РАЗДЕЛ 5. ЗАРУБЕЖНЫЙ ОПЫТ

Цзи Сяосяо
Москва, Россия

ОБ ИССЛЕДОВАНИИ МЕТАФОРЫ В АМЕРИКАНСКОМ ПРЕЗИДЕНТСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ

АННОТАЦИЯ. *В статье проводится анализ употребления концептуальных метафор в выступлениях четырех американских президентов — Дж. Буша-ст., Билла Клинтона, Дж. Буша-мл. и Барака Обамы — на предмет выявления повторяющихся метафорических моделей в президентской риторике. С помощью используемой в работе методики «критического анализа метафоры» («critical metaphor analysis») Джонатана Чартериса-Блэка делается попытка продемонстрировать, как использование концептуальной метафоры в речи президентов упрощает понимание сложных политических событий, рисует знакомые всем образы и, как следствие, является эффективным средством манипуляции массовым сознанием. На основе данных исходных доменов в работе Джонатана Чартериса-Блэка в статье проводится сравнение и контрастивный анализ метафор, использованных четырьмя президентами. Сравнение показывает, что, во-первых, среди всех областей исходных доменов в текстах выступлений выявляются три наиболее частотные модели: МАТЕРИАЛИЗАЦИЯ, ПЕРСОНИФИКАЦИЯ и ПУТЕШЕСТВИЕ. Во-вторых, среди четырех президентов Билл Клинтон и Барак Обама используют метафору чаще, чем другие. Частота использования метафоры также способствует популярности президентов.*

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА: *концептуальная метафора; президентский дискурс; президенты США; критический анализ метафоры.*

СВЕДЕНИЯ ОБ АВТОРЕ: *Цзи Сяосяо, аспирант, кафедра английского языкознания, филологический факультет, Московский государственный университет имени М. В. Ломоносова; 119234, г. Москва, Ленинские горы, 1, стр. 51, ауд.1045/46; e-mail: rabbitjixiao@mail.ru.*

The conceptual metaphor theory founded by Lakoff and Johnson in their seminal work *Metaphors We Live By* (1980) has provided a new perspective for metaphor research in various fields, the political domain being no exception. Lakoff then in his book *Moral Politics* (1996) systematically analyzed the worldviews underlying political thinking in the United States and worked out two opposing cognitive models based on the conceptual metaphors — a STRICT FATHER model and a NURTURANT PARENT model. In Europe, Musolff [1996, 2004] made a corpus-based analysis of metaphors underlying public discourses in Europe. It was later echoed in the works of J. Chateris-Black (2004, 2011). Charteris-Black proposed a corpus-based methodology called "critical metaphor analysis", and then applied it to analyze metaphors used in speeches by major British and American politicians.

This is to suggest that studying metaphor in politicians' rhetoric is increasingly popular with researchers. This paper focuses on metaphor use in American presidential discourse as language of American presidents may disclose quite a few important things for getting a better grasp of the country and its leader. Metaphor in presidential discourse is not only a rhetorical device which helps a president sound eloquent, but also a conceptual tool which can reveal a president's thinking patterns and underlying mindset in various communication settings. Meanwhile, metaphor in political discourse is also one of the most effective ways of manipulating human consciousness (Mukhortov, 2015a). Presidents condensed their hopes and intentions into a vivid image which can be easily understood and accepted by audiences.

There are several questions lying before presidential speech researchers. One of them is the authorship of political speeches. It is well known that presidential speeches in most communication situations are combined work of political advisers and speech-writers. Therefore, how can we differentiate conceptual metaphors produced by presidents themselves from those of speech-writers? Although speech-writers create speeches with consent of presidents, to what extent do speechwriters' mindsets influence presidential cognition of reality through metaphors? A key to solving this puzzle is differentiating prepared speeches from spontaneous speeches. The prepared speech usually suggests that it was made by political advisors or speechwriters, such as inaugurals. While a spontaneous speech, without scripts, on the contrary, goes off the cuff, as it were, and can be heard in debates, talk shows, Q&A sessions, and briefings. The metaphor researchers may compare metaphor variety and frequency in prepared speeches and spontaneous speeches related to a specific topic. The comparison and contrast may help researchers draw inferences about consistency across the conceptual metaphors being used. And should there be any inconsistencies in metaphor use or sudden loss of figurative language, a researcher should seek a well-grounded explanation.

Methodology is another stumbling block. The first problem before metaphor researchers is how to identify metaphors. Conceptual metaphor theory expands the definition of metaphor and its application by saying that "human thought processes are largely metaphorical" [Lakoff, Johnson 1980: 6]. However, the definition of metaphor as "understanding of one thing

in terms of another" [Lakoff, Johnson 1980: 3] certainly could not provide sufficient and specific criteria for researchers to identify metaphor in real discourse. To solve the problem, a group of researchers called "the Pragglejaz Group" (2007) developed a metaphor identification procedure (MIP) based on their cooperative work from 2000 to 2006.

Simply, MIP includes the following steps. First of all, read a text thoroughly in order to understand it. Second, divide the text into lexical units. Third, analyze whether each unit has more basic meaning than its contextual meaning. If each lexical unit has a basic meaning which is different from its contextual meaning, then the unit is metaphorical. During the process, a certain dictionary will be used in order to make sure of the basic meaning of each unit. To simply illustrate how MIP works, let us assume the sentence *Your claims are indefensible* is part of a text. The lexical units in the sentence are *your, claims, are,* and *indefensible*. It is clear that among these words, *indefensible* means some statement or idea cannot be justified or supported because it is completely unacceptable. However, *indefensible* also has a more basic meaning which is places or buildings cannot be defended if they are attacked according to Collins English Dictionary. Therefore, the lexical unit *indefensible* is metaphorical in sentence and may be analyzed for pragmasemantic purposes.

It can be seen that the word-by-word analysis provides detailed elaboration of each metaphorical expression. It is an "explicit set of steps allowing scholars to pinpoint the locus of their disagreements as to why, or why not, a word is presumed to convey metaphorically meaning in context" [Pragglejaz Group 2007: 13]. Researchers oftentimes identify metaphor according to their own intuitive knowledge and they attempt to determine and define a metaphor with different criteria and theoretical choices. MIP provides "a research tool that is relatively simple to use and flexible for adaption by scholars interested in the metaphorical content of realistic discourse" (Pragglejaz Group, 2007: 2).

Another problem is how to group and interpret metaphors after identifying them. To reiterate, one of the most comprehensive frameworks of analyzing metaphors in political dis-

course was proposed by Jonathan Charteris-Black. In the book *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis* (2004), he proposes a corpus-based methodology called "critical metaphor analysis", which integrates cognitive linguistics, pragmatic approaches to metaphors, critical discourse analysis, and corpus linguistic approaches. Based on his consideration that "metaphor has a number of different roles in language: a semantic role in creating new meanings for words, a cognitive role in developing our understanding on the basis of analogy and a pragmatic role that aims to provide evaluations" [Charteris-Black 2004: 23—24], metaphor can only be explained with the consideration of the interdependency of its three dimensions — semantic, pragmatic, and cognitive. The approach encompasses three stages: metaphor identification, metaphor interpretation and metaphor explanation.

In the identification stage, metaphors can be extracted by close reading of a corpus of thematically related texts and considering the possible relation between a literal source domain and a metaphoric target domain. Then, a relationship between metaphors and the pragmatic and cognitive factors will be established in the second stage. The last stage involves an explanation of the way the metaphors are interrelated in the text or texts, and a consideration of the discourse functions realized by the metaphors (Charteris-Black, 2004). Charteris-Black (2004, 2011) then applied his methodology to analyze speeches by major British and American politicians and provided a detailed procedure of analysis.

Among other purposes, his data may as well serve to compare and contrast the metaphors used, for instance, by successive presidents. Take George H. W. Bush, Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama. By comparing source domains of the metaphors used by each president, we can work out similarities and differences in metaphor use of these presidents. In the comparison table below the columns show how often each of the presidents used each type of metaphor and the rows show frequency of each of the metaphor source domains. For comparison's sake, we slightly changed the order of succession and put Presidents Bush together.

Table 1

An overview of metaphor types by source domain in George H. W. Bush,
Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama [Charteris-Black, 2011: 344—355]

Source domain	George Bush Senior	George Bush Junior	Bill Clinton	Barack Obama	Total
JOURNEY	29	30	76	85	220
REIFICATION(INCLUDING CREATION AND DESTRUCTION)	52	43	118	115	328
PERSONIFICATION	60	50	9	39	158
LIFE/REBIRTH			68	3	71
FINANCE	3	26		21	50
CONFLICT			7	40	47
SLEEP/DREAM				36	36
LIGHT AND DARKNESS	12	11		12	35
CRIME AND PUNISHMENT	3	21			24
RELIGION AND MORALITY			18	14	22
FIRE			10	10	20
BUILDINGS				18	18
READING				17	17
HEALTH			6	11	17
ANIMALS	2	8		5	15
LANDSCAPE			7	6	13
WATER			5	7	12
WEATHER			6	3	9
OTHER	62	42	29	5	138
TOTAL	223	231	359	447	1260

The first observation to be made is that among all the source domains, some domains are ubiquitous in presidential speeches while others are only used by particular politicians. It can be seen that all the four presidents used the source domains REIFICATION, JOURNEY, and PERSONIFICATION frequently.

The *reification* metaphor is quite a common metaphor which represents abstractions such as mental states and processes as if they were material ones, tangible and concrete. This happens because presidential language may be full of complicated and abstract political ideas or notions and in order to make those accessible to an average audience, it is necessary to make them concrete and tangible. In this paper, the *creation* metaphor and *destruction* metaphor all belongs to the reification metaphor. Usually *reification* metaphor from the domain of creation applies phrases related to building and manufacture while *reification* metaphor from the domain of destruction focuses uses phrases related to damage. Examples of the reification metaphors from the creation domain and the destruction domain used by the four presidents are as follows:

1) From our Revolution to the Civil War, to the Great Depression, to the Civil Rights movement, our people have always mustered the determination to *construct from these crises the pillars* of our history. (Bill Clinton, 20 January 1993)

2) We don't have to *wrest* justice from the kings. (Bush Senior, 20 January 1989)

3) After the *shipwreck* of communism came years of relative quiet, years of repose, years of sabbatical, and then there came a day of fire. (Bush Junior, 20 January 2005)

4) That's why we were able to reform a death penalty system that *was broken*. (Obama, 10 February 2007)

The source domain JOURNEY seems favored by American presidents. Statistically, they use journey metaphor most frequently. *Journey* is a kind of physical movement in which a subject moves towards a certain destination. When American presidents use j*ourney* metaphor in domestic affairs, they usually conceptualize their country or their people as a traveler who walks down the road along with the president who understandably comes as the guide and leader. Whatever the obstacles, they will deal with them bravely, and eventually achieve the goals set. When journey metaphor is used to talk about foreign affairs, American Presidents tend to emphasize the unparallel advantages of their journey compared to other choices [Mukhortov 2015a: 177]. It should also be said that frequency of journey metaphor by American presidents has an explanation which is rooted in American immigration history.

1) With a new vision of Government, a new sense of responsibility, a new spirit of community, we will sustain America's *journey*. (Bill Clinton, 20 January 1997)

2) Great nations of the world *are moving toward* democracy through the door to freedom. (Bush Senior, 20 January 1989)

3) Start on this *journey* of progress and justice, and America will *walk* at your side. (Bush Junior, 20 January 2005)

4) This is the journey we continue today. (Obama, 20 January 2009)

The second observation is the individual variations. It can be seen that clearly among the four presidents the two presidents, Bill Clinton and Barack Obama, use metaphor more frequently than Presidents Bush, which make them quite persuasive speakers. Some scholars indicate that there exists a relationship between the rated charisma of American presidents and their frequency of use of metaphors in inaugurals (Jeffery Scott Mio et al., 2005). From this point of view, it can be seen that frequency of metaphor use is one of the factors which contributes to the popularity of presidents in certain communication settings.

From table 1 it can be seen that among the presidents listed Barack Obama used metaphors in high frequency than others and more types of source domains than the others. As far as the frequency of metaphor use is concerned, he uses nearly 10 metaphors every 1000 words (Charteris-Black, 2011: 295). As for metaphor type, he not only used the conventional ones like *journey* metaphor, but also less common source domains such as *reading* metaphor, *sleep/dream* metaphor and *fire* metaphor. The high frequency and diversity of metaphor use shows his creativity of metaphor use and his ability of creating images for audiences.

Take *reading* metaphor for example, Obama related certain situations to books, and bad history as "dark chapter" and to change means to "turn the page". This metaphor originates from the understanding that history is written in books and therefore arises a concept that HISTORY IS A BOOK. The metaphorical linguistic expressions are as follows:

1) We are shaped by every language and culture, drawn from every end of this Earth; and because we have tested the bitter swill of civil war and segregation, and emerged from that *dark chapter* stronger and more united, we cannot help but believe that the old hatreds shall someday pass. (Obama, 20 January 2009)

2) It's time to *turn the page* on health care. (Obama, 10 February 2007)

3) If you believe America is still that last, best hope of Earth, then it's time to *turn the page*. (Obama, 28 April 2007)

It can be seen from above analysis metaphor use in presidential discourse not only uncovers the influence of same national and cultural background on presidents' linguistic characteristics, but also shows their personal differentiation of rhetoric style. The linguistic characteristics of a president can uncover his speech patterns and reveal his character, his views and his manners of political decision making [Mukhortov, 2015b: 93]. Therefore, reading metaphor in presidential discourse can reveal who these presidents are, or at least what they want to sound like.

To sum up, a combination of conceptual metaphor theory and critical discourse analysis is a useful tool for metaphor researchers in political discourse. The conceptual metaphor theory founded by Lakoff and Johnson mainly focuses on the cognitive aspect of metaphor in which metaphor is a way of thinking. From 1980 and to the present day, researchers have elaborated Lakoff and Johnson's theory and read into it in many other ways. Charteris-Black integrated cognitive semantics of metaphor and traditional view of metaphor in which metaphor is treated as a linguistic device and a way of argumentation and style. The integration way of researching metaphor in presidential discourse not only may figure out thinking patterns of some presidents, but also figure out what they mean pragmatically when metaphors are used in a particular context. Furthermore, the corpus-based methodology also gives empirical support to metaphor research and maintains validity.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Charteris-Black J. Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis. — Basingstoke : Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

2. Charteris-Black J. Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor. — London : Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

3. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. — Chicago : Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1980.

4. Lakoff G. Moral Politics, How Liberals and Conservatives Think. — Chicago : Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1996.

5. Mio Jeffery Scott, Ronald E. Riggio, Shana Levin, Renford Reese. Presidential Leadership and Charisma: The Effects of Metaphor // The Leadership Quarterly. 2005. № 16. P. 287—294.

6. Musolff A., Schaeffner C., Townson M. (eds). Conceiving of Europe, Diversity in Unity. — Aldershot : Dartmouth, 1996.

7. Musolff A. Metaphor and Political Discourse, Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe. — London : Palgrave-Macmillan, 2004.

8. Мухортов Д. С. Метафора во внешнеполитическом дискурсе как проявленеие общности идеологических установок англо-саксонских политиков (на материале выступлений Б. Обамы, Д. Кэмерона, Т. Эбботта и С. Харпера в 2014—2015 гг.) // Политическая лингвистика : проблематика, методология, аспекты исследования и перспективы развития научного направления : материалы Междунар. науч. конф. (27 нояб. 2015 г.) / Урал. гос. пед. ун-т ; гл. ред. А. П. Чудинов. — Екатеринбург, 2015. С. 175—182.

9. Мухортов Д. С. Практика когнитивно-дискурсивного анализа языковой личности политика (опыт прочтения публичных выступлений Билла Клинтона) // Коммуникативные исследования. 2015. № 2 (4). С. 86—95.

10. Pragglejaz Group. MIP: A Method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse // Metaphor and Symbol. 2007. № 22 (1). P. 1—39.

Zi Xiaoxiao
Moscow, Russia

INSIGHTS INTO METAPHOR USE IN AMERICAN PRESIDENTIAL DISCOURSE

ABSTRACT. *The paper seeks to analyze the conceptual metaphors occurred in the presidential speeches of four US Presidents, George Bush, Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama, and to discuss recurrent patterns of metaphor use in the presidential rhetoric. The paper applies J. Charteris-Black's "critical metaphor analysis" so as to show how conceptual metaphor in presidential inaugurals can help the presidents simplify complicated political events, draw comprehensible images, and, hence, manipulate the mass consciousness. Based on Black's data of source domains occurred in every president's speech, the paper makes a comparison and contrast of metaphor use by the four presidents. The comparison shows that at first among all the source domains REIFICATION, JOURNEY, and PERSONFICATION are ubiquitous in presidential speeches. Secondly, among the four presidents Bill Clinton and Barack Obama use metaphor more frequent than the others. The frequency of metaphor use also contributes to the popularity of presidents in certain communication settings.*

KEYWORDS: *conceptual metaphor; presidential discourse; US Presidents; critical metaphor analysis.*

ABOUT THE AUTHOR: *Zi Xiaoxiao, Post-graduate Student, Department of English Philology, Faculty of Philology, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia.*

REFERENCES

1. Charteris-Black, J. (2004) Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

2. Charteris-Black, J, (2011) Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor. London, Palgrave Macmillan.

3. Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980) Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

4. Lakoff, G. (1996) Moral Politics, How Liberals and Conservatives Think. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

5. Mio, Jeffery Scott, Ronald E. Riggio, Shana Levin, and Renford Reese. (2005) 'Presidential Leadership and Charisma: The Effects of Metaphor', The Leadership Quarterly 16: 287-294.

6. Musolff, A. Schaeffner, C. Townson, M. (eds) (1996) Conceiving of Europe, Diversity in Unity. Aldershot: Dartmouth.

7. Musolff, A. (2004) Metaphor and Political Discourse, Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe. London: Palgrave-Macmillan.

8. Mukhortov D. S. Metafora vo vneshnepoliticheskom diskurse kak proyavleneie obshchnosti ideologicheskikh ustanovok anglo-saksonskikh politikov (na materiale vystupleniy B. Obamy, D. Kemerona, T. Ebbotta i S. Kharpera v 2014-2015 gg.) // Politicheskaya lingvistika. 2015. № 427. C. 175-182.

9. Mukhortov D. S. Praktika kognitivno-diskursivnogo analiza yazykovoy lichnosti politika (opyt prochteniya publichnykh vystupleniy Billa Klintona) // Kommunikativnye issledovaniya. 2015. № 2 (4). S. 86—95.

10. Pragglejaz Group, 2007, MIP: A Method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. Metaphor and Symbol 22(1): 1-39.

Статью рекомендует к публикации канд. филол. наук, доц. Д. С. Мухортов.