

**INDEFINITE QUANTITY IN LANGUAGE AND COGNITION:
IMAGERY-EVALUATIVE PERSPECTIVE**

O. Yehorova, *PhD in Philology, Associate Professor*

Sumy State University,

2, Rymskogo-Korsakova St., Sumy, 40007, Ukraine

E-mail: o.egorova@gf.sumdu.edu.ua

The study highlights different types of cognitive metaphors, identifies motivational bases of quantitative images, and reveals evaluative potential of these metaphoric imaging. Analyzing both cognitive and language contexts helps establish correlations between the quantitative and qualitative (axiological) judgments in terms of notions “good” and “bad”. Involvement of image-schemes as motivational bases for interpreting quantitative metaphors is conditioned by their explanatory potential that reveals the patterns and specifics of human’s thinking and imagination, by their contribution to the development of both somatic and special codes of a linguoculture and to objectifying the motivational grounds of the language quantitative expressions.

Key words: *indefinite quantity, semantics, concept, imagery-evaluative layer, metaphor, image-scheme.*

Introduction. Over the past few decades, both domestic and foreign research fields are marked by a sharp increase of interest in cognitive aspects of language and, as V. I. Postovalova puts it, in transition from analyzing the “immanent-semiological” paradigm, which considers language “in itself and for itself”, to the anthropocentric paradigm, which sets the language forth from the perspective of existentialism in its close connection to human consciousness, cognition, and spiritual world [10, p. 28]. Thus, one of the most promising areas of current research in the field of language quantification deals with cognitive approach and rests on works of N. D. Arutiunova, N. N. Boldyrev, L. I. Belehova, A. Wierzbicka, S. A. Zhabotinskaia, V. I. Karasik, S. A. Krylov, Ye. S. Kubriakova, G. Lakoff, R. Langacker, B. Toshovych, S. O. Shvachko etc.

The system of ideas, associations, and all the accumulated information about the human reality constructs a conceptual picture of the world with concepts as its operational elements. Concept as a subject of linguistic pursuits appeals to its dichotomous nature. Primarily, concept is a product of either individual or collective consciousness marked by phenomenological nature. However, linguistic research has to deal rather with the “traces” of concepts in language, not the concepts themselves. In other words, linguistics has at its disposal only that part of the conceptual content which can get verbalized in a particular linguoculture.

The **subject area** of the study constitute verbal representations of the INDEFINITE QUANTITY concept in the English language; **specific topic** is imagery and evaluative profile of the concept that they actualize in language.

The **purpose** of the study is to determine the content of imagery and evaluative layer of the INDEFINITE QUANTITY concept as the one designed at the expense of the inner form of language units, human associative capacity, and cognitively adopted prototypes. The **tasks** of the study comprise:

- 1) identification of typical metaphorical images that constitute the imagery and evaluative layer of INDEFINITE QUANTITY concept;
- 2) interpreting the content of the identified images;
- 3) defining basic cognitive features of the imagery and evaluative layer of the INDEFINITE QUANTITY concept.

To perform the tasks of the study, we turn to the identification and interpretation of cognitive images of quantity through the **methods** of metaphorical analysis (cognitive metaphor) and cognitive interpretation.

Despite the lack of unanimity among the scholars as to the principles of concept's structuring and labeling its structural parts, most cognitologists tend to recognize notional (also informational or factual), imagery-perceptual (also figurative and associative), and evaluative (value) layers (fields or components) [2, p. 7; 5, p. 73; 6, p. 29; 8, p. 713; 9, p.106; 11, p. 55].

Along with the notional field, which frames the kernel of the concept, the imagery layer is of no less importance in analyzing language explication of a concept. N. F. Alefirenko considers image a prime form of the conceptual embodiment viewed as a fictitious object or attitude of the object to the idea due to which the concept becomes a phenomenon of reality and gets some form [1, p. 59]. Evaluative component is determined by the place of the concept on the value scale of a particular linguoculture, its significance and frequency of use in everyday life. We believe that both content and essence of the INDEFINITE QUANTITY concept require an integrative approach to its imagery and evaluative layers because 1) quantitative expressions of indefiniteness serve as a regular tool for expressing personal or collective evaluations in discourse (cf. *great cry and little wool* – many gives little → bad, *to be Jack of all trades and master of none* – many gives none → bad, *too many cooks spoil the broth / little knowledge is a dangerous thing* – many/little → bad, etc.) and 2) quantity is an attribute of the object of evaluation, a part of its image, so the value of quantitative characteristics is predetermined by the specifics of the object which possesses these characteristics and the evaluator in the context (cf. *a Manhattan of books* is a good thing for a book lover but a great challenge for a tomorrow's examinee).

This study considers evaluative field through the prism of the imagery one as we treat these fields as complementary and nonseparable. This leads to identifying the syncretic imagery-evaluative layer of the INDEFINITE QUANTITY concept. We also agree with G. Lakoff and M. Johnson that the most fundamental values in a culture are coherent with the metaphorical structure of the most fundamental concepts in the culture [7, p. 46–48]. In other words, the metaphoric system with the images of indefinite quantity gives key to the cultural values that mastermind these metaphors.

Cognitive mechanism known as “conceptual metaphor” is quite typical for designing quantitative designations that are traced in language. The theory of conceptual metaphor features metaphor as a language and speech cognitive mechanism designed for processing information about abstract objects that can not be experienced perceptually by comparing them with specific objects that have a perceptual basis [4, p. 3].

According to the functions performed cognitive metaphors are traditionally subdivided into the classes of ontological, orientational, and structural metaphors [7; 15, p. 32–36]. At the same time, it should be highlighted that metaphors are not arbitrary entities as long as they are motivated by the structures that come from the experiential knowledge. These structures, called “image-schemas”, constitute our preconceptual embodied experiences [14, p. 19–21] and serve as an effective tool for cognitive interpretation of metaphors.

Ontological metaphors are primarily rooted in people's experience with physical world, especially their experience with body organization [7, p. 51; 15, p. 16]. It speaks to the fact that the human once became a cognitive tool for the human himself. Among a vast number of ontological metaphors (some of them already featured in the study by Yehorova and Kalchenko [3]) the anthropomorphic metaphor INDEFINITE QUANTITY IS HUMAN stands out against the rest as a cognitive product of quantity personification:

(1) *There was a rough wooden shelf with cheap editions of novels and a number of old travel books in battered leather; and another shelf was crowded with empty bottles* (W. S. Maugham, *The Force of Circumstance*).

(2) *The canals are thronged with tour buses, the bridges festooned with banners* (C. Greenland, *Take Back Plenty*).

The cited fragments of literary discourse feature mainly negative evaluation of the assemblage. It is also proved by the cultural practice of distancing peculiar of both the English and the Americans [13, p. 114–116; 17, p. 73–74]. A multitude or a high density of something or somebody cause discomfort for they breach the “privacy-zone” and may give rise to fear or anxiety – a typical reaction to the “big”, “unknown”, “unbounded”, and, probably, “dangerous”. The confirmation to the thesis “many is bad” in this context is found in the discourse:

(3) *To be herded with fifty men, the scum of the earth, and never to be alone for a minute – it was awful. That was the worst of all* (W. S. Maugham, *A Man with a Conscience*).

(4) ... *And then terror seized him. He felt a horror of the winding multitudinous streets of the Chinese city, and there was something ghastly and terrible in the convoluted roofs of the temples with their devils grimacing and tortured. He loathed the smells that assaulted his nostrils. And the people. Those myriads of blue-clad coolies, and the beggars in their filthy rags, and the merchants and the magistrates, sleek, smiling, and inscrutable, in their long black gowns. They seemed to press upon him with menace* (W. S. Maugham, *The Taipan*).

INDEFINITE QUANTITY IS MILITARY FORCE is a specification of the basic anthropomorphic metaphor which projects conceptual features “multitude”, “power, strength”, “hostilities”, etc.:

(5) *She bombarded them with foolish questions* (W. S. Maugham, *A Man with a Conscience*).

(6) *‘Go along and do your packing, Mr Harrington,’ said Ashenden, smiling, ‘and then we’ll take you to the station. The train will be besieged’* (W. S. Maugham, *Mr Harrington’s Washing*).

(7) *They’ve boomed her like an army of press-agents* (W. S. Maugham, *The Wash-Tub*).

(8) *Mr Gingrich, the former Speaker of the House of Representatives, has promised a tougher tone in the race after finishing a disappointing fourth in Iowa following a barrage of negative adverts from Romney allies* (*The INDEPENDENT*, January 10, 2012).

The presence of “military” image in the nominations of quantity determines negative evaluation of the concept: lots of questions, press-agents, and adverts are viewed as a means of assault that brings destruction, losses and entails defense behavior whereas the image of many passengers in the train is associated with the state of siege that puts hinders coming inside the train.

Cognitive image-scheme “container” serves a basis for ontological metaphors of CONTAINER. G. Lakoff and M. Johnson neatly state that defining of a territory, putting a boundary around it, is an act of quantification as long as bounded objects have sizes and can be quantified in terms of the amount of substance they contain [7, p. 55]. Such cognitive interpretation of metaphors like *oceans of time, river of tears, torrents of reproaches* give reasons to consider great masses of water as large amounts of something (CONTAINER SUBSTANCES) and the carriers of these masses – CONTAINER OBJECTS.

The image-scheme “container” consists of the “interior”, “boundary”, and “exterior” structural elements. All elements of this image-scheme are traced in language where they feature the quantitative scale “many/much – more – the most”:

1) such word combinations as *bushels of girls, a barrel of laughs, horn of plenty, a handful of attorneys, a dreg of pity, a bellyful of lies* feature the subjects of quantification being indefinite (unknown) in quantity *inside* the container;

2) the image of an even a greater quantity is coded by the *boundary-structure* the subjects of quantification are in such quantity that it reaches the brims of the container: e.g. *brimful of energy, up to the ears, bumper crop, to the hilt*. In this light, G. Lakoff and M. Johnson claim that every human is a container with a bounding surface and an in-out orientation; we project our own in-out orientation onto other physical objects that are bounded by surfaces [7, p. 54]. The proof of such cognitive motivation is revealed through

a range of verbal signs that render the idea of human's body as a measuring tool (cf. *up to one's elbow / ears / eyebrows / eyes / chin, up to one's neck, to have a bellyful of, be fed to the teeth, to one's / the fingertips, to be full (up) to the / one's throat with smth, etc.*). Notably, mostly head and parts of the face get treated in terms of container brims. We believe that it is preconditioned by the concentration of the "channels of cognizing" in this part of the human's body, i.e. eyesight, hearing, senses of smell and taste, brain activity;

3) the objects of quantification may appear in such a big quantity that they go beyond the borders of the container (e.g. *to overflow with joy, a deluge of requests, to go beyond the mark, to go too far, to abound in mistakes, to grow in profusion, a superfluity of unoccupied time*), thus, actualizing the "exterior" element of the image-scheme.

Our body organization and movement experience give grounds for mastering complex designations able to be interpreted in several dimensions. Thus, on the one hand, we can discriminate another typical anthropomorphic metaphor INDEFINITE QUANTITY IS A PART OF A BODY which is a result of evolutionary experience of measuring "by sight". On the other hand, the interpretation of the metaphor should imply the image-scheme "center-periphery", peculiar of structuring orientational metaphors which deal with the projection of concepts spatially related to each other. This image-scheme is rooted in the physiological experience of the humans who perceive themselves as entities each with a center (head, trunk and the internals, especially heart and brain) and a periphery (fingers, toes, hair, etc.) [12, p. 103–104]. Accordingly, the central part is conceived as something specific, important, and clear while the periphery is viewed less important and not clearly specified. Indefinite quantity, being not clearly specified in nature, is mostly associated with the peripheral phenomena, in terms of body – with the extremities.

For example, the hand as the most distant part of the human's body projects discursive meaning "little", whereas other parts of the upper extremities and the combination of hands and legs explicate meanings "many". Cf. *Tommy Thumb, life is but a span, not a dram of, a handful of people on the street, to be fathoms deep in love, give him an inch and he'll take an ell, to cost an arm and a leg*. Physical impossibility of grasping a big quantity of something by a hand alone defines cognitive motivation of designating little quantity, while the compass of both arms or involvement of both upper and lower limbs marks a significantly greater quantitative volume. However, the range of extremities is not limited to hands and feet and the meanings of little quantity get coded in the images of parts of the human's head (cf. *to win by a hair / neck / nose / whisker, a hair of, within a hair of ... , by the skin of one's teeth, etc.*). This speaks for the tendency to identifying double-structured center-periphery organization of the human body: heart and internals vs limbs and brain vs other parts of the head.

Horizontal location of objects and change of their quantitative attributes is also coordinated by the scheme "center-periphery", due to which the motion from the center to the periphery is conceived as broadening or distancing and correlate to the meaning of enlargement ("more/most"), and from the periphery to the center – as narrowing or approaching, which correlate with the meaning of lessening ("less/least"). In the center of this scheme is the subject (learner / observer) whereas the periphery marks the limits of their rational and sensory cognition: what approaches these limits or goes beyond them is treated in terms of "much/many"; what approaches the subjects and whose size is not reaching these limits is treated in terms of "few/little".

Let's consider several examples found in the literary discourse:

(9) *...but when a rumour spread abroad that he was going to marry her consternation seized his friends and ribald laughter everyone else*(W. S. Maugham, *His Excellency*).

(10) *"...You see, all this will be his one day."* Freddy gave a sweeping gesture that seemed to embrace the whole county (W. S. Maugham, *The Alien Corn*).

(11) *He disliked him because he was narrow-minded and dogmatic*(W. S. Maugham, *The Vessel of Wrath*).

(12) *Now they can say that art and beauty are all rot; when it comes to a pinch people like us always let you down* (W. S. Maugham, *The Door of Opportunity*).

Sentence (9) features rumor in terms of a substance capable of quantitative changes – to grow due to “covering or extending over a larger space” [11]. Sentence (10) features a gesture as a tool of spatial quantification in terms of “extending through a long stretch or wide space” [11].

Lexeme *narrow-minded* in the textual fragment (11) objectifies metaphoric embodiment of INTELLIGENCE IS CONTAINER where horizontal projection marks the volume of this container as an indicator of the level of the human’s mental development (*narrow-minded* – lacking in breadth of mind; incapable of broad views; illiberal, bigoted, prejudiced [16]), namely its insufficiency (“little”). The seme “little” also comes to the fore in the metaphor *to come to a pinch* that features an image of spatial compression, narrowing, imposing limits (*to pinch* – to limit or restrict narrowly the supply of anything [16]).

Indefinite quantity variations according to the scheme “narrower/broader” are used as tools for forming value judgments: what is cognitively perceived as “narrow” and “little” usually gets negative utilitarian estimates, whereas expansion is viewed positively:

(13) *Mr Gruyter both disliked and respected him. He disliked him because he was **narrow-minded** and dogmatic (W. S. Maugham, *The Vessel of Wrath*).*

(14) *The **cramped monotony** of my existence grinds me away by the grain (Ch. Dickens, *The Mystery of Edwin Drood*).*

(15) *My **tightwad** Uncle Irv joined an organization that fights inflation, but he was very disappointed. An hour after he joined, they raised the dues (An Encyclopedia of Humor).*

(16) *Its [science’s] implications are as **far-reaching** and awe-inspiring as can be imagined. Even as it promises answers to some of our oldest questions, it poses still others even more fundamental (President Clinton Statement Regarding Mars Meteorite Discovery, 1996).*

(17) *At that early hour of noon they would have it to themselves, and Winifred had thought it would be 'amusing' to see this **far-famed** hostelry (J. Galsworthy, *The Forsyte Saga*).*

(18) *“I follow terrorists, not mainstream politicians.”– “Well, then maybe you should broaden your scope” (F. Mathews, *The Cutout*).*

Three-dimension spatial orientation of the human in the surrounding world enables revealing quantitative images not only in horizontal projection but also in vertical one that leads to metaphoric interpretation of quantity in terms of height and depth. Again, the case marks harmonization of metaphoric representations of quantity: on the one side, it objectifies “up–down” projection, and on the other side, activates the image-scheme “container”. For example, such quantitative nominations as *a pile of trouble, to heap gifts on smb., debts are mounting, a Manhattan of books* originate in the prototype of a rising ground whose height poses a challenge for a perceiver. As long as any conglomeration or multitude of something piled or heaped causes discomfort and problems, such images are usually treated negatively.

The semantics of indefinite quantity is revealed in the nominations like *a mine of information, a well of quotations, to be fathoms deep in love, to be knee-deep in work, to wallow in sin, to be swamped with complaints, abyss of hopelessness*. Such models feature depth as a container to be filled by the substances whose nature determines axiological status of each particular quantitative nomination.

Metaphors MANY/MUCH IS UP and FEW/LITTLE IS DOWN are rooted in both physical (perceptual) and cultural experience of the humans. Such metaphors project results of our sensual and rational interpretation of quantity as an important attribute of the denotata that enables forming judgments. For instance, the range of voice and tone variations as a product of audible reception is primarily subjected to the quantitative evaluation (in terms of “much/little”::“high/low” notions) and then to qualitative assessment (“good/bad”), thus, activating conventional metaphors GOOD IS UP and BAD IS DOWN:

MANY/MUCH IS UP:

(19) *In his measured **high-pitched voice**, without emphasis or expression, he read page after page (W. S. Maugham, Mr Harrington's Washing).*

(20) *"Bother her?" My **voice shot up the scale** (H. Garner, The Spare Room).*

(21) *Then I did lose my head. I ran in the direction of the sound, **screaming at the top of my voice** (W. S. Maugham, Neil MacAdam);*

FEW/LITTLE IS DOWN:

(22) *She gave a groan of horror and then burst **into low, hoarse shrieks** which sounded hardly human, and she beat her head passionately on the ground (W. S. Maugham, Rain).*

(23) *"You bet your life she does," **boomed** Frank in her **deep voice** (W. S. Maugham, The Three Fat Women of Antibes).*

(24) *The girl went over to him and sat by his side. He **whispered** something to her, and she started violently. For a few minutes they talked in hurried **undertones**, and then they stood up (W. S. Maugham, Honolulu).*

Another common case is the interpretation of the size of financial means or social status in terms of vertical scaling:

(25) *Mr Cheeseman was not a bad person to work for, so long as you understood that if you worked till the Day of Judgment you would never get **a rise of wages** (G. Orwell, Keep the Aspidistra Flying).*

(26) *The anonymous guests, who are **nouveau riche social climbers** and freeloaders, attend Gatsby's spectacles with the hope of acquiring aristocratic wealth, power, and status (T. E. Tunc, The Great Gatsby: The Tragedy of the American Dream on Long Island's Gold Coast").*

(27) *I'd worn pips on my shoulder, and my **social standards had risen** (G. Orwell, Coming up for Air).*

(28) *His **expenses didn't go down**, for he had to be smartly dressed or the manager of the hotel made remarks ... (W. S. Maugham, Gigolo and Gigolette).*

The grounding of such metaphors refers to the images of dynamics realized on upright projection. Thus, quantity in human's understanding doesn't merely refer to a static condition but is able to move and change. This, to its turn, leads to forming qualitative judgments in discourse.

Conclusions. The study of imagery-evaluative layer of the INDEFINITE QUANTITY concept proves that indefinite quantity actualizes in the English language worldview not only as an abstract entity but also as sensual images embodied in cognitive metaphors and provoking different evaluations. Cognitive features of this layer reveal association of indefinite multitude with assemblage and consolidated force that may cause fear and discomfort. The value of indefinite quantity takes the form of "quantitative motion" of substances on "many/much – few/less" scale that is projected in reality through orientations "up–down", "broad–narrow", "far–close" and estimated axiologically. Moreover, conceptual features "social status" and "financial condition" refer to the particular elements of the human's value system. The given typology of quantitative cognitive metaphors doesn't bear a universal or an exhaustive character but rather leads to further investigation into gnosiological potential of quantitative nominations in language, especially to identifying and interpreting structural metaphors of quantity.

НЕВИЗНАЧЕНА КІЛЬКІСТЬ У МОВІ ТА КОГНІЦІ: ОБРАЗНО-ЦІННІСНА ПЕРСПЕКТИВА

О. І. Єгорова, канд. філол. наук, доцент

*Сумський державний університет,
вул. Римського-Корсакова 2, м. Суми, 40007, Україна
E-mail: o.egorova@gf.sumdu.edu.ua*

У ході дослідження виокремлюються різні типи когнітивних метафор, ідентифікується вмотивованість квантитативних образів, визначається ціннісний потенціал, що стоїть за тими чи іншими метафоричними образами невизначеної кількості. Останнє здійснюється за

допомогою аналізу когнітивних та мовних контекстів, що допомагають співвіднести квантитативні судження з позиціями «добре / погано» за аксіологічною шкалою цінностей суб'єктів пізнання. Залучення «образ-схем» до осмислення квантитативних когнітивних метафор зумовлене їх експланаторною силою, що виявляє закономірності мислення та особливості роботи нашої уяви, їхньої участі у формуванні соматичного та просторового кодів лінгвокультури, в упорядкуванні експерієнціального фонду, а також у об'єктивізації умотивованості мовних знаків кількості.

Ключові слова: невизначена кількість, семантика, концепт, образно-ціннісний шар, метафора, образ-схема.

НЕОПРЕДЕЛЕННОЕ КОЛИЧЕСТВО В ЯЗЫКЕ И КОГНИЦИИ: ОБРАЗНО-ЦЕННОСТНАЯ ПЕРСПЕКТИВА

О. И. Егорова, канд. филол. наук, доцент

Сумский государственный университет,
ул. Римского-Корсакова 2, г. Сумы, 40007, Украина
E-mail: o.egorova@gf.sumdu.edu.ua

В ходе исследования выделяются разные типы когнитивных метафор, идентифицируется мотивированность квантитативных образов, определяется ценностный потенциал, стоящий за теми или иными метафорическими образами неопределенного количества. Последнее осуществляется при помощи анализа когнитивных и языковых контекстов, помогающих соотносить квантитативные суждения с позициями «хорошо/плохо» по аксиологической шкале ценностей субъектов познания. Привлечение «образ-схем» к осмыслению квантитативных когнитивных метафор определяется их экпланаторной силой, проявляющей закономірности мышления и работы нашего воображения, их участия в формировании соматического и пространственного кодов лінгвокультури, в упорядочивании експерієнціального фонду, а также в объективізації мотивированности языковых знаков количества.

Ключевые слова: неопределенное количество, семантика, концепт, образно-ценностный слой, метафора, образ-схема.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Алефиренко Н. Ф. Проблема вербализации концепта: Теоретическое исследование / Н. Ф. Алефиренко. – Волгоград : Перемена, 2003. – 96с.
2. Воркачев С. Г. Вариативные и ассоциативные свойства телеономных лингвоконцептов / С. Г. Воркачев. – Волгоград : Парадигма, 2005. – 214 с.
3. Егорова О. И. Специфика когнитивной обусловленности метафорических номинаций неопределенного количества / О. И. Егорова, А. В. Кальченко // Филологические науки в России и за рубежом : материалы Междунар. науч. конф. (г. Санкт-Петербург, февраль 2012 г.). – СПб. : Реноме, 2012. – С. 120–123.
4. Жаботинская С. А. Концептуальная метафора: процедура анализа для множественных данных / С. А. Жаботинская // Актуальні проблеми менталінгвістики : Збірник статей за матеріалами VII Міжнародної конференції. – Черкаси, Черкаський національний університет імені Б. Хмельницького, 28–29 квітня 2011 р. – Черкаси : Ант, 2011. – С. 3–6.
5. Карасик В. И. Этноспецифические концепты / В. И. Карасик // Введение в когнитивную лингвистику / отв. ред. М. В. Пименова. – Кемерово : Кузбассвузиздат, 2005. – С. 61–105.
6. Красавский Н. А. Эмоциональные концепты в немецкой и русской лингвокультурах / Н. А. Красавский. – Волгоград : Перемена, 2001. – 495 с.
7. Лакофф Дж. Метафоры, которыми мы живем / Дж. Лакофф, М. Джонсон; пер. с англ. А. Н. Баранова, А. В. Морозовой; под. ред. и с предисл. А. Н. Баранова. – М. : Едиториал УРСС, 2004. – 256 с.
8. Никитин М. В. Курс лингвистической семантики : учебное пособие. – 2-е изд., доп. и испр. – СПб. : Узд-во РГПУ им. А. И. Герцена, 2007. – 891 с.
9. Попова З. Д. Когнитивная лингвистика / З. Д. Попова, И. А. Стернин. – М. : АСТ : Восток-Запад, 2007. – 314, [6] с.
10. Постовалова В. И. Лингвокультурология в свете антропологической парадигмы (к проблеме оснований и границ современной фразеологии) / В. И. Постовалова // Фразеология в контексте культуры: сб. статей / отв. ред. В. Н. Телия. – М. : Языки русской культуры, 1999. – С. 25–33.
11. Приходько А. М. Концепти і концептосистеми в когнітивно-дискурсивній парадигмі лінгвістики / А. М. Приходько. – Запоріжжя : Прем'єр, 2008. – 332 с.

12. Самигуллина А. С. Понятие «образ-схема» в современных исследованиях по когнитивной лингвистике / А. С. Самигуллина // Вестник Челябинского государственного университета. Сер. Филология. Искусствоведение. – 2008. – № 20 (121). – С. 101–106.
13. Стернин И. А. Очерк английского коммуникативного поведения / И. А. Стернин, Т. В. Ларина, М. А. Стернина. – Воронеж : Изд-во «Истоки», 2003. – 184 с.
14. Johnson M. *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason* / M. Johnson. – Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1987. – 233 p.
15. Kövecses Z. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* / Kövecses Z. – Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002. – XV, 285 p.
16. Oxford English Dictionary – OED – [Электронный ресурс] : Second Edition on CD-ROM (v. 4.0.0.2). – [Second Edition (1989) including Oxford English Dictionary Additions Series (Volumes 1–3) (1993 and 1997)]. – Oxford University Press, 2009. – 1 электрон. опт. диск (CD-ROM) : кольор. ; 12 см. – Систем. вимоги: Windows PC with Intel® Pentium® 4 1.6 GHz processor or equivalent; 512 MB RAM; CD-ROM/DVD drive; Windows Vista, XP, 2000, Windows Server 2003; Mac OS X v.10.4.x or 10.5.x. – Назва з титул. екрану.
17. Sternina M. *Russian and American Communicative Behavior* / Marina Sternina, Iosif Sternin. – Voronezh : Istoki Publishing House, 2003. – 94 p.

REFERENCES

1. Alefirenko N. F. (2003). *Problema verbalizatsii kontseptu. Teoreticheskoye issledovaniye* [Concept Verbalization: Theoretical Investigation]. Volgograd, Russia: Peremena.
2. Vorkachev, S. G. (2005). *Variativnyie i assotsiativnyie svoystva teleonomnyh lingvokontseptov* [Variation and Associative Features of Teleonomic Linguoconcepts]. Volgograd, Russia: Paradigma.
3. Yehorova, O. I., & Kalchenko, A. V. (2012). Spetsifika kognitivnoi obuslovlennosti metaforicheskikh nominatsii mnozhestvennogo chisla [Specifics of Cognitive Grounding in Metaphoric Nominations of Indefinite Quantity]. *Philological Sciences in Russia and Abroad: Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference (St. Petersburg, February, 2012)* (pp. 120–123). St. Petersburg, Russia: Renome.
4. Zhabotynska, S. A. (2011). Kontseptualnaya metafora: ghjtsedura analiza dlia mnozhestvennykh dannykh [Conceptual Metaphor: Analysis Procedure for Multiple Data]. *Actual Topics in Linguistics. Proceeding of the XII International Conference (Cherkasy, April 28–29, 2011)* (pp. 3–6). Cherkasy, Ukraine: Ant.
5. Karasik, V. I. (2005). Etnospetsificheskiye kontsepty [Ethnospecific Concepts]. In M. V. Pimenova (Ed), *Introduction into cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 60–105). Kemerovo, Russia: Kuzbassvuzizdat.
6. Krasavskiy N. A. (2001). Emotsionalnyie kontsepty v nemetskoj i russkoj kulturah [Emotional Concepts in German and Russian Language Cultures]. Volgograd, Russia: Peremena.
7. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2004). *Metafori kotorymi my zhivom* [Metaphors we Live by] (A. N. Baranov & A. V. Morozova, Trans), (A. N. Baranov, Ed.). Moscow, Russia: Editorial URSS.
8. Nikitin, M. V. (2007). *Kurs lingvisticheskoi semantiki* [Course of Linguistic Semantics] (2nd ed.). St. Petersburg, Russia: Herzen Univ. Publ.
9. Popova, Z. D. & Sternin, I. A. (2007). *Kognitivnaya lingvistika* [Cognitive Linguistics]. Moscow, Russia: AST: Vostok-Zapad.
10. Postovalova, V. I. (1999). Lingvokulturologiya v svete antropologicheskoi paradigmy (k probleme osnovanii i granits sovremennoi frazeologii) [Linguoculturology in Frames of Anthropocentric Paradigm (To the Issue of Roots and Borders of Contemporary Phraseology)]. *Phraseology in the Context of Cultures*. (V. N. Telia, Ed.), (pp. 25–33). Moscow, Russia: Yazyki russkoj kultury.
11. Pryhodko, A. M. (2008). *Kontsepty i kontseptosistemy v kognitivno-diskursivnoi paradyhmi lingvistyky* [Concepts and Conceptual systems in Cognitive-Discursive Paradigm of Linguistics]. Zaporizhzhya, Ukraine: Premier.
12. Samigullina A. S. (2008). Poniatiye ‘obraz-skema’ v sovremennykh issledovaniyakh po kognitivnoi lingvistike [The Notion of ‘Image-Schema’ in Present-day Cognitive Linguistics]. *Bulletin of Chelyabinsk State University. Series Philology. Art History*, 20 (121), 101–106.
13. Sternin, I. A., Larina, T. V., & Sternina, M. A. (2003). 2 [Essay on the English Communicative Behavior]. Voronezh, Russia: Istoki.
14. Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
15. Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
16. *Oxford English Dictionary* (2009). (2nd ed.) on CD-ROM (v. 4.0.0.2). – [Second Edition (1989) including Oxford English Dictionary Additions Series (Vols 1–3) (1993 and 1997)]. Oxford University Press.
17. Sternina, M., & Sternin, I. (2003). *Russian and American Communicative Behavior*. Voronezh, Russia: Istoki.

Received: May 17, 2017