

**Kosovych O. V.**

Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University

## METAPHORICAL MODELS IN CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL DISCOURSE

*The article focuses on the notion of conceptual metaphor, which belongs to the cognitive-discursive paradigm, aimed at finding out how this linguistic phenomenon satisfies discursive and cognitive requirements through the internal, mental activity of human consciousness, as well as the use of this phenomenon in the process of communication. The principles of cognitive and cognitive-discursive analyses are considered, the basic formulas of metaphorical modelling of political campaigns are studied. It is established that political discourse exerts a manipulative influence on the masses with the help of special discursive strategies and tactics (deliberate appeal to universal values and emphasising the most beneficial aspects of life), as well as grammatical and stylistic means, among which the military metaphor prevails. It is proved that political bias and the choice of specific linguistic means are based on metaphorical models, such as: war as politics, state-individual, model of a rational personality, fairy tale of a just war, mathematisation of risks, rational action, expert metaphor (Clausewitz metaphor, metaphor of a rational performer). It is established that the demonstration of actions as commercial transactions in the course of metaphorical modelling facilitates the application of manipulative strategies in practice. The basic metaphorical models are distinguished, and it is established that conscious and unconscious systems of metaphors are used to understand and understand the surrounding reality through mental processes based on concepts and having a source and target sphere. When studying the source spheres of metaphorical models, the regional, political, economic and cultural specificity of the discourse is taken into account. In the cognitive discourse approach, a metaphor is seen as a part of a narrative consisting of many interconnected tests that have a common context in the form of a political situation or ideas. Most metaphorical models are based on attempts to rationalise the costs of military action through mathematical and economic calculations, the use of metaphorical definitions and other techniques.*

**Key words:** metaphor; political metaphor; conceptual metaphor; metaphorical modelling, discourse, political discourse, discourse strategies.

**Statement of the problem.** Political prejudices, which are reflected both in the choice of a certain discourse strategy and in the choice of specific linguistic means, are based on metaphorical models and stereotypes that can be identified through the analysis of frames and concepts of political discourse.

**Analysis of recent research and publication.** Modern cognitive studies of political metaphor originate from the study by D. Lakoff and M. Johnson “Metaphors we live by” [11], which, along with conceptual metaphors, examines military metaphors in the discourse of political figures, which proved that metaphors devoid of emotional colouring allow to hide the inhumane nature of state policy in any type of economy. From this theory emerged: the theory of primary and complex metaphors (D. Grady: 1996); the model of conceptual projection (C. Ahern, S. Chang: 2003); the coherent model of metaphor (G. Spelman: 1993); the theory of blending (M. Turner, G. Fauconnier: 1994; 1998); the connective theory of metaphorical interpretation (D. Ritchie: 2003; 2004).

**Task statement.** The purpose of the article is to consider metaphor within the framework of the cognitive discourse approach, the main areas-sources of conceptual metaphor that are characteristic of contemporary political discourse.

**Outline of the main material of the study.** Most of the studies of conceptual metaphor belong to the cognitive-discursive paradigm, which aims to find out how this linguistic phenomenon satisfies discursive and cognitive requirements through the internal, mental activity of human consciousness, as well as the use of this phenomenon in the process of communication [4, p. 112]. The difference between the cognitive-discursive and cognitive approaches lies in the identification of the connection between metaphors and the factors that determine their implication in discourse in the discursive-cognitive approach, and to study the metaphorical model as a mental phenomenon with a detailed description of its source and target spheres, as well as a detailed description of the frames, slots and other elements of this metaphorical

model using the cognitive approach. In the cognitive-discursive approach, a metaphor is seen as a part of a narrative consisting of a set of interconnected texts that have a common context in the form of a certain political situation or ideas [12, p. 10].

Metaphors describe complex and abstract situations. At the same time, there is a large unconscious system of metaphors that people use automatically. The use of a metaphor that has a number of meanings that vary depending on the context can be detrimental if it hides a “painful” reality. It is necessary to distinguish between the metaphorical and the non-metaphorical, because the suffering of entire nations, which is often hidden by metaphor, is real.

Contemporary trends in the study of political narrative:

- study of metaphors related to a specific military campaign (D. Lakoff, D. Luehl, etc.);
- study of metaphors characteristic of a particular political period (R. D. Anderson, etc.);
- study of metaphors related to a specific political event (A. O. Kaslova, O. Santa Ana, etc.);
- study of metaphors reflecting a certain political position (V. Benoit, H. Kelly-Holmes, J. Zinken, etc.);
- studying the metaphorical idiostyles of individual political figures (D. Berkho, D. Cherteris-Black, etc.);
- comparative studies of political metaphor (A. Musolf, E. Semino, J. Zinken, etc.).

Metaphorical models are divided into three groups: occasional, secondary and dominant (O. Santa Ana).

The main spheres-sources of conceptual metaphor, characteristic of the discourse of contemporary political figures (A. Berkho: 2000, D. Goodnight: 2004, 1994, H. Kelly-Holmes: 2004, D. Lakoff: 1991, A. Musolf: 2001, O'Regan: 2004, J. Zinken: 2002): *metaphors of size, superiority, subordination; the state is an individual; the villain is the hero; wild – developed; movement, road, speed; container – the balance of containers; immigration – environmental pollution, immigration – invasion, disease, burden; home, family; school (pupil – teacher); house, building, construction; healthy – sick; body, organism; war; plant world, theatre, sport, animal world, mechanism, etc.*

When studying the source spheres of metaphorical models, the regional, political, economic and cultural specificity of the discourse is taken into account. Often, differences in metaphorical models are manifested at the level of individual concepts. Thus, some models may be incomprehensible to representatives of other cultures.

Basic metaphorical models:

1) war as politics; politics as business (in the modern understanding of the military metaphor,

war is often actualised through business. American strategists in international and military relations use the metaphorical model of cost-benefit analysis);

2) State – Individual (metonymic transfer of the image of the state to a specific individual, for example, its leader: “*Iraq is Saddam Hussein*”; comparing the state with a minor child and vice versa with an adult; the implicit logic of using this metaphorical model is a rational approach to military action and personal gain);

3) the model of a rational personality (the desire to increase income and reduce expenses, often without taking into account the costs of the other party);

1) a fairy tale of a just war. Actors: hero, criminal, helpers. Standard scenario: a crime is committed by a criminal against an innocent victim (e.g., hostage-taking, robbery, kidnapping). The hero gathers helpers or takes action to protect the victim alone. The criminal is evil and a monster who upsets the balance of everything moral in society. The fairy tale is based on asymmetry: the hero is moral and brave, the criminal is immoral and cruel. The hero is rational, and although the villain is often rational, the hero cannot negotiate with him because the villain is immoral. The hero must defeat the criminal. Thus, the metaphorical model of the ‘enemy as a demon’ emerges;

2) such metaphorical models (‘the enemy as a demon’) form a separate scenario of metaphorical definitions, aimed at structuring a given fairy tale in order to justify the moral basis of the situation. Metaphorical definitions are used to answer questions that define the main criteria of the conflict: “*Who is the victim?*”, “*Who is the hero?*”, “*What is a crime?*”, “*What is considered a victory?*”. The use of metaphorical definitions in answering these questions makes it possible to replace concepts and values and simplify the implementation of a manipulative strategy;

1) risks, mathematisation of metaphor. The source-sphere metaphors of “*casual commerce*” and “*risks as a game*” have become perceived through the prism of our everyday understanding of risky military actions, and as a result, their metaphorical nature often goes unnoticed. Thus, social scientists believe that the principle of literal application of mathematical calculations used in gambling is applicable to all forms of risky actions. Thus, a scientific basis is being created for the study of risky actions in order to minimise risks using metaphorical models;

2) rational action (performed by a rational individual acting in his or her own interests to improve material well-being). In casual commercial systems, rational action is metaphorically translated into profit maximisation and cost minimisation, in other words,

rationality is benefit maximisation. The formula for this metaphorical model can be presented as follows: casual commercial metaphor + risk as a game + mathematical calculation of gambling + risky action with possible application of the metaphorical model “*state – individual*”, resulting in the model “*international politics is business*”;

1) international politics is a business (the Rational Actor is at the centre of the metaphorical construction, increasing profits and reducing costs. The model is based on mathematical calculations of income and expenses and game theory, which are usually studied in the final years of international relations faculties);

2) expert metaphor. Most metaphorical models are based on attempts to rationalise the costs of warfare through mathematical and economic calculations, the use of metaphorical definitions, the development of a fairy tale about a just war, etc. These techniques are studied by experts in international relations, forming an additional system of metaphors of the “rational” approach. The two main models of this system are the metaphor of the Rational Actor and the Clausewitz metaphor [11].

To understand Clausewitz’s metaphor (and the reality that expert metaphors can conceal), let us consider a system of metaphorical models that imply its existence:

- the system of casual commerce

This system helps to understand actions aimed at achieving positive results or those that lead to negative effects, its components are:

1) the metaphor of casual transfer. As a result, the object is transferred from the cause of the action to the affected party (transfer of the results of a potential action to the cause of the victim’s difficulties);

2) the metaphor of “exchange for value”: the value of something is how much you are willing to pay for it;

3) the metaphor of “well-being is success”: expensive items represent well-being, thus, an increase in well-being is “profit”, a decrease is “loss”. Such a metaphor is aimed at converting the qualitative into the quantitative [11].

The combination of the above metaphors demonstrates actions as commercial transactions. Thinking of actions as transactions is key to applying ideas from economics to them.

– risks as a game (a game consists of “winnings”, “bets” and the possibility that someone may “lose”. Use of “gambling vocabulary”. The use of such metaphors allows you to publicise strategic information if necessary);

- mathematisation of the metaphor;
- rational action;

- rationality is the increase of benefits;
- international politics is a business.

Since it is unprofitable for the ruling elite to speak directly about their personal benefits, which pushes them to launch military actions, the expert metaphor, in particular the Clausewitz metaphor, becomes a tool to justify selfish goals. If politics is a business, war becomes a cause of maximising political benefits and minimising costs. Clausewitz’s metaphor suggests that immoral actions during war can be justified if they result in maximum profit. Morality is completely absent, except when acting immorally becomes economically unprofitable. The justification of war is often possible only from the point of view of pragmatism. Otherwise, the Clausewitz metaphor is used in conjunction with the Just War Tale, in which case a balance must be struck between “costs” and “benefits” in the Clausewitz metaphor and “costs” and “victory” in the Just War Tale.

The Clausewitz metaphor is a typical expert metaphor. Its formation requires experts in calculating political costs and revenues, knowledge of mathematical theories, probability and decision-making, and game theory. Its properties include: perception of implicit information as literal truth; transformation of qualitative effects of influence on the recipient into quantitative ones; consideration of political processes as economic ones, which means that the priority is to rationally increase profits and that war is viewed within the framework of its political orientation, which is conceptualised through business.

The concept of an expert metaphor can be asymmetrical: the moral can go beyond the metaphorical model, but is brought to the fore when necessary (Clausewitz’s metaphor of War as a Crime).

Since this type of metaphor involves the calculation of profits and costs, the costs are the costs incurred by the Hero country. The opponent’s losses are either ignored or underestimated. This raises the problem of the moral price of using the metaphor of “cost”: by not discussing the moral price of killing, we qualify the results of the war as qualitative, ignoring the real pain and suffering. The system of calculating costs and profits is “zero-based” – the enemy’s costs are considered profit.

**Conclusions.** Thus, conscious and unconscious systems of metaphors are used to understand and comprehend the surrounding reality through mental processes based on concepts and having a source and a target sphere. When studying the source spheres of metaphorical models, the regional, political, economic and cultural specificity of the discourse is taken into account. In the cognitive discourse approach, a metaphor is seen as a part of a narrative

consisting of many interconnected tests that have a common context in the form of a political situation or ideas. Most metaphorical models are based on

attempts to rationalise the costs of military action through mathematical and economic calculations, the use of metaphorical definitions and other techniques.

#### Bibliography:

1. Балашова С.С. Варіативність метафоричних моделей у німецькомовному політичному дискурсі. *Науковий вісник Волинського державного університету імені Лесі Українки*. № 3. 2007. С. 276–280.
2. Винник О.Ю. Концептуальна метафора в сучасному англomовному дискурсі програмування. *Наукові записки*. Випуск 130. Серія: Філологічні науки (мовознавство). Кіровоград: РВВ КДПУ ім. В.Винниченка, 2014. С. 85–87.
3. Лут К.А. Концептуальна метафора в економічній літературі. *Мова і культура*. Київ : Вид. Дім ДМ. Бурого, 2007. Вип.9, Том IV. С. 77–79.
4. Селіванова О.О. Лінгвістична енциклопедія/Полтава : Довкілля-К, 2011. 293 с.
5. Astrero E. Linguistic analysis of social relation in a political and religious discourse. Philippines: 2017. p. 1–5.
6. Benoit W.L. Seeing spots: a function analysis of presidential television advertisement from 1952–1996. New York : Praeger, 1999. P. 198–199.
7. Choulouraki L. Media discourse and the public sphere. *Discourse theory in European politics. Identity, policy and governance*. London: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd., 2005. P. 275–296.
8. Fauconnier G., Turner M. Rethinking Metaphor. *Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press, 2008. P. 53–66.
9. Johnson K., Lee I-Ta. Ideological Phrase Indicators for Classification of Political Discourse Framing on Twitter. Purdue : Purdue University press: 2016. P. 5–15.
10. Lakoff G. Moral politics. Chicago : The University of Chicago Press, 1990. P. 421.
11. Lakoff G. Metaphors We Live By. London : University of Chicago Press, 2003. 276 p.
12. Schiffrin D. Approaches to Discourse. Oxford; Cambridge : MA, 1994. p. 10.
13. Torfing J. Discourse Theory: Achievements, Arguments, and Challenges. *Discourse Theory in European Politics: Identity, Policy and Governance*. Basingstoke : Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. P. 1–32.
14. Wodak R., Meyer M. Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Dijk T.A. van. Multidisciplinary CDA: a Plea for Diversity*. London: Sage Publications, 2001. P. 95–121.
15. Yule G. Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. P. 138.

#### Косович О.В. МЕТАФОРИЧНІ МОДЕЛІ В СУЧАСНОМУ ПОЛІТИЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ

У статті увага зосереджена на понятті концептуальної метафори, яка належить до когнітивно-дискурсивної парадигми, що спрямована на з'ясування того, яким чином дане мовне явище задовольняє дискурсивні та когнітивні вимоги за посередництвом внутрішньої, ментальної діяльності людської свідомості, а також використання даного явища в процесі комунікації. Розглянуто принципи когнітивного та когнітивно-дискурсивного аналізу, вивчено засадничі формули метафоричного моделювання політичних кампаній. Установлено, що політичний дискурс чинить маніпулятивний вплив на маси за допомогою спеціальних дискурсивних стратегій і тактик (навмисної апеляції до загальнолюдських цінностей і підкреслення найвигідніших аспектів життєдіяльності), а також граматики-стилістичних засобів, серед яких переважає військова метафора.

Доведено, що в основі політичної упередженості та виборі конкретних мовних засобів лежать метафоричні моделі, такі, як: війна як політика, держава – індивід, модель раціональної особистості, казка про справедливую війну, математизація ризиків, раціональна дія, експертна метафора (метафора Клаузевіца, метафора раціонального виконавця). Встановлено, що демонстрація дій як комерційних транзакцій під час метафоричного моделювання сприяє застосуванню маніпулятивних стратегій на практиці. Виокремлено базові метафоричні моделі, а також встановлено, що свідомі та несвідомі системи метафор використовуються для усвідомлення і розуміння навколишньої реальності за допомогою ментальних процесів, що будуються на базі концептів і мають сферу-джерело і сферу-мішень. Під час вивчення сфер-джерел метафоричних моделей урахується регіональна, політична, економічна та культурна специфіка дискурсу. У рамках когнітивно-дискурсивного підходу метафору розглядають як частину наративу, що складається з безлічі пов'язаних між собою тестів, які мають загальний контекст у вигляді політичної ситуації або уявлень. Більшість метафоричних моделей будуються на спробах раціоналізувати витрати на військові дії за допомогою математичних та економічних розрахунків, вживання метафоричних дефініцій та інших прийомів.

**Ключові слова:** метафора, політична метафора, концептуальна метафора, метафоричне моделювання, дискурс, політичний дискурс, дискурс-стратегії.