стилистическому критерию, а также уточнены понятийные различия терминов «военный сленг» и «профессиональный жаргонизм».

Ключевые слова: военные омофразы, стилистические типы, профессиональный жаргонизм.

Vygivsky V. L. The Stylistic Stratification of Military Homophrases and Their Stylistic Types

The article deals with the functional and stylistic differentiation of military homophrases taking into consideration their stylistic appliance, linguistic function and the sphere of discourse realization. There have been next to no works to investigate the phenomenon of military homophrases. Homophrasal oppositions appear due to asymmetrical dualism of linguistic signs and consist in formal coincidence of material forms of two or more phrases parallel with divergence in their content. The above-mentioned process is very active in Anglo-American military phraseology. Homophrases – professional jargonisms perform an emotive-expressive function and are realized in an informal spoken discourse. Homophrases – military phrasal terms are informative by function and the sphere of their realization is formal spoken and written discourses as well as an informal spoken discourse. Here is also presented the quantitative distribution of military homophrases in accordance with a stylistic criterion together with the clarification of the conceptual difference between the terms of «military slang» and «professional jargon». Stylistically neutral military phrasal terms do not have homophrases among free and phraseological word groups. More than two thirds of military homophrases belong to professional jargonisms which are highly idiomatic, often humorous or ironic, and possess a high level of expressiveness.

Key words: military homophrases, stylistic types, professional jargonism.

УДК 811.111:165.194

I. A. Bokun

FORCE DYNAMICS AS A CONSTRUAL OPERATION

Cognitive linguistics pays much attention to construal operations [1; 2; 3]. Construal operations are cognitive processes whereby we understand particular situations. Such cognitive processes include categorization, metaphor, figure-ground alignment, blending, and force dynamics. Force dynamics is the view that a large part of meaning can be described in terms of

two forceful entities in interaction. We conceptualize many situations as having two entities acting on each another with a particular result [4, p. 167]. Such conceptualizations are coded into language in particular ways. One of them, conceptualization of causation, has been described in our previous article [5]. The purpose of this article is to focus on other domains that involve force dynamics. Our task is to analyze the domain of EMOTION as an area where force image-schemas play a significant role.

So let us look at emotion and force. The description of an event in terms of force dynamics involves [6, p. 212]: force entities (Agonist/Antagonist), intrinsic force tendency (toward action / toward rest (inaction), resultant of the force interaction (action/ rest (inaction), balance of strengths (the stronger entity/ the weaker entity.

If we apply these force-dynamic notions to the domain of EMOTION, we get the following correspondences [7, p. 75]:

Force Agonist (FAgo) $\rightarrow$ Emotion Agonist (EmAgo)
Force Antagonist (FAnt) $\rightarrow$ Emotion Antagonist (EmAnt)
FAnt's force tendency $\rightarrow$ EmAnt's force tendency
FAgo's force tendency $\rightarrow$ EmAgo's force tendency
FAgo's resultant state $\rightarrow$ EmAgo's resultant state

Two questions immediately arise in this connection: (1) What allows us to set up these correspondences? (2) Precisely what is the emotion agonist, the emotion antagonist, the force tendency of the emotion agonist, and so on? To answer these questions, we should examine the most basic and skeletal emotion scenario in our folk theory of emotion. In this scenario, there is a cause that induces a person (self) to have an emotion, and the emotion causes the person to produce some response. In a schematic way, this can be given as: a cause leads to emotion or emotion leads to some response.

Since we know from the EVENT STRUCTURE metaphor [8, p. 24] that causes are forces, we can regard «cause» in part one and «emotion» in part two as forces and apply force dynamics to the EMOTION domain.

Let us begin with the first part of the scenario. If we think of the agonist as an entity that has an intrinsic force tendency toward inaction, that is, to stay inactive or at rest, the corresponding entity will be the self in the EMOTION domain; and if we think of the antagonist as an entity that has an intrinsic force tendency toward action, that is, to overcome the inaction of the agonist, to cause it to act, the corresponding entity will be the cause of emotion in the EMOTION domain.

Now let us look at the second part of the scenario, using the same definition of agonist and antagonist as before. If we think of the agonist as an entity that has an intrinsic force tendency toward inaction, the corresponding entity will be the self again, who will produce some kind of response. And if we think of the antagonist as an entity that has an intrinsic force tendency toward action, the corresponding entity will be the emotion itself. In other words, in both cases the emotion agonist will be the self (in that it becomes

emotional in part one and it produces a response in part two) and the emotion antagonist will be the cause of emotion in the first part and the emotion itself in the second part of the scenario.

These instantiations of the abstract force-dynamic schema will apply to the majority of emotion metaphors but not all of them. Table 1 shows how the various emotion metaphors instantiate the force-dynamic schema. Metaphors in group I focus on the second part of the scenario, metaphors in group II can focus on both parts, and metaphors in group III focus on part one.

Table 1 The Agonist and Antagonist in Emotion Metaphors

Source Domain	Agonist	Antagonist
I		
Internal pressure	Self	Emotion
Opponent	Self	Emotion
Wild animal	Self	Emotion
Social superior	Self	Emotion
Natural force	Self	Emotion
Trickster	Self	Emotion
Insanity	Self	Emotion
Fire	Self	Emotion
II		
Hunger 1	Self	Desire for emotion
Hunger2	Emotional self	Insatiable desire
Physical agitationl	Self	Cause of emotion
Physical agitation2	Body	Emotion
Burden	Self	Emotional stress
III		
Physical force	Self	Cause of emotion

Now let us take some conceptual metaphors of emotion and see how force dynamics applies to them. We can begin with EMOTION IS AN OPPONENT (IN A STRUGGLE). Consider some examples for this metaphor:

EMOTION IS AN OPPONENT: He was *seized by* emotion. He was *struggling with* his emotions. I was *gripped by* emotion. She was *overcome by* emotion.

There are two opponents in this struggle. As the first and third examples suggest, one opponent is inactive (the one who is seized and gripped all of a sudden). This is the agonist. The other, the one who seizes and grips, is active and attempts to cause opponent one to give in to his force. This is the antagonist. There is some struggle in which opponent one tries to resist opponent two's force and opponent two tries to make him give in to his force. There is the possibility of either opponent one winning or opponent two winning. Corresponding to opponent one in the source is the rational self in the target, while corresponding to opponent two in the source is the emotion in the target domain. Corresponding to opponent one's force tendency in the source is the rational self's force tendency to try to maintain control over the emotion, and corresponding to opponent two's force tendency is the emotion's force tendency to cause the self to lose control.

The OPPONENT and NATURAL FORCE metaphors both focus on the second part of the skeletal emotion scenario – «emotion → response».

Now let us take a metaphor that can work for both the second and first parts: EMOTION IS A PHYSIOLOGICAL FORCE. Physiological forces include hunger and thirst. Consider the following two examples:

EMOTION IS HUNGER/THIRST: I'm *starved for* affection. His anger was *insatiable*.

Both examples are based on the mapping according to which: hunger → desire. The physiological hunger corresponds to emotional desire. But the two desires are very different. In the case of «*starved for* affection», the hunger for food corresponds to the psychological desire for an emotion. In the case of «*insatiable* anger,» the hunger for (more) food corresponds to the emotional desire for (more) revenge or retaliation. In other words, in version one of the EMOTION IS HUNGER metaphor we are talking about the first part of the emotion scenario («cause→emotion»), whereas in version two focus is on the second part («emotion→response»).

The logic of version one says this: A nonhungry person does not want food. What causes a hungry person to want food is the hunger. Similarly with emotion: An emotionally desireless person (self) does not want emotion, but a desire for emotion makes the self want emotion.

The last metaphor of emotion that I use to demonstrate the workings of force dynamics in the conceptualization of emotions is the EMOTION IS A PHYSICAL FORCE metaphor. This metaphor tends to have its main focus on the first part of the emotion scenario – «cause→emotion». It comes in a variety of forms (MECHANICAL, ELECTRIC, GRAVITATIONAL, MAGNETIC), which are illustrated with the following examples [6, p. 218]:

EMOTION IS A PHYSICAL FORCE.

EMOTION IS A MECHANICAL FORCE; EMOTIONAL EFFECT IS PHYSICAL CONTACT: When I found out, it *hit* me *hard*. That was a terrible *blow*. She *knocked* me *off my feet*.

EMOTION IS AN ELECTRIC FORCE: It was an *electrifying* experience.

EMOTION IS A GRAVITATIONAL FORCE: Her whole life *revolves around* him. They *gravitated toward* each other immediately.

EMOTION IS A MAGNETIC FORCE: I was *magnetically drawn to* her. I am *attracted to* her. She found him *irresistible*. That *repels* me.

In the source domain, there is a physical object with the force tendency toward inaction, that is, to continue to be as before. There is also another force-exerting entity here, a physical force that has the force tendency to produce some effect in the object. Correspondingly, there is a rational self that has the force tendency to stay as before (that is, unemotional), and there is a cause (of emotion) that has the force tendency to cause the self to become emotional. This situation is depicted by such examples as «The news *hit* me *hard*» and «I was *attracted to* her», where a cause of emotion acts on the rational self, causing it to become emotional.

We can represent this interplay of forces in emotion as a conceptually richer version of our initial skeletal emotion scenario:

1. cause of emotion – force
   tendency of the cause of emotion $\Big\}$ $\leftrightarrow$ $\Big\{$ rational self – force
   tendency of self

$\rightarrow$ 2. self has emotion

$\rightarrow$ 3. self's force tendency $\leftrightarrow$ force tendency of emotion

$\rightarrow$ 4. self's emotional response

In this richer schema it becomes clear that the various components of the EMOTION domain are conceptualized as forces that interact with one another. The schema shows that there are two main points of tension in the experience of emotion: The first takes place between the cause of emotion and the rational self, resulting in the emergence of emotion. The second occurs between the self that has the emotion but is still in control over it, on the one hand, and the force of the emotion, on the other. This second force interaction prototypically results in the self losing control and producing an emotional response. Most emotion metaphors (though not all) can be described in a similar fashion as an interaction of forces. This leads us to the conclusion that there exists a single «master metaphor» for emotion: EMOTIONS ARE FORCES. A large number of emotion metaphors are specific-level instantiations of this superordinate metaphor, each playing a specific and different role in conceptualizing the EMOTION domain.

Further research might cover force dynamics in grammar.

References
1. Langacker R. W. Foundations of Cognitive Grammar / R.W. Langacker. – Stanford, CA : Stanford University press, 1987. – 515 p. **2. Croft W.** Cognitive Linguistics / W. Croft, A. Cruse. – Cambridge : Cambridge University press, 2004. – 356 p. **3. Talmy L.** Toward a Cognitive Semantics / L. Talmy. – Vol. II: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring. – Cambridge, MA : MIT Press, 2000. – 368 p. **4. Talmy L.** The relation of grammar to cognition / L. Talmy // Topics in Cognitive Linguistics / Ed. Brygida Rudzka-Ostyn. – Amsterdam : John Benjamins, 1988. – P. 165 – 205. **5. Bokun I.** Construal operations having to do with overall structure / I. Bokun // Наук. вісник Волинського нац. ун-ту ім. Лесі Українки. – 2012. – №23 (248). – C. 21 – 25. **6. Kövesces Z.** Language, Mind, and Culture / Z. Kövesces. – Oxford : Oxford University press, 2006. – 397 p. **7. Kövesces Z.** Metaphor and Emotion / Z. Kövesces. – New York : Cambridge University Press, 2000. – 237 p. **8. Lakoff G.** Metaphors We Live By / G. Lakoff, M. Johnson. – Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1980. – 373 p.

Бокун І. А. Динаміка сили як інтерпретативна операція
Стаття аналізує когнітивні операції, які включають динаміку сили. Доводиться, що більшість метафор емоцій можуть описуватися як взаємодія сил. ЕМОЦІЇ – СИЛА є єдиною когнітивною метафорою

для емоцій. Метафори емоцій є конкретизацією цієї когнітивної метафори на специфічному рівні, виконуючи свою особливу роль в концептуалізації сфери емоцій. В статті ми розглядаємо деякі концептуальні метафори емоцій, для того, щоб подивитися, як динаміка сили може бути застосована до них.

Ключові слова: когнітивні операції, метафора, динаміка сили, концептуалізація.

Бокун И. А. Операции интерпретации, связанные с динамикой силы

Статья анализирует когнитивные операции, затрагивающие динамику силы. Доказывается, что большинство метафор эмоций могут быть описаны как взаимодействие сил. ЭМОЦИИ – СИЛА являются общей когнитивной метафорой для эмоций. Метафоры эмоций являются конкретизацией этой когнитивной метафоры на специфическом уровне, играя свою особую роль в концептуализации сферы эмоций. Мы взяли некоторые концептуальные метафоры эмоций, чтобы посмотреть, как динамика силы может быть приложена к ним.

Ключевые слова: когнитивные операции, метафора, динамика силы, концептуализация.

Bokun I. A. Force Dynamics As a Construal Operation

The article analyzes cognitive operations having to do with force dynamics. It is proved that most emotion metaphors can be described as an interaction of forces. EMOTION ARE FORCES is a single cognitive metaphor for emotion. Emotion metaphors are specific-level instantiations of this superordinate metaphor, each playing a specific and different role in conceptualizing the EMOTION domain. We have taken some conceptual metaphors of emotion to see how force dynamics applies to them. We have considered the following conceptual metaphors: «emotion is an opponent», «emotion is hunger/thirst», «emotion is a physical force», «emotion is a mechanical force», «emotional effect is a physical contact», «emotion is an electric force», «emotion is a gravitational force», «emotion is a magnetic force». In the richer schema it becomes clear that the various components of the EMOTION domain are conceptualized as forces that interact with one another. The schema shows that there are two main points of tension in the experience of emotion: The first takes place between the cause of emotion and the rational self, resulting in the emergence of emotion.

Key words: cognitive operations, metaphor, force dynamics, conceptualisation.