DOI: https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2024.28.03
UDC: 81-11:81'373.612.2

Yuliia V. Kravtsova
Doctor of Sciences (Linguistics), Professor,
Department of Slavic, Romance and Oriental Languages,
Faculty of Foreign Philology,
Mykhailo Dragomanov State University of Ukraine,
Kyiv, Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9848-4909
e-mail: yu.v.kravtsova@udu.edu.ua

LINGUOMETAPHOROLOGY AS A BRANCH OF MODERN LINGUISTICS: MAIN DIRECTIONS, PROBLEMS, AND METHODS OF RESEARCH

Bibliographic Description:

Kravtsova, Yu. V. (2024). Linguometaphorology as a Branch of Modern Linguistics: Main Directions, Problems, and Methods of Research. *Scientific journal of Mykhailo Dragomanov State University of Ukraine. Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development*, 28, 26–44. https://doi.org/10.31392/UDU-nc.series9.2024.28.03

Abstract

The paper presents the characteristic of a new integrative area of linguistics – linguometaphorology, in which a theoretical and methodological base as well as a categorical and terminological apparatus are gradually being formed, empirical material is accumulating. However, many theoretical provisions require scientific rethinking, generalization, and systematization, while terminology needs clarification and unification. Based on the analysis of the main linguometaphorological works, the leading directions and current problems of linguometaphorology, basic methods of studying metaphorics are described, and dynamics of this branch of linguistics development is predicted.

The analysis of linguometaphorological researchs of the late 20th–21st centuries shows that the study of metaphors is most productively carried out in the semantic and cognitive directions. The author of this paper develops a semantic-cognitive approach to the study of metaphors, the relevance of which is due to the objective necessity of its theoretical understanding as a single mental-verbal construct.

The current problems of linguometaphorology are as follows: defining the essence of metaphor; establishing the principles of modelling metaphorization and the parameters of metaphorical models; clarifying the specifics of the metaphorical picture of the world; identifying the features of metaphorical conceptualization; developing methods and techniques for the complex analysis of metaphorics; developing the principles of the lexicographic description of metaphors and compiling metaphorical dictionaries. The methodology of linguometaphorology, which is developing in various directions, is based on such linguistic methods as componential analysis, contextual analysis, linguistic (semantic, cognitive, semantic-cognitive) modelling.

It is promising to continue linguometaphorological research in semantic, cognitive, semantic-cognitive and lexicographic aspects. Further development of linguometaphorology will allow to get a deeper understanding of the nature and mechanisms of figurative-metaphorical thinking.

Keywords: *linguometaphorology, metaphor, metaphorization, metaphorical representation, metaphorical conceptualization, metaphorical concept, metaphorical modelling, metaphorical model.*

1. Introduction.

The theory of metaphor has over two thousand years of history and long-established traditions. It is gradually enriched and improved by new research directions that offer their own understanding of the essence of metaphor, their own ideas about its types and functions, which contributes to the expansion and deepening of scientific knowledge about it.

At the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries, the phenomenon of metaphor again attracted the attention of scientists from various branches of science – philosophy, psychology, cognitlogy, culturology, literary studies, linguistics, etc. This is due to the changes in the structure and dynamics of modern knowledge about the world, a fundamental revision of positions on the relationship between language and thinking, linguistic reflection of reality, awareness of the significance of metaphor in cognition, conceptualization and representation of the world, understanding it as a modelled object, and an attempt to clarify the mechanisms of individual, national and universal imaginative metaphorical thinking. As a result, metaphorology was formed as an independent direction of science that integrated various studies, the object of which is metaphor.

In linguistics, the study of metaphor has long been applied and fragmentary. Metaphor became the object of linguistic theory only in the second half of the last century (Black, 1962; Lakoff, Johnson, 1980; Lakoff, 1993; Ortony, 1993; Gibbs, 1994; Jackel, 1995; Fauconnier, Turner, 1998; and others) in connection with the search for a scientific justification of its linguistic essence, the desire to model the processes of formation and understanding of metaphor, the emergence of ideas about the cognitive nature of metaphorization. At the beginning of the 21st century, a linguistic theory of metaphor was formed from individual studies, which already included many new conceptions, theoretical positions and applied developments. This marked the emergence of linguometaphorology as a separate integrative branch of linguistics, which arose at the intersection of linguistics, philosophy, psychology, cognitology, culturology, rhetoric, and literary studies. The new linguistic direction is focused on the study of metaphor as a phenomenon of language and thinking, explaining the mechanisms of metaphorization as a reflection of human metaphorogenic activity. However, many theoretical positions still require scientific rethinking, generalization, and systematization.

2. Literature Review.

The number of linguistic works, focusing on metaphor, is very large, but interest in it still persists and periodically becomes more active. The attention of modern researchers is attracted by the following problems: the essence of metaphor, its place in the lingual picture of the world and its role in language (Zinken, 2004; Havryliuk, 2013; Ovsiienko, 2018); approaches to the study of metaphors (Fauconnier, Turner, 2000, 2002; Kravtsova, 2011, 2024; Sakhniuk, 2019); classification of metaphors (Ovsiienko, 2018; Stretovych, 2018); specificity of the metaphorical picture of the world (Chendei, 2007; Kravchenko-Dzondza, 2013); metaphor as a cognitive mechanism, features of metaphorical conceptualization of the world (Musolff, 2004; Ritchie, 2004; Slobodian, 2011; Kravets, 2018); modelling of metaphorization processes (Fauconnier, Turner, 2000, 2002; Kravtsova, 2011, 2022, 2024); functioning of metaphor in different styles of language (Kravets, 2012; Liashchenko, 2014), etc.

Modern researchers of metaphor consider it as a lingual and mental phenomenon, which is associated with such basic linguistic approaches to the study of this phenomenon as semantic (from the side of language) and cognitive (from the side of thinking). From the standpoint of linguistic semantics (semasiology, onomasiology, semantic derivatology), metaphor is a process (metaphorization) and the result (actually a metaphor) of a secondary

(metaphoric) nomination, which reflects, respectively, the onomasiological and semasiological aspects of its study. From the point of view of cognitive linguistics, metaphor is a cognitive mechanism, a mental operation, a projection of meaning from one sphere to another. But some scholars have expressed the opinion that the essence of metaphor lies in its belonging to both thinking and language, since mental mechanisms can be observed and interpreted only in language. In the fundamental work of G. Lakoff and M. Johnson (1980), it was noted that, on the one hand, "no metaphor can be perceived or even adequately represented independently of its empiric". On the other hand, "metaphors as language tools become possible precisely because they exist in the conceptual system of man" (Lakoff, Johnson, 1980, p. 68).

G. Lakoff and M. Johnson postulated the leading role of metaphor in the process of perception and conceptualization of reality, since it is characteristic of a person to learn the unknown through the known, and metaphor is the most convenient cognitive mechanism in this regard. The main provisions of their work are as follows: 1) metaphor is by its nature not so much a lingual, but a conceptual phenomenon that organizes human perception; 2) the basis of metaphorization is primarily human experience; 3) the metaphorical concept is based on the physical, social, and cultural experience of a person; 4) metaphor is an important mechanism by which a person perceives abstract concepts and thinks about them; 5) generally accepted conceptual metaphors are habitual, unconscious, automatic, and used without effort; 6) metaphorical thinking is embodied in language, which helps to delve deeper into the essence of human mental processes (Lakoff, Johnson, 1980). Thus, the founders of this theory of metaphor considered it as a conceptual phenomenon, as a stable correspondence between the sphere of the source (donor) and the sphere of the target (goal, recipient), fixed in the lingual and cultural tradition of a certain community. Conceptual metaphors form special cognitive structures, organize information about the sphere of knowledge, determine its representation in the memory of an individual and ensure the accumulation of the acquired knowledge in the linguocultural community as a whole, which is a confirmation of the stereotyped nature of human thinking and the essential role of metaphor in the cognition of reality.

In linguometaphorology, the theory of metaphorical modelling is actively being developed, which has two directions: semantic, based on linguistic semantics and semantic derivatology, taking into account the ideas and achievements of cognitive linguistics, and cognitive, formed in the stream of linguocognitology, taking into account the achievements of linguistic semantics, where metaphor is considered, respectively, as a semantic and cognitive model.

In linguometaphorological works that describe the results of semantic modelling of metaphorization, carried out on a significant amount of linguistic material, classifications of metaphorical models are presented according to various criteria.

L. Kudryavtseva characterized four models of metaphorization, identified on the basis of the analysis of explanatory dictionaries: 1) metaphorization with the actualization of the hidden peripheral seme (*bouquet, spring, equator*, etc.); 2) metaphorization with the actualization of the seme 'external sign' (*newspaper, zebra, pencil case,* etc.); 3) functional metaphorization (*janitor, calculator, lumberjack*, etc.); 4) associative metaphorization (*brain, shackle, turn off,* etc.) (Kravtsova, 2022, pp. 22–23). As we can see, the author of the classification, highlighting these "models of lexical-semantic derivation", confirms that in the metaphorical meaning not only potential (peripheral), but also differential semes of motivating direct meaning can be actualized.

G. Sklyarevska, relying on data from ideographic dictionaries, described regular models of substantive metaphorization established by her on the material of modern

explanatory dictionaries, in which the sphere-source of metaphorization and the direction of metaphorical transfer were indicated. According to the researcher, metaphorization in language has rather strict laws and occurs in certain directions from one semantic sphere to another. She identified about ten regular "semantic models of substantive metaphorization": "Object → Mental world" (*star of luck, cascade of eloquence*); "Object → Abstraction" (*sea of problems, chain of events*); "Animal → Man" (*donkey, rooster*); "Man → Man" (*actor, gentleman*); "Object → Man" (*burdock, cork*); "Object → Object" (*mountain of books, jungle of the city*); "Physical world → Mental world" (*burst of laughter, catastrophe of hopes*) and "Object → Physical world" (*beam of light, fan of rays*), where such spheres as "Human", "Animal", "Object", "Abstraction", "Physical world", "Mental world" are highlighted. All other types of transfers were called irregular by the author of the classification due to the small number of linguistic implementations (Kravtsova, 2022, pp. 23–24). Thus, this classification of semantic models of metaphorization in the sphere of nouns confirmed that there are relatively few of them, however, the listed directions indicate the presence of systemic relations in the metaphorical vocabulary.

O. Laguta developed a detailed thematic classification of substantive metaphors belonging to the inanimate world, which were distributed according to the main semantic spheres: 1) artefacts (*key, necklace, window*, etc.); 2) abstractions (nominations of abstract concepts with hypersemas "space", "attribute", "state", "action", "quantity": *battle, hysteria, mania*, etc.); 3) nature (*thunderstorm, gold, sun*, etc.) (Kravtsova, 2022, pp. 24–25). The spheres of the source and direction of metaphorization were put forward as the main parameters of the classification – the conceptual spheres of creative (direct) and derived (metaphorical) meanings, characteristic of usual substantive metaphorization. In general, the author identified twenty types of metaphorical transfers, regular in the sphere of inanimate nouns. In addition to the types established by G. Sklyarevska, O. Laguta also identified others: "Object → Social phenomenon", "Physical phenomenon → Object", "Physical phenomenon → Abstract concept", "Mental phenomenon → Physical phenomenon", "Abstract concept → Mental phenomenon", etc. In this classification, the following semantic spheres of the inanimate world are presented as the main ones: "Object", "Physical phenomenon", "Mental phenomenon", "Social phenomenon", "Abstract concept".

In linguometaphorological works describing the results of cognitive modelling of metaphorization, also conducted on significant linguistic material, metaphorical models were classified according to other criteria.

A. Chudinov, when describing metaphorical models, suggests characterizing such parameters as the original and new conceptual spheres (sphere-source and sphere-target), structured using typical frames and slots, as well as a component that connects primary and secondary meanings. The scientist identified such ideographic spheres-sources of metaphorical projection as "Man", "Society", "Artefact", "Nature" (sphere-target – politics), within which frequency metaphorical models are established and their frame-slot structure is described. For example, in the source sphere "Man" the model "Political realities are a human organism" is presented, structured in the form of frames "human body", "physiological organs", "body parts", "physiological actions", etc. The frame "physiological actions" is formed by the slots "nutrition, digestion and related processes" (*swallow, digest*), "sleep and its phases" (*doze, dream, sleep, hibernation*), "birth, death and related concepts" (*embryonic, be born, die*), "drunkenness and related concepts" (*hangover, sober*), "breathing" (*breath, breathing*) (Ovsiienko, 2018, p. 108; Sakhniuk, 2019, p. 32; Kravtsova, 2022, pp. 30–31).

A. Baranov describes metaphorical models as tuples of significant and denotative descriptors, presented as semantic "trees". They demonstrate hierarchical relations between

descriptors, mainly reflecting the "genus – species" relationship. For example, within the semantic field that organizes the metaphorical model "War", several conceptual spheres are distinguished, in particular "weapons", "types of military actions", "participants in military actions", etc., which form a set of terminal concepts: "weapons" – *rifle, sword, dynamite*, etc. Denotative descriptors are grouped in a similar way. The list of denotative descriptors is open, – its composition largely depends on the set of categories of the conceptual sphere under study. The list of significant descriptors is also open and is formed depending on which spheres of human knowledge are involved in interpreting the concepts of the conceptual sphere under study. The use of metalanguage of significant and denotative descriptors allows, according to the author of the theory, firstly, to uniformly describe the contexts of metaphor use and process them using computer programs – databases; secondly, to quantitatively evaluate metaphorical models from the point of view of their functioning in discourse; thirdly, to carry out an objective analysis of metaphors in their real use (Sakhniuk, 2019, p. 32; Kravtsova, 2022, pp. 30–31).

Many special publications are directed towards identifying specific metaphorical models in texts (discourses) of a certain genre and style qualification. However, there are still many unresolved and debatable issues in this field that require further research.

3. Aim and Objectives.

The purpose of the paper is to characterize linguometaphorology as an integrative branch of modern linguistics, to describe its main directions, current problems and productive methods of studying metaphor.

The purpose of the paper involves solving the following *tasks*:

– based on the analysis of linguometaphorological research, to describe the main directions of studying metaphor;

– to identify and state the current problems of linguometaphorology;

– to characterize traditional and new methods of studying metaphor, which are productive in understanding its essence and formation;

– to predict the further development of linguometaphorology.

4. Methodology.

The results were obtained using such general scientific methods as *analysis* (to obtain the necessary information through the study of basic linguometaphorological research) and *synthesis* (to combine the data obtained as a result of the analysis), *comparison* (to identify common and different in conceptions of scientists), *generalization* (to unite similar views of scientists on certain problems of metaphor research, identified in the process of abstraction) and *systematization* (to organize the knowledge obtained on the problems of linguometaphorology).

5. Results.

Linguometaphorology, which acquired the status of an independent branch of linguistics at the beginning of the 21st century, continues to develop actively and productively. Currently, the number of linguometaphorological works is vast, in connection with which some scientists rightly note that the idea of the omnipresence of metaphor has led to the blurring of the very concept of metaphor, when it began to be called any method of indirect and figurative meaning. Therefore, the main task of the linguistic theory of metaphor is to limit its conceptual scope and return its genetic essence. In addition, the following can be attributed to the important tasks of linguometaphorology: unification of terminology; multiaspect study of linguistic metaphors; systematic study of the metaphorics of various

idiolects and sociolects; determination of the specifics of national metaphorical pictures of the world; comparative study of metaphorical pictures of the world of different ethnic groups; diachronic description of national metaphorical pictures of the world; development of principles of lexicographical description of metaphorics; compilation of metaphorical dictionaries, etc.

The basic concepts of linguometaphorology, which form its conceptual and terminological apparatus, are metaphor, metaphorics, metaphorization, metaphorical model, metaphorical motivation, metaphorical picture of the world, metaphorical representation, metaphorical conceptualization, metaphorical concept, conceptual metaphor, etc. It should be noted that some of them still do not have a single interpretation.

5.1. Main Directions of Linguometaphorological Research.

The analysis of linguometaphorological research of the late 20th–21st centuries showed that the most productive study of metaphors is carried out in the semantic and cognitive directions, which are based on methodological principles inherent, respectively, to linguistic semantics (semasiology, onomasiology, semantic derivatology) and cognitive linguistics in their views on language in general and metaphor in particular.

5.1.1. Semantic Direction of Linguometaphorology.

In semantic linguometaphorological studies, metaphor is considered as a process and result of the formation of figurative meaning, secondary nomination and is analysed together with other semantic models of language. Understanding the metaphorical model is based on the theory of regular polysemy, primarily on the proposition of semantic parallelism. Its essence lies in the fact that words close in meaning often have similar secondary meanings, and the typical ratio of primary and secondary meanings of these words can serve as a model for modifying the meanings of other words belonging to any semantic group.

The study of metaphor in modern semasiology is carried out to establish its semantic structure and structural-semantic description of metaphorics on a particular material. However, there is still no comprehensive study that would summarize the classification procedures of the facts of metaphorization, since it is extremely difficult to typify a significant amount of linguistic material.

Onomasiological studies of recent years seek to penetrate the mechanisms of metaphorization and describe typical metaphorical models. The process of metaphor formation is considered, as a rule, either in parallel with its semasiological analysis, or within the framework of semantic derivation, where it is considered as a semantic model and, accordingly, described together with other models of semantic derivation. These studies are integrated into the stream of linguocognitology, which is manifested in actualising the problems of metaphorical modelling, which reflect the processes of metaphorogenic activity of a human.

Metaphor as a semantic model is interpreted ambiguously: a typical correlation of the semantics of primary and secondary meanings existing in the minds of native speakers, which is a model for the emergence of new secondary meanings; a description of the method of formation, which takes into account the denotative-conceptual meaning of the motivating sememe, the denotative-conceptual meaning of the derived sememe, as well as the semantic formant, characterized from the substantive and formal sides; etc. (Kravtsova, 2022, p. 21). In general, the metaphorical model acts as a certain scheme of meaning formation and is interpreted as a regular correlation of the denotative spheres of the motivating and motivated meanings of words.

Descriptions of metaphorical models in modern semantic studies also have significant differences both in establishing their component composition and in the characteristics of these components: 1) the archiseme, the replacement of which is carried out; seme, which is actualized in the derivative; new differential semes; 2) generalized ideographic affiliation of the formative and derivative meanings, the sphere-donor and the sphere-recipient; lexical-thematic or lexical-grammatical affiliation of the formative and derivative meanings; lexical meaning of the motivating and motivated meanings; semantic characteristic of semantic formants; formal characteristic of semantic formants; etc. (Kravtsova, 2022, p. 21–22).

According to the semantic approach, each model allows the possibility of transforming the meanings of words that are close in meaning. The basis of modelling can be different principles, which is reflected in the nature of the description and classification of models. Therefore, when describing a metaphor as a semantic model, denotative (ideographic) spheres (various semantic groups (lexical-semantic or thematic), semantic fields, etc.) are most often characterized, which include the corresponding words in primary and secondary (metaphoric) meanings, and, less often, signs that motivate metaphorical transfer.

In semantic linguometaphorological studies, metaphorical models contain components that are different in nature and number, but the allocation of semantic (ideographic) spheres of creative and derivative meanings is similar. Such works are usually characterized by the perfection of considering the facts of secondary nomination, based on component analysis, which contributes to a deep penetration into the essence of metaphorization. However, such descriptions of metaphorical models are usually carried out on a relatively small amount of material, are often selective in nature, and are distinguished by the complexity of structuring and the ambiguity of model parameterization.

Thus, metaphorical modelling from the standpoint of semantics (semantic derivatology) can be characterized as the construction of metaphorization models that demonstrate the regular transfer of names from one class of objects to another based on the similarity of their features. A metaphorical model is a certain scheme of meaning formation, a regular correlation of the semantic spheres of the motivating (primary) and motivated (secondary) meanings of words connected by a common semantic element.

5.1.2. Cognitive Direction of Linguometaphorology.

In cognitive linguometaphorological studies, metaphor is considered as a mental operation on conceptual structures, which consists in the projection of knowledge from one conceptual sphere to another, as a mechanism for cognition of the surrounding reality, which makes it possible to identify similarities between different realities as a result of the application of knowledge and experience acquired in one field to solve problems in another field. Understanding metaphor as a cognitive model is based on the idea of it as a mental formation that reflects the process of cognition of the surrounding world and is explicated in language.

Cognitive research on metaphor, which began with the fundamental work of G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, which became the “bible of the cognitive approach to metaphor” (A. Baranov), is carried out in various directions. In recent years, various theories of metaphor have been formed: conceptual integration, or blending (G. Fauconnier, M. Turner), cognitive-discursive (A. Chudinov), descriptive (A. Baranov), etc. The cognitive direction in the study of metaphor, which has spread in world linguistics, has found application in various applied studies. At the same time, many issues are debatable. Therefore, the cognitive theory of metaphor continues to actively develop and be implemented in new scientific interpretations.

Metaphorical modelling in cognitive linguistics is considered as a means of understanding, categorizing, representing and evaluating reality at a certain stage of development of society, which reflects national identity. Metaphorical models are embedded in the conceptual system of the human mind itself as certain schemes that influence a person's mental activity and speech behaviour, which is one of the main theses of the cognitive theory of metaphor.

In cognitive linguometaphorological studies, the metaphorical model is interpreted ambiguously: the existing scheme of connection between two conceptual spheres in the minds of native speakers, which can be represented by a certain formula: "X is Y"; homogeneous source spheres, the elements of which are connected by various semantic relations; etc. (Kravtsova, 2022, p. 26).

The components of the metaphorical model as a cognitive structure are also described differently: 1) two source spaces; a common space; a mixed space, or blend; 2) the source conceptual sphere (mental sphere-source, sphere-donor, source of metaphorical expansion) in the primary meaning; a new conceptual sphere (mental sphere-target, sphere-recipient, direction of metaphorical expansion) in the figurative meaning; typical frames that structure the corresponding conceptual sphere; typical slots that are included in a certain frame; a component that connects the primary and secondary meanings of the units covered by this model, that is, provides grounds for the metaphorical use of the corresponding concepts; etc. (Kravtsova, 2022, p. 26–27).

The theory of conceptual integration by G. Fauconnier and M. Turner was based on the synthesis of G. Fauconnier's theory of mental spaces and G. Lakoff's and M. Johnson's conceptual theory of metaphor, some of whose provisions have been revised. The researchers concluded that metaphorization is not limited to a projection from the sphere-source to the sphere-target, as was claimed in the conceptual theory, but contains complex integration processes that create new mixed mental spaces capable of building a structure of meaning in the process of conceptual integration itself. In this case, the emergence of a metaphor is accompanied by the simultaneous activation of at least brain parts that are responsible for visual and abstract images.

The authors of the theory proposed an alternative to the two-domain model of metaphor, a model of several spaces (Fauconnier, Turner, 2002). In their opinion, the unidirectional metaphorical projection from the sphere-source to the sphere-target is only a special case of a more complex, dynamic, and variable complex of processes, for the explication of which it is necessary to introduce two intermediate spaces into the study of cognitive metaphor. Thus, in contrast to the two conceptual domains in the theory of G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, it is proposed to consider four mental spaces: two source spaces, a common space and a mixed space, or blend. The source spaces correspond to the sphere-source and the sphere-target in the conceptual metaphor theory, although the number of source spaces can be more than two. The common space contains abstract elements (frames and slots) inherent in both source spaces. The blend "mixes" the parts of the output spaces, resulting in a qualitatively new conceptual structure, which is no longer dependent on the output spaces and has its own potentials for further development. According to G. Fokonier and M. Turner, the projection always involves the conceptual integration, which is the most common cognitive operation, which stands in a par with analogy, mental modelling and conceptual categorization.

The cognitive-discursive theory of metaphor, developed by A. Chudinov on the material of political discourse, is based on the postulates of the semantic theory of regular ambiguity and the cognitive theory of metaphor. The author used "all the best that was created by the representatives of each of the mentioned linguistic directions – completely

different in terms of initial theoretical premises and at the same time surprisingly close in terms of methodology and some specific results of the research of speech activity" (Kravtsova, 2022, p. 30). According to this theory, metaphorization should be considered a basic cognitive operation, which consists in the interaction between the knowledge structures of two conceptual spheres – the sphere-source and the sphere-target, that is, according to the conceptual theory of G. Lakoff and M. Johnson. A metaphorical model is a scheme of connection between conceptual spheres that exists in the minds of native speakers. Accordingly, the system of one mental sphere, including frames and slots, is the basis for modelling the mental system of another sphere. The frame-slot structure of the metaphorical model reflects everyday (naive) human ideas about the world. The author of the theory notes that the classification and inventory of metaphorical models will make it possible to identify the most frequent and productive models, and possibly to establish general laws of metaphorical modelling of the world. At the same time, it is important to choose the basis for classification, so the scientist suggests choosing the sphere-source (and its separate frames) or the sphere-target as the basis of such systematization.

The descriptive theory developed by A. Baranov is based on the achievements of cognitive and linguistic semantics and is intended for thesaurus-type description, or, as the author notes, "for a formalized description of a large corpus of metaphor use contexts, that is, for the study of the metaphorics of discourse as a whole, rather than the analysis of individual isolated examples" (Kravtsova, 2022, p. 28). According to the aforementioned theory, metaphorization should be considered as a projection of elements of the source domain onto elements of the target domain. The source domain and the target domain are structured fields of knowledge that must be described with a special metalanguage of semantic descriptors – denotative (for the target domain) and significant (for the source domain). Thematically related fields of significant descriptors form metaphorical models – M-models (for example, significant descriptors with the semantics of military actions, armies, form the M-model of war). The author of the concept established that in political discourse the most frequently used metaphors were those that form about fifty M-models – war, sports, games, transport, mechanism, family relations, fauna, etc. The author describes each M-model using hierarchically ordered "trees" of significant descriptors. The scientist calls the sets of M-models that profile common or similar meanings in texts of a specific problem area constellations. Metaphorical constellations in different texts can be modified. The methodology for analysing and describing metaphors in a corpus proposed by the author makes it possible to use standard computer data processing tools and involve significant amounts of factual (linguistic) information for analysis, significantly increasing the reliability of the results obtained.

When describing a metaphor as a cognitive model, its parameters are usually noted, such as the conceptual spheres of the source and target of the metaphorical projection (or only the sphere of the source), their frames and slots. With the cognitive approach, conceptual convergence is perceived as a much more important factor than level or structural differences, as a result of which the limitations inherent in the semantic approach are eliminated when characterizing metaphorical models (clear structuring of models according to semantics: semantic fields or microfields, lexical-semantic or thematic groups, etc. which include creative and derivative meaning, the hierarchy of seme), and this leads to certain different readings in descriptions of frame-slot structures of the same conceptual spheres.

Therefore, cognitive metaphorical modelling is the reconstruction of metaphorical projections that directly exist in the conceptual system of the human mind as mental schemes and influence the thinking activity and speech behavior of native speakers. From the standpoint of linguocognitology, the metaphorical model is considered as a cognitive

mechanism present in the conceptual system of a human, which ensures stable correspondence between the spheres of the source and the goal, reflecting the cultural traditions of the ethnos, as well as some stereotypy of collective figurative and metaphorical thinking.

5.1.3. Semantic-cognitive Direction of Linguometaphorology.

The author of this paper develops a semantic-cognitive approach to the study of metaphor (Kravtsova, 2011, 2022, 2024). The prerequisites for the emergence of our concept were as follows: 1) intensive development and formation of individual branches of modern linguistics – linguistic semantics, linguocognitology, linguoculturology, linguoconceptology, corpus linguistics; 2) the emergence of a new semantic-cognitive direction in the study of language, which allows establishing a close relationship between linguistic and cognitive structures; 3) the activation of linguometaphorological research in connection with the awareness of the significant role of metaphor in cognition, conceptualization and representation of the world. The relevance of such consideration of metaphor is due to the objective necessity of its theoretical understanding as a single mental-verbal construct in the context of modern trends in linguistics.

The semantic-cognitive approach to the study of metaphor, developed for its integrative description as a lingual and mental phenomenon, is that as a result of the analysis of the semantics of metaphorical nominations and the construction of metaphorical models reconstructed on a particular linguistic material, it is possible to establish typical models of metaphorical thinking of an ethnic group or its individual representative, and in general – the main trends and patterns of metaphorical representation and conceptualization of the world, characteristic of a certain historical period. In this case, a metaphor is considered a mental-verbal construct intended for the characterization and nomination of an object and created on the basis of its analogy or associative similarity with another object that already has a name, in the process of human cognitive activity. It is a component of the metaphorical picture of the world and the metaphorical conceptual sphere of the ethnos.

The proposed semantic-cognitive approach to the study of metaphor is based on such principles as: understanding metaphor as a mental-verbal construct; synthesis of ideas of semantic and cognitive modelling of metaphorization; implementation of metaphorical modelling based on the reconstruction of a national or individual metaphorical picture of the world or its fragments; analysis of a significant corpus of metaphorical nominations; parameterization of the metaphorical model as a three-component structure; identification of productive metaphorical models; structuring of metaphorical models as variants of the megamodel and invariants organizing submodels; establishment of basic metaphorical concepts, description of their content and structure. Semantic-cognitive research of metaphor as a product of cognitive mental-verbal activity of carriers of ethnoculture is focused on a comprehensive description of this unique phenomenon of language and thinking.

According to the proposed approach, the metaphorical model is a scheme of verbalization of correlative concepts in the analogue-associative plan existing in the minds of native speakers. It is a three-component structure that includes the original and new denotative-conceptual spheres and the semantic-cognitive motivant, which is interpreted as a conceptual-semantic element that integrates various entities that are similar in some respect: original denotative-conceptual sphere (metaphorical motivator) → new denotative-conceptual sphere (metaphorical motivate) | semantic-cognitive motivant (motivating feature of metaphorical nomination).

The metaphorical model is structured in the form of metaphorical submodels, which are means of its concretization and are characterized by the variability of the initial and / or

new denotative-conceptual spheres and/or semantic-cognitive motivator within a certain invariant. The set of metaphorical models with similar denotative-conceptual spheres forms a metaphorical megamodel, which indicates the direction of metaphorical projection from one ideographic sphere to another, formulated in the most general form.

Semantic-cognitive metaphorical modelling involves the following stages: 1) analysis and systematization of a significant corpus of metaphorical contexts; 2) construction of basic constructions – metaphorical models; 3) structuring metaphorical models as variants of a certain megamodel and invariants that organize submodels; 4) comparison of metaphorical models, identification of basic trends and patterns of metaphorical modelling; 5) verification of the obtained results and their application for the establishment and description of metaphorical concepts.

Thus, the semantic-cognitive approach to the study of metaphor, which consists in the analysis of the semantics of metaphorical nominations as a means of language and a way of objectifying metaphorical concepts, allows us to implement the idea of a comprehensive consideration of metaphor as a lingual and mental phenomenon.

5.2. Current Problems of Linguometaphorology.

In our opinion, the following are among the current problems of linguometaphorology: defining the essence of metaphor; establishing the principles of modelling metaphorization and the parameters of metaphorical models; clarifying the specifics of the metaphorical picture of the world; identifying the features of metaphorical conceptualization; developing methods and techniques for the complex analysis of metaphorics; developing the principles of metaphors lexicographic description and compiling metaphorical dictionaries.

5.2.1. Definition of the Essence of Metaphor.

The concept of metaphor, which existed in ancient times, has many different definitions: the transfer of a name from one object (phenomenon, action, sign) to another based on the similarity of their external or internal properties; the use of a word (phrase, sentence) denoting a certain object (phenomenon, sign, action, situation) to characterize or nominate another object based on the similarity (conditional identity) of the properties attributed to them; a semiotic regularity that manifests itself in the use of signs of one conceptual sphere when designating another that is likened to it in a certain respect; the main mental operation that unites two conceptual spheres and creates the opportunity to use the potential of structuring the source sphere using a new sphere, etc. Thus, a metaphor arises when one object is likened to another based on the analogical or associative proximity of their external or internal properties. Therefore, common to all its definitions is the understanding of metaphor as the transfer of a name from one object to another based on their similarity since all modern studies of metaphor are based in one way or another on Aristotle's fundamental proposition about metaphorical transfer.

5.2.2. Establishing the Principles of Modelling Metaphorization and the Parameters of Metaphorical Models.

The term "metaphorical model" is understood differently, due to which there are differences in the parameterization of models, the principles of their description and classification. In linguistic semantics, a metaphorical model is interpreted as a scheme of meaning formation, a regular correlation of the semantics of the primary (generative / motivating) and secondary (derived / motivated) meanings of words, which is a model for the emergence of new figurative meanings. From the standpoint of cognitive linguistics, a

metaphorical model is considered as a relationship between the sphere-source (sphere-donor) and the sphere-target (sphere-recipient), that is, the interaction of two conceptual spheres, which reflects the mental and cultural traditions of a particular ethnic group (for example, "Human → Plant", "Inorganic world / Inanimate nature → Human", etc.).

When characterizing a metaphor as a semantic model, such mandatory parameters as semantic (denotative) spheres of direct and figurative meanings, sometimes motivational signs of transfer, are distinguished, and when describing a metaphor as a cognitive model, the sphere-source, the sphere-target, their typical frames and slots are distinguished. Despite certain differences in the parameterization of a metaphorical model in semantic and cognitive approaches, there are also similar points: the unity of the basic concepts of metaphorical modelling (in the presence of different terminology); operating with one term "metaphorical model"; commonality in highlighting such parameters of the model as the original and new spheres of metaphorization.

5.2.3. Clarification of the Specifics of the Metaphorical Picture of the World.

The term "metaphorical picture of the world" has only recently entered scientific use, and therefore there is ambiguity in its understanding. Some scientists consider the metaphorical picture of the world as a fragment of the linguistic picture of the world, others – as a broader phenomenon, when the metaphorics of language create not a fragment of the linguistic picture of the world but fill its entire space.

We consider the understanding of the metaphorical picture of the world as a fragment of the linguistic picture of the world to be not entirely correct, since the process of metaphorization covers the semantic space of the language as a whole, and not a separate part of it, although, of course, not all lexemes have the ability to metaphorize. However, it is also difficult to agree with the thesis about the imposition of a metaphorical picture of the world on the lingual one and its almost complete coincidence with it, because this practically leads to the identification of the two pictures of the world. In our opinion, the metaphorical picture of the world is a fragmentary projection of the lingual picture of the world. First, from the standpoint of lexical semantics, if we conditionally divide all lexical meanings into direct and figurative, metaphorical meanings are a projection of the corresponding direct ones. Secondly, from the point of view of grammatical semantics, a significant part of full-meaning words (nouns, adjectives, verbs, less often – participles, adverbs) have the ability to metaphorize. Thirdly, in the cognitive plan, when creating a metaphor, some properties of the sphere-source are projected into the sphere-target and manifest themselves in language as metaphorical consequences. Therefore, we believe that the metaphorics of language is an independent formation – a metaphorical system, projected into language not completely, but fragmentarily. The set of lingual metaphors constitutes a metaphorical picture of the world of a certain ethnic group, which, on the one hand, is as if opposed to the lingual (relatively speaking, non-metaphorical) picture of the world, and on the other – is part of it. Thus, we understand the metaphorical picture of the world of an ethnic group as a fragmentary projection of the lingual picture of the world, a set of figurative analogue-associative ideas about the world, existing in the national consciousness of a particular people and explicated in language.

The existence of different views on the nature of the metaphorical picture of the world indicates the need for further research.

5.2.4. Identifying the Features of Metaphorical Conceptualization.

Metaphorical conceptualization of the world reflects a creative interpretation of the surrounding reality, the perception of which is based on the social and personal experience of

representatives of a particular ethnic group. The metaphorical concept, equivalent to the conceptual metaphor, was introduced by G. Lakoff and M. Johnson to describe the cognitive nature of metaphor (1980). At the beginning of the 21st century the term "metaphorical concept" (= conceptual metaphor) became widespread in linguometaphorology, which was due to the formation of linguoconceptology as an independent branch of linguistics and the emergence of various methods for studying ethno-cultural concepts.

The term "metaphorical concept" also does not have a single interpretation. It is understood as the equivalent of the concept of "conceptual metaphor" (following G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, who introduced this term) – a stable correspondence between the spheres of source and target, fixed in the lingual and cultural tradition of an ethnic group, which forms a special cognitive structure that contains information about a certain sphere of knowledge and is stored in the memory of native speakers.

The metaphorical concept, in our opinion, is a mental construct that reflects the stable figurative analogue-associative connections of realities in the collective and individual consciousness and is explicated in the process of creative verbal activity of a person in the form of specific metaphorical realizations. Therefore, we believe that the conceptual metaphor and metaphorical concept should be distinguished: a conceptual metaphor is a metaphor that contains an important concept for each ethnocultural community, an idea of something (for example, *life is a game, theatre, path, journey*); a metaphorical concept is a general figurative idea, a key concept that is realized in a number of metaphors, that is, a component of a linguocultural concept (for example, *Water*: *wave of joy, sea of tears, stream of time, light is pouring*, etc.).

A metaphorical concept is a certain figurative-mental invariant, which is realized in various linguistic metaphorical variations, and a component of the corresponding ethnocultural concept, its figurative component. Therefore, there is still no generally accepted definition of a metaphorical concept, its complex characteristics as a mental unit, a single methodology of analysis.

5.2.5. Development of Principles of Lexicography of Metaphors and Compilation of Metaphorical Dictionaries.

Independent descriptions of metaphorics in lexicography were absent until recently, although they still occupy a minor place in it. The objective difficulties in compiling metaphorical dictionaries are that metaphor is one of the most productive ways of creating meaning and is widely used in language as a figurative means, therefore it is very difficult to establish the facts of metaphorization, systematize and describe metaphorical nominations. Very few works consider the features of the lexicographic description of metaphors (Kravtsova, 2020, p. 92).

The main principles of lexicography of metaphorical nominations in modern explanatory dictionaries include the following: clear hierarchization of metaphorical meaning in the structure of a polysemantic word and appropriate fixation in the dictionary entry; necessary and sufficient interpretation of metaphors; introduction of grammatical, style, and stylistic marks; providing relevant illustrative material that demonstrates the functioning of a certain metaphorical nomination in speech; reflecting various semantic and word-formation connections of metaphors.

Recently, separate dictionaries of metaphors have begun to appear, compiled on the material of various discourses (mainly political and artistic). Metaphorical lexicography, focused on the description of artistic metaphors, which is carried out on the basis of the analysis of a certain idiolect or fragment of literature, is developing especially productively.

In general, the following main trends in metaphorical lexicography can be distinguished: fixing metaphor as a headword; complex structuring of a dictionary entry by introducing new components (for example, indicating the direct meaning, metaphorical model; interpretation of a typical figurative representation); adding various comments and notes; integrative nature of the description, which includes both the interpretation of metaphorical semantics and other information (from history, cultural studies, etc.).

We see prospects for the further development of metaphorical lexicography in compiling an explanatory dictionary of metaphors and developing national metaphorical corpora in different languages. It should be noted that such national metaphorical corpora already exist as the Amsterdam Metaphor Corpus (2010) and MetaNet (2012). The successful implementation of such lexicographic projects will contribute to the effective implementation of research, educational, and translation activities.

5.3. Methodology of Linguometaphorological Studies.

The methodology of linguometaphorology, which is developing in different directions, is based on such linguistic methods as: component analysis (for studying the semantics of metaphorical nominations, identifying sems and determining the seme structure of metaphors); contextual analysis (to establish the semantic content of the author's metaphors, not recorded in explanatory dictionaries, in texts of different genre and style qualifications); linguistic (semantic, cognitive, semantic-cognitive) modelling (when identifying parameters and building metaphorical models).

5.3.1. Componential Analysis of Metaphors.

This method consists in studying the content side of semantic units of language, in particular metaphors as figurative meanings, and establishing their structure by decomposing the meaning (metaphoric sememe) into minimal semantic components (semes). The purpose of componential analysis of a metaphor is to establish and describe its seme structure as completely as possible. It is carried out using dictionary definitions with the involvement, as a rule, of the entire lexical-semantic group of words to which the studied unit belongs.

Componential analysis is based, as is known, on the following provisions: 1) meaning (semema) is a complex phenomenon that has a certain structure; 2) a sememe can be decomposed into separate semantic components – semes; 3) each sememe has a unique set of semes; 4) the decomposition of a lexeme into semantic multipliers is carried out taking into account the distribution of its meanings by semantic fields (microfields).

Componential analysis of metaphors involves the following stages: 1) identification, based on data presented in explanatory dictionaries, of a polysemantic lexeme to which the studied metaphorical sememe belongs; 2) identification in various explanatory dictionaries of interpretations of the studied lexeme (all its sememes) and metaphorical sememe in the semantic structure of the polyseme, highlighting in them separate semes – integral and differential; 3) in the absence of integral semes in the metaphor and other sememes of the polyseme, establishing a potential (associative) seme; 4) clarification of the semantic feature (integral / potential), which is the basis for the formation of a metaphor by similarity; 5) determination of the differential seme, which is the carrier of a new metaphorical meaning.

5.3.2. Contextual Analysis of Metaphors.

This is a type of distributive analysis, which has emerged as an independent method as a set of procedures for determining the conditions and nature of the implementation of the semantic content of a language unit in the context. In terms of the study of metaphor, it is

similar to component analysis. Still, it is used when the metaphor is occasional (author's) and its meaning is not recorded in explanatory dictionaries.

The method is based on the following provisions: 1) a language unit as a linguistic sign is asymmetrical (mismatch of the signifier and the signified), but it is possible to distinguish separate discrete elements (meanings); 2) in the language (text) a language unit is actualized only in one of its possible options (meanings); 3) native speakers are equally familiar with the conditions for the implementation of language units in a particular language; 4) the language system remains relatively unchanged. This approach considers the influence on the lingual semantics of the communicative situation, the role structure of communication, social factors and the conditions for language functioning.

Contextual analysis of metaphor involves the following stages: 1) collecting of factual material in language (text); 2) analysis of actual material according to certain criteria determined by the purpose of the research; 3) establishment of typical metaphor contexts – minimal, extended; 4) discretization (recognition) of the meanings of the identified metaphors; 5) identification of potential semantic components (contextual meanings of metaphors).

5.3.3. Linguistic Modelling of Metaphors.

The essence of this method is to build a model of a real object, the study of the properties and structure of which is impossible or difficult in the natural environment. A model is usually understood as an analogue (scheme, sample) of a certain fragment of reality, which appears in a more simplified form (material or imaginary) and reflects the most essential properties of the modelled object.

Semantic metaphorical modelling is the construction of metaphorization models that demonstrate the regular transfer of names from one class of objects to another based on the similarity of their features and reflect the specifics of the figurative-associative thinking of the ethnos at a certain stage of its development. In general, a semantic metaphorical model is a metaphor formation scheme, a regular (typical) correlation of the semantic (denotative) spheres of the creative (motivational) and derived (motivated) meanings of words. But in various semantic linguometaphorological studies, metaphor as a semantic model is treated ambiguously. Accordingly, parametric descriptions of semantic metaphorical models also have significant differences in establishing their component composition as well as in the characteristics of these components. But, despite some differences, the indication of the mandatory allocation of denotative spheres or other semantic associations, which include creative and derived meanings, sometimes also the grounds (motivation) of transfer, is similar. In general, constructing metaphorical models as varieties of semantic derivation models reproduces the procedure of projecting the source sphere onto the target sphere and reveals the essence of various metaphors.

Cognitive metaphorical modelling is the reconstruction of metaphor as a cognitive mechanism that reflects the process of figurative cognition of the surrounding world; the construction of mental schemes embedded in the conceptual system of the human mind that influence a human's thinking and speech behaviour. Metaphor is a stereotypical image through which experience and knowledge about the world are organized. Figurative thinking of a human allows him to creatively perceive unfamiliar surrounding reality and not only to identify objects by establishing similarities between spheres perceived by different sense organs, but also to catch commonalities between concrete and abstract objects. The cognitive metaphorical model is a stable correspondence between the sphere-source and the sphere-target (the interaction of two conceptual spheres), which reflects the mental and cultural traditions of a certain ethnic group. However, in cognitive linguometaphorological studies,

the metaphorical model is also understood ambiguously. Accordingly, the components of a metaphorical model as a cognitive structure are also described differently. Despite certain differences, when describing a metaphor as a cognitive model, such parameters as the conceptual spheres of the source and target of the metaphorical projection, and sometimes their frames and slots, are usually noted.

Semantic-cognitive metaphorical modelling – establishment of typical models of metaphorical thinking and basic metaphorical concepts, characteristic of the carriers of any ethnoculture at a specific historical stage, and in general – the main trends and patterns of reflection of certain cognitive structures of knowledge (metaphorical concepts) in lingual structures (metaphorical meanings). Semantic-cognitive metaphorical model – is a regular scheme of verbalization of concepts correlative in analog-associative terms existing in the consciousness of native speakers, which contains the original and new denotative-conceptual spheres (sphere-source and sphere-target) and semantic-cognitive motivant as an integrating semantic-cognitive feature.

Semantic-cognitive modelling of metaphorization involves the following stages: 1) collecting a corpus of metaphors or metaphorical contexts, respectively, from explanatory dictionaries or texts of a certain genre-style qualification of a specific historical period; 2) analysis of the corpus of all collected facts of metaphorization and construction of metaphorical models; 3) taking into account the established spheres-sources of metaphorization, finding out which metaphorical concepts all identified metaphorical names are representatives of; 4) analysis (componential, contextual) of the semantics of all representatives of the established metaphorical concepts to determine associates (cognitive features); 5) description of the content of metaphorical concepts (at the semantic and cognitive levels); 6) description of the structure of metaphorical concepts (core, co-core zone, periphery); 7) description of the structure of the reconstructed metaphorical concept sphere (core, co-core zone, periphery). Thus, semantic-cognitive metaphorical modelling contributes to the study of the semantics of metaphorical nominations as means of language and a way of representing metaphorical concepts.

Thus, in linguometaphorology, a theory of metaphorical modelling is actively being developed, which has three directions: semantic, based on linguistic semantics and semantic derivation, taking into account the ideas and achievements of cognitive linguistics; cognitive, formed in the stream of linguocognitology, taking into account the achievements of linguistic semantics; semantic-cognitive, which partially combines semantic and cognitive directions. However, there is currently no single methodology for analysing metaphors.

6. Discussion and Conclusions.

Linguometaphorology, which acquired the status of an independent science only at the beginning of the 21st century, is actively developing in various research directions for a deep and comprehensive study of metaphor as a phenomenon of language and thinking. The basic principles, methods and various techniques for analysing metaphors have been developed, a categorical and conceptual apparatus has been formed, and significant empirical material has been accumulated. However, due to the complexity and multifaceted nature of this phenomenon, many questions remain open and require further scientific understanding. The definition of the essence of metaphor, the methods of its formation and perception, the modelling of metaphorization, and the establishment of the specifics of metaphorical conceptualization and representation are debatable.

The unflagging interest in metaphor is due to the desire to clarify the essence of figurative thinking, to determine the mechanism and models of metaphorization, since metaphors play a huge role in cognition, categorization, and representation of the world, are

the most important component of the conceptual and lingual pictures of the world. Therefore, despite the huge number of works in this field, many unresolved and debatable issues still require further research.

The development of linguometaphorology in line with the anthropocentric paradigm will allow over time to understand the general patterns of metaphorical thinking and identify the specifics of metaphors of different languages. The most important tasks of this new branch of linguistics include: the unification of the linguometaphorological terminological system; multi-aspect study of lingual metaphors; determination of the specifics of national metaphorical pictures of the world; comparative study of metaphorical pictures of the world of different ethnic groups; further development of the principles of metaphors lexicographic description and compilating of metaphorical dictionaries.

It is promising to continue linguometaphorological research in semantic, cognitive and lexicographic aspects. In our opinion, descriptive study of metaphors of one language or comparative study of metaphors of more languages and compilation of national metaphorical dictionaries can be productive. The semantic-cognitive approach to the study of metaphor developed by the author of this paper, which consists in the analysis of the semantics of metaphorical nominations as means of language and representatives of metaphorical concepts, has vast opportunities for the study of metaphors, which allows implementing the idea of a comprehensive consideration of metaphor as a mental-verbal construct. Further development of linguometaphorology will allow to learn more deeply the nature and mechanisms of figurative-metaphorical thinking.

R e f e r e n c e s

Black, M. (1962). Models and Metaphors. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 267 p.

Chendei, N. V. (2007). Metaforychna kartyna svitu ta yii mistse u systemi svitiv [Metaphorical picture of the world and its place in the system of worlds]. *Kultura narodov Prychernomoria*, 110, 114–120. [in Ukrainian].

Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (2002). The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities. New York: Basic Books. 400 p.

Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (1998). Conceptual integration networks. *Cognitive Science*, 22(2), 133–187.

Gibbs, R. (1994). The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding. New York: CU Press. 214 p.

Havryliuk, A. P. (2013). Metafora, yii pryroda ta rol u movi ta movlenni [Metaphor, its nature and role in language and speech]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho tekhnichnoho universytetu Ukrainy «Kyivskyi politekhnichnyi instytut». Seriia: Filolohiia. Pedahohika*, 2, 29–33. [in Ukrainian].

Jackel, O. (1995). The Metaphorical Concept of Mind. Language and cognitive construal of the world. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 229 p.

Kravets, L. V. (2018). Kontseptualna metafora v movi ukrainskoi poezii XX st. [Conceptual metaphor in the language of Ukrainian poetry of the 20th century]. *Slovianski movy*: zb. nauk. pr. Redkol.: Yu. V. Kravtsova (vidp. red.) [ta in.]. Kyiv: Vyd-vo NPU im. M. P. Drahomanova, 1 (13), 136–147. [in Ukrainian].

Kravets, L. V. (2012). Dynamika metafory v ukrainskii poezii XX st. [The dynamics of metaphor in Ukrainian poetry of the 20th century]: monohrafiia. Kyiv: VTs "Akademiia". 416 s. [in Ukrainian].

Kravtsova, Yu. V. (2024). Semantyko-kohnityvnyi pidkhid do vyvchennia metaforyky: teoretychni ta metodolohichni zasady [Semantic-cognitive approach to the study of metaphors: theoretical and methodological foundations]. *Philology and philological education in the digital transformation era: European dimensions, national context, intercultural communication*: Scientific monograph. Riga: Baltija Publishing, 186–204. [in Ukrainian].

Kravtsova, Yu. V. (2022). Semantyko-kohnityvne modeliuvannia protsesiv metaforychnoi nominatsii [Semantic-cognitive modelling of metaphorical nomination processes]: monohrafiia. Kyiv: Vyd-vo NPU im. M. P. Drahomanova. 170 s. [in Ukrainian].

Kravtsova, Yu. V. (2020). Metaphorical lexsicography: basic principles, current problems and development prospects. *Scientific journal of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. Series 9. Current*

Trends in Language Development: collection of scientific works. Ed. of prof. A. V. Korolyova. Kyiv: Vyd-vo NPU im. M. P. Drahomanova, 20, 91–100.

Kravtsova, Yu. V. (2011). Semantyko-kohnityvne modeliuvannia metaforyzatsii [Semantic-cognitive modelling of metaphorization]. *Movoznavstvo*, 1, 43–54. [in Ukrainian].

Kravchenko-Dzondza, O. (2013). Metaforychna kartyna svitu v zakhidnoukrainskii prozi 20-30-kh rokiv XX st. [A metaphorical picture of the world in Western Ukrainian prose of the 20s and 30s of the 20th century]. *Ridne slovo v etnokulturnomu vymiri*, 380–387. [in Ukrainian].

Lakoff, G. (1993). The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. *Metaphor and Thought.* Ed. A. Ortony. Cambridge: CU Press, 202–251.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors We Live by. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 237 p.

Liashchenko, O. A. (2014). Prahmatychnyi potentsial metafory v hazetnomu teksti [The pragmatic potential of metaphor in newspaper text]. *Naukovyi visnyk Mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu. Seriia "Filolohichni nauky"*, 10 (1), 148–150. [in Ukrainian].

Musolff, A. (2004). Metaphor and conceptual evolution. Metaphorik, 7, 55–75.

Ovsiienko, A. S. (2018). Metafora v suchasnomu movoznavstvi: tlumachennia ta klasyfikatsiia [Metaphor in modern linguistics: interpretation and classification]. *Naukovyi visnyk Mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu. Ser.: Filolohiia*, 32(3), 105–110. [in Ukrainian].

Ortony, A. (1993). Metaphor and Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. 196 p.

Ritchie, D. (2004). Common Ground in Metaphor Theory: Continuing the Conversation. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 19(3), 233–244.

Sakhniuk, O. S. (2019). Teorii metafory [Theories of metaphor]. *Naukovi zapysky Natsionalnoho universytetu "Ostrozka akademiia", seriia "Filolohiia"*, 6 (74). [in Ukrainian].

Slobodian, M. V. (2011). Metaforyzatsiia yak kohnityvnyi protses [Metaphorization as a cognitive process]. *Aktualni problemy slovianskoi filolohii*, XXIV, 1, 460–466. [in Ukrainian].

Stretovych, T. P. (2018). Klasyfikatsiine rozmaittia vydiv metafor [Classification of types of metaphors]. *Naukovyi chasopys Natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni M. P. Drahomanova. Seriia 9: Suchasni tendentsii rozvytku mov*, 16, 232–239. [in Ukrainian].

Turner, M., & Fauconnier, G. (2000). Metaphor, Metonymy, and Binding. *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Cross-roads*: *A Cognitive Perspective*. Ed. A. Barcelona. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 133–148.

Zinken, J. (2004). Metaphors, stereotypes, and the linguistic picture of the world: Impulses from the Ethnolinguistic School of Lublin. *Metaphorik*, 7, 115–136.

Бібліографічний опис:

Кравцова, Ю. В. (2024). *Л*інгвометафорологія як галузь сучасної лінгвістики: основні напрями, проблеми, методи дослідження. *Науковий часопис Українського державного університету імені Михайла Драгоманова. Серія 9. Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов*, 28, 26–44. https://doi.org/10.31392/UDU-nc.series9.2024.28.03.

Анотація

У статті подано характеристику нової інтегративної галузі лінгвістики – лінгвометафорології, у якої поступово формується теоретико-методологічна база й категорійно-термінологічний апарат, накопичується емпіричний матеріал. Проте багато теоретичних положень потребують наукового переосмислення, узагальнення й систематизації, а термінологія – уточнення та уніфікації. На підставі аналізу основних лінгвометафорологічних праць описано провідні напрями й актуальні проблеми лінгвометафорології, базові методи дослідження метафорики, спрогнозовано динаміку розвитку цієї галузі лінгвістики.

Проведений аналіз лінгвометафорологічних досліджень кінця XX–XXI ст. показав, що найбільш продуктивно здійснюється вивчення метафор у семантичному та когнітивному напрямах. Автор цієї статті розробляє семантико-когнітивний підхід до вивчення метафор, актуальність якого зумовлена об'єктивною необхідністю теоретичного її осмислення як єдиного ментально-вербального конструкта.

Актуальними проблемами лінгвометафорології є такі: визначення сутності метафори; встановлення принципів моделювання метафоризації і параметрів метафоричних моделей; з'ясування специфіки метафоричної картини світу; виявлення особливостей метафоричної концептуалізації; розроблення методів і методики комплексного аналізу метафорики; розроблення принципів лексикографічного опису метафор та укладання метафоричних словників. Методологія

лінгвометафорології, що розвивається в різних напрямах, ґрунтується на таких лінгвістичних методах, як компонентний аналіз, контекстний аналіз, лінгвістичне (семантичне, когнітивне, семантико-когнітивне) моделювання.

Перспективним є продовження лінгвометафорологічних досліджень у семантичному, когнітивному, семантико-когнітивному та лексикографічному аспектах. Подальший розвиток лінгвометафорології дозволить глибше пізнати природу та механізми образно-метафоричного мислення.

Ключові слова: *лінгвометафорологія, метафора, метафорика, метафоризація, метафорична репрезентація, метафорична концептуалізація, метафоричний концепт, метафоричне моделювання, метафорична модель.*