

DOI: 10.35923/BAS.30.15

CONNECTING IDIOMS AND METAPHORS: WHERE COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS MEETS COGNITIVE STYLISTICS

YURII KOVALIUK

Chernivtsi ‘Yurii Fedkovych’ National University

DOI-10.35923-BAS.30.15-p157-170

***Abstract:** The article discusses important issues in the conceptual analysis of English idioms based on a multilayered online processing view of metaphor and the cognitive stylistic analysis of idioms, in an attempt to reconcile the two lines of research. The study focuses on idioms grouped under the semantic category of argument and conflict. First, the idioms are analysed from the perspective of the multilayered online processing view of metaphor. Second, the relevant cognitive stylistic features of idioms are described. The hypothesis that the multilevel view of metaphor can help establish certain conceptual regularities in semantically related idioms is investigated.*

***Keywords:** cognitive stylistics, conceptual metaphor, extended idiomatic metaphor, idiom, linguistic metaphor, multilevel view of metaphor*

1. Introduction

Compared to other long-standing traditions within linguistics, cognitive linguistics, metaphor research and metaphorical idioms, among other topics, qualify as fairly recent research foci of linguistic inquiry. As regards idioms in particular, the last several decades have seen numerous publications on the topic, the needs to describe their functions (Gibbs and Colston 2012), semantic transparency/opacity and decomposition (Turner and Littlemore 2023), pedagogical (Bui, Boers and Coxhead 2020), and lexicographical applications (Giacomini 2022) being among the most relevant.

However, given some recent developments in the field, such as the introduction of the Cognitive Stylistics Theory (Naciscione 2010) and the Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Kövecses 2020), the time is ripe to zoom in on a context-based cognitive linguistic and cognitive stylistic analysis of English idioms. Naciscione (2010: 68) maintains that the stylistic use of idioms as reproducible language units is driven by the intentional choices made by the language user, a view similar to the characterization of ‘formulaic sequences’ in Psycholinguistics (Wray 2002). On the other hand, the major premise grounded in Kövecses’s theory echoes what could be described as a clash between the ‘primarily relational and primarily non-social’ (Enfield 2017: 13) aspects of ‘more general cognition’ (Langacker 1987: 13) that have been widely utilized in cognitive linguistic explorations and usage-based approaches to language (Bybee 2010). According to a usage-based model, “it is not enough to describe a piece of language structure, a linguistic (sub)system, or a pattern of variance in language.

We must ask why it is that way.” (Enfield 2017: 14) Therefore, the present paper aims to bridge the gap between these two approaches by looking at the conceptual structure of the English idioms based on a multilayered online processing view of metaphor and the cognitive stylistic analysis of idioms. It is hypothesised that, despite being posited as an online processing model, the multilevel view of metaphor can aid in tracing certain conceptual regularities in semantically related idioms, especially when it comes to the levels of image schema, domain, and frame. Besides, it is also argued that with the help of the cognitive stylistic analysis, the intentionality behind the use of a given idiom, and hence the idiom instantiated metaphor, can be determined. The study of the conceptual potential of the idioms also necessitates their (corpus-based) lexical semantic analysis.

2. Material and methodology

The Oxford Dictionary of Idioms, 4th edition, was chosen as the main source of material. Overall, 36 idioms under the category ‘Argument and conflict’ were considered for the analysis. They were selected from the updated thematic index included in the dictionary.

The main approach used in this study rests on Kövecses’s (2020) Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory. This theory proposes a comprehensive perspective on metaphor that considers various contextual elements, including situational context (mainly consisting of the physical environment, the social situation, and the cultural situation), discourse context (mainly comprising the linguistic context and the common ground), conceptual-cognitive context (based on the conceptual system, ideology, and awareness of past states and events), and bodily context (having to do with a particular state of a body). When it comes to discussing the core principles of metaphor production, Kövecses puts forth a schematic multilevel view of metaphor, which can be realised linguistically, grounded in image schemas (the most schematic level), domains (the less schematic level), frames (the more specific level), and mental spaces (the most specific level).

As regards the cognitive stylistic analysis of the idioms, the term ‘extended idiomatic metaphor’ is adapted from Naciscione’s ‘extended phraseological metaphor’, which the author characterizes as follows:

Extended phraseological metaphor is among the most frequently used patterns of instantial use. The pattern is prototypically present in every case of use when the phraseological image is sustained. Extended metaphor is characterised by a spread of the phraseological image; thus, it is not a single metaphor but a string of sub-images creating associative metaphors tied together, covering an entire area of experience. The pattern stipulates extension of the phraseological image, which is part of the base form, and creation of one sub-image (at least) or several sub-images, based on various associations. Sub-images cluster around the base metaphor of the phraseological unit, creating a cohesive network of various types of associative bonds, immediate or remote, forward or backward, linking things which occur together in space and time. Extension of phraseological image is achieved in the search for a more accurate representation of human thought and experience. (Naciscione 2010: 80)

Apparently, Naciscione coined the term ‘extended phraseological metaphor’ on the basis of extended metaphor, which, in the simplest terms, stands for a sustained use of a single metaphor in discourse. I will be using the term ‘sub-

metaphor' for any metaphors that appear subordinate to the base idiom-instantiated metaphor, instead of Naciscione's 'sub-image', for the sake of terminological consistency.

3. Analysis

3.1. Idioms: a view from the extended conceptual metaphor theory

To further demonstrate the application of the multilevel view of metaphor, let us look at the following example. Despite the common knowledge that certain idiomatic expressions can be based on conceptual metaphors, simplifying the metaphorical idioms solely in this manner would overlook the complexity of the situation. Apparently, metaphorical idioms can be associated with specific metaphorical concepts at one level, but this level is a representation of just one aspect of an intricate hierarchy of schematicity. Additionally, this hierarchy can culminate in various image-schema metaphors that collectively describe the particular idiom. Consider an extract taken from the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA):

(1) *I mean, listen, there's something – what's fascinating about China is you got to give Trump and Peter Navarro, who's -- a lot of it's behind – he's behind a lot of the anti-China stuff -- credit for at least enlightening people on what -- how pernicious China is as a global trading partner; how they steal our stuff, how they attack. They're **on the warpath** against us. They have -- they have basically created a cold - a hot war in terms of trade and stealing and theft of intellectual property.* (COCA)

Here the idiomatic expression is *on the warpath*; I shall explore its metaphorical conceptualisation and the sentence within the framework of the multilevel view of metaphor outlined above. Speaking of the most specific level, otherwise known as mental spaces, the country of China is metaphorically represented as a war opponent. The concept of (China's) engaging in illicit economic policies is equated with stepping on the warpath (with the USA). The way the parties engage in this trade, especially China, is likened to military maneuvers. Thus, according to this line of analysis, the idiomatic expression *on the warpath* encompasses specific conceptual metaphors that involve mappings between the source (readiness to a war, in Native American terms) and the target (economic policies) at the level of mental spaces:

CHINA IS A WAR OPPONENT
 CHINA'S INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICIES ARE MILITARY
 MANEUVERS
 CHINA'S ENGAGING IN ILLICIT ECONOMIC POLICIES IS STEPPING ON A
 WARPATH WITH THE USA

At the frame level, the final metaphorical element becomes more generalised. China, which is metaphorically seen as a war opponent, is conceptualised as a military formation, while engaging in an argument is understood as proceeding to a battle. Furthermore, within the typical exchange of goods/commodities/services frame, there are two key participants, i.e., trading partners, one of which is more belligerent than the other. Thus, economic transaction is understood as military hostility, whereas the economic policy is represented as military tactics. Therefore, it can be summarised as follows:

CHINA IS A MILITARY FORMATION
 ECONOMIC POLICY IS MILITARY TACTICS
 ECONOMIC TRANSACTION IS MILITARY HOSTILITY
 ENGAGING IN AN ARGUMENT IS PROCEEDING TO A BATTLE

At the domain level, the typical exchange of goods/commodities/services frame undergoes a transformation and becomes a specific example of the broader concept of international trade. This kind of trade is conceptualised as cold (hot) war. In this metaphorical framework, the political entity that engages in the international trade is metaphorically represented as an army, while engagement is seen as movement. In summary, the metaphors or mappings involved can be described as follows:

ENGAGEMENT IS MOVEMENT
 POLITICAL ENTITY IS AN ARMY
 MANAGEMENT OF AN ECONOMY IS MANAGEMENT OF AN ARMY
 INTERNATIONAL TRADE IS COLD WAR

At the highest level of abstraction, known as image schemas, we arrive at overarching metaphorical conceptualisations that arise from applying various image schemas to the different components of the domain of war. These components include actions, entities, exchanges, and resources. These elements are metaphorically organised through image schemas such as motion, force, forces, and antagonism, resulting in the following metaphors:

ACTION IS MOTION
 ENTITY IS FORCE
 MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES IS MANAGEMENT OF FORCES
 EXCHANGE IS ANTAGONISM

As evidenced from the above analysis of the idiom *on the warpath*, there is a progressive shift in the level of abstraction of the conceptual metaphor connecting the different layers. The metaphorical concept of China's international economic policies being akin to military maneuvers is more specific than the notion of economic policy as military tactics. The latter is more specific than the idea of management of an economy as management of an army, which, consecutively, is more specific than resources being forces and entity being a force. Similarly, the metaphorical concept of China's engaging in illicit economic policies, perceived as stepping on a warpath with the USA, is less abstract than the idea of engaging in an argument as proceeding to a battle. That being said, the engagement is movement metaphor is more specific than the action is motion metaphor, sitting at the top of the schematicity hierarchy. The final two metaphors in both instances are part of the overarching system, because China's engaging in illicit economic policies is limited not only to an exchange of goods/commodities/services frame, but also to action and entity, which renders the entire hierarchical system immediately meaningful, right down to the metaphor of "stepping on a warpath."

This metaphorical system can be illustrated in the following manner (from most schematic to least schematic). The conceptual metaphors highlighted in bold are interconnected in terms of hierarchical schematicity, and they form the fundamental structure of this metaphor system. The conceptual metaphors in the regular font are, too, related hierarchically, yet they are context-dependent in that

the left-hand side slot is always reliant on a specific context-based frame, other than the exchange of goods/commodities/services frame discussed above.

IMAGE SCHEMA

ACTION IS MOTION

ENTITY IS FORCE

MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES IS MANAGEMENT OF FORCES

EXCHANGE IS ANTAGONISM

DOMAIN

ENGAGEMENT IS MOVEMENT

POLITICAL ENTITY IS AN ARMY

MANAGEMENT OF AN ECONOMY IS MANAGEMENT OF AN ARMY

INTERNATIONAL TRADE IS COLD WAR

FRAME

CHINA IS A MILITARY FORMATION

ECONOMIC POLICY IS MILITARY TACTICS

ECONOMIC TRANSACTION IS MILITARY HOSTILITY

ENGAGING IN AN ARGUMENT IS PROCEEDING TO A BATTLE

MENTAL SPACE

CHINA IS A WAR OPPONENT

CHINA'S INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICIES ARE MILITARY MANEUVERS

CHINA'S ENGAGING IN ILLICIT ECONOMIC POLICIES IS STEPPING ON A WARPATH WITH THE USA

If the analysis algorithm outlined above is correct, it paves the way for other metaphorical and unilateral idioms denoting argument and conflict to be scrutinised using this method. That being said, 12 additional idioms identified as metaphorical, such as *lock horns*, *cross swords*, *at loggerheads*, *take up the cudgels*, *cut and thrust*, *at daggers drawn*, *add fuel to the fire*, *go to the mat*, *hold the ring*, *running battle*, *be at each other's throats*, and *fight tooth and nail*, were searched for in the COCA and examined by using the multilevel view of metaphor. The idioms will not be discussed individually, but rather the results will be first summarised in Table 1 and then commented on further below.

<i>Lock horns</i>	IS: <i>interaction is counterforce and/or contact; resources are physical substances; resources are enablements (of interaction)</i> DM: <i>conflict is an animal fight and/or intense physical contact, entity / a person is an animal, arguments are animal body parts</i>
<i>Cross swords</i>	IS: <i>interaction is counterforce and/or contact; resources are physical objects; resources are enablements (of interaction)</i> DM: <i>conflict is a knight fight and/or intense physical contact; an entity / person is a knight; arguments are weapons</i>
<i>At loggerheads</i>	IS: <i>interaction is counterforce and/or contact; resources are physical objects; resources are enablements (of interaction)</i> DM: <i>conflict is a fight and/or intense physical contact; an entity/person is a fighter; arguments are weapons</i>
<i>Take up the cudgels</i>	IS: <i>interaction is counterforce and/or contact; resources are physical objects; resources are enablements (of interaction)</i> DM: <i>conflict is a fight and/or intense physical contact; an entity / person is a fighter; arguments are weapons</i>

<i>Cut and thrust</i>	IS: <i>interaction is counterforce and/or contact; resources are physical objects; resources are enablements (of interaction)</i> DM: <i>conflict is a fight and/or intense physical contact; an entity/person is a royal marine; arguments are weapons</i>
<i>At daggers drawn</i>	IS: <i>interaction is counterforce and/or contact; resources are physical objects; resources are enablements (of interaction)</i> DM: <i>conflict is a fight and/or intense physical contact; an entity/person is an armed adversary; arguments are weapons</i>
<i>Add fuel to the fire</i>	IS: <i>interaction (sensation) is a physical process; producing an intense interaction (sensation) is intensifying a physical process</i> DM: <i>conflict (anger) is fire; producing an intense conflict (feeling of anger) is intensifying a physical process of fire</i>
<i>Go to the mat</i>	IS: <i>interaction is counterforce and/or contact; resources are physical forces; resources are enablements (of interaction)</i> DM: <i>conflict is a contact sport and/or intense physical contact; an entity/person is a wrestler; arguments are human bodies</i>
<i>Hold the ring</i>	IS: <i>interaction is counterforce and/or contact; resources are physical forces; resources are enablements (of interaction)</i> DM: <i>conflict is a contact sport and/or intense physical contact; an entity/person is a guard; arguments are human bodies</i>
<i>Running battle</i>	IS: <i>interaction is continual process</i> DM: <i>continual conflict is continual warfare; an entity/person is a fighter</i>
<i>Be at each other's throats</i>	IS: <i>interaction is counterforce and/or contact; resources are physical forces; resources are enablements (of interaction)</i> DM: <i>conflict is a fight and/or intense physical contact; an entity/person is an adversary; arguments are human bodies</i>
<i>Fight tooth and nail</i>	IS: <i>interaction is counterforce and/or contact; resources are physical substances; resources are enablements (of interaction)</i> DM: <i>conflict is an animal fight and/or intense physical contact; an entity/person is an animal; arguments are animal body parts</i>

Table 1: Higher-level conceptual metaphors for the idioms denoting argument and conflict

Table 1 presents the data in the form of idiom listings, paired with the corresponding conceptual metaphors at the highest levels of abstraction (IS – image schemas and DM – domains), which are relatively fixed and hence fundamental for each idiom, irrespective of the context. On the other hand, the conceptual metaphors on the lower levels of frames and mental spaces were understandably not included in the table, because of their variability and dependability on the context. Thus, it was found that when using the majority of the metaphorical idioms under analysis, such as *lock horns*, *cross swords*, *at loggerheads*, *take up the cudgels*, *cut and thrust*, *go to the mat*, *hold the ring*, *be at each other's throats*, and *fight tooth and nail*, at the most schematic level, speakers will most likely think of the argument and conflict interaction in terms of counterforce and/or contact, which is reflected in the image schema metaphor INTERACTION IS COUNTERFORCE AND/OR CONTACT. Moreover, the resources the speakers have at their disposal, when engaged in an argument or conflict, are metaphorically perceived as physical substances, physical objects, and physical forces (abstracted from horns, swords, loggerheads, cudgels, cutlasses, human hands (3 idioms), teeth, and nails, respectively), which the conceptual metaphors at the level of image

schema RESOURCES ARE PHYSICAL SUBSTANCES, RESOURCES ARE PHYSICAL OBJECTS, and RESOURCES ARE PHYSICAL FORCES show. The efforts and/or the intentions that are the driving force behind the speakers' use of the above resources are metaphorically depicted as enablements. This manifests itself in the image schema RESOURCES ARE ENABLEMENTS (OF INTERACTION) conceptual metaphor. What sets these idioms apart conceptually is the source domain, wherein person or entity is likened to an animal (2 idioms), a knight, a fighter (2 idioms), a Royal Marine, an (armed) adversary (2 idioms), a wrestler, and a guard (in a boxing match). This is reflected in the respective conceptual metaphors on the domain level, such as ENTITY/PERSON IS A WRESTLER or ENTITY/PERSON IS AN ANIMAL, for example. Additionally, the dual conceptual metaphor INTERACTION IS COUNTERFORCE AND/OR CONTACT is downgraded to the less schematic domain-level dual metaphor CONFLICT IS A FIGHT AND/OR INTENSE PHYSICAL CONTACT. While the latter metaphor, i.e., CONFLICT IS INTENSE PHYSICAL CONTACT, has been assigned to most of the idioms under analysis, the former metaphor, i.e., CONFLICT IS A FIGHT metaphor is a predominant one (5 idioms), followed by its conceptual varieties, such as CONFLICT IS AN ANIMAL FIGHT (2 idioms), CONFLICT IS A CONTACT SPORT (2 idioms), and CONFLICT IS A KNIGHT FIGHT. Furthermore, with regard to the arguments speakers tend to deploy in conflictual situations, these are predominantly associated with animal body parts (2 idioms), weapons (4 idioms), and human bodies (3 idioms), as can be illustrated through the domain-level metaphor ARGUMENTS ARE HUMAN BODIES, pertaining to the *be at each other's throats* idiom, for example. The situation is slightly different for the idioms *add fuel to the fire* and *running battle*. When it comes to *add fuel to the fire*, it can describe both a sensation, i.e., anger, and a specific type of interaction, for example conflict. Thus, at the highest level of schematicity, we have the conceptual metaphors INTERACTION (SENSATION) IS A PHYSICAL PROCESS and PRODUCING AN INTENSE INTERACTION (SENSATION) IS INTENSIFYING A PHYSICAL PROCESS. At the domain level, these very metaphors become more specific, whereby interaction is conceived of as conflict, sensation is depicted as anger, and the physical process is described as fire, which the relevant metaphors at the level of domain show, as in CONFLICT (ANGER) IS FIRE and PRODUCING AN INTENSE CONFLICT (FEELING OF ANGER) IS INTENSIFYING A PHYSICAL PROCESS OF FIRE. In the case of the idiom *running battle*, argument and conflict are perceived as a continual process at the highest level of schematicity, as the conceptual metaphor INTERACTION IS CONTINUAL PROCESS at the level of image schema demonstrates. Based on this, the domain-level conceptual metaphors CONTINUAL CONFLICT IS CONTINUAL WARFARE and AN ENTITY/PERSON IS A FIGHTER are arrived at.

3.2. Idioms: a view from cognitive linguistics and cognitive stylistics

The time is ripe to now turn to how the extended conceptual metaphor theory can benefit from the application of some cognitive stylistics ideas, namely the concept of extended metaphor. For this purpose, an extract taken from the British National Corpus (BNC) will be considered.

(2) *Although things change in fishing, as in any other industry, I feel that we are travelling familiar waters tonight. We are gathered here a little before Christmas to perform our annual fishing industry pre-ministerial Council season's service--that litany of woe from every corner of the kingdom--telling of sad tidings of discomfort and no joy in the industry. In fact, the position is not as bad as in the recent past, but we are still not there yet, because there is no question but that any extra cuts in quotas must mean hardship.*

I suspect that we all know our lines--we have heard several of them repeated tonight--and, like a pantomime by a well-loved local drama group, we fishing industry Members of Parliament will perform well in this packed House. I am sorry that that old favourite, the very nauseating tie usually worn by the hon. Member for Great Grimsby (Mr. Mitchell), is not with us, although the hon. Gentleman has just arrived. The band of bleating chorus from Scotland is present, with its regular melody, played on the strings of our hearts, about how bad things are north of the border. It gives Conservative Members the occasional chance to shout a seasonal "humbug" or two.

All may be well in the Chamber because we are on familiar ground, but outside in the real world of fish markets and the North Sea, all is not fully well. For the past year or so, all hon. Members except my hon. Friends on the Front Bench have sung from the same hymn book about decommissioning. This year, I am delighted that my hon. Friends have at least found the same page of the hymn book. (BNC)

This paragraph features two instances of idiom use. The sentence ‘*For the past year or so, all hon. Members except my hon. Friends on the Front Bench have sung from the same hymn book about decommissioning*’ exemplifies the use of the base form of the idiom. The sentence ‘*This year, I am delighted that my hon. Friends have at least found the same page of the hymn book*’ illustrates a creative variation of the idiom. In the first place, let us examine these examples from the standpoint of the extended conceptual metaphor theory. According to Kövecses (2020), it is essential to avoid any preconceptions about the superiority of the conceptual metaphor theory and the conceptual integration theory – neither should be deemed as better. Instead, their relationship should be seen as grounded in interconnectedness and complementarity. Although Kövecses does not provide any specific practical examples of analysing idiom blends within the extended conceptual metaphor theory, as his focus lies on the theoretical aspects of the matter, we find it necessary to explore such examples in this current paper.

Let us proceed to analyse these instances based on the multilevel view of metaphor. Regarding the most specific level of mental spaces, a number of mappings reside here. Firstly, the UK Parliament is understood as a church. Secondly, a session in the UK Parliament is interpreted as a gathering of a church choir. Thirdly, the members of the UK Parliament are imagined as singers in a church choir. Fourthly, expressing shared opinions by the members of the UK Parliament is perceived as singing (in unison) in a church choir. The reason ‘in unison’ is placed in brackets is that two different scenarios are accounted for, i.e., the first one where it is directly applicable, as can be seen from the use of the base form of the idiom, *sing from the same hymn book*, and the second one where it is not applicable, as evidenced from the idiom modification. This difference is a crucial one, as it illustrates the intentionality behind using the base form of the idiom (to demonstrate the cohesiveness and solidarity in the Chamber) and the modification (to demonstrate lack thereof). Fifthly, the intellectual resources of the

members of the UK Parliament are thought of as the voices of the singers in a church choir. Finally, the shared knowledge of the members of the UK Parliament can be described in terms of a hymn book. That said, these mappings can be illustrated as follows:

THE UK PARLIAMENT IS A CHURCH
 A SESSION IN THE UK PARLIAMENT IS A GATHERING OF A CHURCH
 CHOIR
 THE MEMBERS OF THE UK PARLIAMENT ARE SINGERS IN A CHURCH
 CHOIR
 EXPRESSING SHARED OPINIONS BY THE MEMBERS OF THE UK
 PARLIAMENT IS SINGING (IN UNISON) IN A CHURCH CHOIR
 THE INTELLECTUAL RESOURCES OF THE MEMBERS OF THE UK
 PARLIAMENT ARE THE VOICES OF THE SINGERS IN A CHURCH
 CHOIR
 THE SHARED KNOWLEDGE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE UK PARLIAMENT
 IS A HYMN BOOK

As regards the level of conceptual frames, the metaphorical elements under analysis assume a broader characterisation. The concept of the UK Parliament undergoes a schematisation to a more general frame of parliament and/or parliamentary work, mainly focussing on such attributes as parliament as an institution, a parliamentary session, the members of parliament, the shared opinions, ideas and/or understanding of situation by the members of parliament, the intellectual resources of the members of parliament, and the knowledge of the members of parliament. This process holds for all the mappings discussed above, rendering them more general, as in:

THE PARLIAMENT IS A CHURCH
 A SESSION IN THE PARLIAMENT IS A GATHERING OF A CHURCH CHOIR
 THE MEMBERS OF THE PARLIAMENT ARE SINGERS IN A CHURCH CHOIR
 EXPRESSING SHARED OPINIONS BY THE MEMBERS OF THE
 PARLIAMENT IS SINGING (IN UNISON) IN A CHURCH CHOIR
 THE INTELLECTUAL RESOURCES OF THE MEMBERS OF THE
 PARLIAMENT ARE THE VOICES OF THE SINGERS IN A CHURCH
 CHOIR
 THE SHARED KNOWLEDGE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE PARLIAMENT IS A
 HYMN BOOK

At the level of the conceptual domains, the typical parliament/parliamentary work frame is reorganised into a higher-level concept of cooperation, while the members of parliament and the parliament itself emerge as persons and entity, accordingly. By the same token, the concept of the intellectual resources of the members of parliament is elevated to a notion of cooperation resources. The final metaphorical elements, too, are subjected to a process of schematisation, resulting in a domain matrix associated with *signing in a choir*, namely *sound and/or melody creation process*, *singer*, and *human voices*. Consequently, the following conceptual metaphors are obtained:

DM: COOPERATION IS A SOUND AND/OR MELODY CREATION PROCESS
 DM: THE ENTITY/PERSON IS A SINGER
 DM: COOPERATION RESOURCES ARE HUMAN VOICES

The highest level of abstraction is marked by highly schematic pre-conceptual structures that stem from our basic embodied experience. The application of various image schemas, such as process, sound vibrations and/or actions, and enablements, to the conceptual components of the singing in a choir domain, i.e., interaction and resources, yields the following metaphors:

INTERACTION IS A PROCESS
 RESOURCES ARE SOUND VIBRATIONS AND/OR ACTIONS
 RESOURCES ARE ENABLEMENTS (OF INTERACTION)

Returning one last time to the extended context of the idiom use, this study subscribes to the idea that the use of metaphors in communication is largely influenced by a number of contextual meaning-making elements, such as situational context, discourse context, conceptual-cognitive context, and bodily context (Kövecses 2020: 95-100). To get a better understanding of why the idiom *sing from the same hymn book* and its blended variant were used in the above extract, it seems reasonable to imbue the analysis with these ideas.

In relation to the *situational context*, it is apparent that the speaker and the listeners share a great deal of common ground between them, especially communal common ground (Clark 1996: 100). In other words, Clark places a great emphasis on the person's membership in a cultural community, which, in turn, gives rise to shared expertise. In layman terms, communal common ground may consist in the fact that the speaker and the listeners are UK, Ireland or Commonwealth citizens of at least four different nationalities, i.e., English, Welsh, Irish, and Scots. They may also be linked by their places and locations of residence and education. However, given that anyone who is 18 years old can stand as a candidate in a UK Parliamentary General Election, it follows that the representation of people's concerns and interests in the House of Commons is a top priority in the British society, with the candidate's university education and prior work experience being of secondary significance. Furthermore, the speaker and the listeners share the same language, i.e., English, occupation, and employment as they all are members of the UK Parliament, some of them members of the Conservative Party, the House of Commons, and the annual fishing industry pre-ministerial Council. That said, all the members of the annual fishing industry pre-ministerial Council are well-informed of the agenda against the backdrop of the growing disparity between the northern and the southern regions in the UK and the rising accumulation of wealth among the affluent, often concentrated in London, with a focus on financial and educated elites, fishing quotas in fishing industry being no exception.

As for the *discourse context*, the surrounding (linguistic) context and the extension of metaphor are what can be referred to as touching points between cognitive linguistics and cognitive stylistics in this study. The preceding context provides a glimpse into a wide variety of linguistic metaphors employed by the speaker in a lead up to the conceptual metaphors, such as THE UK PARLIAMENT IS A CHURCH, A SESSION IN THE UK PARLIAMENT IS A GATHERING OF A CHURCH CHOIR, THE MEMBERS OF THE UK PARLIAMENT ARE SINGERS IN A CHURCH CHOIR, etc., subsumed under the base form and variation of the idiom. These sub-metaphors are outlined in Table 2.

Tenor	Mapping	Vehicle
<i>Discuss familiar issues</i>	→	<i>Travel familiar waters</i>
<i>Annual fishing industry pre-ministerial Council</i>	→	<i>Annual Christmas carol service</i>
<i>Litany of joy</i>	→	<i>Litany of woe</i>
<i>Good tidings</i>	→	<i>Sad tidings</i>
<i>Rhetoric</i>	→	<i>Lines</i>
<i>Fishing industry Members of Parliament</i>	→	<i>Theatre actors</i>
<i>Parliamentary committee sitting</i>	→	<i>Pantomime by a well-loved local drama group</i>
<i>Packed House (of Commons)</i>	→	<i>Packed theatre</i>
<i>Reach important decisions</i>	→	<i>Perform well (in public)</i>
<i>Scottish representation in the UK Parliament</i>	→	<i>The band of bleating chorus from Scotland</i>
<i>The rhetoric of the Scottish representation</i>	→	<i>Regular melody, played on the strings of our hearts</i>
<i>Familiar circumstances</i>	→	<i>Familiar ground</i>

Table 2: Extended metaphorical mappings for A SESSION IN THE UK PARLIAMENT IS A GATHERING OF A CHURCH CHOIR

Essentially, what Table 2 demonstrates is a set of linguistic metaphors. They take the form of a vehicle and a tenor joined with an arrow. What the speaker masterfully succeeds in is weaving several metaphors that inhere in different domains together, under the umbrella of the A SESSION IN THE UK PARLIAMENT IS A GATHERING OF A CHURCH CHOIR metaphor. The domains in question relate to fishing industry and fisheries, theatre and performing arts, and, as already discussed, singing in a church choir. The speaker attempts to establish the rapport in the Chambers of the annual fishing industry pre-ministerial Council by introducing a fishing metaphor, that of *travelling familiar waters* for *discussing familiar issues*. He then proceeds to draw parallels between the annual fishing industry pre-ministerial Council and the annual Christmas carol service by means of analogy, as in *litany of woe* for *litany of joy* and *sad tidings* for *good tidings*. Next, he speculates about the agenda and the statements to be made by the members of the Council (which are all but pre-rehearsed and had already been made known publicly prior to their declaration) by exploiting theatre and performing arts metaphors, e.g., *lines* for *rhetoric*, *pantomime by a well-loved local drama group* for *Parliamentary committee sitting*, *packed theatre* for *packed House (of Commons)*, *theatre actors* for *fishing industry Members of Parliament*, *performing well (in public)* for *reaching important decisions*, *the band of bleating chorus from Scotland* for *the Scottish representation in the UK Parliament*, and *the regular melody, played on the strings of our hearts* for *the rhetoric of the Scottish representation in the UK Parliament*. Eventually, the speaker juxtaposes the fishing metaphor *familiar ground*, which implies *familiar circumstances* in discourse, with the idioms *have sung from the same hymn book* and *have at least found the same page of the hymn book*, in an effort to reveal the division within the House of Commons on issues such as fishing quotas in the UK, especially when viewed as an opposition of England and Scotland, where the latter finds itself in the minority and thus underprivileged. In all their totality, these metaphors constitute what can be termed as extended idiomatic metaphors, where a string of sub-metaphors precedes the main idiomatic metaphor.

This brings us to the *conceptual-cognitive context*, which rests on the metaphorical conceptual system, ideology, and knowledge about past events, interests, and concerns. Building on the idiom-instantiated conceptual metaphor THE UK PARLIAMENT IS A CHURCH and its corresponding variations, one might hypothesise that they are part of the broader overarching metaphor POLITICS IS RELIGION, which may serve as an explanation of the speaker's use of the idiom *sing from the same hymn book* and the intentionality behind creating the blend *have at least found the same page of the hymn book*. In terms of ideology, noteworthy is the fact that, although the links between the Conservative Party and the Church have often been described as weak, the Conservatives remain the party of Christianity for the foreseeable future (Catterall 1994: 640). That is to say, the speaker's choice of the idiom was presumably governed by the then political ideology of his party. In addition, it is evident that Mr. David Porter in this very case builds on his personal experience and interests as, before going into Parliament, he had served as a co-founder and director of the Vivid Children's Theatre and Head of Drama at Benjamin Britten High School in Lowestoft, which may offer an explanation of his prowess in using such 'flowery' language.

4. Discussion and conclusion

Generally speaking, idioms provide a fertile ground for cognitive linguistic explorations, although certainly to a varying extent. The results of the present study demonstrate that, while there are idioms that are metaphor-based or, put otherwise, metaphorical, there are others that seem inextricably related to metonymy, hyperbole, proverbial wisdom, social interaction, etc. Despite the fact that it is metaphorical and unilateral idioms that are best suited to being tested within the framework of the Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory, in quantitative terms, however, they are not increasingly prevalent, as evidenced from the study material, accounting only for 36% of the semantic category 'Argument and conflict'. It is likely that this tendency will hold for the other semantic categories, such as 'Bribery, corruption, and extortion', 'Critics and criticism', etc., which are out of the scope of this study and would therefore require further conclusive evidence.

I had a good reason to assume that, conceptually, idioms are multilevel structures, in the sense that they may be attributed to a complex hierarchy of schematic metaphorical ideas, ranging from image schemas as most abstract ones down to domains, frames, and mental spaces. There are, however, several caveats complicating this assumption. Throughout his book, Kövecses (2020: 70, 145, 147) spares no effort to emphasise that image schemas, domains, and frames are decontextualized conceptual patterns that are experiential and inhere in our long-term memory, as opposed to mental spaces that are assembled online and belong in our working-memory. In other words, mental spaces are context-dependent, while image schemas, domains, and frames are context-independent. At the same time, he (2020: 105) theorises that context may undergo dynamic changes each time a new mental space is created. What that essentially means is that the repeated exposure to the contextual factor may render frames contextually-dependent, too. I believe that this is exactly the case with idioms. To demonstrate, consider the following examples from the COCA.

(3) *The Depression brought terrible unemployment to the shipping industry. Labour MPs **took up the cudgels** on the seamen's behalf in parliament by declaring that Black, Lascar and Coolie labour that is not British' was taking work away from the English Jack Tar'. (COCA)*

(4) *President Nicolas Sarkozy, never known for being overly concerned about things cultural, **took up the cudgels** at the last IOF summit. He bitterly criticized French diplomats who "are happy to speak English, " rather than French, which is "under siege."* (COCA)

Evidently, not only do we have differing mental spaces here, we are dealing with different frames recruited as well, such as *shipping industry* and *language policy*. As for the image schemas and domains, in my opinion, they remain entirely consistent with the ones defined in Table 1.

This pilot study focused on establishing conceptual regularities in English idioms denoting argument and conflict and idioms denoting cooperation, resting on the multilevel theory of metaphor. The outcomes suggest, when speaking of the most schematic conceptual level, that image schemas such as INTERACTION IS COUNTERFORCE AND/OR CONTACT, RESOURCES ARE PHYSICAL SUBSTANCES, AND RESOURCES ARE ENABLEMENTS (OF INTERACTION) have been found to underlie the majority of the idioms denoting argument and conflict.

Based on these results, I can refer back to my hypothesis, postulated at the beginning. My hypothesis claimed that the multilevel theory of metaphor can help discover certain conceptual regularities in semantically related idioms, especially on the levels of image schema, domain, and frame. The outcomes of the conceptual semantic analysis do not fully support this; hence I need to partially dismiss this hypothesis.

The cognitive stylistic analysis of the idioms under the auspices of the Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory is nothing else but yet another attempt to bring conceptual and linguistic metaphor together. In the present case, it was the notion of extension, namely of metaphor and context, that was the common denominator in pursuing this goal successfully. First, by means of the surrounding context, I was able to pin down the extended idiomatic (linguistic) metaphor under analysis and illustrate its progression in discourse. Second, exploiting the notion of *conceptual-cognitive context* (Kövecses 2020), the interrelationship between the metaphorical conceptual system and ideology and the speaker's knowledge about past events, interests, and concerns, i.e., speaker's purported intentionality regarding the use of the idiom and the extended metaphor, was addressed. In addition, it is worth pointing out that the example of the extended metaphor discussed above presents a novel type of extended idiomatic metaphor. Naciscione (2010: 81, 82) mentions the following types of extended idiomatic metaphor: (1) one or several sub-images go back to the same base constituent; (2) a string of sub-images; (3) two or several notional base components extended. Otherwise said, she maintains that the extension of metaphor is a linear process, whereby an idiomatic metaphor is first introduced in discourse and then followed by a cluster of associated metaphors. In our case, however, we first have a cluster of subordinate metaphors culminating in the superordinate idiomatic metaphor.

It might be then reasonable to conclude that forging an alliance between cognitive linguistics, cognitive stylistics, and the study of idioms is a complex undertaking that is still in the making and needs to be addressed in the forthcoming linguistic inquiries. Despite its limitations, I am hopeful that, with this study, I have at least managed to lay the initial groundwork in this direction.

References

- Bui, Thuy, Frank Boers, Averil Coxhead. 2020. "Extracting Multiword Expressions from Texts with the Aid of On-line Resources: A Classroom Experiment" in *ITL – International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 171 (2), pp. 221–252.
- Bybee, Joan. 2010. *Language, Usage and Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Catterall, Peter. 1994. "The Party and Religion" in Anthony Seldon, Stuart Ball (eds.) *Conservative Century: The Conservative Party since 1900*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 637-670
- Clark, Herbert. 1996. *Using Language*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Enfield, Nick. 2017. "Opening Commentary: Language in Cognition and Culture" in Barbara Dancygier (ed.). *The Cambridge Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 13-18.
- Giacomini, Laura. 2022. "The Contextual Behaviour of Specialised Collocations: Typology and Lexicographic Treatment" in *Yearbook of Phraseology* 13 (1), pp. 55-80.
- Gibbs, Raymond W. Jr., Herbert Colston (2012). *Interpreting Figurative Meaning*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltán 2020. *Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald Wayne. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Volume I: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Naciscione, Anita. 2010. *Stylistic Use of Phraseological Units in Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Turner, Sarah, Jeannette Littlemore. 2023. "Literal or Metaphorical? Conventional or Creative? Contested Metaphoricity in Intense Emotional Experiences" in *Metaphor and the Social World* 13 (1), pp. 37-58.
- Wray, Alison. 2002. *Formulaic Language and the Lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corpora and dictionaries

- Davies, Mark. 2004. *BYU-BNC* (Based on the British National Corpus from Oxford University Press). [Online]. Available: <http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk>
- Oxford Dictionary of Idioms*. 2020. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- The Corpus of Contemporary American English* (COCA). [Online]. Available: <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca>