

Received: February 2023 Accepted: March 2023

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.58262/ks.v11i2.440>

Cognitive Metaphor as a Phenomenon of Reality Conceptualisation

Duisekova Kulyash¹, Zagidullina Aliya², Bakitov Aitkali³, Nurkenova Saule⁴, Ospanova Zhanna⁵

Abstract

This work is devoted to the study of the processes of conceptualization of reality and linguistic ways of expressing its state. The central place in the work occupied by the conceptual (cognitive) metaphor, which expresses the reality of the picture of the world, and related to it. The research carried out on the material of the English language. The relevance of the study is due to the prevalence of the cognitive metaphor in modern English-language discourse as a popular means of linguistic creativity. The relatively limited number of studies of the cognitive metaphor and, in particular, its subspecies - malaphor, which is a hybrid of two or more idiomatic expressions, in which there is a change or addition of the values of the components constituting malaphor, as well as the ambiguity of the interpretation of the cognitive metaphor indicates the need for special studies of this phenomenon. In addition, it seems necessary to study the possibility of identifying some patterns of mental processes based on the material of cognitive metaphor. The object of the research is monomodal and multimodal cognitive metaphors, which are occasional or purposefully created formations that constantly replenish the vocabulary of modern English. The aim of the work is to study the linguo-cognitive mechanisms of the formation of the meaning of metaphors in the process of interaction of their constituent initial components and to identify the functions of metaphors in the process of conceptualizing reality in modern discourse in English.

Key words: *cognitive, metaphor, phenomenon, reality, conceptualization*

Introduction

Researchers (Candland, 2003) distinguish two approaches to learning and understanding. J. Lakoff and M. Johnson in their work "Metaphors we live by" (Lakoff, Johnson, 1980) noted that emotions are almost never expressed directly, but are always likened to something. A. Vezhbitskaya also says that feelings can be described only through assimilation (Wierzbicka, 1986), and the most acceptable description is their description through metaphors. Conceptual metaphor occupies a special place in the cognitive theory of language. J. Lakoff, and M. Johnson (Lakoff, Johnson 1980) believe that linguistic means of expression are highly metaphorical, and define conceptual metaphor as one of the main mental operations, as a way of knowing, structuring and conceptualizing the world around us. This point of view can be found in other authors (Baldauf 1997; Jäkel 1997; Kövecses 2002; Liebert 1992). Cognitive

¹ Doctor of Philology, Professor, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Satpayev str.,2, 010008 Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan

² Doctor of Philology, Professor, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages, Muratbaev str., 200, 050022, Almaty, Kazakhstan

³ Candidate of Philology, Acting Professor Al-Farabi Kazakh National University 71, al-Farabi avenue, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan, 050040

⁴ Candidate of Philology, Acting Professor L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Satpayev str.,2, 010008 Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan

<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5590-7035>

⁵ Phd, Associate Professor The Eurasian Humanities Institute, M.Zhumabayev prospect 4, 010009 Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan

linguistics, studying metaphors as conceptual metaphors, emphasizes their essence as a cognitive mechanism for establishing connections between conceptual structures related to different areas of knowledge. One and the same phraseological unit can be correlated with several conceptual metaphors, which indicates the productivity of the model. So, phraseological units to fall into despondency or in seventh heaven with happiness can be attributed both to the manifestation of the metaphor "emotional states are different territories" and to the manifestation of a cognitive metaphor with the opposition "good is the top, bad is the bottom." In a number of works (Lakoff, Johnson 1990; Kovecses 2003), touching upon the problem of the universality of emotions in different languages, the issue of conceptual metaphors was studied using the example of metaphor. A number of phraseological expressions, which are manifestations of this metaphor, and all kinds of projections included in its structure, were also considered. The research was carried out on the material of the American version of the English language. The linguistic implementation of the metaphor was also illustrated on the material of other languages, from which it was concluded that it is universal. The cognitive metaphor as several (two or more) logically incompatible metaphors in close proximity in the text (in one expression or sentence) was first recorded in the works of the 17th century, however, until the second half of the 20th century, this linguistic phenomenon was deliberately ignored, being considered a mistake of the speaker ... The development of the cognitive direction in linguistics since the middle of the last century has changed the attitude of scientists to this phenomenon, providing the necessary cognitive tools for studying metaphor, which made it possible to integrate it into the general problematic field of metaphorical research. In addition, cognitive linguistics focuses not only on the familiar uses of linguistic units, but also on deviations from the rules, errors and slips. Their analysis makes it possible to reveal the patterns of the thought process reflected in the language, and in the case of purposeful deviation, to touch upon the patterns of linguistic creation. Conventional metaphors (e.g., a firm grasp on an idea) are extremely common. A possible explanation for their ubiquity is that they are more engaging, evoking more focused attention, than their literal paraphrases (e.g., a good understanding of an idea). To evaluate whether, when, and why this may be true, we created a new database of 180 English sentences consisting of conventional metaphors, literal paraphrases, and concrete descriptions (e.g., a firm grip on a doorknob). Extensive norming matched differences across sentence types in complexity, plausibility, emotional valence, intensity, and familiarity of the key phrases (Mon, Serena & Nencheva, Mira & Citron, Francesca & Lew-Williams, Casey & Goldberg, Adele, 2021) It should be noted that some studies of metaphor are carried out on large corpora (such as British National Corpus, Bank of English Corpus, iWeb, etc.), and when a researcher is interested in analyzing metaphors in certain types of discourse, special corpora are created for these purposes. that include a limited number of texts of certain genres. But since a cognitive metaphor is, in the overwhelming majority of cases, phraseological occasionalism, one should not expect a high or any frequency of its appearance in the corpus. However, the enclosures have a high potential for studying the phenomenon of metaphor, and further corpus research in the field of metaphor and other occasional formations will be based mainly on corpus data obtained in the future using more modern technologies. Metaphors influence how people think about the topics they describe by shaping how people attend to, remember, and process information. The effects of metaphor on reasoning are not simply the result of lexical priming. Metaphors can covertly influence how people think. That is, people are not always aware that they have influenced by a metaphor (Thibodeau, P., Hendricks, R. K., & Boroditsky, L., 2017). The way we talk about complex and abstract ideas is suffused with metaphor. In five experiments, we explore how these metaphors influence the way that we reason about complex issues and forage for further information

about them. We find that even the subtlest instantiation of a metaphor (via a single word) can have a powerful influence over how people attempt to solve social problems like crime and how they gather information to make "well-informed" decisions. Interestingly, we find that the influence of the metaphorical framing effect is covert: people do not recognize metaphors as influential in their decisions; instead they point to more "substantive" (often numerical) information as the motivation for their problemsolving decision. Metaphors in language appear to instantiate frame-consistent knowledge structures and invite structurally consistent inferences. Far from being mere rhetorical flourishes, metaphors have profound influences on how we conceptualize and act with respect to important societal issues. This study is devoted to the study of the role and features of cognitive metaphor as a linguo-cognitive phenomenon in modern English. The interpretation of metaphors in various forms of philosophical knowledge (such as emerging, mature, scientific, non-scientific, classical and non-classical philosophy) naturally had its own specifics inherent in each form of philosophizing, but there is no doubt that the metaphor has been used for many centuries by the "mother of all Sciences" philosophy as one of the essential linguistic means (Thibodeau, P. H., and Boroditsky, L.,2011; Stedman et al., 2023).

Methodology

Research Methods

The method of conceptual analysis (three-level analysis of metaphors), the method of linguo-pragmatic analysis, the method of discourse analysis, the method of analyzing the process of integration (construction) of mental spaces, the method of frame analysis. More than 400 examples of metaphors selected by the method of continuous sampling from English-language print and Internet resources (political and sports reviews, radio broadcasts, TV series, films, social networks Facebook and Instagram, talk shows, stand-up shows, newspapers, magazines) as well as visual corpora VisMet.org and Google Image. The research was carried out using such modern cognitive-oriented methods for the study of cognitive metaphors as the method of conceptual integration (J. Fauconnier, M. Turner, O. K. Iriskhanova), the method of frame analysis by C. Fillmore and the theory of conceptual metaphor by D. Lakoff and M Johnson. These methods consider the phenomenon of metaphor from a cognitive point of view as a manifestation of linguistic creativity and allow us to identify the pragmatic features of its functioning. The study analyzes the factors of overcoming cognitive dissonance, which is a consequence of the use of metaphor in discourse, using the theory of "modules of understanding", and also conducts a linguo-cognitive experiment for the empirical study of this phenomenon.

Discussion

Cognitive metaphor is a structurally and semantic complex linguistic phenomenon in English, which is the result of the manifestation of the linguistic creativity of the discourse participant (in cases where it is not a slip of the tongue / speech error). a cognitive metaphor has individual cognitive characteristics and is a special unit of communication in which the constituent components interact simultaneously at the linguistic, conceptual and pragmatic levels. This is a special linguo-cognitive phenomenon that is a pragmatically loaded element of discourse and is difficult to understand. In the course of interpreting the meaning of a cognitive metaphor, the following basic cognitive operations are involved: focusing and defocusing attention,

compressing information, integrating the meanings of the constituent components of a cognitive metaphor, overcoming cognitive dissonance. A linguo-cognitive experiment conducted in the framework of this study with the participation of 120 recipients from 35 countries (of which 50 were native speakers of English) made it possible to determine that the level of cognitive dissonance arising in a recipient when faced with a cognitive metaphor in discourses is often unpredictable and depends on many factors: the individual characteristics of the recipient, the level of the effect of disappointed expectations, knowledge of the meaning of the components that make up the expression, the belonging of the original frames to the same linguo-cognitive area, etc. Dissonance of the cognitive metaphor depends mainly on the following factors: the keys to deciphering the cognitive metaphor must be unambiguous; the gestalt similarity of objects / images should be recognizable and prototypical for the linguistic culture in which the cognitive metaphor is reproduced; the recipient's inference of all metaphorical and metonymic transferences that take place in the cognitive metaphor must be successful; the amount of background knowledge required should not exceed the threshold of acceptability for a non-specialist in the field. Cognitive metaphors can be presented in verbal-visual form. Verbal-visual (multimodal) cognitive metaphors in English have the following features: the presence of extralinguistic modalities, their purposeful use by the author, etc. One of the fundamental linguo-cognitive processes of structuring the meaning of CT is conceptual integration. Processes conceptual integration / opposition are implemented in KM according to two models: "Integration model", which is based on the process of conceptual integration and has two subspecies (an integration model based on strengthening the value of KM, and an integration model based on combining values in KM); and the "opposition model", which is based on the conceptual opposition process. The main factors of "success" of a cognitive metaphor are the compatibility of metaphorical images; correspondence of the components of a cognitive metaphor to a certain matrix, i.e. lexical and grammatical construction at the external level of a specific expression; individual human capacity for synesthetic perception of the world. For this study, we will consider the following options for juxtaposing metaphorical constructions as a cognitive metaphor: a) two or more metaphors that are in close proximity in discourse (in the same or different modalities), but provoke a certain dissonance in its perception due to their contradiction, inconsistency, the possibility of dual perception. For example, two metaphors that have a single target domain (LIFE), but different source domains (JOURNEY BY WATER vs JOURNEY BY LAND), for example, as in the title of the article: National park visitors leave roadkill in their wake (USA Today URL), where wake (wake) can be left only by water transport, and roadkill (death of an animal as a result of a collision with a vehicle on the road) - only land vehicles. b) two or more idioms combined into one metaphor, or malaphor, for example, It's not rocket surgery (English Urban Dictionary URL). Cognitive metaphors differ in a variety of forms, and in this study we will try to offer several ways of classifying them (Taimur, 2020). 1. Classification by modality. Cognitive metaphors are subdivided into monomodal and multimodal (for example, verbal and verbal-graphic, respectively). 2. Classification according to the degree of success. Cognitive metaphors are divided into successful and unsuccessful (understandable / incomprehensible, and, accordingly, do not cause / cause discomfort in the addressee, provoking a possible breakdown of the communicative act). 3. Classification by domain coincidence. a) the components that make up the cognitive metaphor have a common target domain, but have different source domains. For example, We aren't going to throw in the white flag (ABC URL) where the target domain (surrender) is the same but the source domains are different (to throw in the towel and to wave the white flag. White flag)); b) the components that make up the cognitive metaphor have a common source domain, but have different target domains. For example, in a cognitive

metaphor, Don't put all your chickens in one basket before they've hatched, the source domain (hindsight) is one. At the same time, the target domain-1 is don't put all your eggs in one basket (keeping your resources in one place); target domain-2 is don't count your chickens before they hatch and they are different. c) The components that make up the cognitive metaphor have different source and target domains. For example, Killing a bird in the hand is worth two with one stone [Reddit. Malaphors: The art of blending phrases. URL]. A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush and to kill two birds with one stone are idioms with different domains. 4. Classification by structure. a) Complex cognitive metaphor or conduit cognitive metaphor; b) compound cognitive metaphor; c) extended cognitive metaphor (conceit or megametaphor); d) Malaphor or metaphor blend. A complex cognitive metaphor or conduit cognitive metaphor is a cognitive metaphor in which literal meaning is expressed by more than one figurative term or a combination of primary metaphors (Nordquist, 2019), i.e. it is a multi-layered cognitive metaphor in which one metaphor is used as the basis and other metaphors are formed on the same basis. They can be described as telescopic blended metaphors because they contain "Layered" sequence of projections between domains (cross-domain mapping) (Golubkova, 2019); those. "Complex metaphors are based on simple ones, which are in turn based on tight, local correlations in experience" (Kövecses, 2005). An example of a complex cognitive metaphor is the phrase of the British politician D. Burroughs in an interview with the Independent, describing his attitude to same-sex marriage: It would open up a can of worms and a legal minefield about freedom, religion and equalities legislation ... It may open up old wounds and put people into the trenches; no one wants that (Grice, 2012). The Conservative Party tried to thwart David Cameron's plan to legalize same-sex marriage, and David Burroughs tried to warn the Prime Minister of the negative consequences of his decision on Britain and its people. The phrase can be translated as "This will lead to a huge number of problems, incl. at the level of legislation in the field of freedom, religion and equality ... This may open old wounds and lead to war, which no one wants. " The cognitive metaphor used by Burroughs, who strives to be expressive, is built on the phrasal verb to open up, which is the basis of the cognitive metaphor. He combines it with three different ideas - the idiom to open up a can of worms (to create a complex situation in which any action taken to solve the problem leads to even more problems), the metaphor to open up a legal minefield (where minefield is a situation or object that is very complex and full of hidden problems and dangers) and a stable expression to open up old wounds (Merriam Webster Dictionary URL). This cognitive metaphor is built on the stylistic device of Zeugma (a figure of speech characterized by a violation of the semantic agreement of grammatically homogeneous components that join a nuclear word) (ABBY Lingvo European Dictionary). Despite the fact that the components of a cognitive metaphor are associated with different semantic fields, they all have the same meaning of "complicate the situation." This is, in our opinion, the reason for the "success" of the cognitive metaphor. Another example of a complex metaphor is the expression Anger is hot fluid in a container (Lakoff, Johnson, 1980). It combines at least three simple metaphors of intensity, which are layered components of a complex cognitive metaphor - heat, quantity and speed. An example of a complex cognitive metaphor can also be considered the phrase of business consultant P. Drucker, vividly describing his opinion about attempts to predict the future, which uses a combination of the original domains UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING and LIFE IS A JOURNEY, which is unusual for the English language: Trying to predict the future is like trying to drive down a country road at night with no lights while looking out the back window. In English-language discourse, the concept LIFE IS A JOURNEY means moving forward when the future is unknown (since a person remembers the past, but does not know what lies ahead). If a metaphor belonging to this domain is combined with a metaphor from the

UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING domain, the resulting metaphor becomes cognitive, since moving forward while watching what is happening from behind is extremely unusual for everyday human experience. However, it does a good job of describing the dangers of trying to predict the future. As another example, consider the complex cognitive metaphor It's difficult to get that idea across to her as it's hard to put my idea into words (Lakoff, Johnson 1980), which presents a layer-by-layer sequence of projections between source domains: IDEAS ARE OBJECTS, WORDS ARE CONTAINERS, COMMUNICATION IS SENDING. Followed by Sullivan, we note that if two metaphors referring to different source domains occur in the same sentence, they will not necessarily be considered a cognitive metaphor. For example, John was feeling down but he staggered forward with his life (Sullivan, 2018). It uses the metaphors to feel down (HAPPY IS UP) and to stagger forward with one's life (LIFE IS A JOURNEY), and the likelihood of both their confusion and the emergence of new cognitive connections between them is small in this situation. However, in John's proposal was staggered up out of his depression, where the source domains are cognitive, the common source domain becomes ACHIEVING A HAPPIER LIFE IS JOURNEYING UPWARDS, which adds additional semantic meanings not found in the original metaphors (such as "moving up requires effort, ie John is working hard to become happier "; "the opposite direction leads downward ", ie if John turns around and starts to move back, his depression will intensify"). Each of the possible conclusions made on the basis of additional meanings can be useful for the logical construction of a train of thought during communication, making it more successful. A compound cognitive metaphor consists of several successive parts. Numerous adverbs and adjectives can be used to attract the attention of the recipient in a compound cognitive metaphor, and each part in a compound metaphor can be used to denote an additional element of meaning (Simple English Wikipedia URL). An example of a compound cognitive metaphor is the phrase I don't like it. When you open that Pandora's box, you will find it full of Trojan horses [Independent 1948]. Ernest Bevin, Britain's Foreign Secretary for Labor, used this metaphor to criticize the creation of the Council of Europe. He tries to be eloquent and uses two famous idioms from Greek mythology, used consistently. Open the Pandora's box means "to do or start something that will cause a lot of problems in the future", while a Trojan horse) means "someone or something who / what intends to defeat you or spoil the situation from the inside, usually by deceitful means." Another example is the phrase of the famous singer and actress Cher: I've been up and down so many times that I feel as if I'm in a revolving door. The celebrity obviously describes the ups and downs in a career (ups and downs - STATUS IS VERTICALITY) and variable progress (revolving door - LIFE IS A JOURNEY). In composite cognitive metaphors, dead metaphors often "come to life" and again acquire metaphorical meaning, for example, That task was so hard I couldn't make a dent in it (Sullivan, 2018). Here the long-worn historical metaphor of DIFFICULTY IS HARDNESS "wakes up" again ("wakes up" in C. Muller's terminology), because physical hardness protects surfaces from dents and other damage. Another example of a compound metaphor can be borrowed from Shakespeare's Macbeth [Poetry Foundation URL], where in the same episode he describes life as a journey (LIFE IS A JOURNEY), as speech (LIFE IS A SPEECH), as a candle (LIFE IS A CANDLE) like a shadow (LIFE IS A SHADOW), as an actor (LIFE IS AN ACTOR) and as a story (LIFE IS A STORY): Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow, Creeps in this petty pace from day to day, To the last syllable of recorded time; And all our yesterdays have lighted fools The way to dusty death. Out, out, brief candle! Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player, That struts and frets his hour upon the stage, And then is heard no more. It is a tale Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, Signifying nothing. Composite cognitive metaphors make it possible to describe almost any processes that exist in the conceptual picture of a person.

Fleming and Pine believe that "new ideas come into this world like falling meteors, with a flash and explosion, and possibly breaking through the roof of someone's castle" [Fleming, Payne 1988: 92]. Here, the original domain UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING allows ideas to be described as sources of light (like light bulbs or meteors). The meaning of this cognitive metaphor is complemented by the fact that innovative ideas can bring destruction, as sometimes happens with meteorites falling to the ground, and the idea of destroying the theory is subordinated to the original domain THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS. Interestingly, here meteorites do not destroy the first roof they come across, but the roof of the castle, associated with established, durable, strong beliefs, which is an additional conceptual element that arose as a result of the interaction of the two original domains. It can thus be summarized that cognitive metaphors are practically indispensable for describing concepts that cannot be seen or touched, but which are "integral to some of the cleverest, most insightful and most famous writing in the English language" (are an integral part of some of the most highly intelligent, most instructive and most famous works in English) (Sullivan, 2018). Such cognitive metaphors are popular in political discourse as well. Trump's lobby description, for example, is an example of a compound cognitive metaphor: Outside this 1980s-chic aquarium, cable news has become a dog pack chasing the brightly colored balls that Mr. Trump throws in every direction (outside of this swanky 1980s aquarium, the cable news has become a pack of dogs, chasing brightly colored balls that Mr. Trump throws in all directions) [Poniewozik 2016]. Here the press is unflatteringly described using metaphors belonging to the original domains LIFE IS A JOURNEY (dogs running in different directions, do not achieve their goals) and ACHIEVING A PURPOSE IS OBTAINING A DESIRED OBJECT (colored balls seem to be important goals, but in reality they are completely unimportant). Extended or conceit cognitive metaphor / megametaphor is essentially a type of cognitive metaphor, close to the term "Compound cognitive metaphor", which exists on a longer segment of the narrative - a poem, a story, a paragraph (Golubkova, 2019). A. Naciscione notes that in the process of constructing a cognitive metaphor of this type, interaction and mixing of many stylistic processes often take place - euphemization, irony, metonymy, pun, hyperbole, personification, which make an important contribution to the expansion of the metaphor (Naciscione, 2016). An example of such a cognitive metaphor "smeared" in the text is the phrase by M. Chrusostomu We're like the canary down the mine. We're the first people who pick up what's going on out there and what we're seeing at the moment is a boiling pot whose lid is coming off (We're like a canary in a mine. We're the first people to understand what's going on there, and what we see at the moment is a boiling cauldron, the lid of which is about to fly off). Markos Chrysostomou of the Haringey Citizens Advice Bureau used this cognitive metaphor to describe the decline in homelessness at the Highway Home. In English, the idiom "to be a canary in the mine" means "Unwittingly being used in some dangerous experiment, being susceptible to danger." Previously, miners carried a canary cage with them into the mines, and when dangerous gases formed in the mine, the bird was the first to suffocate, thereby serving as a warning to the miners to immediately leave the underground. Another metaphor ("boiling pot") refers to the conceptual field of "kitchen", "cooking". At first glance, it makes sense that when the pot boils, the canaries will warn the miners. However, the boiler cannot boil in the mine, as it is dangerous to use gas there, and any use of gas can cause an explosion. Those. these two metaphors should not be used in parallel, as the constituent parts of the metaphor contradict each other. Usually the reason for the emergence of an extended cognitive metaphor is the similarity of the meanings of its metaphorical components, for example, The future of the church depends on passing the torch to the next generation. Tonight's speaker is one who has taken hold of the baton (the future of the church depends on passing the torch to the next

generation, and our guest today is one of those who have taken hold of the baton) (Forceville, 2016). Robert Taylor, host of Death Valley Days, mixes two target domains from the same source domain: INSURING FUTURE SUCCESS IS PASSING ON A TORCH TO A YOUNGER PERSON / INSURING FUTURE SUCCESS IS PASSING ON A BATON TO THE NEXT RUNNER IN A RELAY RACE. that leads to a certain semantic incompatibility of metaphorical scripts. Literary critic S. Connolly uses an extended cognitive metaphor to describe the horrors of an artist's choice of another career: The artist of today ... walks at first with companions, till one day he falls through a hole in the brambles. and from that moment is following the dark rapids of an underground river which may sometimes flow so near the surface that the laughing picnic parties are heard above (today the artist is the one who first walks with his comrades, until one day he falls through the thorn bushes in hole, and from that moment on it follows the dark rapids of an underground river, which sometimes flows so close to the surface that the laughter of people who came to the picnic can be heard from above) [Brainy Quotes URL]. For Connolly, this journey alone (LIFE IS A JOURNEY) underground (HAPPINESS IS VERTICALITY) in the dark (HAPPINESS IS BRIGHTNESS) perfectly expresses all the sad prospects, complexity and unusualness of an artist's life. When an extended cognitive metaphor becomes oversaturated with an excess of its constituent metaphorical components, this makes it difficult for the recipient to understand it (which can be empirically confirmed). The next subtype of cognitive metaphor is malaphor or metaphor blend, where a mixture of two or more idiomatic expressions occurs at the linguistic and cognitive levels, when the speaker (intentionally or unintentionally) replaces part of one proverb / say / idiom with another with a similar structure, or changes in the original phraseological unit any word (several words) to a similar sound. One of the main reasons for the appearance of malaphors in discourse, as shown by modern cognitive research, is the desire of the author of the utterance to show his sense of humor. In recent decades, the study of humor has taken on a multidisciplinary nature, becoming the topic of numerous studies in linguistics, psychology, sociology and cognitive sciences. However, there is still no universal theory of humor that could describe the reason, source and true addressee of a particular joke (Hempelmann, 2012). Generally in humor theory, it is believed that a joke should contain a short ending (a punchline). The study of the various types of malaphor, carried out in this work, shows that they can all contain humor (to varying degrees of success) in one phrase. Thus, in the course of the research, such types of cognitive metaphors in structure as complex or telescopic cognitive metaphor, composite cognitive metaphor, extended cognitive metaphor and malaphor were identified. Cognitive metaphors were classified according to the degree of success (success / failure); by modality (monomodal / multimodal); by domain match (target domain match / source domain match / both domains mismatch). Since malaphora and multimodal cognitive metaphor have not been studied in detail from a cognitive point of view by researchers, in this work we consider it necessary to conduct a more detailed analysis of their properties. The term "malaphor" (a malaphor) was first introduced into linguistics in 1976 by the American scientist Lawrence Harrison (Harrison, 1976), and since then has been actively used in linguistics. In his work, Harrison stated that malaphora is a hybrid of malapropism and metaphor, where malapropism (from the French "mal a propos", that is, out of place) is a semantic error, in which one significant word is replaced in the text by another, similar in sound, but different in meaning and therefore, as a rule, does not correspond to the context (for example, input traffic, start a campaign, price net). In modern sources, it is noted that malapropisms arise due to random misspellings or obvious lexical errors. Today, malaphora can be defined as an accidental or deliberate combination in one expression of several idioms, aphorisms or cliches, as a result of which the meaning of the components changes. A "hybrid"

of components (Harrison 1976; Hofstadter, Moser 1989; Celandia 2017; Cooper, Cutting, Bock 1997). For example, Nothing to shake home about, where there is a mixture of the idioms more (something) than you can shake a stick at and nothing to write home about - malaphora used by a former American football player and popular sports commentator J. Tisman during an American sports radio show. D. Hatfield, who has been studying the malaphor problem for more than 30 years, claims that real malaphora is written or pronounced unintentionally, calling them “Mental hiccups” (Hatfield 2016), while D. Hofstadter describes the process of malaphor appearance as taking two cookies out of a cookie box at the same time, breaking during this process into two parts, as a result of which two different pieces remain in the hand halves (Hofstadter, Moser 1989). Analysis of the malaphors existing in the modern English-language discourse allows us to classify them according to their pragmatic meaning into the following subspecies (categorization and terms in both languages were introduced by the author of the study): a. Malaphor-amplifier / empowerer; b. Malaphor-combiner; c. Malaphor-contraster; d. Malaphor-wisecrack. A. Malaphor amplifier is a hybrid of two (or more) idiomatic expressions belonging to the same target domain (or very similar domains), which leads to an increase in the original meaning of the metaphors used in the final expression. This type of malaphor is one of the most popular, which is confirmed by the results of this study (more than 53% of all selected malaphor). This is obviously due to the similarity of the semantic fields of the language units involved in blending. Or, as K. Sullivan puts it metaphorically, because when several pieces of the mosaic have the same color, we are more likely to put them side by side (Sullivan 2018). This can also be confirmed by a psychological experiment conducted at the University of Illinois, USA (Cooper Cutting, Bock 1997). Participants in the experiment were asked to quickly read two idioms in a row and then reproduce them. Experimental psychologists expected the subjects to produce malaphors (in their idiom blends terminology), as this could shed light on how idioms function. The results were positive when the participants were presented with idioms with similar semantic structure (e.g., flip your lid + hold your tongue = hold your lid), and even more convincing when the syntactic and semantic structures were similar (kick the bucket + meet the maker = kick the maker / kick the bucket maker). Of course, such malaphors were obvious speech errors, but if these errors are repeated in real discourse, then they may well become part of the language, as, for example, It’s not rocket surgery. Here are some examples of malaphor amplifiers, which D. Hatfield (Hatfield 2016) calls “congruent confluents”, selected as a result of this study:

- I can’t make these split-minute decisions (Hofstadter, Moser 1989), where two English metaphors (split-second, last-minute) are combined, both meaning “to do something very quickly”; Other examples of malaphor amplifiers:
- We pulled our heads together (put our heads together + pull together, collaborate) (Malaphors URL);
- Hit the ground flying (to hit the ground running + to get off to a flying start, quickly start doing something) [Pittsburg Post-Gazette Interactive URL];
- Cough it over (cough it up + hand it over, get rid of something, transfer the problem to another person);
- I have a beef to pick with you (have a beef + have a bone to pick, complain about something, have a complaint);
- I have it on the tip of my hand (on the tip of my tongue + tip my hand, to have something in memory / in the hand, but not be able to use it at the moment);
- He said it off the top of his cuff (off the cuff + off the top of one’s head, speak spontaneously, thoughtlessly);

- Right from the bat (right from the start + right off the bat, do something immediately);
- He has his act in order (to put one's house in order + to get one's act together, put your affairs in order and start acting in an organized manner);
- You wash my back; I'll wash yours (one hand washing the other + you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours, agree on mutual assistance);
- Let's roll up our elbows and get to work (roll up your sleeves + elbow grease, exhausting work) (Hatfield 2016);
- A similar malaphora from the world of politics: Let's roll up our hands and all get together (to roll up your sleeves, work, roll up our sleeves + to join hands, work together + to get your hands dirty, don't hesitate to do any work) by Howard Fineman, TV show *Hardball*;
- She rules with an iron thumb (to rule with an iron hand + to be under one's thumb, powerfully control the situation / someone);
- Trump shoots from the cuff (to shoot from the hip + to speak off the cuff, to speak spontaneously and sincerely) by Megyn Kelly about the meeting between Trump and J. Ramos [Fox News Channel URL];
- I have a pulse to the ground (to have one's finger on the pulse + to have one's ear to the ground, to be attentive to what is happening around), expression of D. Trump, 20.07.2015 [The New York Times URL];
- I screwed myself in the foot (I shot myself in the foot + I screwed up, make a mistake) [Malaphors URL]; • It's a two-way blade (two-way street + cuts both ways + double edge sword, have merits and demerits [Diane Rehm URL];
- Let's get to the chase (to cut to the chase + to get to the point, get to the point, not beat around the bush);
- The humidity was off the roof (off the chart + through the roof, too high, off scale, unmatched) [Howard Stern URL];
- Keep your mouth down (keep your mouth shut + keep your voice down, be quiet) [English Urban Dictionary URL];
- I got better fish to fry (I've got bigger fish to fry + I've got better things to do, I have better things to do, I have better things to do) (the film "Batman Returns", a replica of the character of K. Watkins);
- I just wanted to get it out of my chest (to get it out of my system + to get it off my chest, relieve the soul, talk about the problem), phrase by D. Ortiz, Boston Red Sox player in Sports News Sports News [New England Patriots URL];
- You nailed that right on the head (to hit the nail on the head + to nail it, do exactly what you need to do) - malaphor amplifier from the world of sports from NFL expert Mike Carey during the Denver-Kansas game [CBS Sports URL];
- I'm shooting off the cuff (off-the-cuff + shoot from the hip, speak spontaneously, thoughtlessly) from F. Jackson in his welcome speech to the New York Knicks [The New York Times URL]; • That's a hot potato issue (hot potato + hot button issue, sensitive, hot topic + painful question) by Savannah Guthrie on the Today show [Today URL];
- We are going to keep this one in the back of our pocket (in the back of one's mind + to put it in one's back pocket, put it aside for later) by Drew Scott in the Canadian TV series *Property Brothers* [House Beautiful URL];
- You have a long road to climb (long road + a mountain to climb, difficult situation) [Malaphors URL];
- We really nailed it out of the park (to nail it + to hit it out of the park, to do something successfully) - a malaphora from one of the participants in the Beach Flip show on HGTV [IMDb URL].

Conclusion

Metaphor as a means of expressing ideas is used both in the first philosophical works and in the most modern works of art, and has been studied for centuries by leading linguists and scholars of related fields of knowledge. The cognitive metaphor also has a very long history of existence, but this linguistic phenomenon became the subject of close study after the beginning of the development of cognitive linguistics, which allows us to look at this phenomenon as not only a linguistic, but also a linguo-cognitive phenomenon, since cognitive linguistics, in addition to studies of usage and correct statements, looking for an explanation for errors and deviations. The study of linguistic literature on cognitive metaphor has shown that today the attitude of scientists to a cognitive metaphor is ambiguous, but an increasing number of scientists see the potential of linguistic creativity in it. Cognitive metaphors have different cognitive functions: they can serve as stylistic tools for expressing highly complex concepts (for example, chronic pain or despair), indicate the speaker's highly developed sense of humor, but they can also hint at the incompetence and ignorance of their author. There are still some discrepancies in the interpretation of the cognitive metaphor as a linguo-cognitive phenomenon, such as the contextual proximity and the degree of coherence of the components that make up the cognitive metaphor. In this dissertation research, by a cognitive metaphor, we mean two or more metaphors that are in close proximity in discourse (in one or different modalities), but provoking a kind of cognitive tension in its perception due to their inconsistency, inconsistency, the possibility of dual perception; or two or more idioms combined into one metaphor, or malaphor. In the present study, the classification of cognitive metaphors was carried out according to the degree of success, by modality, by coincidence of domains and by structure. An innovative classification of malaphors according to their pragmatic value was also proposed and it was found that malaphors are subdivided into amplifier malaphors, combinator malaphors, opposing malaphors and sharpness malaphors.

References

- Thibodeau, P., Hendricks, R. K., & Boroditsky, L. (2017). How linguistic metaphor scaffolds reasoning. *Trends in Cognitive Science*, 21(11), 852–863. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2017.07.001
- Thibodeau, P. H., & Boroditsky, L. (2011). Metaphors we think with: The role of metaphor in reasoning. *PloS ONE*, 6(2), Article e16782. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0016782>.
- Mon, Serena & Nencheva, Mira & Citron, Francesca & Lew-Williams, Casey & Goldberg, Adele. (2021). Conventional metaphors elicit greater real-time engagement than literal paraphrases or concrete sentences. *Journal of Memory and Language*. 121. 104285. 10.1016/j.jml.2021.104285.
- Lakoff, George. 1987, *Women, fire and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh*. New York: Basic Books.
- Levin, Beth and Rappaport Hovav, Malka. 2005. *Argument realization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Majid, Azifa, Melissa Bowerman, Miriam van Staden, and James S. Boster. 2007. The semantic categories of cutting and breaking events: Crosslinguistic perspective. *Cognitive Linguistics* 18:2, 133-152.
- Majid, Azifa, James S. Boster and Melissa Bowerman. 2008. The crosslinguistic categorization of everyday events: A study of cutting and breaking. *Cognition* 108:2, 175-294.

- Quinn, Naomi. 1997. Chapters 6 and 7 of Claudia Strauss and Naomi Quinn, cognitive theory of cultural meaning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Slobin, Dan I. 2006, What makes manner of motion salient? Explorations in linguistic typology, discourse, and cognition. In *Space in languages: Linguistic systems and cognitive categories*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 59- 81.
- Sullivan, Karen, 2007. *Grammar in metaphor : A construction grammar account of metaphoric language*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Linguistics, University of California, Berkeley.
- Bouveret, M., & Sweetser, E. E. (2009). Multi-frame semantics, metaphoric extensions, and grammar. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 35, 49–59.
- Sullivan K. *Frames and constructions in metaphoric language*. USA: John, Benjamin Publishing Company, 2013. 192 p.
- Sullivan K. What makes metaphors mixed? // *Book of Abstracts ICLC-14*. 2017. P. 482.
- Sullivan K. *Mixed Metaphors: their use and abuse*. UK: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018. 230 p.
- Sweetser E., Sullivan K. *Minimalist metaphors* // *English text construction*. 2012. № 5 (2). P. 153-173.
- Nordquist R. *Complex metaphor*, 2019. URL: <https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-complex-metaphor1689886>
- Nordquist R. *What are malaphors*, 2018. URL: <https://www.thoughtco.com/malaphor-word-play-1691298>
- Online Cambridge English Dictionary. URL: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/>
- Müller C. *Metaphors dead and alive, sleeping and walking*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2008. 290 p.
- Müller C. *Why mixed metaphors make sense* // *Mixing Metaphor*. Gibbs R.W. Jr. (ed.). Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, Chapter 3, 2016. P. 31-56.
- Lakoff G. *A figure of thought* // *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*. 1986. № 1 (3). P. 215–225.
- Lakoff G. *Women, fire and dangerous things*. USA: University of Chicago Press, 1989. 373 p.
- Lakoff G. *The contemporary theory of metaphor* // *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*. Geeraerts D. (ed.). Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006. P. 186-238.
- Lakoff G., Kövecses Z. *The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English* // *Cultural models in language and thought*. Ed. By D. Holland, N. Quinn. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. P. 195-220.
- Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors We Live By*. USA: University of Chicago Press, 1980. 252 p.
- Lakoff G., Turner M. *More than cool reason: a field guide to poetic metaphor*. USA: The university of Chicago, 1989. 237 p.
- Langacker R.W. *Concept, image and symbol: the cognitive basis of grammar*. Berlin / New-York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2002. 395 p.
- Kövecses Z. *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford: OUP, 2002.
- Kövecses Z. *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*. UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005. 314 p.
- Kövecses Z. *Conceptual metaphor theory*, 2017. URL: https://www.academia.edu/30234610/Conceptual_metaphor_theory
- Hempelmann C., Taylor J., Raskin V. *Tightening up joke structure: Not by length alone* // *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*. 2012. № 34. P. 450-455.
- Hilpert M. *An empirical approach to the use and comprehension of mixed metaphors* // *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*. 2010. № 8 (1). P. 66-92
- Hoffman R. *Some implications of metaphor for philosophy and psychology of science*. Amsterdam, 1985. 327 p.
- Hofstadter D., Moser D. *To Err Is Human; To Study Error-Making Is Cognitive Science*. US: Michigan Quarterly Review. 1989. Vol. XXVII. P. 322- 334.
- House Beautiful. URL: <https://www.housebeautiful.com;https://www.housebeautiful.com/lifestyle/a28124295/property-brothers-foreverhome-season-one/>
- Forceville C. *The role of non-verbal metaphor sound and music in multimodal metaphor* //

- C. Forceville, E. Urios-Aparisi (eds.), *Multimodal Metaphor*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009. P. 38
- Abdikerimova, G., Duisekova, K., Bissenbayeva, Z. The value dominant “Laicite” as part of the media picture of the world of France, *XLinguae*, 2020, 13(1), pp 75–85
- Mukhametkaliyeva, S., Smankulova, Z., Kidirbayeva, K., Ismagulova, N., Bissenbayeva, Z. Discursive strategies of using numerological expressions and paroemias | Stratégies discursives d'utilisation des expressions numérogiques et parémies, *XLinguae*, 2022, 15(4), pp 129–138
- Bekbenbetova, K., Baltabayeva, G., Aimbetova, U., Smagulova, K., Kemberbay, R. Social and philosophical research structures of drama and folk narratives: the manifestations of embodied world views, *XLinguae*, 2022, 15(1), p 14–22
- [Ospanova, Z., Tolybayeva, K., Nurkenova, S., Duisekova, K., Baltabayeva, G.](#) *Lingua and culture study research on indirect communication cognitive metaphor. XLinguae.*, 2020, 13(2), pp 157–165
- Stedman, J. M., Spalding, T. L., Gagné, C. L., & Hancock, C. L. (2023). The Relationship of Concepts, Memory, and Language in the Cognitive Psychology of Thinking: An Aristotelian–Thomistic Appraisal. *The Journal of Mind and Behavior*, 44(1/2), 15-36.