (theme), i.e. macro position, and slots or terminals filled with propositions. This cognitive structure is organized around any concept, but unlike the trivial set of associations, such units contain only the most significant, typical and potentially possible information that is associated with this concept”³⁷.

Frame technique is widely used in cognitive linguistics. In our study, in the process of considering the dynamics of metaphorization, the methodological discourse uses a frame technique (constructing a taxonomic frame based on the allocation of domains and taxa), while the frame is considered as one of the ways to represent the concept at the mental level. Another widely used method in modern linguistic research, which is also used in dissertation research, is the metaphorical modeling method. Modeling in linguistics is one of the types of scientific

³⁶ Minsk M. Ostroumiye and logic of cognitive unconscious. *New in foreign linguistics*. 1988. Issue 23. P. 281–309.

³⁷ Krasnykh V.V. Etnopsikholingvistika and cultural linguistics: Course of lectures. Moscow : ITDGK Gnosis, 2002. 284 p.

classification, a certain method of formalizing and systematizing the language³⁸.

Modeling is defined as “the process of creating artificial models that are designed to describe the linguistic and mental (cognitive) processes that occur in the consciousness of a person who generates and perceives text”, and the main goal of modeling is seen in the mapping “of the observed object in its general and essential features”³⁹.

Among the main features of the model, the researcher identifies its general meaning, composition and principles of the organization. Metaphorization is “a special metaprocedure that plays an important role in the cultural fixation of new scientific results... As the volume of theoretical knowledge increases, the role of metaphorization only increases”⁴⁰.

The general principle of metaphorization is that the characteristics of the source region, being more specific, are used to interpret and structure a more abstract target region. The basis for metaphorization is often sensual experience⁴¹.

Since discourse means verbally mediated activity, and activity involves development, which in the cognitive paradigm is understood as a source of conceptualization, that is, the formation and change of the concept, then, speaking of the dynamics of metaphorization, we mean a change in the structure of the concept. Moreover, the activity is characterized by the presence of results, therefore, in relation to the theory of discourse, we believe that the implementation of the results is carried out directly in language/texts, that is, each individual metaphor reflects a change in the structure of the concept. A metaphorical model is “an existing and/or emerging scheme of communication between conceptual spheres in the minds of native speakers, which can be represented by a certain formula”: X is Y... “The relationship between the components of the formula is not understood as a direct identification, but as a similarity; “X is like W”. According to this formula, a system of frames (slots, concepts) of one mental sphere

³⁸ Nemchenko V.M. About a concept of word-formation model. Vocabulary. Terminology. Styles. *Interuniversity collection*. Issue 1. Gorky, 1973. P. 58–67.

³⁹ Linguistic modeling: collective monograph. Tyumen : Bouck’s vector, 2009. 186 p.

⁴⁰ Velichkovsky B.M. Cognitive science. Fundamentals of psychology of knowledge; in 2 t. T. 2. Moscow Sense: Publishing center “Akademiya”, 2006. 432 p.

⁴¹ Lakoff J. Metaphors which we live. Moscow : Editorial of URSS, 2004. 256 p.

(source sphere) serves as the basis for modeling the mental system of another sphere (magnet sphere)⁴².

Metaphorical models (M-models), according to A.N. Baranov, are thematically related fields of significant descriptors. “The M-model is organized as a semantic tree of signifying descriptors, the connections between which are reflected by the position that the descriptor occupies in the tree. The signifying descriptor can be included in several M-model trees at the same time⁴³.”

According to this definition, the metaphorical model is a conceptual area (source region), the elements of which are connected by various semantic relations (“perform a function”, “promote”, “causate”, “be an example”, etc.); the name of the metaphorical model is the generic concept, combining; its elements of its taxa. We believe that the concept as a “set of all types of knowledge on a certain problem⁴⁴” is formed as a result of conceptualization processes in discourse, which determine the specifics of its structure. The concept has many ways of representing at the mental and verbal level. Frame and cognitive metaphor are recognized as mental ways of representing the concept, while individual examples of metaphors represent the concept at the verbal level.

5. Discourse as a category of cognitive linguistics. Conceptualization in methodological discourse

V.V. Krasnykh defines discourse as verbalized speech activity, which appears as “a combination of process and result and has two plans: actual linguistic and linguistic-cognitive”. Discourse as a process is a verbalized activity itself. Discourse as a result appears as a collection of texts. In other words, the actual linguistic plan of the discourse is associated with the language, manifests itself in the language means used and manifests itself in the totality of generated texts (discourse as a result). The linguo-cognitive plan is associated with language consciousness, determines the choice of language means, affects the generation (and perception) of texts, manifesting itself in context and presupposition (discourse as a process). Thus, the discourse, being “a single organism in which a wide variety of aspects of not only language,

⁴² Chudinov A.P. A metaphorical mosaic in modern political communication. Yekaterinburg, 2003. 248 p.

⁴³ Baranov A.N. About types of compatibility of metaphorical models. *Questions of linguistics*. 2003. № 2. P. 73–94.

⁴⁴ Alekseeva L.M. Medical discourse: theoretical bases and principles of the analysis. Perm : Publishing house of technical training college, 2002. 200 p.

but also linguistic thinking are simultaneously realized”⁴⁵, appears as an integrative object. On the one hand, in the discourse there is a conceptualization of special knowledge (thought processes), on the other hand, concepts are represented in the discourse by various linguistic means, including metaphor.

Summarizing various understandings of discourse in domestic and foreign linguistics, V.E. Chernyavskaya identifies two main approaches to the definition of discourse: firstly, discourse is “a specific communicative event recorded in written texts and oral speech, carried out in a certain cognitively and typologically conditioned communicative space” and secondly, discourse can be.

In line with the cognitive approach, discourse is understood as “verbally mediated activity in the special sphere”⁴⁶.

It is common knowledge that any activity involves development, which in cognitive linguistics is understood as a source of conceptualization. Moreover, the activity is characterized by the presence of results, so we believe that, in relation to the theory of discourse, the implementation of the results is carried out directly in language/texts. Summarizing the above, we note that in this study we relate the concepts of discourse, concept and metaphor and define discourse as verbally mediated activity in a special sphere in which the formation and subsequent modification of the concept, which has many ways of representation (metaphor is one of them), takes place.

The detailed definition of methodology as a scientific discipline is given by A.N. Schukin: “This is a science that studies the goals, content, means, methods, organizational forms of teaching a foreign language, introduces the culture of the country of the language studied, as well as studies the methods of teaching, education and mastery of the language in the process of its study”⁴⁷.

At the same time, throughout the history of the methodology as a scientific discipline, the question of its status has been widely discussed, namely, whether the methodology of teaching foreign languages is an independent science, or relies on data from other sciences. A.N. Schukin identifies the following points of view on this problem relevant to this

⁴⁵ Krasnykh V.V. Etnopsikholingvistika and cultural linguistics: Course of lectures. Moscow : ITDGG Gnosis, 2002. 284 p.

⁴⁶ Alekseeva L.M. Medical discourse: theoretical bases and principles of the analysis. Perm : Publishing house of technical training college, 2002. 200 p.

⁴⁷ Schukin A.N. Training in foreign languages. Theory and practice. Moscow, 2010. 476 p.

science that existed in the 20th century: 1) the methodology is not an independent science, but relies on these linguistics (L.V. Scherba); 2) the methodology is the applied field of psychology (B.V. Belyaev); 3) the methodology is a section of pedagogy (private didactics) and is based on didactic principles developed in this field of knowledge (Y.K. Babansky, A.V. Tekuchev, V.S. Tsetlin, E.P. Shubin). A.N. Schukin also notes that the relationship of the methodology with other sciences (pedagogy, psychology Arguments in favor of such a statement are the presence of the methodology of its conceptual apparatus, its object and subject of study, its subject of teaching⁴⁸.

Let us turn to the consideration of the specifics of methodological discourse, that is, the sphere of the methodology of teaching foreign languages. The terminology of the discourse we are considering is formed mainly by abstract concepts (methodological categories), therefore, there is a restructuring of the semantics of language units, the necessary adaptation of natural language signs to adequately reflect the recognizable aspect of reality. Due to the fact that methodological categories are highly abstract, metaphor is necessary to explain them. In addition, a feature of methodological discourse is that the subjects of the educational process (teacher and student) have different amounts of scientific knowledge, here there is not such an increase in knowledge, but a transfer of knowledge and experience. Traditionally, practical, general education, educational and developmental goals are distinguished in methodological discourse. In recent years, we have been talking about the strategic goal of training. The essence of the strategic goal is the formation in the process of teaching a secondary linguistic personality, that is, “the level of language proficiency that is inherent in the native speaker (linguistic personality) in terms of opportunities in the process of communication to reflect by means of the language the surrounding reality”⁴⁹.

The term secondary linguistic personality was introduced into scientific circulation by Yu.N. Karaulov (1987) and goes back to the concept of linguistic personality, first used by V.V. Vinogradov (1930). If a language personality is a native speaker, then a secondary linguistic personality is one who speaks a language that is foreign to him. In the

⁴⁸ Schukin A.N. Training in foreign languages. Theory and practice. Moscow, 2010. 476 p..

⁴⁹ Schukin A.N. Training in foreign languages. Theory and practice. Moscow, 2010. 476 p.

structure of the secondary linguistic personality, Yu.N. Karaulov identifies three levels; 1) verbal-semantic (knowledge of the language system and the ability to use it in various situations of communication; 2) cognitive (knowledge of concepts, the ideas, the representations developing in a world picture); 3) pragmatic (the opportunity to realize their goals, motives, interests, assessments in the process of speech activity).

There are different classifications of the description of a methodical discourse: on the basis of a chronological factor (A.A. Mirolyubov, A.N. Schukin, etc.), on the basis of approaches to training in terms of an object to training (language, speech, *rechedeyatel'nostny*), on the basis of approaches in terms of ways of training (direct, conscious, activity), etc. When studying complex, integrative objects such as discourse, a method of polyparadigmatic analysis is used that combines several research paradigms. At the same time, different aspects of the discourse demonstrate the heuristics of each of the research paradigms, as well as the complementarity of the results⁵⁰.

According to M. Fuco, there may be similarities between different discourses, their continuity⁵¹. In our opinion, when compiling the periodization of methodological discourse, you need to take into account several parameters: the purpose of learning, the method of studying the object, psycholinguistic models of mastering the second language, the method of learning, the model of interaction between subjects of the educational process, the model of learning. So, depending on the purpose of training, methodological discourse can be divided into three periods: 1. Language learning period (hereinafter the first period); 2. speech activity training period (hereinafter the second period); 3. Competency formation period (hereinafter the third period).

Proficiency in a foreign language is considered within the framework of a contrasting hypothesis as being under the most direct influence of the first language. The understanding of the essence of the language mastery process is based on the idea that language phenomena that are the same in both languages can be easily learned, and different phenomena cause difficulties and errors. The analysis is made that the process of teaching foreign languages should be based on a thorough

⁵⁰ Alekseeva L.M. Medical discourse: theoretical bases and principles of the analysis. Perm : Publishing house of technical training college, 2002. 200 p.

⁵¹ Foucault M. *Arkheologiya of knowledge*. Kiev, 1996. 208 p.

analysis of linguistic systems of two languages in order to identify similar and different phenomena⁵².

In methodological discourse at this time, the goal of learning is language as a system, while only one method is used, grammatically translated, based on the principle of a conscious approach to learning. This method has existed since ancient times and was widely used in teaching Greek and Latin, and in the XIX century. began to be used in the teaching methodology of other European languages – French, German, English. The teaching was based on the following principles: the main object of learning is grammar, the mastery of which gives an idea of the language system; deduction is considered as the leading method of learning; the main technique for revealing the meaning of lexical units and grammatical forms is verbatim translation, and the way they are stored in memory is memorization; receptive language proficiency is considered as the main task of learning⁵³. The advantages of this method can be considered that students got acquainted with works in the original language, grammar was studied in the context, the native language served as a means of semantization, analysis, elements of comparison and comparison were used. The disadvantages of this method include the following: language training was reduced to the study of its grammatical structure, other aspects of the language, for example, phonetics, received little attention. Since only such forms of work as reading, translation into the native language prevailed in teaching a foreign language, students eventually mastered only such types of speech activities, teaching speech using only the grammar-translation method (there were no others then) became problematic. The first period is characterized by an instrumental model of interaction of subjects of methodological discourse. This model assumes that only the teacher has the knowledge that he must transfer to the student. This model is characterized by an approach in the center of which is the teacher-centered approach⁵⁴.

The trainee within the framework of the model under consideration “plays the role of an” accumulator “of knowledge: at each lesson he is

⁵² Galskova N.D. Modern technique of training in foreign languages: A grant for the teacher. Moscow, 2003. 192 p.

⁵³ Schukin, A.N. Training in foreign languages. Theory and practice. Moscow, 2010. 476 p.

⁵⁴ Kolesnikova I.L., Dolgina O.A. English-Russian terminological reference book on a technique of teaching foreign languages. Cambridge University Press, St. Petersburg Russian-Baltiyekey BLIC information center, 2001. 223 p.

obliged to perceive, remember, reproduce the content of training that is offered to him”⁵⁵.

The educational process is strictly controlled, it is characterized by a monotonous type of lesson and a negative attitude to errors. The presentation, practice, production “presentation – practice – application” or “three P” model is correlated with this model of interaction between participants in the discourse. At the presentation stage, the teacher introduces a new language material (form and value), often repeats, demonstrates, illustrates, shows pictures so that the class understands the meaning of a new lexical unit or grammatical structure. “Practice” involves training in the use of the phenomenon being studied. The following exercises are performed: filling out omissions, adding suggestions, reproducing using various means of clarity, learning short dialogs and others. This process is controlled by the teacher and at first is strictly controlled.

At the third stage, students independently use learned phenomena in speech, and the teacher regulates their activities. In this model, learning is understood as learning knowledge, skills and skills. Currently, this model of the lesson is criticized for its linear nature, the passive role assigned to) D1, and for its orientation towards the teacher⁵⁶.

The model of communication between teacher and student is considered as one-sided. At the beginning of the 20th century, it became necessary to speak a foreign language not only at the level of reading and translating texts, but also at the colloquial level. Consequently, there was a paradigm shift in methodological discourse, and in the second period speech activities began to be taught. Linguistics currently uses a functional approach, stating that the properties of a language cannot be described without referring to the concept of a function, “one of the key functions of a language is considered communicative (language as a means of transmitting information from one person to another)”⁵⁷.

Language mastery is considered within the framework of the “identity” hypothesis, which postulates the universality of all processes of language mastery, regardless of whether it is a native or foreign

⁵⁵ Galskova N.D. Modern technique of training in foreign languages: A grant for the teacher. Moscow, 2003. 192 p.

⁵⁶ Kolesnikova I.L., Dolgina O.A. English-Russian terminological reference book on a technique of teaching foreign languages. Cambridge University Press, St. Petersburg Russian-Baltiyeky BLIC information center, 2001. 223 p.

⁵⁷ Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary / chapter of an edition of V.N. Yartsev. the 2nd prod., additional. Moscow, 2002. 709 p.

language. In accordance with this hypothesis, the process of mastering the language is a process of creative design of the language, during which language phenomena should be learned by the student not in terms of their linguistic significance and systematics, but in accordance with communicative expediency. Errors in the speech of students are recognized as inevitable, since they are considered as a consequence of the influence not of the system of the mother tongue, but of the features of the newly mastered language⁵⁸.

But with the help of the old (grammar-translation method) it was impossible to train speech activities, so first a number of direct methods appear (natural method, audiovisual, audiolingual, oral, the method of relying on physical actions (Total Physical Response)), then situational, communicative, suggestopedic (Lozanov method), the method of “quiet” learning (Gattenative method)⁵⁹.

The direct method of learning was developed in contrast to the grammar-translation method, which did not satisfy the need for communication. Its representatives are M. Berlitz, F. Guen and O. Yespersen. The direct method is based on the idea that teaching a foreign language should imitate mastery of the native language and take place naturally, without specially organized training. The name “direct method” follows from the provision that the meaning of a foreign word, phrase and other units of language should be transmitted to students directly (directly) by creating associations between language forms and their corresponding concepts, which are demonstrated through facial expressions, gestures, actions, subjects, situations of communication. The main provisions of the direct method are, first, the fact that instruction should be carried out only in a foreign language, the native language of the learners, as well as translation from the native language and from a foreign language are completely excluded from the educational process. Secondly, the purpose of training is to form oral speech skills. Of all speech activities, audition and speaking are preferred. Thirdly, the introduction and training of lexical units is carried out orally using periphrase, clarity, demonstration of actions and objects. When introducing words denoting abstract concepts, techniques such as interpretation, antonymic and synonymous pairs, opposition, etc.

⁵⁸ Galskova N.D. Modern technique of training in foreign languages: A grant for the teacher. Moscow, 2003. 192 p.

⁵⁹ Kolesnikova I.L., Dolgina O.A. English-Russian terminological reference book on a technique of teaching foreign languages. Cambridge University Press, St. Petersburg Russian-Baltiyecky BLIC information center, 2001. 223 p.

are used. Fourth, grammar is taught inductively, the use of grammatical rules is not allowed, errors are corrected as students allow them in speech. Finally, the formation of phonetic skills is put forward as one of the tasks of training.

The third period of the development of methodological discourse is correlated with the information model of interaction between subjects of discourse, which requires a teacher of deep knowledge of linguistics, pedagogy, psychology, and language teaching methods. This model is characterized by the autonomy of both the teacher and the student in making decisions, their joint creative activity. This model emphasizes the equality of participants in the process of learning a foreign language. By teaching, the teacher not only informs knowledge, but also improves his professional and personal qualities. With this model of interaction between teacher and student, the ESA learning model (engage, study, activate) is correlated – engagement, study, activation, proposed by J. Harmer. This model involves the motivation of students, the study of language tools and the active use of the studied material in speech. The possibility of such learning is recognized when the lesson is not planned, and in its actions the teacher is guided by what happens in the classroom, and step by step, without any preliminary plan, purely intuitively builds a lesson, the type of which is called “jungle path”.

CONCLUSIONS

The metaphor in the cognitive-discursive paradigm is considered as one of the fundamental techniques, mechanisms of cognition and understanding, categorization and conceptualization of reality, implementing cognitive, communicative and pragmatic functions in the discourse. The cognitive potential of metaphor in scientific cognition lies in the ability of metaphor to provide clarification of the content.

The sides of the target area using the relevant characteristics of the source area. An important result of metaphorization is the verbalization of complex abstract entities, the creation of a speculative image and a visual model not given in the direct observation of the object of cognition, which allows us to consider it as a means of modeling, interpretation and understanding.

In a discourse understood as verbally mediated activity in a special sphere, a concept is formed – cumulative knowledge on a certain problem, which has many ways of mental and verbal representation. Metaphor is considered as one of the ways to represent the concept.

SUMMARY

Conceptualization is a certain way of generalizing human experience that the speaker realizes in a particular utterance. Conceptualization of methodological discourse can be represented by three periods based on several parameters: training purpose, object study method, training method, model interaction of educational process subjects, training model. According to the competence approach, language learning has taken into account the features of real communication, and the basis of the process learning should lie the model of real communication, since possession language system (grammar and vocabulary) is insufficient for effective use of the language for communication purposes. The phenomenon of the secondary language personality, which advanced at the modern stage of the development of methodological discourse in as a strategic objective of foreign language instruction, is a complex cognitive-psychological phenomenon.

References

1. Alekseeva L.M. Medical discourse: theoretical bases and principles of the analysis. Perm : Publishing house of technical training college, 2002. 200 p.
2. Alekseeva L.M. Problems of a term and terminoobrazovaniye. Perm : Publishing house of technical training college, 1998. 120 p.
3. Alekseeva L.M. Term and metaphor: semantic justification of metaphorization. Publishing house of technical training college, 1998. 250 p.
4. Arutyunova N.D. Metaphor and discourse. Theory of a metaphor. Moscow : Progress, 1990. P. 5–32.
5. Arutyunova N.D. Metaphor. LES. Moscow : Soviet encyclopedia, 1990. P. 296–297.
6. Baranov A.N. About types of compatibility of metaphorical models. *Questions of linguistics*. 2003. № 2. P. 73–94.
7. Boldyrev N.N. Cognitive semantics: A course of lectures on the English philology. Tambov : Tamb publishing house state. un-ta, 2000. 172 p.
8. Budayev E.V, Chudinov A.P. A metaphor in a political inter-diskurs. Yekaterinburg, 2006. 208 p.
9. Chenki A. Semantics in cognitive linguistics. Modern American linguistics: the fundamental directions / under the editorship of A.A. Kibrik, I.M. Kobozeva, I.A. Sekerina. Prod. the 2nd. Moscow : Editorial of URSS, 2002.

10. Chudinov A.P. A metaphorical mosaic in modern political communication. Yekaterinburg, 2003. 248 p.
11. Fauconnier G. Conceptual blending and analogy. 1999. URL: <http://www.wam.umd.edu/~mtum/WWW/blending/html>.
12. Fillmore, Ch.J. An Alternative to Checklist Theories of Meaning. *BLS*. 1975. Vol. 1. P. 123–131.
13. Foucault M. *Arkheologiya of knowledge*. Kiev, 1996. 208 p.
14. Galskova N.D. *Modern technique of training in foreign languages: A grant for the teacher*. Moscow, 2003. 192 p.
15. Golovanova E.I. *Introduction to a cognitive terminovedeniye*. Moscow : Science, 2011. 222 p.
16. Grandmother's A.P. *Types of concepts in lexicological and phraseological semantics of language*. Voronezh : Voronezh publishing house state. un-ta, 1996. 104 p.
17. Karaulov Yu.N. *Linguistic designing and thesaurus of the literary language*. Moscow : Science, 1981. 366 p.
18. Karaulov Yu.N., Petrov V.V. *From text grammar to the cognitive theory of a discourse*. Language. Knowledge. Communication. Moscow, 1989. P. 5–11.
19. Kolesnikova I.L., Dolgina O.A. *English-Russian terminological reference book on a technique of teaching foreign languages*. Cambridge University Press, St. Petersburg Russian-Baltiyecky BLIC information center, 2001. 223 p.
20. Krasnykh V.V. *Etnopsikholingvistika and cultural linguistics: course of lectures*. Moscow : ITDGK Gnosis, 2002. 284 p.
21. Kubryakova E.S. *Language and knowledge: On the way to obtaining knowledge about language: Parts of speech from a cognitive point of view. The role of language in the knowledge of the world*. Grew. Academy of Sciences. In-t linguistics, 2004. 42 s.
22. Kubryakova E.S. *Nominative aspect of speech activity*. Moscow : Science, 1986. 156 p.
23. Kubryakova E.S. *Short dictionary of cognitive terms*. Moscow : MSU publishing house, 1996. 248 p.
24. Lakoff J. *Cognitive modeling*. Moscow, 1996. P. 143–184.
25. Lakoff. J. *Metaphors which we live*. Moscow : Editorial of URSS, 2004. 256 p.
26. *Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary / chapter of an edition of V.N. Yartsev. The 2nd prod., additional*. Moscow, 2002. 709 p.
27. *Linguistic modeling: collective monograph*. Tyumen : Bouck's vector, 2009. 186 p.

28. McCormack E. Cognitive theory of a metaphor. Theory of a metaphor. Moscow : Progress, 1990. P. 358–386.
29. Minsk M. Frames for representation of knowledge. Moscow, 1979. P. 152.
30. Minsk M. Ostroumiye and logic of cognitive unconscious. *New in foreign linguistics*. Issue 23. Moscow, 1988. P. 281–309.
31. Mishlanova S.L. A metaphor in a medical discourse. Perm : Publishing house of technical training college, 2002. 160 p.
32. Nemchenko V.M. About a concept of word-formation model. Vocabulary. Terminology. Styles. *Interuniversity collection*. Issue 1. Gorky, 1973. P. 58–67.
33. Popova Z.D. Cognitive linguistics. Moscow : ACT the East – the West, 2007. 314 p.
34. Rakhilina E.V. Cognitive analysis of subject names: semantics and compatibility. Moscow : Russian dictionaries, 2000. 416 p.
35. Ricker P. Metaphorical process as knowledge, imagination and feeling. Theory of a metaphor. Moscow : Progress, 1990. P. 416–434.
36. Schukin A.N. Training in foreign languages. Theory and practice. Moscow, 2010. 476 p.
37. Topazova V.M. Conceptual parameters of semantic abstraction. *Questions of cognitive linguistics*. 2004. № 2–3. P. 178–181.
38. Velichkovsky B.M. Cognitive science. Fundamentals of psychology of knowledge; in 2 t. T. 2. Moscow : Publishing center “Akademiya”, 2006. 432 p.
39. Vorkachev S.G. Methodological bases of a lingvokontseptologiya. Theoretical and applied linguistics. Voronezh. Issue 3: Aspects of metacommunicative activity, 2002. P. 79–95.

Information about the author:

Haieva Polina Oleksandrivna,

Lecturer at the Department of English for Humanities
National Technical University of Ukraine
“Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute”
37, Peremohy avenue, Kyiv, 03056, Ukraine