

UDC 81'373.72: 811.111

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31861/gph2024.850-851.54-63>**METAPHORICAL INSTANTIATION OF IDIOMATIC EXPRESSIONS
IN MODERN POLITICAL DISCOURSE****МЕТАФОРИЧНА АКТУАЛІЗАЦІЯ ІДІОМАТИЧНИХ ВИРАЗІВ
У СУЧАСНОМУ ПОЛІТИЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ****Yurii KOVALIUK¹, Myroslava KOVALIUK²**

¹PhD, Associate Professor,
Assistant Professor of the Department of English
Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University
y.kovalyuk@chnu.edu.ua
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9379-2187>

²PhD, Associate Professor,
Assistant Professor of the Department of English
Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University
m.kovaliuk@chnu.edu.ua
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5972-2145>

The present paper is a study of English idiomatic expressions denoting cooperation in terms of Cognitive Linguistic Critical Discourse Analysis, which is herein referred to as a form of applied cognitive linguistics that investigates the links between language, cognition and social action in contexts of political communication. The methodological underpinnings involve principles of Critical Discourse Analysis proper, such as analysis of ideology (a system of values and/or ideas that shape and are shaped by discourse), framing (the way language and discourse shape how individuals or groups interpret and understand certain events, values or ideas), pragmatic inference (understanding intended meaning), lexical choices (words or phrases employed to convey a certain meaning), and discourse strategies (the conscious selection and use of language to achieve specific goals in communication). The cognitive linguistic dimension of the survey relies on the principles of schema induction and hierarchical schematic modeling of the idiomatic expressions under analysis. It is argued that meaning in context, instantiated by an idiomatic expression, is a schematic representation on two distinct conceptual levels: the dynamic, provided for by mental spaces, and the static, realized by frames, conceptual domains, and image schemas. A case study to verify this hypothesis was performed on the idiom stand shoulder to shoulder, and its findings were then employed to exemplify the extended cognitive structure of the idiomatic expressions, such as play ball, build bridges, in concert, hitch horses together, on the same page, close ranks, sing from the same hymn sheet, and it takes two to tango.

Key words: *critical discourse analysis, idiomatic expression, schema induction, schematicity, instantiation, conceptual metaphor.*

У статті досліджуються англійські ідіоматичні вирази на позначення співпраці з точки зору лінгвокогнітивного критичного дискурс-аналізу, який витлумачується як галузь прикладної когнітивної лінгвістики, що досліджує зв'язки між мовою, пізнанням і соціальними діями в контексті політичної комунікації. Методологічне підґрунтя праці спирається на принципи критичного дискурс-аналізу в класичному розумінні, такі як ідеологія (система цінностей та/або ідей, які формують дискурс і формуються в ньому), фреймінг (спосіб, у який мова і дискурс формують розуміння про певні події, цінності або ідеї з боку індивідів або груп), прагматичний умовивід (розуміння значення, яке використовується), лексичний вибір (слова або фрази, що використовуються для передачі певного значення) і дискурсивні стратегії (свідомий відбір і використання мови для досягнення конкретних цілей у комунікації). Лінгвокогнітивний аспект дослідження ґрунтується на принципах індукції схеми та ієрархічного схематичного моделювання досліджуваних ідіоматичних виразів. Висувається гіпотеза, що значення в контексті, конкретизоване ідіоматичним висловом, є схематичною репрезентацією на двох різних концептуальних рівнях: динамічному, що увиразнюється ментальними просторами, і статичному, реалізованому фреймами, концептуальними доменами та образами-схемами. Перевірку цієї гіпотези здійснено на прикладі ідіоми *stand shoulder to shoulder*, а його результати були використані для опису розширеної когнітивної структури таких ідіоматичних виразів, як *play ball*, *build bridges*, *in concert*, *hitch horses together*, *on the same page*, *close ranks*, *sing from the same hymn sheet* і *it takes two to tango*.

Ключові слова: критичний дискурс-аналіз, ідіоматичний вираз, індукція схеми, схематичність, актуалізація, концептуальна метафора.

I. INTRODUCTION

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) in Cognitive Linguistics, as suggested by C. Hart, is “a form of applied cognitive linguistics that investigates the links between language, cognition and social action in contexts of political communication” [Hart 2024, p. 1]. In this regard, metaphor performs a function of a methodological (and empirical) nexus between CDA proper, which tends to view it as “a word or expression that is used to talk about an entity or quality other than that referred to by its core, or more basic meaning” [Deignan 2006, p. 34], and Cognitive Linguistics, where metaphors are posited as the building blocks of the “human cognition” [Lakoff & Johnson 2003]. Thus, the most important argument advanced by G. Lakoff and M. Johnson is that metaphor first and foremost inheres in the conceptual knowledge rather than language. This fact was acknowledged by the authors themselves, as in “primarily on the basis of linguistic evidence, we have found that most of our ordinary conceptual system is metaphorical in nature” [Lakoff & Johnson 1980, p. 4]. Idioms, as a matter of fact, are claimed to have constituted the lion’s share of the said “linguistic evidence” (ibidem): “it could be argued that much of the evidence for conceptual metaphors actually came from the study of idioms” [Boers 2014, p. 186].

In an effort to adapt CDA to Cognitive Linguistics, C. Hart convincingly argues that “metaphor may be a feature of both language and discourse, yet a CDA perspective requires a theory that allows for metaphor to be treated as discourse” [Hart 2008, p. 93]. This line of thinking seems congruous with the Sociocognitive CDA (van Dijk 2002), which assumes that discourse originates in short-term memory against the backdrop of knowledge stored in long-term memory. To this end, C. Hart [2008, p. 94-96] suggests that Blending Theory (BT), which is an online meaning construction theory, is a viable solution. Based on the CMT, Blending Theory (Fauconnier & Turner 2002) posits that meaning construction involves combining structures in a way that leads to a more complex structure. The structures in question are otherwise known as mental spaces, which are “regions of conceptual space that contain specific kinds of information” [Evans 2007, p. 134]. The distinctive feature of a mental

space is that it occurs on-line, “in the moment of speaking or thinking” [Evans 2007, p. 134], which makes it relatable to discourse in general and CDA in particular.

In another attempt to bridge the gap between (C)DA and Cognitive Linguistics, Z. Kövecses goes one step further to introduce his relatively recent ‘Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory’ [Kövecses 2023]. The researcher advances the idea that a contextualist (or discourse-based) version of CMT necessitates the description of the “metaphor is discourse” assumption, which, evidently, is “an aspect of meaning-making and communication in general” [Kövecses 2023, p. 170]. This theory draws both on CMT and BT by maintaining that a metaphor is a multilevel structure, hence when interacting, speakers recruit specific static conceptual structures at a specific dynamic level by means of schema induction [Kövecses 2020; Kövecses 2023]. Indeed, revisiting the Sociocognitive CDA, it can be postulated that mental spaces are primarily linked to short-term memory, while image schemas, domains, and frames tend to occur in long-term memory. In this case, linguistic expressions, such as idioms, are believed to serve as prompts for the schema induction of the above internal level structures, which was outlined in [Ковалюк 2024; Kovalyuk 2022; Kovalyuk 2024].

The present paper is **aimed at** describing the linguistic representation of schema induction in political discourse, evidenced from the idiomatic expressions semantically related to cooperation.

The following **methods** are employed: contextual analysis, schema induction, discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, semantic description, and etymological analysis.

Resting on the above referred to premise that in political discourse speakers employ long-term memory structures, such as image schemas, domains, and frames, at the short-term memory level, i.e., mental spaces, the aim of the paper is further extended to the following goals: 1) to uncover the hidden meanings of the (metaphorical) idiomatic expressions denoting cooperation in political discourse; 2) to inductively reveal and clearly exemplify the image schemas and domains underlying the idiomatic expressions semantically related to cooperation in political discourse.

I. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Consider the following snippet taken from the spoken part of the Corpus of Contemporary American English (abbr. – COCA):

(1) “VAN-SUSTEREN: *You know, it's (INAUDIBLE) watching the president today, though, if the whole idea is that both parties have to work together -- I have interviewed Congressman Paul Ryan a number of times, and I think he's rather mild-mannered. And he came out in response to the president's speech. I think he was livid. He said it was exclusively -- it was excessively partisan, dramatically inaccurate, hopelessly inadequate, not fiscal leadership, political broadside by our campaigner-in-chief, not building bridges but poisoning wells, exploiting people's emotions of fear, envy and anxiety is not hope, is not change, it is partisanship. So when you -- you know, when such a -- at least it looks like Paul Ryan thinks that this is a -- looks like a declaration of war and not as we go into 2012 discussion any sort of, Let's work together*” [COCA].

In the above discourse fragment, the American journalist Greta van Susteren shares her impressions of an interview with Paul Ryan, one of the Republican Party leaders. Van Susteren makes a contrast between the desired bipartisan cooperation and the reality of political interaction. In general, she has an impression of Paul Ryan as a soft-spoken person, but his extraordinary reaction to President Barack Obama’s speech against the backdrop of inter-party discrepancies on tax policy/budget approval for 2012 deserves special attention. Paul Ryan, reacting to the speech in question, uses evaluative adverbial intensifiers, such as *exclusively*, *excessively*, *dramatically*, and *hopelessly*, combined with emotive and markedly formal lexical items such as *partisan*, *inaccurate*, and *inadequate*, respectively, which express merciless ideological criticism of the president. When it comes to figurative language, Paul Ryan resorts to military metaphors, such as *political broadside*,

our campaigner-in-chief, and *poisoning wells* in an effort to frame the president's actions as aggressive attacks as opposed to attempts at cooperation, as instantiated by the idiom *build bridges*. In the final analysis, Paul Ryan likens the content of Barack Obama's speech to a declaration of war against the Republican Party in advance of the 2012 US presidential election. Referring to van Susteren's initial comment that the whole idea is that both parties have to work together, it should be noted that this is a case of deontic modality, i.e., the legally established obligation of the parties to cooperate with each other for the good of the state. However, the interview with Paul Ryan has led van Susteren to believe that the obligation to cooperate across party lines has moved from the deontic (or necessary) modality to volitional (voluntary), as evidenced by the phrase *Let's work together*.

(2) "CRUZ: *Well, it goes from here to the House of Representatives. And last week, the House stood strong. They passed a strong bill that defunded "Obama care." They listened to the people. And I am hopeful and optimistic they're going to continue to do the same thing. They're going to pass another strong bill and they're going to send it back to the Senate. And it's going to be back in our lap, and I hope this time, when it comes back to the Senate that Senate Republicans come together and stand shoulder to shoulder with House Republicans to actually fix this disaster of a law.*

VAN-SUSTEREN: *What makes you think that would happen? Because if it goes back to the -- or it's going back to the House, and let's say the House puts back in the defunding of "Obama care, " the same bill, and then ships it back across to the Senate, why would you expect the Senate vote to be any different this time around?"* [COCA].

In another snippet, in which Greta van Susteren interviews a Republican Party member Ted Cruz, fundamental ideological differences based on the "us versus them" opposition, namely Republicans versus Democrats, can be traced. By promoting the ideology of the Republican Party and condemning the stance of the Democrats, Ted Cruz, amidst the controversy over the Barack Obama's Healthcare and Patient Protection Reform in the United States, known as Obama care, acts a Republican Party leader in an effort to mobilize the support of other members of the Senate against the reform. He emphasizes the strength and cohesion within the House of Representatives, which voted against funding Obama care, by employing positively evaluative descriptors, lexis and utterances, such as: "*the House stood strong*", "*They passed a strong bill*", "*They listened to the people, I am hopeful and optimistic they're going to continue to do the same thing, And it's going to be back in our lap*". As in some previous contexts, Ted Cruz equates the Senate to an important battleground, where the conflict over defunding health care reform and patient protection in the United States will be resolved. Senator Cruz's message sounds clear and convincing when he expresses his wish for cohesion and unanimity between Republicans in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, thereby calling for unity within the party. The idiom *stand shoulder to shoulder* and its contextual synonym *come together*, like the military in formation, are intended to emphasize solidarity and collective action, directly implying that failure to do so would be considered a betrayal of both party loyalty and the public will. This specific phraseology indicates a pressure dynamic within the Republican Party, urging senators to support the House's decision. By referring to the above-mentioned law as "a disaster of a law", Ted Cruz emphasizes the ideological differences between the Republican and Democratic parties, in the light of which one side (the Republicans) is positioned as fighting for justice, while the other (the Democrats) is framed as advocating a failed policy.

This analysis implies that idioms serve either communicative-pragmatic or coherence-forming functions in political discourse, which, essentially, corresponds to interpersonal and textual functions of language within the Systemic Functional Linguistics framework [Halliday & Matthiessen 2004].

As regards the cognitive linguistic dimension of CDA, previously it had been claimed that certain idiomatic expressions are underlain by specific conceptual metaphors, as in *play your cards right*, *play it close to your vest*, and *ace in the hole*, for example, which have all originated in gambling

and are the living proof of the existence of the “LIFE IS A GAMBLING GAME conceptual metaphor” [Lakoff & Johnson 1980; Kovalyuk 2019]. That said, the Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory has been aimed at adopting a holistic approach to account for the interplay between language and discourse through the metaphorical meaning-in-use lens. The Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory operates by a schema induction method, whereby it relies on identifying and extracting underlying patterns or structures from linguistic data. It should be noted, however, that the notion of schema induction is not inescapably linked to the concept of image schema only. Rather, as the notion of schema broadly implies a recurring cognitive structure or pattern that organizes and interprets information, so does schema induction refer to a process of recruiting this structure or pattern from long-term memory. Cognitive Grammar holds that linguistic expressions constitute a unified structure of schemas that are modeled in a top-down manner [Langhacker 2008]. It follows that linguistic expressions, or instantiations, are specific contextual realizations of a schematic representation.

To demonstrate, let us explore the following example taken from the discourse fragment above:

“*And it's going to be back in our lap, and I hope this time, when it comes back to the Senate that Senate Republicans come together and **stand shoulder to shoulder** with House Republicans to actually fix this disaster of a law*” [COCA].

Apparently, here the idiomatic expression *stand shoulder to shoulder* “acting together towards a common aim; with united effort” prompts the instantiation of a specific region of conceptual space containing specific kinds of information, namely physical proximity between soldiers, soldiers in alignment, military alliance and a soldier. Thus, the unity in the US Congress can be identified as physical proximity between soldiers and the cooperation resources in the US Congress can be construed as soldiers in alignment. The political alliance, i.e., the agreement between Senate Republicans and House Republicans can be thought of as military alliance. Based on the above, the metaphorical idiom *stand shoulder to shoulder* can be regarded as an instantiation of a number of very specific mental-space-level metaphors:

THE UNITY IN THE US CONGRESS IS PHYSICAL PROXIMITY BETWEEN SOLDIERS

THE COOPERATION RESOURCES IN THE US CONGRESS ARE SOLDIERS IN ALIGNMENT

THE POLITICAL ALLIANCE IS MILITARY ALLIANCE

THE POLITICIAN IS A SOLDIER

These mental space metaphors are further structured by more static long-term memory structures known as frames, which are recruited by schema induction. That said, physical proximity between soldiers is conceived as physical proximity at the level of a frame. What was referred to as soldiers in alignment on the level of a mental space becomes conceptualized as human bodies on the level of a frame. The notion of military alliance is abstracted to the notion of attraction of military forces. Finally, a soldier is viewed as part of military forces in terms of frame semantics. These ideas can be summarized as follows:

THE UNITY IS PHYSICAL PROXIMITY

THE COOPERATION RESOURCES ARE HUMAN BODIES

THE COOPERATIVE ACTION IS ATTRACTION OF MILITARY FORCES

THE COOPERATING PERSON IS PART OF MILITARY FORCES

At the domain level, the typical unity is physical proximity frame lends itself to conceptual shift and changes to a more abstract representation of proximity. The cooperation resources are seen as physical forces. In addition, a cooperative action is posited as attraction of forces, while a cooperating person is described as content of a container. Thus, the said metaphorical propositions can be illustrated as follows:

UNITY IS PROXIMITY

COOPERATION RESOURCES ARE PHYSICAL FORCES

A COOPERATIVE ACTION IS ATTRACTION OF FORCES
A COOPERATING PERSON IS CONTENT OF A CONTAINER

At the highest level of schematization, certain overarching metaphorical conceptualizations arising from matching certain image schemas to the specific aspects of the cooperation conceptual domain by means of schema induction. These components include occurrences, resources, actions, and persons. These elements are metaphorically organized by way of image schemas such as contact, forces, attraction, and content, summarized by the following metaphors:

OCCURRENCE IS CONTACT
RESOURCES ARE FORCES
ACTION IS ATTRACTION
A PERSON IS CONTENT

The main idea behind the above analysis is to demonstrate the process of schema induction in action, evidenced from the idiomatic expression *stand shoulder to shoulder*. In the above sentence, the instantiation of this idiom invokes a number of online associations, such as soldiers, alignment, alliance, etc., which are ultimately governed by their static correlates, beginning with a frame and ending with an image schema. Thus, the contextualized idiom *stand shoulder to shoulder* in this very sentence is the instantiation of the idea that *the unity in the US Congress is physical proximity between soldiers*, which is specific to this very context. Yet, it is its more generalized and abstracted readings, such as *the unity is physical proximity* (frame), *unity is proximity* (domain), and occurrence is contact (image schema), that give rise to it.

This metaphorical system for this particular idiom instantiation can be illustrated deductively:

IS:
OCCURRENCE IS CONTACT
RESOURCES ARE FORCES
ACTION IS ATTRACTION
A PERSON IS CONTENT

D:
UNITY IS PROXIMITY
COOPERATION RESOURCES ARE PHYSICAL FORCES
A COOPERATIVE ACTION IS ATTRACTION OF FORCES
A COOPERATING PERSON IS CONTENT OF A CONTAINER

F:
THE UNITY IS PHYSICAL PROXIMITY
THE COOPERATION RESOURCES ARE HUMAN BODIES
THE COOPERATIVE ACTION IS ATTRACTION OF MILITARY FORCES
THE COOPERATING PERSON IS PART OF MILITARY FORCES

MS:
THE UNITY IN THE US CONGRESS IS PHYSICAL PROXIMITY BETWEEN SOLDIERS
THE COOPERATION RESOURCES IN THE US CONGRESS ARE SOLDIERS IN
ALIGNMENT
THE POLITICAL ALLIANCE IS MILITARY ALLIANCE
THE POLITICIAN IS A SOLDIER

The same line of analysis was applied to other metaphorical idioms categorized as those denoting cooperation, and the results are summarized in the Table 1 (frame-level data excluded).

Table 1

Conceptual structure of the idioms denoting cooperation

<i>play ball</i>	IS: interaction is contact, resources are physical objects, resources are enablements (of interaction) D: cooperation is physical contact, entity/person is a player, cooperation resources are balls
<i>build bridges</i>	IS: interaction is process, resources are physical objects and/or actions, resources are enablements (of interaction) D: cooperation is an engineering process, entity/person is an engineer, cooperation resources are engineering tools and/or actions
<i>in concert</i>	IS: interaction is enablement, resources are physical objects and/or actions, resources are enablements (of interaction) D: cooperation is enablement of voices and sounds, entity/person is a musician and/or singer, cooperation resources are human voices and musical instruments
<i>hitch horses together</i>	IS: interaction is process, resources are physical objects and/or actions, resources are enablements (of interaction) D: cooperation is a horsekeeping process, entity/person is a horsekeeper, cooperation resources are ropes
<i>on the same page</i>	IS: interaction is process, resources are sound vibrations and/or actions, resources are enablements (of interaction) D: cooperation is sound and/or melody creation process, entity/person is a singer, cooperation resources are human voices
<i>sing from the same hymn book</i>	IS: interaction is process, resources are sound vibrations and/or actions, resources are enablements (of interaction) D: cooperation is sound and/or melody creation process, entity/person is a church singer, cooperation resources are human voices
<i>shoulder to shoulder</i>	IS: occurrence is contact, resources are forces, action is attraction, person is content D: unity is proximity, cooperation resources are physical forces, a cooperative action is attraction of forces, a cooperating person is content of a container
<i>close ranks</i>	IS: interaction is near/far and/or movement D: cooperation is proximity and/or movement of troops, entity/person is a soldier
<i>it takes two to tango</i>	IS: interaction is process, resources are movements and/or actions, resources are enablements (of interaction) D: cooperation is movement creation process, entity/person is a dancer, cooperation resources are body movements

Table 1 offers a look at the idioms denoting cooperation, such as *play ball*, *build bridges*, *in concert*, *hitch horses together*, *on the same page*, *close ranks*, *shoulder to shoulder*, *sing from the same hymn sheet*, and *it takes two to tango*, arranged as a compilation of idioms along with their corresponding conceptual metaphors, organized according to their levels of abstraction, encompassing image schemas and domains. The analysis revealed that the metaphorical idioms under scrutiny, unlike those denoting argument and conflict, are not entirely consistent in the way their most schematic underlying concepts are represented. One apparent reason would be the fact that they originated in various source domains, ranging from ball games to singing, etc. Therefore, it seems rational to conduct the discussion based on their semantic relatedness.

First, as for the idioms *in concert*, *on the same page*, *to sing from the same hymn sheet*, and *it takes two to tango*, the highest level of schematicity, that of image schemas, is assembled through the overarching metaphorical conceptualizations that stem from assigning the image schemas, such as *enablement(-s)*, *process*, *physical objects*, *actions*, *movements*, and *sound vibrations*, to the different components of the domain of (performing) arts in general, singing, dancing, and public performance in particular. These components include interaction and resources, producing the metaphors INTERACTION IS PROCESS and RESOURCES ARE SOUND VIBRATIONS AND/OR

ACTIONS (for the idioms *on the same page* and *sing from the same hymn sheet*), INTERACTION IS ENABLEMENT and RESOURCES ARE PHYSICAL OBJECTS AND/OR ACTIONS (for the idiom *in concert*), and INTERACTION IS PROCESS and RESOURCES ARE MOVEMENTS AND/OR ACTIONS (for the idiom *it takes two to tango*). It should be noted that the metaphor RESOURCES ARE ENABLEMENTS (OF INTERACTION) has proved common for all these four idioms. At the domain level, the image-schema transformation process occurs, resulting in the reduced abstraction of the image schemas *enablement(-s)*, *process*, *physical objects*, *actions*, *movements*, and *sound vibrations*, which become *enablement of voices and sounds*, *sound creation process*, *movement creation process*, *human voices*, *musical instruments*, and *body movements*, respectively. In turn, the metaphorical conceptualizations involved, such as interaction and resources, acquire a less schematic status of cooperation and cooperation resources. This brings us to the following domain-level mappings: COOPERATION IS ENABLEMENT OF VOICES AND SOUNDS and COOPERATION RESOURCES ARE HUMAN VOICES AND MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS (for the idiom *in concert*), COOPERATION IS SOUND AND/OR MELODY CREATION PROCESS and COOPERATION RESOURCES ARE HUMAN VOICES (for the idioms *on the same page* and *sing from the same hymn sheet*), and COOPERATION IS MOVEMENT CREATION PROCESS and COOPERATION RESOURCES ARE BODY MOVEMENTS (for the idiom *it takes two to tango*).

Second, regarding the idiom *play ball*, its conceptual hierarchy relies on the image-schema resources, such as *contact*, *physical objects*, and *enablements*, on the one hand, and a number of components pertaining to the source domain of ball games, such as *interaction* and *resources*, on the other hand. Based on these inputs, the following metaphors on the level of image schema are formed: INTERACTION IS CONTACT, RESOURCES ARE PHYSICAL OBJECTS, and RESOURCES ARE ENABLEMENTS (OF INTERACTION). On the lower level of conceptual domains, the abovementioned image schemas descend with respect to their schematicity to *physical contact* and *balls*. As regards the metaphorical concepts under analysis, they are replaced with less schematic *cooperation* and *cooperation resources*. This results in the conceptual mappings as follows: COOPERATION IS PHYSICAL CONTACT and COOPERATION RESOURCES ARE BALLS.

Third, given the evident similarities between *build bridges* and *hitch horses together*, it seems reasonable to discuss them jointly. Both idioms build upon similar image schemas, such as *process*, *physical objects and/or actions*, and *enablements*, corresponding to the most abstract concepts from the source domains of engineering and horsekeeping, respectively. These pairings manifest themselves in the INTERACTION IS PROCESS, RESOURCES ARE PHYSICAL OBJECTS AND/OR ACTIONS, and RESOURCES ARE ENABLEMENTS (OF INTERACTION) conceptual metaphors. Further, as far as the level of conceptual domains is concerned, it is evident that the referenced image schemas were abstracted from *engineering process*, *engineering tools and/or actions*, *horsekeeping process*, and *ropes*, while interaction and resources were abstracted from cooperation and cooperation resources. Thus, in the case of *build bridges*, the mappings correlating with the meaning foci are as follows: COOPERATION IS AN ENGINEERING PROCESS and COOPERATION RESOURCES ARE ENGINEERING TOOLS AND/OR ACTIONS. Conversely, in the case of *hitch horses together*, we arrive at the following correspondences of meanings: COOPERATION IS A HORSEKEEPING PROCESS and COOPERATION RESOURCES ARE ROPES.

Fourth, when speaking of the idioms *close ranks* and *shoulder to shoulder*, the one salient feature is their underlying *near/far* and *movement* image schemas matched with the most schematic concept of interaction, as evidenced in the INTERACTION IS NEAR/FAR AND/OR MOVEMENT metaphor. This very metaphor is replaced with a more specific COOPERATION IS PROXIMITY AND/OR MOVEMENT OF TROOPS mapping at the level of domain.

It follows that in relation to the idioms under discussion a cooperating person or entity is seen as a musician and/or singer, a singer, a dancer, a player, an engineer, a horsekeeper, and a soldier, which is exemplified by the relevant mappings, such as ENTITY/PERSON IS A MUSICIAN AND/OR A SINGER, for example.

III. CONCLUSION

The outcomes of the study prompt drawing the following conclusions. The cognitive linguistic aspect of critical discourse analysis is a promising area of research that yields into marrying the sociolinguistic, pragmatic, and contextual factors with the cognitive linguistic structures behind every linguistic expression used in discourse. Evidenced from idiomatic expressions denoting cooperation, not only was it possible to explore ideology, framing, pragmatic inference, lexical choices, and discourse strategies, but also inductively perform the hierarchical schematic modeling of idiomatic expressions. It has been convincingly demonstrated that meaning in context, instantiated by the idiomatic expression *stand shoulder to shoulder*, is a schematic representation on two levels: the dynamic, provided for by mental spaces, and the static, realized by frames, conceptual domains, and image schemas. Furthermore, based on this analysis, the extended cognitive structure of the idioms *play ball*, *build bridges*, *in concert*, *hitch horses together*, *on the same page*, *close ranks*, *sing from the same hymn sheet*, and *it takes two to tango* was examined.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ковалюк Ю. Ідіоматика англійської мови: електронні дані та концептуальне знання: монографія. Чернівці: Чернівець. нац. ун-т ім. Ю. Федьковича, 2024. 304 с.
- Boers F. Idioms and Phraseology. *The Bloomsbury Companion to Cognitive Linguistics* / ed. by J. Taylor, J. Littlemore. New York : Bloomsbury Academic, 2014. P. 185-202.
- COCA (The Corpus of Contemporary American English). URL: <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/> (дата звернення: 11.2024).
- Deignan A. The grammar of linguistic metaphors. *Corpus-Based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy* / ed. by A. Stefanowitsch, S. Th. Gries. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006. P. 106–122. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110199895.106>
- Fauconnier G., Turner M. *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books, 2002. 464 p.
- Glossary of Cognitive Linguistics / ed. by V. Evans. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007. 256 p.
- Halliday M. A., Matthiessen Ch. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 3rd ed.. London: Hodder Education, 2004. 700 p. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203783771>
- Hart C. Critical discourse analysis and metaphor: toward a theoretical framework. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 2008. Vol. 5. No. 2. P. 91–106. <https://doi:10.1080/17405900801990058>
- Hart C. *Ten Lectures in Cognitive Linguistics: Cognitive Critical Discourse Analysis*. Leiden: Brill, 2024. 219 p.
- Kovaliuk Yu. Connecting Idioms and Metaphors: Where Cognitive Linguistics Meets Cognitive Stylistics. *British and American Studies Journal*, 2024. Vol. 30. P. 157–170. <https://doi:10.35923/BAS.30.15>
- Kovaliuk Yu. Idioms in Cognitive Linguistics: Is It All about Conceptual Metaphor Theory? *British and American Studies Journal*, 2022. Vol. 28. P. 287-299. <https://doi:10.35923/BAS.28.29>
- Kovalyuk Yu. Idioms in Action: A Case of Conceptual Metaphor Theory vs. Blending Theory. *Advanced Education*, 2019. Vol. 6. No. 13. P. 97-102. <https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.143104>
- Kövecses Z. *Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020. 206 p. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108859127>
- Kövecses Z. *Metaphor and Discourse: A View from Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory*. *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, second edition / ed. by M. Handford, J. P. Gee. London / New York: Routledge, 2023. P. 170–184. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003035244>

- Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors We Live by*. Chicago : The University of Chicago Press, 1980. 242 p. <https://doi.org/10.2307/430414>
- Langhacker R. *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press, 2008. 562 p. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195331967.001.0001>
- van Dijk T.A. *Ideology: Political discourse and cognition. Politics as text and talk* / ed. by P. Chilton & C. Schäffner. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2002. P. 203–238. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.4>

REFERENCES

- Boers, F. (2014). Idioms and phraseology. In J. R. Taylor, & J. Littlemore (Eds.). *The Bloomsbury Companion to Cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 185–202). Bloomsbury Academic.
- Deignan, A. (2006). The grammar of linguistic metaphors. In A. Stefanowitsch, & S. Th. Gries (Eds.). *Corpus-Based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy* (pp. 106-122). Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110199895.106>
- Evans, V. (2007). *Glossary of Cognitive Linguistics*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (2002). *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. Basic Books.
- Halliday, M. A., & Matthiessen, Ch. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3rd ed.). Hodder Education. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203783771>
- Hart, C. (2008). Critical discourse analysis and metaphor: toward a theoretical framework. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 5 (2), 91–106. <https://doi:10.1080/17405900801990058>
- Hart, C. (2024). *Ten Lectures in Cognitive Linguistics: Cognitive Critical Discourse Analysis*. Brill.
- Kovaliuk, Yu. (2022). Idioms in Cognitive Linguistics: Is It All about Conceptual Metaphor Theory? *British and American Studies Journal*, 28, 287-299. <https://doi:10.35923/BAS.28.29>
- Kovaliuk, Yu. (2024). Connecting Idioms and Metaphors: Where Cognitive Linguistics Meets Cognitive Stylistics. *British and American Studies Journal*, 30, 157-170. <https://doi:10.35923/BAS.30.15>
- Kovaliuk, Yu. (2024). *Idiomatyka anhliys'koyi movy: elektronni dani ta kontseptual'ne znannya: monohrafiya [The study of idioms in English: electronic data and conceptual knowledge]*. Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University Press.
- Kovalyuk, Yu. (2019). Idioms in Action: A Case of Conceptual Metaphor Theory vs. Blending Theory. *Advanced Education*, 6(13), 97–102. <https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.143104>
- Kövecses, Z. (2020). *Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108859127>
- Kövecses, Z. (2023). Metaphor and Discourse: A View from Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory. In M. Handford & J. P. Gee (Eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 170-184). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003035244>
- Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live by*. The University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/430414>
- Langhacker, R. W. (2008). *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195331967.001.0001>
- The Corpus of Contemporary American English* (COCA). Available at: <https://www.englishcorpora.org/coca/>
- van Dijk, T.A. (2002). *Ideology: Political discourse and cognition*. In P. Chilton & C. Schäffner (Eds.). *Politics as text and talk* (pp. 203–238). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.4>

Отримано: 10 вересня 2024 р.

Прорецензовано: 8 жовтня 2024 р.

Прийнято до друку: 29 жовтня 2024 р.