

# Cognitive metaphor as the background for actualization of evaluative content of concept TERRORISM

O. Zhulavska

Sumy State University

Corresponding author. E-mail: o.gulawskay@gf.sumdu.edu.ua

Paper received 29.08.18; Accepted for publication 05.09.18.

<https://doi.org/10.31174/SEND-Ph2018-177VI52-19>

**Abstract.** The problems of actualization of evaluative content through various kinds of metaphors in concepts in general and in concept TERRORISM are investigated in this article. Great attention is paid to the cognitive metaphors, its main function and duality of their nature is studied in detail. Application of the mapping process for the formation of cognitive metaphors is explained. Language metaphor and its components are studied on the examples of the notions, comprising concept TERRORISM. Ontological metaphors are examined, grounding on the ways of perception of events, actions, emotions, ideas and appealing to the human experience. Researches, proving that this kind of metaphors comprise the major part of TERRORISM metaphors was held.

**Keyword:** *Cognitive metaphor, ontological metaphors, structural metaphors, orientational metaphors, evaluative content, concept TERRORISM, metaphoric mapping, dual nature of metaphors.*

**Introduction.** Figurativeness of the concept is based on the sensory perception of the reality, that is, on the visual, audile, tactile, gustatory and smelling characteristics of the things, phenomena and events, which are depicted in our memory, and on the relevant features of the practical knowledge [13, p.154]. Figurativeness always goes before the notion in the structure of the concept [18, p.13]. “Notional kernel of the concept like the concept nucleus is surrounded by the gas cloud of the different figurative associations both connotative and metaphorical. Connotative because they comprise the difference between the deepness of the logical notion and the idea of the subject domain [3, p.369], their relation to the denotative part of the concept is greatly accidental, and their presence in the semantics is defined by the ethnos “caprice”. Metaphorical because metaphor is the only way to embody the formless and difficult for understanding abstraction into the figurative image” [10, p. 115]. Having agreed to the fact that the figurative information relates to the connotative one, at the same time it must be stressed that very often the source of the connotation is the metaphor itself, which is hidden in the basis of the figuratively motivated nomination: word or phraseological unit [20, p. 144-150].

**Literature review.** Since the antique times metaphor was investigated by the great number of scientists and authors. Starting from Aristotle, who examined metaphor within the bounds of speech form [2], proceeding to the Russian linguists, such as Apresian, Halperin, Shmelev and others, who fixed their attention to the studying of the stylistic functions of metaphors [1; 11; 20]. Semantics and ways of metaphor shift were investigated by the number of both Russian, Ukrainian and foreign scientist, such as Apresian, Arutiunova, Skliarevska, Teliya, Black, Davidson, Kittay, Ortony, Searle and others [1; 4; 7; 8; 12; 19; 24; 30]. To the force of metaphor influence their works devoted such researches as A. Baranov, N. Pavlovich, G. Pocheptsov [5; 16; 17], to its ability to make speech bright and to realize poetic function of speech their works devoted such scientists as V. Vovk, G. Yermolenko and others [9; 13].

Nowadays, the theory of cognitive metaphor becomes much more popular and requires special attention. It was worked out by J. Lakoff in his works “Metaphors we live by”, “The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor” [27; 28]

and by his co-authors M. Johnsons in his works “The Body in the mind: The Bodily basis of meaning, imagination and reason”, “Metaphors we live by” and others [24; 29; 30], M. Turner in his co-works with J.Lakoff “More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic reason” [30], and improved by some other famous researches.

The idea of the cognitive metaphor by J. Lakoff is based on the theory of “linguistic gestalts”. According to this idea, thoughts, perception, processes of cognition, motor activity and speech are organized into categories of typical structures and are called gestalts. Lakoff characterizes these notions quite broadly. According to him: gestalts at the same time are integral and unsuitable for analysis structures; they consist of parts which are impossible to gather in the aggregate; gestalt can be connected to the other internal gestalts or can be opposed to some other gestalt; gestalts can cross; in the gestalts prototypical and non-prototypical features must be distinguished; gestalts are the structures, that are used in speech, intellectual, perceptual and physical and other processes [28, p. 202-251].

**Aim of the research.** The aim of the research is to study the main function of cognitive metaphor, dual nature of cognitive metaphor, the grounding of cognitive metaphor, to study conventional metaphors, which are a kind of cognitive metaphor and their types (ontological, structural, orientational).

**Main results and discussion.** Within the bounds of the cognitive theory metaphor is distinguished as the understanding of one concept through another one; “a kind of conceptualization, cognitive process, that defines and forms new notions, without which it is impossible to receive new knowledge” [32, p. 55]; “fixed in one’s experience reflection of the ideal cognitive model of one sphere in the ideal cognitive model of another sphere” [27, p. 539].

The main function of the cognitive metaphor is to characterize and to describe “complex mental processes”, which are impossible for direct understanding through the images of sense perception [27, p.55].

Metaphor comes forth as one of the most important instruments of the general categorization of the world, taxonomy of the perception of the world and sensory experience. The absence of the metaphor makes impossible self-

cognition and cognition of the world because the assimilation of one part of the reality to another one, distinguishing of one part of conceptual world to understand the other one – is the leading way for creation of multiple concepts, which comprise the unique picture of the world. “Metaphor has the implicit opposition of the routine outlook on world to the special, extraordinary, which reveals individual features of the subject. Metaphor emphasizes the belonging of the subject or of the substance to the kind, to which this subject or substance are not possible to be relates under normal conditions and at the same time it denies any relation of this subject or substance to the kind, to which it really belongs” [3, p.17].

Based on the definitions of the cognitive metaphor it becomes clear that metaphoric model has dual nature, as it is based on the interaction of two mental units. Some literature sources in linguistics give several terms, which define this duality, that is: conceptual referent – conceptual correspondent, significative zone – denotative zone [5, P.166-177], donor zone – recipient zone [19]; target sphere – source sphere [29]. In our research terms “target sphere” / “conceptual referent” are used to define the concept under analysis, and terms “source sphere” / “conceptual correspondent” – to define the concept that is involved in the process of the assimilation.

The target sphere, as a rule, is represented by the abstract, indefinite, vague concept and the source sphere – by definite concept, which comes out as a kind of generalization of the practical experience of the people’s activities. Definite concepts (e.g. living being, human being, tangible object, manipulation object, disease, crime, enemy, auto, fire, etc.) are involved for understanding and interpretation indefinite mental substances [26, P. 16-20]. It relates to the idea of the “embodiment” of cognitive structures, according to which human consciousness is anthropocentrically natured and non-object activity is organized according to the space and time, which are given through the indirect feelings [27; 29].

The fact, that human experience of the existence in the physical and social environment is a natural and logical basis for the understanding of more abstract concepts, is placed in the basis of the unidirectional principle of metaphor [26, 29], according to which definite, sensitive perceptual source sphere, as a rule, does not change place with the indefinite target sphere.

The grounding of the cognitive metaphor is the linguocognitive process of mapping [23; 26, p. 6], which establish difficult systematical relations between the source sphere and target sphere. Metaphorical mapping is distinguished as the process of projecting of the elements of the source sphere on the conceptual elements of the target sphere [26, p. 6; 29, p. 245], during which, the features of the reasoning phenomenon, that are substantial for its understanding from the point of view of the native speakers are highlighted and during the metaphorical correlation they acquire invariant character [28, p. 54].

Metaphorical mapping is an analogues process that is realized by means of three different ways – attributive (feature), relative and situational [6; 23]. Attributive analogues mapping is understood as cognitive process, within which the transference of features, qualities, characteristics, special aspects inherent to the source sphere on the target sphere takes place. Relative analogue mapping is

understood as the process of the transference of the relations, which have cause-and-effect character, because of which in the source and target spheres equal states are distinguished. Situational analogues mapping is distinguished as the transference of situations and actions, that characterize the source sphere on the analogues substances of the target sphere of the metaphorical correlation [6, p. 36-43].

Metaphor is actualized by any language structure that “denotes definite type of objects, subjects, etc” (that is represents the source sphere of metaphor) and is used “to characterize and name another type of objects or subjects” (that is target sphere of metaphor) [4, p. 296].

Four elements take part in the creation of language metaphor, they are: objects of two types (source sphere and target sphere) and properties of each of them while the process of metaphorisation the property of the source sphere (which is the typical and bright characteristic feature of this sphere) is transferred to the target sphere. The carrier of this property can be a subject (function, form, etc), process (manner of action, intensity, and attendant characteristics) or quality (degree or color shade). In accordance with the idea about three ontological categories – category of subjects, category of process, and category of quality – [20, p.44] – they distinguish metaphorical expressions that differ according to the belonging of them to different parts of speech, especially: 1) substantive, which name things and objects of surrounding reality and their attributes; 2) verbal, which name different kinds of activities and appear as a result of compatibility of predicate words; 3) adjective, that name properties of subjects and objects of the surrounding reality; 3) adverbial, that name properties of different types of activities [the same, p.44-45].

It is distinguished conventional or “erased” metaphors and creative, constructive or “alive” image metaphors [29, p. 61].

In the first case the correspondence between the source and target domains is completely conventional in the conceptual system of the speakers [28, p.48]. Conventional metaphors are fixed in the consciousness examples of the conceptual correspondences between the domains, which make the thinking process easier and experience context within the bounds of which abstract concepts and notions can be adjusted to the understanding and correctly understood. The backgrounds of the conventional metaphors constitute culturally fixed ideas about the reality, which are used to comprehend and understand the problematic situations of the surrounding reality. According to G. Lakoff our conceptual system consists of multiple numbers of conventional metaphorical projections, which are as if “integrated” into our commonsense thinking, which are easily actualized in the consciousness of communicators, and which comprise an inherent part of the speakers’ cultural paradigm through which they are literally understood by the members of the speech community. Network of metaphors, which are the basis of the mental process, comprise the cognitive map of the concepts, which is organized to place the abstract notions and new experience in the acknowledged practice of the interaction of the subject with the surrounding reality [29]. Conventional metaphors, based on the repetition and “systematic correlation between the phenomena, fixed in our mental

experience”, comprise the conceptual system of the human.

The level of the conventionality of the metaphoric expression is its' classification index while the realization of the metaphor in discourse and is distinguished relying on such properties of metaphorical expression as: diffuseness and presence in its' semantic common property (statics). These very criteria distribute metaphors into conventional and image metaphors [26, ix; 27, p. 49]. In western linguistic researches conventional metaphoric expressions are distinguished as shared ones and clichéd or well-worn ones [26, p.30]. These are the metaphors, which are well-known for speakers and are widely used by them in speech.

Conventional metaphors are opposed to new – image and creative – metaphors, which represent “new way of understanding of our experience” [29, p. 61] and give “new sense to our past and our everyday life [the same, p.139].

The case study of our research is conventional metaphors of TERRORISM. According to the way of conceptualization conventional metaphors are distributed into ontological, structural and orientation. 1200 metaphorical expressions were analyzed while our research. It was found out that the quantity of ontological metaphors is equal to 816, that is 67% of the whole quality, the quantity of structural metaphors is equal to 264, that comprises 22% from the whole quantity, and the quantity of orientation metaphors is equal to 130, that comprises 11% from the whole quantity.

Ontological metaphors are interpreted as the way of perception of events, actions, emotions, ideas, etc. as well as tangible subjects and things [29, p. 25]. They appeal to the human experience, which relates to the physical objects. Human experience can be comprehended through the objects and substances, what, in its turn gives possibility to “single out some parts of human experience and to interpret them as the discreet substances or homogeneous materials. In case of representation of the human experience as the subjects or substances we can refer on them, unite them into categories, classify them, and establish their quantity and this way think about them. [the same]. According to G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, ontological metaphors penetrate our mind and they are so natural, that they are accepted as the fact as it is [the same, p.28].

According to the Kövečses Z. the cognitive function of ontological metaphors is in “giving existential status of the physical object, substance or package to the diffusive, abstract matters” [26, p.34-35]. By reference to M. Blake the essence of the ontological metaphor is in its significance and conceptualization of the target domain primary by terms of attributive and active properties of source domain [8].

So, it can be stated that through the ontological metaphor takes place the cognition of the abstract (no specified) substance based on its assimilation to the definite material substance, that is present in the physical experience of individual.

Depending on the character of the source (what is it presented by – inanimate or animate creature – plant, animal or human being) ontological metaphors are distributed into objective (for example, IDEAS ARE OBJECTS [25, c. 283]), biomorphic (ABSTRACT

COMPLEX SYSTEMS ARE PLANTS [26, p. 281]), zoomorphic (FIRE IS A HUNGRY ANIMAL [the same, p. 283] and anthropomorphic (TIME IS A THIEF [the same, p. 285]). Taking into consideration the meaning of the prefix bio-, which is of Greece origin, we name all the metaphors, which correlate is an animate creature, biomorphic. Correlates, which represent organisms of the plant origin, we name botanymorphic (botany – science of the physical life of animals [OALD]), and accordingly, on the analogy correlates, which represent animals, we name zoomorphic (zoology – science of the physical life of animals [OALD]).

Most ontological metaphors of concept TERRORISM are represented by verbal free word-combinations, in which the basic component is the name of the concept TERRORISM, for example verbal word-combinations: *to combat / fight / battle against / stand united against / wage a war against / mobilize for a war against / grapple with terrorism* – the general meaning of these word-combinations is fight terrorism; *to defeat / destroy / eradicate / stamp out / root out / push from the face of the world / crack down on / bring an end to / win the war against / to triumph over terrorism* – the general meaning of these word-combinations is to get victory over terrorism, and also *to bow (down) to / yield to / give in to terrorism* – the general meaning of these word-combinations is to subject to terrorism. These examples represent the metaphor-personification (anthropomorphic metaphor) TERRORISM is ENEMY.

Metaphors-personifications (anthropomorphic metaphors) [26, p. 35] are special type of ontological metaphors. Traditionally, in the theory of metaphors, this kind of metaphors is characterized as basic one, because it serves as the mean of cognition by the subject the objects of the surrounding through himself [7, p. 155; 8, p. 35].

From the linguistic point of view metaphor-personification is realized by usage of predicates, that, as a rule, denote actions, processes and states of the person to characterize inanimate substances. So, for example, theory, inflation, computer are inanimate substances (*His theory explained to me the behavior of chickens raised in factories; Inflation is eating up our profits; The computer went dead on me*), but they are given the features of human being, namely: ability to explain, eat and die [26, p. 35]. Thus, the presented above examples demonstrate the realization of the metaphor-personification: INANIMATE PHYSICAL OBJECT (THEORY/ INFLATION/ COMPUTER) is ANIMATE CREATURE (HUMAN BEING).

Metaphors, in which conceptual referent serves as the subject of action are of special interest for the researches. Such metaphors are presented in the following examples. M. Nikitin names such metaphors syntactical. Syntactical metaphors differ from the lexical ones by that that they correlate not with the single denotates from “inventory list”, but with so called “state of events” – events, situations, phenomena, that is, denotates, which interact within the special relations [15, P. 222-236].

Syntactical metaphors are interested in by the fact that they change onomastic model of the sentence. Onomastic model of the sentence comprises the typical structure fields, for fulfilling arguments, defined by the definite predicate. Besides of the meaning of words, which fill this

structure in, it has general syntactic value. Despite the abstractness of the meaning of such structures, the meaning is well-understood by the speakers and is the objective factor of their mental and speaking activity. In case of syntactic metaphors, the outer onomastic model of action [AGENT (theory, inflation, computer) affects PATIENT (definite individuals, their incomes), as a result of which PATIENT transforms into AFFECTIVE (becomes SUCH as a result of caused changes)] corresponds to the deep model of process, in which PATIENT-AFFECTIVE arises as a participant, who is involved in the situation out of control because of absence of the force, that introduces changes, because the introduced changes can be direct result of the action of AGENT, as it is not the living being.

One more special kind of ontological metaphor is the image-scheme CONTAINER / CONTENTS OF CONTAINER. In cognitive linguistics image-scheme is defined as the basic structural unit, that is supported by the sensomotor experience of the person in interconnection with physical world, which is gestalt-structured [24, p. 75] and is applied for the conceptualization of more complicated cognitive structures. It is organized in recurrent dynamic model of perception processes and motor programs, that give coherence and structure to our experience [24; 30].

Structural metaphors “give opportunity to apply one highly structured and clearly isolated notion to structure another one” [29, p. 61]. Based on structural metaphor conceptualization of abstract entity takes place within the frame of natural experience in the sphere, that is quite familiar for native speakers (WAR, GAME, BUSINESS). Moreover, the target source, as a rule has more complicated structure, including several objects, which depict various aspects [26, p. 33-34; 29, p. 14-16]. So, for example, metaphor WAR implies ENEMY, ARMY, WAR ACTIONS, REARWARD AREA, FRONT LINE, etc.

In the analyzed British newspaper discourse, both structural and ontological metaphors are realized, in general, through the verbal word-combinations, though their

number is not so numerous. For example, word-combination *to be a recruiting agent for terrorism* actualizes metaphor TERRORISM IS ARMY, and *to have a degree in terrorism* – actualizes metaphor TERRORISM IS EDUCATION.

Oriental metaphors “give the concept space orientation” [29, p. 14] based on opposition “up – down” (CONSCIOUS IS UP – UNCONSCIOUS IS DOWN), “ahead-behind” (FUTURE EVENTS ARE AHEAD – PAST EVENTS ARE BEHIND) etc. [the same, p. 15]. In the researched discourse orientational metaphors, as a rule, interact with ontological ones, reflecting space coordinates of objects. For example, *to live under tyranny* presents TERRORISM as a material object, located over the human being, pressing on him/her. The position “under” is associated in English-speaking culture with negative connotation.

**Conclusion.** To conclude it can be said that the main function of the cognitive metaphor is to characterize and to describe “complex mental processes”, which are impossible for direct understanding through the images of sense perception. General categorization of the world, taxonomy of the perception of the world and sensory experience is not possible without metaphors. Metaphoric model has dual nature, as it is based on the interaction of two mental units. The grounding of the cognitive metaphor is the linguocognitive process of mapping, which establish difficult systematical relations between the source sphere and target sphere. Metaphors are distributed into conventional or “erased” metaphors and creative, constructive or “alive” image metaphors. The level of the conventionality of the metaphoric expression is its’ classification index while the realization of the metaphor in discourse and is distinguished relying on such properties of metaphorical expression as: diffuseness and presence in its’ semantic common property (statics). Ontological metaphors are interpreted as the way of perception of events, actions, emotions, ideas, etc. as well as tangible subjects and things.

#### ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Апресян Ю. Д. Образ человека по данным языка: попытка системного описания. // Вопросы языкознания. 1995. № 1. С. 37-67.
2. Аристотель. Поэтика. Риторика [пер. с греч. В. Аппельрот, Н. Платонова; вступ. ст., коммент. С. Ю. Трохачев]. СПб.: Азбука, 2000. 348 с.
3. Арутюнова Н. Д. Типы языковых значений: Оценка. Событие. Факт. М.: Наука. 1988. 341 с.
4. Арутюнова Н. Д. Метафора и дискурс. // Теория метафоры: сб.; [пер. с англ., нем., исп., польск. яз.] [Вступ. ст. и сост. Н. Д. Арутюновой; общ. ред. Н. Д. Арутюновой и М. А. Журиной]. М.: Прогресс. 1990. С. 5-32.
5. Баранов А. Н. Политическая аргументация и ценностные структуры общественного сознания. // Язык и социальное познание. – М.: Центр. сов. филос. (методол.) семинаров при Президиуме АН СССР. 1990. С. 166-177.
6. Белехова Л. И. Глосарий з когнитивної поетики. Херсон: Айлант, 2004. – 124 с.
7. Блек М. Метафора. Теория метафоры: сб. [пер. с англ., нем., исп., польск. яз.] / [Вступ. ст. и сост. Н. Д. Арутюновой; общ. ред. Н. Д. Арутюновой и М. А. Журиной]. – М.: Прогресс. 1990. С. 153-172.
8. Блек М. Метафора URL: <http://metaphor.narod.niMackmain.htm>.
9. Вовк В. Н. Языковая метафора в художественной речи: природа вторичной номинации. К.: Наукова думка, 1986. 142 с.
10. Воркачев С. Г. Счастье как лингвокультурный концепт. М.: ИТДГК “Гнозис”. 2004. 236 с.
11. Гальперин И. Р. Очерки по стилистике английского языка. М.: Изд-во лит-ры на иностр. яз. 1958. 459 с.
12. Дэвидсон Д. Что означают метафоры // Теория метафоры: сб. М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 173-194.
13. Ермоленко Г. А. Метафора в языке философии: автореф. дис. на соискание уч. степени канд. филос. наук: спец. 09.00.01 “Онтология и теория познания” Краснодар. 2001. 22 с.
14. Карасик В. И. Языковой круг: Личность, концепты, дискурс Волгоград: Перемена. 2002. 477 с.
15. Никитин М. В. Лексическое значение в слове и словосочетании. Владимир: ВГУ. 1974. 127 с.
16. Павлович Н. Язык образов: парадигмы образов в русском поэтическом языке М.: Азбуковник. 1995. 496 с.
17. Почепцов Г. Г. (мол.) Теория комунікації. К.: Наукова думка. 1996. 175 с.
18. Рахилина Е. В. О тенденциях развития когнитивной

- семантики // Известия РАН. Сер. лит. и яз. 2000. Т. 59. № 3. С. 3-15.
19. Слышкин Г. Г. От текста к символу: Лингвокультурные концепты прецедентных текстов в сознании и дискурсе М.: Academia. 2000. 128 с.
  20. Телия В. Н. Метафоризация и ее роль в создании языковой картины мира // Роль человеческого фактора в языке. Язык и картина мира. М.: Наука, 1988. – С. 173-205.
  21. Телия В. Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты М.: Языки русской культуры. 1996. 288 с.
  22. Шмелев Д. Н. Современный русский язык. Лексика. М.: Просвещение. 1977. 335 с.
  23. Freeman M. H. Cognitive mapping in literary analysis // Style. 2002. № 36 (3). P. 466-483.
  24. Johnson M. The Body in the mind: The Bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason. Chicago: Un-ty of Chicago Press. 1987. 234 p.
  25. Kittay E. Metaphor: Its cognitive force and linguistic structure. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1987. 358 p.
  26. Kövecses Z. Metaphor: A practical introduction in cognitive linguistics. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press. 2002. – 304 p.
  27. Lakoff G. Women, fire and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind Chicago: Un-ty of Chicago Press. 1987. 614 p.
  28. Lakoff G. The Contemporary theory of metaphor // Metaphor and thought. Cambridge Un-ty Press. 1994. С. 202-251.
  29. Lakoff G. Metaphors we live by. Chicago Un-ty Press. 1980. 242 p.
  30. Lakoff G. Philosophy in the flesh: the embodied mind and its challenge to western thought. N. Y.: Basic Books. 1999. 602 p.
  31. Ortony A. Beyond literal similarity // Psychological review. 1979. № 86. P. 161-180.
  32. Я БЭС = Языкознание. Большой энциклопедический словарь / [под общей ред. В. Н. Ярцевой]. М.: Большая Российская Энциклопедия. 1998. 685 с.
  33. OALD = Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. [ed. by S. Wehmeier]. [Seventh Edition]. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2005. 1780 p.

#### REFERENCES

1. Apresian Y. D. Image of the person according to the language data: attempt of systematical description. // Voprosy Yazikoznaniia. 1995. № 1. P. 37-67.
2. Ariatotel. Poetics. Rhetorics. [tr. From Gr. V. Appelrot, N. Platonova; vstup. stat. koment. S. Trokhachov]. SPb.: Azbuka. 2000. 348 p.
3. Arutiunova N. D. Types of language meanings: Evaluation. Event. Fact. M.: Nauka. 1988. 341 p.
4. Arutiunova N. D. Metaphor and discourse. // Teoriia metafory: sb. [tr. From Engl., Germ., Sp., Pol. L-es.] M.: Progress. 1990. P. 5-32.
5. Baranov A. N/. Political argumentation and evaluative structures of public conscience. // Yazik i socialnoye poznaniye. – M.: Centr sov. pfilisos. (metodol.) seminarov pri Prezidiume AN SSSR pri Prezidiume AN SSSR. 1990. P. 166-177.
6. Belexhova L. I. Glossary on cognitive poetics. Kherson: Ailant, 2004. – 124 p.
7. Black M. Metaphor. // Teoriya metafory: sb. [tr. From Engl., Germ., Sp., Pol. l-es.]. M.: Progress. 1990. P. 153-172.
8. Black M. Metaphor. URL: <http://metaphor.narod.niMackmain.htm>.
9. Vovk V. N. Language metaphor in the literary speech: nature of the secondary nomination. K.: Naukova Dumka 1986. 142 p.
10. Vorkachev S.G. Happiness as linguocultural concept. M.: ITDGG "Gnozis". 2004. 236 p.
11. Halperin I. R. Essays on English stylistics. M.: Izd-vo lit-ry na inoz. yaz. 1958. 459 p.
12. Davidson D. What metaphors mean // Teoriya metafory: sb. M.: Progress, 1990. – P. 173-194.
13. Yermolenko G. A. Metaphor in the philosophy language: abstract of a thesis: spec. 09.00.01 "Ontologiya i teoriya poznaniya" Krasnodar. 2001. 22 p.
14. Karasik V. I. Language circle: Personalities, concepts, discourse. Volgograd: Peremena. 2002. 477 p.
15. Nikitin M. V. Lexical meaning in the word and word-combination. Vladimir: VGU. 1974. 127 p.
16. Pavlovich N. Language of images: paradigms of images in Russian discourse. M.: Azbukovnik. 1995. 496 p.
17. Pocheptsov G. G. (jr.) Theory of communication. K.: Naukova dumka. 1996. 175 p.
18. Rakhilina Y. V. About trends in development of cognitive linguistics // Izvestija RAN. Ser. lit i yiaz. 2000. V. 59. № 3. P. 3-15.
19. Slishkin G. G. From text to symbol: Linguocultural concepts of the precedent texts in conscience and discourse. M.: Academia. 2000. 128 p.
20. Teliya V. N. Metaphorization and its role in creation of the language picture of the world // Rol; cheloveceskogo factore v yiazike. Yiazik i kartina mira. M.: Nauka. 1988. – P. 173-205.
21. Teliya Russian phraseology. Semantic, pragmatic and linguocultural aspects. M.: Yaziki ruskoioy kultury. 1996. 288 p.
22. Shmelev D.N. Contemporary Russian language. Leksika: M.: Prosvescheniie. 1977. 335 p.
23. Freeman M. H. Cognitive mapping in literary analysis // Style. 2002. № 36 (3). P. 466-483.
24. Johnson M. The Body in the mind: The Bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason. Chicago: Un-ty of Chicago Press. 1987. 234 p.
25. Kittay E. Metaphor: Its cognitive force and linguistic structure. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1987. 358 p.
26. Kövecses Z. Metaphor: A practical introduction in cognitive linguistics. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press. 2002. – 304 p.
27. Lakoff G. Women, fire and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind Chicago: Un-ty of Chicago Press. 1987. 614 p.
28. Lakoff G. The Contemporary theory of metaphor // Metaphor and thought. Cambridge Un-ty Press. 1994. С. 202-251.
29. Lakoff G. Metaphors we live by. Chicago Un-ty Press. 1980. 242 p.
30. Lakoff G. Philosophy in the flesh: the embodied mind and its challenge to western thought. N. Y.: Basic Books. 1999. 602 p.
31. Ortony A. Beyond literal similarity // Psychological review. 1979. № 86. P. 161-180.
32. Я БЭС = Linguistics. Big encyclopedic dictionary / [pod obsch. red.. V.N. Yartsevoiy]. M.: Bolshayia Rossiyskaya Entsyclopediyia. 1998. 685 .
33. OALD = Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. [ed. by S. Wehmeier]. [Seventh Edition]. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2005. 1780 p.