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Abstract: The research topicality is conditioned by focus of linguistics on issues of language functions and its units in relation to the main purpose of natural language to serve as a means of storing and transmitting knowledge and also a means of communication in the social practical activity of humans. Because the category of modality is completely realized in the text it is most topical for us to research the phase of "information processing" which is characterized by the terms "schemes", "models", "frames", "scenarios", "scenes". This article reflects interaction of knowledge structures, cognitive systems, in the light of frames of metaphorical and metonymical models which are realization and specific interpretation of the world picture in linguistically-communicative society’s mind.

In that context this article focuses on determining and describing the cognitive modality model of English texts, its structural organisation, character and correlation types of modal meanings with cognitive metaphorical and metonymical models; developing a special technique of cognitive-comparative analysis of modality displaying and also character and types of metaphorical and metonymical models of their realization in English texts; determining and describing universal and idioethnical features of modality category realization as well as character and correlation types of modal meanings to cognitive metaphorical and metonymical models of the English language.

Different analysis methods are used in the work: the leading ones are common scientific theoretical and empirical methods – observation, introspection, synthesis, induction, deduction, modeling which provide a scientifically based structure of the research. The linguistic techniques are informative-semantic, frame, cognitive-comparative, and also elements of context, definition and component analysis contribute to determining qualitative and quantitative characteristics of language units at different levels to realize text modality.

The article presents the following propositions:
1. The cognitive notion of modality reveals full volume of its actualization through informing and naming (reference) at the first stage of written activity in relation "author - text" and also through interpreting and information acquisition at the second stage in relation "text-recipient".
2. The cognitive model of modality is characterized by two basic parameters: stability provided by invariant basic level of referent modality and on the other hand, by dynamism conditioned by level varity of subjective modality. Dynamism, flexible character of language frames interaction at every level, varied transitions and interlevel shifts are provided by cognitive mechanism of metaphorical and metonymical extensions within the so called "marked" active zones and "background" zones of every level. The main reason of dynamism of the modality category is its dependence upon the most unstable component of the world picture that is a human who is the basic element of the inner modality organization.
3. Metaphorical and metonymical models are widely used to activate hyperframe of text modality and also their mixed types – metaphoronymia which along with an individualizing and characterizing function in the text with the help of which modal information is distributed to the marked ("figure") and background one they also realize a cognitive function and contribute to conceptualization of new knowledge and suggest a new approach of reality comprehending.
4. The basis of common metaphorical and metonymical extensions is an anthropological category of modality and correspondingly universal and idioethnical metaphorical and metonymical models are distinguished.

The practical significance of the research is that its results can be used to solve problems as to improve University teaching of such theory subjects as comparative linguistics, theory and practice of translation, and stylistics. The theoretical conclusions and practical material given in the article can be used to develop the
special courses and seminars on text linguistics and also to teach post-graduate students and students research practice.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The problems of metaphorical and metonymical ways of reality comprehending and reflection of metal constructs in the language world picture are very topical in modern linguistics (Y. D. Apresyan, N.D. Arutyunova, M. Jonson, G. Lakoff, V.N. Telia, A.P. Chudinov, B.A. Serebrennikov, E.S. Kubtyakova, V.I. Postovalova, etc.) Metaphor and metonymy are defined as «inevitable phenomena of human mind and human language bearing the most important function in world cognition and description» [Gak 1993, 136]. The language world picture as noted serves to express conceptual picture and exactly to the expression form we refer all those language mechanisms which form the language world picture. Because the form is interdependent with content then the language world picture directly influences the content aspect of reality reflection. A metaphor can provide considering something being cognited anew through already cognited registered in the meaning of the language unit. In this rethinking the image which is at the basis of the metaphor plays the role of inner form with associations that are characteristic for this image and which give the subject of speech a wide diapason to interpret the denoted or to reflect all possible shades of meaning.

The language world picture filled with metaphors and metonymy can disappear one day which, however, does not prevent reflecting reality. The world picture so as metaphor can also be interpreted especially in cases when metaphor operates the associations usual for the language bearers, moreover, that words and phrases like paint for this picture are realized in texts reflecting rather big fragments of the world and its conceptual model. That is why metaphor can combine abstract and concrete that is logical essences of different levels and can synthesize such data into new concepts, it can be considered as a mechanism which causes interaction of cognitive process and empirical experience, cultural background, its language competence to reflect objects that cannot be felt in the language and to make the invisible world picture visible and to create its language picture perceived due to the verbal-image associations and words and phrases constituting it [Serebrennikov B.A. The role of human factor in the language 1988,179].

The work goal is to give a cognitive description of aspects and means of modality realization, establishing character and types of modal meanings correlation with cognitive metaphorical and metonymical models of reality presentation in texts, defining and describing universal and idioethnical features in this correlation.

II. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

The research methods

Different analysis methods are used in the work: the leading ones are common scientific theoretical and empirical methods – observation, introspection, synthesis, induction, deduction, modeling which provide a scientifically based structure of the research. The linguistic techniques are informative-semantic, frame, cognitive-comparative, and also elements of context, definition and component analysis contribute to determining qualitative and quantitative characteristics of language units at different levels to realize text modality.

The research stages

*At the first stage,* the search-theoretical one (2013—2014), the theory of the problem of language and its units functioning was developed in the frame of anthro-po-linguistics on the basis of professional literature study and analysis on the topic, and the research was planned.

*At the second stage,* (2014—2015), different linguistic analysis - informative-semantic, frame, cognitive-comparative, and also elements of context, definition and component analysis contributed to determine qualitative and quantitative characteristics of language units at different levels to realize text modality.

*At the third stage,* result - summary (2015—2016), the theoretical and practical data was summarized, the conclusions drawn, and the research results formulated.

III. RESULTS

Traditionally a metaphor (Greek Metaphora – transfer) is a trope or speech mechanism consisting of using the word denoting some objects, phenomena, etc. class to characterize or denote another objects class which is analogical to the given one in any aspect [LED 1998, 296].

The metaphor secret drew attention of many outstanding philosophers from Aristotle to Russo, E. Cassirer, J. Ortega y Gasset and many other. The long tradition of researching and creating the metaphor theory was continued by logicians, philosophers, psychologists and linguists of different branches. In N.D. Arutyunova’s opinion the metaphor definition is useless without extra linguistic knowledge [LED 1998, 296].
Four components participate in forming and correspondingly analysis of the metaphor: the main and auxiliary subjects and related features of every object or class of objects.

A metaphor is a way to reveal individuality of the concrete object or phenomenon, transmitting its unique character. A metaphor individualizing the object refers it to the class which it does not belong to.

A metaphor is not only a resource of figurative (poetic) speech but also a source of new word meanings which along with the characterizing function can perform a nominative (identifying) function.

Depending on language functions one should distinguish the following types of language metaphors [Arutyunova 1990, 366]: 1) a nominative metaphor (nomination transfer) which consists of changing of one descriptive meaning by the other and serving as a source of homonymy. The metaphor of this type is mostly obvious because it appeals not to intuition but sight (crane is a «bird» and crane of the «well»); 2) a figurative metaphor built as the result of transferring of the identifying (descriptive) meaning into predicative and serving to develop figurative meanings and synonymic language means. In this case a metaphor is a way of individualization and assessment of the object, sense shades (for example, to a physically strong man we can refer several metaphorical characteristics: a lion, ox (bull, horse); 3) a cognitive metaphor developing as the result of shift in combinability of predicate words (transfer of meanings) and creating polysemy (warm wind – warm look); 4) a generalizing metaphor (as the result of the cognitive metaphor) eliminating boundaries between logical orders in the lexical meaning of the word and facilitating appearing logical polysemy (trees whisper – whisper of trees).

It should be added that in all cases earlier or later the metaphor disappears. We can observe the least stability of nominative and generalizing metaphor and next a figurative metaphor. The metaphor transfer to realize its secondary function of nomination eliminates semantic double nature that is leads to a metaphor death [Arutyunova 1990, 367].

Speculating of the metaphor nature E. MacCormac derives a semantic theory which says that semantic changes can take place at building a metaphor. The main idea of this semantic theory is a cognitive process. Metaphor formation according E. MacCormac is not only a linguistic phenomenon taking place on the surface language level but taking its roots in the deep cognitive process of creative character where new possibilities of developing meanings open up.

Cognitive process leading to a metaphor formation is included in a wider process of cognition referring to an individual in the context of evolutional process; here one should speak about brain evolution which provides cognition so as culture to an individual in the context of evolving knowledge increase.

The main idea of this semantic theory is a cognitive process. Cognitive process leading to a metaphor formation is included in a wider process of cognition referring to an individual in the context of evolutional process; here one should speak about brain evolution which provides cognition so as culture to an individual in the context of evolving knowledge increase.

Cognitive process leading to a metaphor formation is included in a wider process of cognition referring to an individual in the context of evolutional process; here one should speak about brain evolution which provides cognition so as culture to an individual in the context of evolving knowledge increase.

Cognitive process leading to a metaphor formation is included in a wider process of cognition referring to an individual in the context of evolutional process; here one should speak about brain evolution which provides cognition so as culture to an individual in the context of evolving knowledge increase.

Constant variations and deviations are obligatory characteristics of the metaphorical process observed at three interrelated levels [MacCormac 1985, 41-43]: 1) a metaphor as a language process (possible movement from a usual language to diaphore-epiphora and back to the usual language); 2) a metaphor as a semantic and syntax process (that is defining a metaphor in the terms of the linguistic theory – dynamics of the metaphorical context); 3) a metaphor as a cognitive process (in the context of evolving knowledge increase) that is a metaphor is considered not only as pragmatic and semantic process but also as fundamental process without which it would be impossible to obtain new knowledge [MacCormac 1985].

The act of metaphorical creativity is basis of many semantic processes such as developing of synonymic means, appearance of new meanings and their shades, building polysemy, developing systems of terms and emotionally-expressive lexis. It is obvious that the so called invisible worlds (inner world of a human being) would not exist without a metaphor, area of secondary predicates characterizing abstract notions, the predicates of wide combinability would not appear (for example, use of motion verbs) nor predicates of exact semantics.

The methodological basis of functional-pragmatic description is provided by pragmatic and cognitive theory of metaphor. The main provision of the pragmatic theory is that a metaphor appears not in the semantic language area but when the language is used in the speech. The area of a living metaphor is not a sentence but a speech act. In everyday reality a metaphor appears in an informal communication to perform definite communicative purposes [Katz 1992, 626]. The pragmatic theory is a significant addition to the semantic-syntax approach with its semantic mechanisms of forming a metaphorical meaning.

The cognitive theory of the metaphor makes it possible to establish correspondence and succession between the metaphor language system and its complex at the first sight semantisized speech forms. At the basis of which there is a provision of deep structural relations between groups of notions that allows to structure some notions in the terms of others and which so predetermine a pervasive character of the metaphor in the speech, its variety in definite manifestations and also easiness of how a metaphor is perceived and understood in many speech types. Based on the traditional definition of a metaphor as «replacement» or «comparison», I.A. Richards and M. Black [Richards, Black 1992, 1993] developed the «interaction theory» of the metaphor where they
stated that a metaphor essence is in the interaction between a metaphorical expression and the context where it is used.

Further many rather intuitive ideas of M. Black were developed in the modern cognitive theories of the metaphor. For example, at the basis of the metaphor theory of hierarchy of dynamic type (HDT) is a theory of conceptual graphs of J. Sowa and interactive approach to the metaphor of M. Black. According to the theory of hierarchy of dynamic types concepts of knowledge can be represented as a hierarchy of definite types which can change depending on the context. The context role changing the whole image of the semantic hierarchy in this case is played by a set of masks. Thus, a metaphor is a result of these masks functioning expressed not only in comparison of some features of the concept but in generating common supertypes that are more than a similarity. In Black’s theory one cannot but mention the system of banalities described by him (later renamed into an implicative complex) referring to the secondary member of the metaphor. The system of banalities was developed further in the conception of semantic «areas» which are passive background and reference knowledge included in the groups of frames and scripts conceptual schemes. A metaphor correspondingly shifts these schemes creating something new. In N. Goodman’s opinion: «the whole multitude of alternative labels, the whole organizational apparatus take a new area. The schemes transfer, concepts migration and categories transfer take place». [Goodman 1968,73]. M. Black explains his theory of associated banalities as follows: the secondary subject who is partially dependent on the context of the metaphorical usage defined the number of what Aristotle called endoxa that is modern views shared by members of some language community [Black 1992, 1993]. But if the idea of transferring the whole semantic areas on the primary subject in metaphor in Black’s theory is represented mostly at the intuition level the hierarchy of dynamic type demonstrates this transfer describing interconnected semantic hierarchy which looks as a decorative tree with additional basic and probable knowledge on its branches.

Due to the links between primary and secondary subjects metaphor creates analogy. Metaphor reveals these links as follows: according to the theory of hierarchy of dynamic types some super type of higher level, which is common for all subjects, exists or is dynamically created. Expressed in a sincere subject it gives rise to new knowledge and understanding. In its turn this super type allows the second subject’s characteristics to serve as a «filter» at selecting, singling out (or, on the contrary, suppressing) and organizing the features of the primary subject. The theory of hierarchy of dynamic types points to this because in a definite hierarchy the concept can have many different super types where it inherits some features of each of them.

In M. Black’s opinion interaction in metaphor causes a «shift in words meaning belonging to one family of the system which is a metaphorical expression» [Black 1962, 45]. By the theory of hierarchy of dynamic type the metaphor interpretation changes a concept scheme set opening new perspectives due to the secondary metaphor subject. Moreover, metaphor changes the mask on the hierarchy and as the result there appears new links and knots and old ones disappear. So, metaphor according to M. Black can «generate new knowledge changing relations between the marked things» [Black 1977, 37]. Furthermore, newly created metaphorical super types can at some time become a part of the concrete mask or maybe disappear. So the type hierarchy dynamically rises and changes with new knowledge and experience and metaphor in this case is the main cognitive instrument. One cannot but agree with this conclusion. However, attaching more dynamics and flexibility to contextual graphs in the case of metaphor the author of the theory of dynamic type hierarchy could not avoid the programmed formalism that prevented revealing the essence of metaphorical mechanism action.

E. Cassirer researching symbolic forms in human culture considered human consciousness integral which united different types of mental activity. He searched reflexes of mythological perceptions about the world in metaphor understood widely by him [E. Cassirer, 1990]. But despite F. Nietzsche E. Cassirer did not refer all ways of thinking to metaphor, dividing two types of mental activity: metaphorical and discourse-logical thinking (where for E. Cassirer metaphorical thinking can mean mythological and language).

The fundamental idea of the logical approach that thinking manipulating of inner (mental) processes points to the obvious limit of such rational understanding of thinking nature. Indeed, if through metaphorical concepts one can explain mechanisms of forming associative links which condition easiness of creating and understanding metaphorical expressions in fiction then it is unlikely that one can find the single matrix conceptual basis in complex variety of art metaphor.

Fiction is a special form of communication. The further development of its concept that is «dynamic» stylistics is connected with text activity, transfer from actualization to contextualization, with going out into extralinguistic sphere, in conditions of text activity of communication subjects in the process of which the person cognites and transforms themselves by the researchers (refer to [Baranov 1997; Bolotnova 1996, 15-16]). The active approach enriches the functional-pragmatic theory of metaphor and contributes to the research as a component of sense text structure.

All these aspects characterize as a single process but it is difficult to explain all three all together in the terms. To P. Ricoeur’s mind it may be possible on condition of overcoming of linguistic plan and going into extra linguistic plane by semantic reintegration into ontology [Ricoeur 1995]. The intermediate stage is reflection that is link between signs understanding and self-understanding. As N.F. Kryukova states following
G.I. Bogin metaphorical shift takes place in the meaning three times. It is the result: 1) of penetrating the outer-going ray of reflection through reflective reality when newly obtained material is cognized through extracting and generating poems; 2) configuring poems that is inner-going ray of reflection comes through the plane of techniques of understanding and forms configuration of links and relations that is sense as base for integration; 3) of integration itself when poematic relations are re-expressed in toposes of human experience and as the result new sense appears which generates a new round of the hermeneutic circle [Крюкова 1999, 64-65].

In cognitive theory metaphor is «main mental operation which unites two notion spheres and creates possibility to use potential of structuring the sphere-source while conceptualization of new sphere» [Chudinov 2001, 36]. One can suppose that metaphor is manifestation of analog possibilities of human thinking and the main role in daily semantic conclusions is played by analogy but not formalized procedures as deduction and induction, and because at the basis of analogy there is transfer of meaning from one context sphere into the other, then metaphor is reflection of more important analogical processes, some model, according to which the person thinks and acts [Mishlanova 2002, 5 Fursova 2003, 433]. Following G. Lakoff, the structure of metaphorical model can be represented as interacted aspects such as initial notion sphere (sphere - source), new notion sphere (sphere - target), typical for this model scenarios and scenes referring to this frame model and sub-frames and the component connecting primary and secondary meanings of the units embraced by this model. In other words metaphor is integrity of formal procedures above two frames. Every metaphorical model is characterized by productivity, particular and pragmatic potential. Among metaphorical models one can distinguish anthropomorphical metaphor, nature metaphor, social metaphor and artifact metaphor [Fursova 2003-434].

Image-centered model of the research supposes a choice of image category (metaphorical model - MM) as metaphor research. Image by its nature is a cognitive unit and correlates with other units of mental level (frame, concept) which responds to the basic level of knowledge categorization (E. Rosch) and because of it opens the deepest, essence regularities of metaphor cognitive mechanism which are projected on the lexical-semantic and other language levels. In other words, image organically combines possibilities of cognitive and linguistic (semasiological) approaches.

From the point of view image-centered approach the process of formation and function of concrete words-metaphors are reproduction of set metaphorical models (models of fire, water stream, house, road, etc.). As it has been proved by observations the composition of metaphorical models is not changed, remains stable for long period of time. Some dynamics can be conditioned by change of particular reproduction of this or that concrete metaphorical models, by the fact that some MM at some definite period can be preferred more than others, others can be moved to the periphery and are rare. But these indices reflect rather quantitative then qualitative essence of the process.

Adequate and multi aspect interpretation of metaphorical process dynamics can be done on the basis of the notion вариирование (variation) which is recognized as a universal feature of language and mental units applied to the image category. Variation is diverse in the sphere of metaphor, moreover it is adequately interprets the very essence of metaphor, its creative mechanism of sense production. Creativity as immanent feature of metaphor is made by versatile variation of cognitive image and its language correlates. It is variation that provides dynamics, evolution in metaphor formation that is why parameters of image variation can serve as change index in this sphere.

The basic most represented indices of metaphoric assessment are three aspects of image variation as a metaphorical model - lexical variation (image is represented in different lexical explication, for example: гореть любовью, пылать гневом, пожар страсти, and etc. (MM of fire): semantic variation (image actualizes different senses, for example: В его душе бушевал огонь чувств (high «intensity», «spontaneity») - дотлеавала надежда («low intensity»). Most often the lexical variation of image is accompanied by a semantic one, for example: вспыхнула искра страсти - пожар страсти в душе - угли былой страсти), вариирование unit of image in the metaphorical function is not fixed in any referent type and tends to characterise varied types of referents, e.g.: пламя восстания, разжечь войну (a social phenomenon), в тылу спора (a psychic condition), горит на работе (a human being, and etc).

So, functioning of metaphorical models is regulated by two opposite tendencies - a tendency to a versatile variation, irradiation and tendency to implement mostly in type variants (lexical, semantic, referent). While the first (centrifugal) tendency is realized live, non-standard individual-author metaphors appear; under the second (centripetal) tendency image is represented as a conventional, half-erased, dead metaphors.

The state of metaphor at any period, metaphor peculiarity od this or that discourse is defined by different correlation of two named tendencies - by relative stability or stable dominating of one of them.

Thus, from the thesis about introduced metaphor into thinking we have assessed its cognitive function and modeling role as follows that metaphor does not only form image of the object but also predetermines type and way of thinking about it. Here where metaphor plays the key (basis) role giving analogs and associations between different systems of notions and generating more often metaphors.
G. Lakoff and M. Jonson’s works such as «Metaphors we live by» have much contributed to develop this topic [Lakoff, Johnson 1980]. «If we are right, supposing that our conceptual system is mostly metaphorical then our way of thinking, emotions and everyday actions are highly influenced by metaphor». Anthropological mechanism of creating a naïve world picture sets analogy between physically perceived reality and invisible world of abstract notions where notions and abstractions are thought as faces and living beings possessing anthropomorphic features. The basis of metaphor is anthropometric principle according to which «a human being is measure of all things» and is shown in making etalons and stereotypes of perception or reality image. The research of metaphor in creating the language world picture reveals not only universal regularities of reality conceptualization but also specific for these languages cognitive regularities conditioned by their structure or national-cultural mind of their bearers. The role of metaphor is, in particular, that it «colours» the conceptual system of the world reflection according to the national-cultural traditions.

G. Lakoff and M. Jonson distinguish several types of conceptual metaphors: structural metaphors, when one notion structurally metaphorically is ordered in the terms of the other: oriented metaphors, when the whole system of notions is organized by analogy with the other system: ontological metaphors when metaphors of essence and substance are taken as basis to cognate notions on the basis of perception of physical objects and substances, metaphors concerning containers limited in space [Lakoff, Johnson1980].

Supposing, conceptual metaphors are not arbitrary as they are based on our physical and cultural experience and can vary from culture to culture because fundamental values correlate to metaphorical structure of basic notions of this culture [Lakoff, Johnson 1980]. M. Minsky who is the author of frame theory introduces into his theory a system of analogy based on the key metaphor. According to M. Minsky a metaphor promotes formation of unexpected inter-frame links with heuristic force. [Minsky 1979].

Thus, linguists recognize as cognitive such metaphors which give a key to understanding language nature and its units. It is obvious the fact that even with a change of the scientific paradigm the key metaphor change takes place when a new sphere of assimilation, new analogy appears. Stimulating the thought developing the metaphor disappears.

However, on the way to its death a «living» individualized metaphor is not limited by the literary language but it penetrates all life activity of society and individuality and is preserved as one of the meanings that is it is conventionalized. For example, many words denoting parts of the body undergo a number of metaphorical (and also metonymical) extensions. The table of the conventional metaphors below shows lists of words referring to the upper part of the body [Wilkinson 1993 and LDOCE].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head</th>
<th>of department, of state, of government, of a page, of a queue, of a flower, of a beer, of stairs, of a bed, of a tape recorder, of a syntactic construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>of a mountain, of a building, of a watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye</td>
<td>of a potato, of a needle, of a hurricane, of a butterfly, in a flower, hooks and eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouth</td>
<td>of a hole, of a tunnel, of a cave, of a river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lips</td>
<td>Of a cup, of a jug, of a crater, of a plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nose</td>
<td>of an aircraft, of a tool, of a gun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>of land, of the woods, of a shirt, of bottle-neck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should</td>
<td>of a hill or mountain, of a bottle, of a road, of a jacket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm</td>
<td>of a chair, of the sea, of a tree, of a coat or jacket, of a record player</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands</td>
<td>of a watch, of an altimeter/speedometer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conventional, lexicalized or «dead» metaphor means that due to the frequent associations with a definite language form the figurative meaning of the word is firmly fixed in the linguistic communicative society (that is became generally accepted) that it was introduced in lexis as one of the word meanings equally with other meanings (that is it became lexicalized). S. Ullman and J. Leach suggested their classification of conventional metaphor types: 1) concrete: the light of learning, a vicious circle; 2) animistic: an angry sky, killing half an hour; 3) humanizing: a charming river, a friendly city; 4) synaesthetic: a warm colour, a dull sound.

According to L. Lipka such conventional metaphors add multiple categorizations to the objects of real life that is when one word relates to several categories [Lipka 1992.123]. In fact, metaphor is not only a way of language expression of definite ideas but also way of thinking about objects of real world. G. Lakoff and M. Jonson think so when they say that, for example, we not simply use the expression «time is money» in the language and speech but we think that is conceptualize the area «target time» by means of area «source money» when we use the following English sentences: You are wasting my time. Can you give me a few minutes? How do you spend your time? We are running out of time. Is that worth you?

From the cognitive point of view having analyzed all given cognitive theories of metaphor it should be emphasized not the mechanism of semantic extension of some separate category in the sphere totally different from it but links, relations and features of these relations between these two categories (compare e.g. metaphor
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is a linguistic communication conceptualized in the terms of sending and receiving of postcards – conduit metaphor (term introduced by M. Reddy) [Reddy 1993, 164-201]. Another significant in the cognitive aspect conclusion can be that the main characteristic of metaphor is not the very features inherent in every separate category but their role in structuring an aggregate «cognitive model». What is transferred in the other area by metaphor is considered as an integral structure, all aggregate of outer and inner relations of the cognitive model.

There is a special term for such metaphorical transfers borrowed from mathematic research and earlier from mapping that is «refection» of the структуры source-model structure to the target-model. So, in one of his schemes of metaphorical transfers G. Lakoff and M. Turner give structural analogies between the source-model «travel» and the target-model «life» [Lakoff and Turner 1989, 30]. The summary table of typical metaphorical transfers of categories and cognitive models can be presented on the basis of the examples taken from works of cognitive linguists [Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Lakoff 1987; Lipka 1988; Lakof and Turner 1989]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target «цель»</th>
<th>Source «источник»</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anger гнев</td>
<td>dangerous animal опасный зверь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument аргумент, спор</td>
<td>Journey путешествие</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication общение</td>
<td>Sending отправка</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death смерть</td>
<td>Departure уход, отправление</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas идея, мысли</td>
<td>Plants растения</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life time жизнь</td>
<td>Day день</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love любовь</td>
<td>War война</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories теории</td>
<td>Buildings здания</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time время</td>
<td>Money деньги</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding понимание</td>
<td>Seeing видение</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word слово</td>
<td>Coin монета</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World мир</td>
<td>Theatre театр</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see in the table that conceptualization of abstract categories (the left column) is based on the models taken from the real world (the right column) that is immediate objects, situations and events. G. Lakoff and M. Jonson suggested a scheme of conceptualization of the cognitive model «argument» through four related metaphors [Lakoff and Johnson 1980]: An argument is a journey. An argument is a battle. An argument is a container. An argument is a building.

1) An argument is a journey. The first metaphorical expression to conceptualize the way of argument development. The linguistic realization of this metaphor is as follows [Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 90]: We have set out to prove that bats are birds. When we go to the next point, we shall see that philosophy is dead. So far, we’ve seen that no current theory will work. This observation points the way to an elegant solution. We have arrived at a disturbing conclusion. Having analyzed examples given we focus on the process of argument development by creating a structural analogy with detailed knowledge which we possess in relation to the process journey. Nominative categories such as: starting point, landmark, way, route and goal, and categories of action, namely: отбытие, продвижение, преодоление расстояния, следование маршруту и прибытие, in aggregate serving as a structure for the model «journey» are reflected in the model “argument”.

2) An argument is a battle. The second cognitive model which pushes forward conceptualization of structural succession and also argument force is denoted by the term «battle» (though Lakoff and Jonson prefer the more common type notion “war”). By analogy with battle «argument» consist of several stages, namely: initial position of opponents followed by the phase of attack, retreat, counterattack and finally victory of one side or which is very rare signing a peace agreement. The structural analogies of the models battle у argument and their language realization are given in the table below (some examples were borrowed from the work of G. Johnson [Lakoff and Johnson 1980];

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opponents’ initial position</th>
<th>They drew up their battle lines. I braced myself for the onslaught...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attack</td>
<td>She attacked every weak point in my argument. He shot down all my arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>They defended their positions ferociously. She produced several illustrations to ?? her argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retreat</td>
<td>He withdrew his offensive remarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterattack</td>
<td>I hit black at his criticism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory/defeat</td>
<td>O.K. You win</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>He had to succumb to the force of her argument Let’s call it a trace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) An argument is a container. The metaphor “container” conceptualizes the content of the «argument». Mostly these are metaphors which realize the third meaning of the word argument: Your argument
4) An argument is a building. The fourth metaphor supplies content, development and quality of arguments with an appropriate form and perspective that is builds the concrete object «building». We've got a frame work for a solid argument. If you don’t support your argument with solid facts, its whole structure will collapse. We will show his argument to be without foundation.

Thus, the examples analysis shows that the abstract cognitive model argument has as the basis the concrete object category “building” (common type category derived from the categories of basic type like house, castle, church, etc.) and also event category journey and battle. Moreover, the image scheme which is at the basis of the metaphor «container» takes part in conceptualization.

Taking into consideration the fact that at metaphorical extension we should focus not on isolated categories of source and target but the whole structure of links and relations between them in the examples like: Ты уклонился от темы сообщения (way). Его аргументы пусты и бесодержательны (container); mentally it is realized not the very way or container but rather blurred, indistinctly outlined mental representations of relations from one point to the other, it is in something. The cognitive linguists state that the basis of such representations are the so-called «imaginative schemes» which along with categories of the basic level reflect our body interaction with the real world and that is why are considered as basis perceptions.

The metaphor cognitive nature on the example of verbs of movement was researched based on provisions of cognitive semantics by R. Langacker, M. Jonson, G. Lakoff, etc.

While projecting the reality into the language the person compares and identifies different concrete objects basing on perception of their topological types. Operating the abstract notions the person does the same thing namely they compare and identify abstract with concrete, for example, the expression письмо пришло (the letter has come) where the verb describing human relocation in relation to the unanimated object found in the mailbox. But why do we choose this verb? We know that what has happened to the letter is according to R. Langacker abstract movement and we compare the essence of this movement with the same characteristics, and in other words the profile of this movement with the common characteristics of familiar situations of the concrete movement; прийти убежать, войти, and etc. The optimal «suitable» that is identical by its semantic type (profile) are verbs of coming and among them a neutral verb – прийти (to come). Here is the essence of metaphor mechanism. It is identical to analogy of building and rebuilding morphological system of languages, and it is the principle of analogy operating in semantics. That is why metaphor takes not the peripheral but central position in the cognitive language model.

There should be donor and recipient zones in any metaphor, for example, verbs of movement can be used in the meaning of verbs of speech when movement is a donor zone for the speech which in its turn is recipient [Rudaka - Ostyn 1988a]. The donor zone is concrete and anthropocentric, it is known that human being is used to form it, the body, in particular, (горлышко, ручка), location in space and movement (он в ярости, он пришел в ярость). The strategy to form a donor zone is suggested by G. Lakoff and is described by the term embodiment.

Along with metaphorical there are non-metaphorical meanings in the cognitive linguistics which are as a way of conceptualization of different non-material objects and processes (ideas, emotions), types of cultural behavior and interaction, and etc. The primary word meaning as a way of conceptualization of some situation of non-language reality is perceived by the speaker as a mental scheme (semantic model) to comprehend other types of situations suitable (to this or that degree) for the scheme.

The basis of the semantic word development is not only basic meaning but also the corresponding prototype situation. It is the source of the cognitive scheme which the farther from the physical substance, the more it «appears» in its general and abstract type in its derived meanings unifying very different situations with different type objects into one group and making them realizations of some «common idea». But the same prototype situation is the source of numerous implications which are not registered in the initial meaning.

Non-metaphor derived meanings group around the initial meaning («nuclear») which correspond to «specialized» denotative variants of the base scheme (for example: поднять чемодан, поднять руку, поднять шляббаху, поднять вещи на лифте, and etc. – they are all variants of (non-metaphor) relocation of the object from lower position into higher one): by analogy – положить в карман, положить в больницу, положить в банк, and etc. ОдноiOne of such realizations is, by the way, the initial word meaning itself which at the given historical period is considered by the dictionary compilers as the basic, the most context free («primary»).

It is obvious that this group of words cannot but have invariants because they are all «context» realizations (denotative variants) of this invariant.

Further are metonymical meanings which due to the nature of metonymy transfer (transfer to a denotatively adjacent situation) both denotatively and semantically are more closely connected with the initial situation and initial meaning than metaphorical ones. They do not have invariants with the initial variant.
because they refer to the other situation but they have a common part with it, a very important part, namely, they completely exclude the initial meaning.

Traditionally metonymy (Greek Metonymia- renaming) is defined as a trope or speech mechanism consisting in regular or occasional transfer from one object class or a single object to the other class or a single object associated with the given by contiguity, adjacency, involvement into one situation [LED 1998, 300].

The name can be transferred from: 1) container to contents or volume of contents (блюдо – тарелка), (еда); 2) material to products made of it (мед – «металл», «денежка»); 3) place to its inhabitants (Вся деревня плескала); 4) action to its result, place or object of action (остановка – действии и место); 5) form of contents expression or its material realization to the contents themselves (толстая книга – предмет, интересная книга – содержание); 6) branch of science to its subject (семантика); 7) social event to its participants (конференция – «состояться в мае», «приняла важное решение»); 8) social organization to the workers in the place (фабрика – ремонтируется), (бастует); 9) whole to the part and vice versa (группа – дерево, плод); 10) emotional condition to its reason (ужас – «страх, ужасное событие»); 11) author’s name to their works (читать Толстого) [LED 1998, 300].

Modern conceptions referring to metonymy agree that there is a syntagmatic structure at the basis of metonymy and it is usually called «contiguity». However, some elements of triad are neglected while defining relations between contiguousity of names and objects. Signifier – signified – referent. As the result, the fact is underestimated that metonymy transfer is characterized by specific conditions of forming contiguity category of reflected reality where at metonymy transfer the contiguity relation is located not in the reality, not in the semantic word system but the reality objects enter contiguity relations being reflected in human mind. The metonymically used word correlates to the reality object with the help of the text where it is integrated. To determine relations of the sign and object supposes referring to the structures which organize the former experience and take into account the situation generating the text. To research metonymy in the speech makes it necessary to study a systematic organization of the sign as a condition of existing a transferred meaning.

The connection between metonymy mechanism and mind structures is noted in the works of M. Jonson, G. Lakoff [Lakoff 1987, Johnson 1987; Johnson 1987, Bonom 1992].

M. Bonom suggested researching relations which determine possibility and direction of metonymy transfer within the structure organized by the principle of an associated field. This approach does not give answer to the question of regularity and randomness of metonymy transfer of naming, though. Correspondingly, to determine the circle of standard situations and to establish the typical formulas of metonymy transfer it is necessary to use the structure frames of higher level, namely, a speech utterance, speech genre.

Metonymy research is connected with naming transfer as a referent-semantic phenomenon. Realizing a shift in reference, metonymy designation provides identification of objects by way of indicating their features and links. Semantic transformations accompanying the researched phenomenon are characterized by weakening of denotative semantic components and strengthening of secondary components by which agreement of meanings take place. In this reference the works of the authors who speak about necessity of analyzing not sense but relational database of metonymy semantic structure are of great interest [Ginsburg 1985]. For this author metonymy contiguity is observed in syntax oppositions which semantic components of lexical units belong to.

Metonymy transfer acquires description as a structure the elements of which interact on the basis of grounds mechanism and the result meaning is grounded by combination of the initial meaning with a semantic predicate.

A similar to this metonymy definition as a speech mechanism is given A.N. Tokmakov «… the mechanism is in transferring the name from one object to the other and is based on the fact that in the speaker’s mind semantic categories of objects’ names are in relations of semantic contiguity». [Tokmakov 2000,6]. With the help of metonymy indirect metonymy is created the reference of which is if intentional character and allows using naming transfer as an expressive means. Common language and speech metonymy are structurally identical and are different by transfer types serving as variable elements within a constant structure.

Metonymy place in the speech structure is defined by text functions of metonymy transfer. So metonymy is introduced in the context as a capacious semantic sign created not only in lexical purpose but also to provide text elements comprehension, to model sense components of semantic compression. Linking function of metonymical designations is observed in conditions of the secondary nomination when between two units there is anaphoric relations that is when one of them contains a reference to another. These units have a common referent which refers a direct and indirect designation in the text.

Anaphoric relations can include elements of multiple secondary designation establishing links as with the unit grounding them, so as between each other. The closer connection with the text is demonstrated by the expended metonymy structures which can be called «extensive metonymy». Mostly extensive metonymy supposes variation of designations of one referent. Another type of extensive metonymy is in use of one designation for reference of different objects.
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While using metonymy transfer part of meanings shifts to the implied level. Metonymy serves as a function of modeling sense components. Hidden components are prompted by events logics, that is procedure of predicate reconstruction accompanying this type of transfer.

The text metonymy extension depends upon type of the construction by which transfer takes place. The local, possessive object structure is provided by text descriptiveness which is explained by nature of predicates accompanying it. The reason and result type of metonymy transfer allow linking separate text parts into a narration. So, within the action of reason construction the name of some condition can be changed by names of source of this condition.

Semantic text compression is connected with reasons of language means economy. The semantic compression phenomenon is explained by peculiarities of meanings summing where the whole does not equal to the sum of components’ meanings. With account of the semantic structure of metonymy transfer the language consequence of such addition is a tendency to reduction of repeated meanings.

Analysis of home and foreign linguistic literature allows making a conclusion about cognitive nature of metonymy. We agree that metonymy along with metaphor are two mental essences which are starting point of «basic characteristics of cognition» [Lakoff, Temer 1989]. We understand the cognitive mechanisms of metonymy as it is suggested by W. Croft that is as actualization of part within the whole mental space: 1 We need a couple of strong bodies for our team. There are a lot of good heads in the university. We need some new faces around here. Camo coo, it is obvious that in all three sentences it says about people. It is interesting that in every example the most suitable for this or that aspect of human activity is focused either it is a cognitive model «physical strength» singled out in sports context correlated to the category «body» in the first example or in the context of university education the model «intelligence» correlated to the category «head». The category «face» is mostly prominent in the context of meeting new people that is exactly this part of the body draws attention when people get acquainted [Croft 1993, 350].

Moreover, it is necessary to take into account the traditional classification of metonymy links by contiguity of quantitative-volume, causative-consecutive, subjective-objective, object, feature, associative and other character. The typical examples of such character are given in table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part for whole</th>
<th>All hands on desk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole for part</td>
<td>To fill up the car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container for content</td>
<td>I’ll have a glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material for object</td>
<td>A glass, an iron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer for product</td>
<td>To buy a Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place for institution</td>
<td>Talks between Washington and Moscow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place for event</td>
<td>Watergate changed our politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled for controller</td>
<td>The buses are on strike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause for effect</td>
<td>His native tongue is German</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we see from the examples metonymy is not only a figure of speech of the literary language but it serves as a «cognitive instrument» [Black 1962, 37].

From the point of view of logical syntax N.D. Arutyunova distinguishes metaphor and metonymy the following way: firstly, it is noted that for a metaphor it is natural to function in the sphere of predicate (wider, attributes). The primary out of two must be considered the function of characterization and function of object identification is secondary. Giving the language the definite technique of nomination the metaphor fades losing its semantic double nature. For metonymy, on the contrary, it is typical to perform an identifying function in relation to some definite objects. Interaction of metaphor and metonymy performing different syntax functions N.D. Arutyunova interprets in the terms of contrast [N.D. Arutyunova 1990, 352].

The differences observed by G. Lakoff and M. Turner are connected with the structure and saving logical links in mental areas. If one structure in metaphor, as a rule, overlaps another structure and logical bonds of the source-area transfer to logical bonds of the target-area then in metonymy basically referent function is performed when with the help of metonymy one can link with any element of the conceptual system through establishing bonds with the other element of the same structure: one structure element correlates to the other element of the same structure or the whole mental area in general [Lakoff and Turner 1989, 103].

However, it is not always possible to distinguish between metaphor and metonymy which can be explained by a number of common features. Metaphor and metonymy are 1) conceptual by their nature, 2) they can penetrate into the conceptual system of a person and, hence, be used automatically, unaware conceptualized; 3) they much extend lexis due to the fact that as a rule during the transfer process the language expression of the source area is used to denote target-area.

On the basis of interaction between centrifugal and centripetal tendencies semantic extension of language meanings through metaphor and metonymy are under consideration in the different theories [Riemer 1999; 2002, 379–401; Barcelonana 2000 а31–586b; Radden 2000; Selo 1999; Parther, Ganter 1999; Wilkins 1996; Kronenfield 1996]. N. Riemer researching verbs of the theme row hit/percussion suggests considering metaphor and metonymy in the terms of conventionalization as two new categories: hypermetaphor and hypermetonymy.
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[Riemer 2002, 379-401]. Hypermetonymy is initially metonymic semantic extensions which with time passing are generalized and conventionalized so that they do not depend upon their link with the referent because their context has passed by the sphere of their initial meaning. The same is true about hypermetaphor which initially being a metaphorical expression of the concept with which there is no link at the moment continue to express the meaning that used to be expressed by the metaphor. In the work N. Riemer argues with Goossens about attributing an independent status to conventional metaphor and metonymy. Goossens in his turn states some combinatory processes called metaphtonymy [Goossens 1999, 1995] which reflects relations “metaphor from metonymy”, “metonymy inside metaphor”, “demetonymyzation inside metaphor ” and “metaphor inside metonymy”. Riemer recognizes relations controlling such types of extensions not combinatory but conventionalized and hypercategorial.

This cognitive mechanism of metaphtonymy is considered in home linguistics by K. V. Golubkina who following Goossens, Lakoff and Turner postulates conceptual dependence of metaphor and metonymy (cumulative metaphtonymy) and integration of metaphor and metonymy within one conceptual operation (integrated metaphtonymy) [Golubkina 1998, 7]. In the research done by us we will stick to this classification and consider cases of language realization of metaphor, metonymy and metaphtonymy.

IV. CONCLUSION

1. The cognitive notion of modality reveals full volume of its actualization through informing and naming (reference) at the first stage of written activity in relation "author - text", and also through interpreting and information acquisition at the second stage in relation "text-recipient".

2. The cognitive model of modality is characterized by two basic parameters: stability provided by invariant basic level of referent modality and on the other hand, by dynamism conditioned by level variability of subjective modality. Dynamism, flexible character of language frames interaction at every level, varied transitions and interlevel shifts are provided by cognitive mechanism of metaphorical and metonymical extensions within the so called "marked" active zones and "background" zones of every level. The main reason of dynamism of the modality category is its dependence upon the most unstable component of the world picture that is a human who is the basic element of the inner modality organization.

3. Metaphorical and metonymical models are widely used to activate hyperframe of text modality and also their mixed types – metaphtonimia which along with an individualizing and characterizing function in the text with the help of which modal information is distributed to the marked ("figure") and background one they also realize a cognitive function and contribute to conceptualization of new knowledge and suggest a new approach of reality comprehending.

Having done the research it is necessary to emphasize the role of metaphorical and metonymical models to attribute modality to meanings and to create a subjectively colored «world picture» of the text and parallel, boundary with objectively iconic «world picture» of the text.

The research and detailed study of the modality category in the cognitive-communicative aspect in different text types is a further perspective.

This research was done in the frames of the state grant of Kazakhstan Republic «The best University teacher-2013».
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