

With confidence, we could say that converting to the Greek-Catholic Church and next cultural changes caused as positive so negative effects. Especially it reflected in evolution of popular languages and national identity. The Eastern Slavs become rapidly westernize and as a result many of them changed their national and culture identity.

Maria P. Taymour (MSLU, Moscow, Russia)

COGNITIVE DISSONANCE IN MIXED METAPHORS AND MALAPHORS AS THE VARIABILITY IN DISCOURSE IN BRITISH HUMOUR

To Err Is Human; To Study Error-Making Is Cognitive Science [1, p.1]

The article focuses on the so-called mixed metaphors and malaphors in contemporary English as a source of cognitive dissonance in discourse (*rocket surgery; when the cookie bounces*). Traditionally perceived in linguistics as a faulty usage of metaphorical expressions, these malapropisms are given here cognitive treatment. The last decade has brought about dramatic changes into cognitive linguistics by developing the cognitive paradigm and, accordingly changed the view of the status and origin of mixed metaphors and malaphors. The article follows the change in the linguists' attitude towards mixed metaphors, where a mixed metaphor is being already defined as a cluster of metaphors, which appear in close contextual adjacency but have different cognitive basis [2].

The phenomenon of a "malaphor", a term coined by a famous American scholar Lawrence Harrison in 1976 in his article 'Searching for Malaphors' for the Washington Post, is understood in this work as a blend of two or more idioms or clichés in modern English. For instance, a malaphor "she really stuck her neck out on a limb" is a blend of two practically synonymous idiomatic expressions. They are "to stick one's neck out for someone" (which means "to personally assume or expose oneself to some risk, danger, or responsibility") and "to go out on a limb" (meaning "to get into a position where one is not joined or supported by anyone else"). This mashup is perceived as an example of the variability in discourse and in a humorous way highlights the idea of putting oneself in a potentially disadvantageous position to support a person or an idea.

The article aims at clarification of the terms applied to different kinds of mixed metaphors and malaphors and at describing the reevaluation of these phenomena in modern linguistics, taking into consideration its creative nature and deliberate usage by a speaker. The author exploits the theory of cognitive dissonance [3] and applies the principle of cognitive consistency as a way to overcome disharmony in mixed metaphors and malaphors.

Since in modern cognitive science linguists often view mixed metaphors and malaphors as a deliberate usage of hybrid structure within a stretch of a sentence or text for creating a comic effect in modern English discourse, the article also analyses ways employed by the speaker to overcome the phenomenon of cognitive dissonance and to create a humorous effect.

REFERENCES

1. *Hofstadter, D.* To err is Human; to study Error-making is Cognitive Science / D. Hofstadter, D. Moser. – USA : Michigan Quarterly Review, Vol. 28, No. 2, 1989. – P. 185–215.
2. *Kimmel, M.* Why We Mix Metaphors (and Mix Them Well) / M. Kimmel. – Austria : University of Vienna, Journal of Pragmatics, 42, 2009. – P. 97– 115.
3. *Festinger, L.* A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance / L. Festinger. – USA : Stanford University Press, 1957. – 291 p.

R. Vogel (University of Bielefeld, Germany)

AD HOC RULES: THE GRAMMAR BEHIND THE GRAMMAR

When alternative variants for a particular grammatical construction or morphosyntactic category are observed in a language, the grammatical literature usually describes them in terms of two coexisting rules that stand in competition, or in a certain kind of division of labour. There is an alternative to such a traditional view, which is rarely ever explored, namely, the *absence* of a particular rule. This idea hardly fits into the current mainstream of grammatical thinking, with its strong focus on cognitivist modeling and synchrony. From that point of view it seems perhaps impossible by necessity that speakers could utter linguistic expressions without having a rule for them at their disposal.

In my presentation, I will show that there are good reasons to assume such a possibility. I will first motivate it with reference to the evolutionary theory of the language change the roots of which can be traced back to Saussure, as Thibault (1997) showed, and which has been outlined in some detail in the work of Rudi Keller (e.g. his 1993 monograph), a.o.

I will then discuss three phenomena from German morphosyntax that are, for various reasons, prototypical candidates for speaking regularly without there being a particular conventionalised rule. In discussing these phenomena, I will also identify factors that determine the regularity of their occurrence, factors that constitute, so to speak, a grammar of general principles behind the particular language system.

Starting point for my discussion is Saussure's distinction between *langue* (language system) and *parole* (speech) as two distinct phenomenological domains of language which, as Thibault (1997) emphasises in contrast to much of the previous Saussure reception, are conceived to stand in a tight dialectical relationship of independence and interdependence. This relationship is at the heart of language change. Whereas *parole* is the domain of real speech events as they can be observed in everyday communicative practice and be collected fragmentarily in linguistic corpora, *langue* is the collection of linguistic *conventions* that have emerged historically through the communicative practices in the speech community. These conventions are no less real than the speech events of *parole*. It is this social nature of grammar that has been emphasised by Saussure, and whose implications for grammatical theory are widely ignored, if not dismissed, under the cognitivist dogma that still dominates the field.