

РАЗДЕЛ 4. ЗАРУБЕЖНЫЙ ОПЫТ

УДК 811.111'42
ББК ШП43.21-51

ГСНТИ 16.21.27; 16.21.51

Код ВАК 10.02.19

Цзи Сяосяо
Москва, Россия

ДИНАМИЧЕСКОЕ ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЕ МЕТАФОРЫ В ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ

АННОТАЦИЯ. В статье рассматривается динамическое использование метафоры в политическом дискурсе с двух точек зрения: феномена кластеризации, или взаимосвязей метафор в конкретном дискурсе, и феномена использования одних и тех же метафор в разных типах дискурса. Исследование кластеров метафор в речи Билла Клинтона по поводу принятия им решения баллотироваться на второй президентский срок от Демократической партии в 1996 году показывает, что кластеризация метафор как важная особенность политического дискурса способствует обеспечению логико-понятийных связей текста и структурно-композиционной, коннотативной, прагматической и супrasegmentной когезии речевого произведения. Анализ метафоры «bridge» в указанной речи Билла Клинтона в 1996 году и его инаугурационной речи в 1997 году показывает, что коллокации и функции одной и той же метафоры различны в разных типах политического дискурса. Полученные данные свидетельствуют о том, что метафора является не статичной единицей с точки зрения когнитивных процессов и лингвистических особенностей речи, а динамическим инструментом, который активно используется политиками для достижения различных целей.

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА: кластеризация метафор; когерентность дискурса; контексты; метафоры; швейцарский сыр; политическая метафорология; политический дискурс.

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

Introduction

At the Republican presidential candidates debate in Houston, Texas on 25th February 2016, Donald Trump called on the need for more border security with a vivid metaphor “You look at our borders, they’re like **Swiss cheese**, everybody pours in”. According to the Merriam-Webster online dictionary, Swiss cheese is a type of hard cheese characterized by elastic texture, mild nutlike flavor, and large holes that form during ripening.

Donald Trump emphasized the feature “large holes” in his use of this metaphor. The holes of Swiss cheese are used to conceptualize the insecurity of American border. This metaphor reflects Trump’s basic understanding of the security problems in American borders. It is no surprise that later he urged to build a wall along the US border with Mexico. A wall is definitely securer than Swiss cheese riddled with holes. The Swiss cheese metaphor in Trump’s discourse has its explanatory function and framing function of the border problem. It reveals the speaker’s ways of thinking about the problem and at the same time how the speaker “set the directions of problem solving” [Schön 1979: 255].

Donald Trump is not the first person to use Swiss cheese metaphor in political discourse. Back to the end of the last century, George H.W. Bush adopted this metaphor to deride his democratic opponents in his Acceptance Address at the Republican National Convention on 18th August 1988:

“There are the facts. And one way you know our opponents know the facts is that, to attack our record, they have to misrepresent it. They call it **a Swiss cheese economy**. Well,

that’s the way it may look to **the three blind mice**. But, when they were in charge, it was **all holes and no cheese**”.

The Swiss cheese metaphor was actually not created by Bush himself, instead, he borrowed it from his democratic opponent Michael Dukakis, the democratic presidential nominee, who in turn borrowed it from his running-mate Bentsen. Michael Dukakis and Lloyd Bentsen attacked the Reagan-Bush economy as Swiss cheese riddled with holes. Bush wittily developed the metaphor and told a more complete and vivid cheese story than his opponents did. Three blind mice were introduced into the cheese story, and the ending of the story is that no cheese was left but holes. The three blind mice were not someone else but his democratic opponents. It can be argued that the development of the metaphor enabled Bush to achieve his purpose of rebutting and deriding his opponents.

This all is to suggest that the same source domain could be used to understand totally different target domains according to the speaker’s cognition and purpose. Trump in his presidential debate used the Swiss cheese to explain and frame the border problem in America, while Bush Senior in his Acceptance Address borrowed his democratic opponents’ Swiss cheese metaphor to rebut their criticism of the Reagan-Bush economy. The same source domain “Swiss cheese” is used to conceptualize different target domains, border security and economy in this case, in different contexts. Metaphor is thus not a static linguistic feature but a dynamic tool exploited by politicians according to different contexts and purposes. The use and reuse of certain metaphorical expres-

sions in different genres and registers communicate new meanings and serve new functions [Semino & Deignan & Littlemore 2013].

Metaphor functions in its context. The interpretation of metaphor should take into consideration how metaphor is used within a discourse and in different contexts. The varied contexts affect how metaphors are produced and interpreted. Even the so-called “dead” metaphor may “come to life” when its context is changed [Гаврилов, Зарипов & Романов 2017: 92].

In this paper, we will explore the dynamic use of metaphor from two aspects: intradiscursive use of metaphor and interdiscursive use of metaphor. The intradiscursive use of metaphor refers to how metaphors are used within a discourse, including how the same or different metaphors are connected within a discourse and crowd together to form metaphor clusters. The interdiscursive use of metaphor refers to how the same metaphors are used within different contexts.

1. Metaphor clustering as a prominent feature in political discourse

In discussing the relationships between metaphors, a few questions may arise. How are metaphors, same or different in form and/or content, related to each other within a discourse or within different types of discourse? Do metaphors reinforce or attenuate each other within a discourse? Do metaphors change their meanings and grow in force when they are used across different types of discourse? The first question has already been widely discussed by scholars from different aspects, yielding some insightful findings.

Jamieson analyzed metaphor use in the rhetoric of a Pope and a politician and found that the recurrent patterns of metaphoric networks in the surface language do reflect deeper rhetorical consistencies and the appearance of clusters of related metaphors made the speaker's rhetoric significant [Jamieson 1980].

Baranov's notion “metaphor constellation” [2014] focuses on the relationship between similar metaphors, i.e., the totality of metaphoric models that are interrelated in terms of approximation in profiling certain properties of the source domain and the target domain.

More recently, a relevant systematic studies of the distribution of metaphor within a discourse have been done in different contexts, e.g., college lectures, Baptist sermons, conciliation conversations, business media discourse [Cameron & Stelma 2004; Cameron & Low 2004; Koller 2003; Corts & Meyer 2002; Corts & Meyer 1999]. It is found that the crowding of metaphors within a discourse contributes to both the structure and purpose of the discourse.

Metaphor clustering within a discourse concerns the distribution of metaphors. In this sense, there are two types of metaphor clustering. “The first one refers to the phenomenon that different kinds of metaphors occur together in adjacent metaphorical sentences. Within this clustering, three additional phenomena may occur: the phenomenon that a target domain is metaphorically understood in terms of different source domains, the phenomenon that a source domain is used to understand different target domains, or the phenomenon that different source domains are used to understand different target domains. The second type refers to the phenomenon that one metaphor is repeated several times in consecutive metaphorical sentences [Mukhortov & Ji 2018 in press].

The crowding of metaphors may form a relative complete cognitive scenario, in which metaphors are combined to elaborate certain topics of the discourse. The cognitive scenarios “reflect the speaker or writer's deliberate or subconscious focus in a discourse and are usually closely related to the important topics of the discourse” [Mukhortov & Ji 2018 in press].

In this section we seek to explore how metaphors are related to each other within a discourse, specifically, the phenomenon of metaphor clustering in political discourse. Take an instance of metaphor clustering in Bill Clinton's Acceptance Address in 1996.

(1) *Let us commit ourselves this night to rise up and **build the bridge we know we ought to build all the way to the 21st century**. Let us have faith, American faith that we are not leaving our greatness behind. We're going **to carry it right on with us into that new century**, a century of new challenge and unlimited promise. Let us, in short, do the work that is before us, so that when our time here is over, **we will all watch the sun go down, as we all must, and say truly, we have prepared our children for the dawn**.* (August 29, 1996)

In example (1), several metaphors such as bridge metaphor, journey metaphor, and sunset and dawn metaphor are crowded together in one paragraph to create a cognitive scenario that presents the audience with a picture of men building bridges, walking forward, and facing the unavoidable destiny of everyone — death. This picture is about devotion, sacrifice and hope.

The bridge metaphor that appears in this address about twenty times is a dominant model [Чудинов 2003: 113] that binds other metaphors and contributes to the structural coherence of the address. The bridge metaphor is used by the speaker to describe his solutions to the challenges and problems that may happen during the journey. It is common in political discourse that the development of a country is un-

derstood in terms of journey. A bridge can carry a pathway or roadway over a depression or obstacle. Thus, it helps travellers to continue their journey when they meet these obstacles.

The sunset and dawn metaphor refers to the end for one generation and the beginning for another. The speaker calls on everyone to fulfill their duties and leave a better world for the next generation.

The analysis of the instance of metaphor clustering reveals that this metaphor cluster is topically related, describing one of the main topics of the Acceptance Address: the promise for bright future. Besides, the metaphor cluster is formed based on one dominant metaphor — bridge metaphor, which binds other metaphors to make a coherent metaphor system in the discourse.

Metaphor clustering as a dynamic linguistic and cognitive tool in political discourse deserves further attention and exploration. It attempts to answer the question about how metaphors are dynamically related to each other within a discourse. The crowding of metaphors within a discourse is not a random and meaningless phenomenon but instead may reflect some deep relationships between these metaphors and the speaker's deliberate or subconscious organization of his temporary mental metaphorical reality.

2. The use of the same metaphor in different contexts

As was stated before, metaphor is a linguistic and cognitive tool that can be dynamically used in different discourse contexts and for different purposes. The same or similar metaphorical expressions may function differently even within the same discourse [Cameron & Low 2004; Cameron 2011], let alone across different types of discourse. In this section, we will mainly focus on the use and reuse of the same or similar metaphor in different contexts, or more specifically, different genres and registers.

Different genres and registers account for different linguistic and discursive patterns, including patterns of metaphor use. In different contexts, the same metaphor may be varied in its use and functions. Let us take bridge metaphor in Bill Clinton's rhetoric for example. We will analyze bridge metaphor in his Acceptance Address, i.e., the address accepting the presidential nomination at the Democratic National Convention on 29th August 1996 and his second inaugural address on 20th January 1997.

On the basis of register and genre theory [Halliday 1985: 12; Eggins & Martin 1997; Martin & Rose 2008], we shall discuss the differences between the two addresses from the following aspects: what is happening (field); who is taking

part (tenor); what part language is playing (mode); and what purposes they fulfill (purpose).

First, the inaugural address is the speech given by a newly sworn-in president during the inauguration ceremony to mark the beginning of a new four-year term. The inauguration ceremony takes place for each new presidential term and has taken place on January 20 regularly. The presidential Acceptance Address is made by the presidential nominee on the final day of the United States presidential nominating convention that is held every four years by most of the political parties in order to select their nominees for the upcoming U.S. presidential election. The Democratic National Convention and the Republican National Convention are the two major parties' quadrennial events.

Second, the inaugural address is made by newly sworn-in presidents to the attendees of the inauguration ceremony and to televised audiences all over the world. The Acceptance Address is given by a presidential nominee to the immediate partisan audiences and larger televised audiences. The halls of the convention are usually filled with many party loyalists.

Third, the similarity between the two types of addresses is that both addresses are given in spoken form. Besides, it is well-known that formal political speech like inaugurals and acceptances are usually written in advance. They are not spontaneous discourse, instead, they are prepared with the help of professional speechwriters.

Fourth, the two types of addresses fulfill different purposes. The inaugural address usually presents the president's vision of America, his or her agendas and goals for the nation, and his or her intention of unifying the two parties after a severe campaign. The Acceptance Address, as the highlight of the convention, is made "to unify the party, rally the troops, and set the issue agenda for the general campaign" [Benoit 2001: 70]. According to Holbrook [1996, cit. in Benoit 2001], the address is also "the highpoint of a very important component of the campaign process, for approximately 25% of the electorate decides how to vote during the party nominating conventions".

From the above comparisons, the two addresses are quite different in many aspects. Now, see how the bridge metaphor was used in Bill Clinton's Acceptance Address.

This address was made on 29th August 1996 at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago. Bill Clinton used the bridge metaphor frequently in almost twenty paragraphs in the address, relating his bridge metaphor to a variety of topics.

(1) *Now, here's the main idea. I love and revere the rich and proud history of America,*

and I am determined to take our best traditions into the future. But with all respect, **we do not need to build a bridge to the past; we need to build a bridge to the future.** And that is what I commit to you to do. (August 29, 1996)

(2) So tonight, tonight **let us resolve to build that bridge to the 21st century**, to meet our challenges and protect our values. **Let us build a bridge to help our parents raise their children, to help young people and adults to get the education and training they need, to make our streets safer, to help Americans succeed at home and at work, to break the cycle of poverty and dependence, to protect our environment for generations to come, and to maintain our world leadership for peace and freedom. Let us resolve to build that bridge.** (August 29, 1996)

(3) Tonight, my fellow Americans, I ask all of our fellow citizens to join me and to join you in **building that bridge to the 21st century.** Four years from now, just 4 years from now—think of it—we begin a new century, full of enormous possibilities. We have to give the American people the tools they need to make the most of their God-given potential. We must make the basic bargain of opportunity and responsibility available to all Americans, not just a few. That is the promise of the Democratic Party. That is the promise of America. (August 29, 1996)

(4) **I want to build a bridge to the 21st century** in which we expand opportunity through education, where computers are as much a part of the classroom as blackboards, where highly trained teachers demand peak performance from our students, where every 8-year-old can point to a book and say, "I can read it myself." (August 29, 1996)

(5) Now, folks, if we do these things, every 8-year-old will be able to read, every 12-year-old will be able to log in on the Internet, every 18-year-old will be able to go to college, and all Americans will have the knowledge they need **to cross that bridge to the 21st century.** (August 29, 1996)

(6) **I want to build a bridge to the 21st century** in which we create a strong and growing economy to preserve the legacy of opportunity for the next generation, by balancing our budget in a way that protects our values and ensuring that every family will be able to own and protect the value of their most important asset, their home. (August 29, 1996)

(7) Do we want **to weaken our bridge to the 21st century?** (August 29, 1996)

(8) **I want to build a bridge to the 21st century** that ends the permanent under class, that lifts up the poor and ends their isolation, their exile. (August 29, 1996)

(9) **I want to build a bridge to the 21st century** where our children are not killing other

children anymore, where children's lives are not shattered by violence at home or in the schoolyard, where a generation of young people are not left to raise themselves on the streets. (August 29, 1996)

(10) There is more we will do. We should say to parolees: We will test you for drugs; if you go back on them, we will send you back to jail. We will say to gangs: We will break you with the same antiracketeering law we used to put mob bosses in jail. You're not going to kill our kids anymore or turn them into murderers before they're teenagers. My fellow Americans, if **we're going to build that bridge to the 21st century** we have to make our children free, free of the vise grip of guns and gangs and drugs, free **to build lives of hope.** (August 29, 1996)

(11) **I want to build a bridge to the 21st century** with a strong American community, beginning with strong families, an America where all children are cherished and protected from destructive forces, where parents can succeed at home and at work. (August 29, 1996)

(12) **I want to build a bridge to the 21st century** with a clean and safe environment. (August 29, 1996)

(13) We should make it easier for families to find out about toxic chemicals in their neighborhoods so they can do more to protect their own children. These are the things that **we must do to build that bridge to the 21st century.** (August 29, 1996)

(14) My fellow Americans, **I want to build a bridge to the 21st century** that makes sure we are still the nation with the world's strongest defense, that our foreign policy still advances the values of our American community in the community of nations. **Our bridge to the future must include bridges to other nations**, because we remain the world's indispensable nation to advance prosperity, peace, and freedom and to keep our own children safe from the dangers of terror and weapons of mass destruction. (August 29, 1996)

(15) My fellow Americans, let me say one last time, **we can only build our bridge to the 21st century if we build it together and if we're willing to walk arm in arm across that bridge together.** I have spent so much of your time that you gave me these last 4 years to be your President worrying about the problems of Bosnia, the Middle East, Northern Ireland, Rwanda, Burundi. What do these places have in common? People are killing each other and butchering children because they are different from one another. They share the same piece of land, but they are different from one another. They hate their race, their tribe, their ethnic group, their religion. (August 29, 1996)

(16) *Look around this hall tonight—and to our fellow Americans watching on television, you look around this hall tonight—there is every conceivable difference here among the people who are gathered. **If we want to build that bridge to the 21st century** we have to be willing to say loud and clear: If you believe in the values of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, if you're willing to work hard and play by the rules, you are part of our family and we're proud to be with you. [Applause] You cheer now, because you know this is true. You know this is true. When you walk out of this hall, think about it. Live by it.* (August 29, 1996)

(17) *So look around here, look around here: Old or young, healthy as a horse or a person with a disability that hasn't kept you down, man or woman, Native American, native born, immigrant, straight or gay, whatever, the test ought to be, I believe in the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the Declaration of Independence; I believe in religious liberty; I believe in freedom of speech; I believe in working hard and playing by the rules; I'm showing up for work tomorrow; **I'm building that bridge to the 21st century.** That ought to be the test.* (August 29, 1996)

(18) *My fellow Americans, 68 nights from tonight the American people will face once again a critical moment of decision. We're going to choose the last President of the 20th century and the first President of the 21st century. But the real choice is not that. The real choice is whether **we will build a bridge to the future or a bridge to the past**, about whether we believe our best days are still out there or our best days are behind us, about whether we want a country of people all working together or one where you're on your own.* (August 29, 1996)

(19) *Let us commit ourselves this night **to rise up and build the bridge** we know **we ought to build all the way to the 21st century.** Let us have faith, American faith that we are not leaving our greatness behind. We're going to carry it right on with us into that new century, a century of new challenge and unlimited promise. Let us, in short, do the work that is before us, so that when our time here is over, we will all watch the sun go down, as we all must, and say truly, we have prepared our children for the dawn.* (August 29, 1996)

The first time he used bridge metaphor in the address is in example (1). Clinton's declaration of being a bridge to the future is juxtaposed with one of his opponent, Dole's offer to be a bridge to the past [Benoit 2001: 75]. Dole in his Acceptance Address on 15th August 1996 declared that "Age has its advantages. **Let me be the bridge to** an America that only the unknowing call myth. **Let me be the bridge to** a time of

tranquility, faith, and confidence in action. To those who say it was never so, that America has not been better, I say, you're wrong, and I know, because I was there. I have seen it. I remember."

Clinton's claim of building a "bridge to the future" thus rejected what Dole proposed to be "bridge to the past". In this sense, Clinton used the bridge metaphor to favorably frame himself and unfavorably interpret Dole [Benoit 2001:70]. The bridge metaphor in this instance served as a covert tool used by Clinton to attack his opponent, as well as in instance (18). When he said "The real choice is whether **we will build a bridge to the future or a bridge to the past**, about whether we believe our best days are still out there or our best days are behind us, about whether we want a country of people all working together or one where you're on your own", he provided voters with two different perspectives that he and his opponent could offer. The distributions of instance (1) and (18) in the address reveals that Clinton began and ended his use of the bridge metaphor both in comparing his bridge to the future and his opponent's bridge to the past and in rejecting his opponent's claims.

The bridge metaphor in other instances was used to interpret his agendas for education (instances 2, 4, 5), poverty (instance 8), crime and juvenile crime (instances 9, 10), community (instance 11), environment (instances 12, 13), foreign affairs (instance 14), nation unity (instances 15, 16). Instance 13 is for an appeal for the unity of the whole country. Instance 7 was used by Clinton to interact with his audiences.

We can see that Bill Clinton used bridge metaphor not only to interpret his agendas for the upcoming presidential campaign, but also to reject his opponent's claims and thus attack him. Clinton's use of the bridge metaphor effectively functioned as "frames for favorably interpreting himself and his agenda, as well as for unfavorably interpreting Dole and his agenda" [Benoit 2001: 70]. The interpreting function and an attacking function of the bridge metaphor is consistent to the nature and purposes of the Acceptance Address, which is to set agendas, to rally the troops, to boost morale, and to prepare to attack opponents in order to win the campaign.

In his presidential inaugural, in terms of the frequency of bridge metaphor, Bill Clinton used it only once at the end of the address:

(1) *And so, my fellow Americans, we must be strong, for there is much to dare. The demands of our time are great, and they are different. Let us meet them with faith and courage, with patience and a grateful, happy heart. Let us shape the hope of this day into the noblest*

chapter in our history. Yes, let us build our bridge, a bridge wide enough and strong enough for every American to cross over to a blessed land of new promise. (January 20, 1997)

What's more, this time he did not unfold bridge metaphor as he did in the Acceptance Address. The bridge metaphor did not function as an interpretative or an attacking tool. Instead, it was used to call on every American to unite for realizing the promising future. It can be seen that the same metaphor in the two different addresses was manifested differently and served different functions.

Conclusion

In this article we have explored the dynamic use of metaphor in political discourse from two perspectives: metaphor clustering in terms of how metaphors are related to each other within a discourse, and how the same metaphor are used in different contexts. The instance of metaphor clustering in Bill Clinton's Acceptance Address in 1996 reflects that several metaphors may crowd together to form a cognitive scenario that contributes to the elaboration of the topics and the structural coherence of the address. The analysis of the bridge metaphor in Bill Clinton's inaugural address and Acceptance Address shows that its specific forms and functions are varied depending on discourse context use, i.e., genre and register. This is to suggest that metaphor is used dynamically by speakers to fulfill different purposes in different contexts. The same metaphor may function differently within a discourse for different purposes. And the discussion of the Swiss cheese metaphor at the beginning of the article shows that the same source domain may be mapped into total different target domains due to the speaker's specific needs. The image of Swiss cheese with its unique characteristic — riddled with holes — vividly exposes problems in economy and border security.

Ji Xiaoxiao
Moscow, Russia

THE DYNAMIC USE OF METAPHOR IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

ABSTRACT. *The paper explores the dynamic use of metaphor in political discourse from two perspectives: how metaphors are related to each other within a discourse — the phenomenon of metaphor clustering, and how the same metaphors are used across different types of discourse. Research into metaphor clustering in Bill Clinton's Acceptance Address in 1996 shows that metaphor clustering, as a prominent feature in political discourse, it contributes to the cognitive and discursive coherence of the address and the elaboration of major topics. The analysis of bridge metaphor in Bill Clinton's Acceptance Address in 1996 and Inaugural Address in 1997 reveals that the collocates and functions of the same metaphor are varied in different types of political discourse. These findings suggest that metaphor is not a static cognitive and linguistic feature, but a dynamic tool that can be used by speakers to fulfill different purposes in different contexts.*

KEYWORDS: *metaphor clustering; discourse coherence; contexts; metaphors; Swiss cheese; political metaphorology; political discourse.*

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

REFERENCES

1. Гаврилов Л. А., Зарипов Р. И., Романов А. С. Об экспрессивности «мертвых» метафор // Политическая лингвистика. 2017. № 4 (64). С.91—94.
2. Мухортов Д. С., Цзи Сяосяо. Metaphor clustering in American presidential inaugurals —from George H. W. Bush to Donald Trump // Вестн. Москов. ун-та. Сер. 9, Филология. 2018. № 3. (in press).
3. Чудинов А. П. Метафорическая мозаика в современной политической коммуникации : моногр. / Урал. гос. пед. ун-т. — Екатеринбург, 2003. 248 с.
4. Benoit W. L. Framing through temporal metaphor: The “bridges” of Bob Dole and Bill Clinton in their 1996 acceptance addresses // Communication Studies. 2001. Vol. 52. № 1. P. 70—84.
5. Cameron L. Metaphor and Reconciliation: The Discourse-Dynamics of Empathy in Post-Conflict Conversations. — London : Routledge, 2011.
6. Cameron L., Low G. D. Figurative variation in episodes of educational talk and text // European Journ. of English Studies. 2004. № 8 (3). P. 355—373.
7. Cameron L., Stelma J. Metaphor clusters in discourse // Journ. of Applied Linguistics. 2004. № 1 (2). P. 107—136.
8. Corts D., Meyers K. Conceptual clusters in figurative language production // Journ. of Psycholinguistic Research. 2002. № 31 (4). P. 391—408.
9. Corts D., Pollio H. Spontaneous production of figurative language and gesture in college lectures // Metaphor and Symbol. 1999. № 14 (1). P. 81—100.
10. Egging S., Martin J. R. Genres and Registers of Discourse // Discourse as Structure and Process / T. van Dijk (ed.). — London : Sage, 1997. P. 230—257.
11. Halliday M. A. K. Spoken and Written Language / Geelong, Vic. : Deakin Univ. Pr., 1985. (Republ. by Oxford Univ. Pr., 1989)
12. Holbrook T. M. Do campaigns matter? — Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage, 1996.
13. Koller V. Metaphor clusters in Business Media Discourse: A Social Cognition Approach : Dissertation. — Vienna Univ., 2003.
14. Martin J. R., Rose D. Genre Relations. Mapping Culture. — London : Equinox, 2008.
15. Schön D. A. Generative metaphor: A perspective on problem-setting in social policy // Metaphor and thought / Andrew Ortony (ed.). — Cambridge : Cambridge Univ. Pr., 1993. P. 164—201.
16. Semino E., Deignan A., Littlemore J. Metaphor, genre and recontextualisation // Metaphor and Symbol. 2013. № 28. P. 41—59.
17. Clinton W. J. Inaugural address. Jan. 20, 1997 [Electronic resource] // The American Presidency Project. URL: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu>.
18. Clinton W. J. Address Accepting the Presidential Nomination at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago. Aug. 29, 1996 [Electronic resource] // The American Presidency Project. URL: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu>.

REFERENCES

1. Gavrilov L. A., Zarirov R. I., Romanov A. S. Ob ekspressivnosti «mertvykh» metafor // Politicheskaya lingvistika. 2017. № 4 (64). С.91—94.
2. Mukhortov D. S., Tszj Syaosyao. Metaphor clustering in American presidential inaugurals —from George H. W. Bush to Donald Trump // Vestn. Moskov. un-ta. Ser. 9, Filologiya. 2018. № 3. (in press).
3. Chudinov A. P. Metaforicheskaya mozaika v sovremennoy politicheskoy kommunikatsii : monogr. / Ural. gos. ped. un-t. — Ekaterinburg, 2003. 248 s.
4. Benoit W. L. Framing through temporal metaphor: The “bridges” of Bob Dole and Bill Clinton in their 1996 acceptance addresses // Communication Studies. 2001. Vol. 52. № 1. P. 70—84.
5. Cameron L. Metaphor and Reconciliation: The Discourse-Dynamics of Empathy in Post-Conflict Conversations. — London : Routledge, 2011.
6. Cameron L., Low G. D. Figurative variation in episodes of educational talk and text // European Journ. of English Studies. 2004. № 8 (3). P. 355—373.
7. Cameron L., Stelma J. Metaphor clusters in discourse // Journ. of Applied Linguistics. 2004. № 1 (2). P. 107—136.
8. Corts D., Meyers K. Conceptual clusters in figurative language production // Journ. of Psycholinguistic Research. 2002. № 31 (4). P. 391—408.
9. Corts D., Pollio H. Spontaneous production of figurative language and gesture in college lectures // Metaphor and Symbol. 1999. № 14 (1). P. 81—100.
10. Eggins S., Martin J. R. Genres and Registers of Discourse // Discourse as Structure and Process / T. van Dijk (ed.). — London : Sage, 1997. P. 230—257.
11. Halliday M. A. K. Spoken and Written Language / Geelong, Vic. : Deakin Univ. Pr., 1985. (Republ. by Oxford Univ. Pr., 1989)
12. Holbrook T. M. Do campaigns matter? — Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage, 1996.
13. Koller V. Metaphor clusters in Business Media Discourse: A Social Cognition Approach : Dissertation. — Vienna Univ., 2003.
14. Martin J. R., Rose D. Genre Relations. Mapping Culture. — London : Equinox, 2008.
15. Schön D. A. Generative metaphor: A perspective on problem-setting in social policy // Metaphor and thought / Andrew Ortony (ed.). — Cambridge : Cambridge Univ. Pr., 1993. P. 164—201.
16. Semino E., Deignan A., Littlemore J. Metaphor, genre and recontextualisation // Metaphor and Symbol. 2013. № 28. P. 41—59.
17. Clinton W. J. Inaugural address. Jan. 20, 1997 [Electronic resource] // The American Presidency Project. URL: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu>.
18. Clinton W. J. Address Accepting the Presidential Nomination at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago. Aug. 29, 1996 [Electronic resource] // The American Presidency Project. URL: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu>.