

Metaphorical creativity in british political discourse on Brexit

Aljukić, Lejla

Doctoral thesis / Disertacija

2020

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku, Filozofski fakultet**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:142:767757>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-07-19**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[FFOS-repository - Repository of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Osijek](#)



JOSIP JURAJ STROSSMAYER UNIVERSITY OF OSIJEK

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Lejla Aljukić

**METAPHORICAL CREATIVITY IN
BRITISH POLITICAL DISCOURSE ON
BREXIT**

Doctoral thesis

Osijek, 2020

JOSIP JURAJ STROSSMAYER UNIVERSITY OF OSIJEK
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Lejla Aljukić

**METAPHORICAL CREATIVITY IN
BRITISH POLITICAL DISCOURSE ON
BREXIT**

Doctoral thesis

Supervisor: Sanja Berberović, Ph.D., Associate Professor

Osijek, 2020

SVEUČILIŠTE JOSIPA JURJA STROSSMAYERA U OSIJEKU

FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET

Lejla Aljukić

**METAFORIČKA KREATIVNOST U
BRITANSKOM POLITIČKOM
DISKURSU OF BREXITU**

Doktorska disertacija

Mentorica: dr.sc. Sanja Berberović, izv.prof.

Osijek, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations, symbols and font styles	1
1. Introduction	2
1.1. The aims of dissertation.....	4
2. Theoretical background	6
2.1. Historical overview of figurative language studies	6
2.2. Cognitive theory of metaphor and metonymy	8
2.2.1. Conceptual metaphor	9
2.2.1.1. Conceptual domains	10
2.2.1.2. Mappings	12
2.2.1.3. Kinds of metaphor	16
2.2.1.4. The basis of metaphor	21
2.2.1.5. Metaphor systems	22
2.2.2. Conceptual metonymy	23
2.2.2.1. Types of metonymies	28
2.2.2.2. Motivation of vehicle and target.....	30
2.2.3. Differences between metaphor and metonymy	31
2.2.4. Interaction of metaphor and metonymy.....	32
2.3. Metaphor variation	34
2.4. Metaphorical creativity.....	37
2.4.1. Creativity based on conceptual domains	40
2.4.2. Context-induced creativity	41
2.4.2.1. The role of the contextual factors in metaphorical creativity	44
2.4.2.1.1. Global contexts	44
2.4.2.1.2. Local contexts.....	46
2.4.2.1.3. Other types of contexts	48

2.4.2.2. Operationalising metaphorical conceptualisation in context.....	49
2.5. Political discourse.....	51
2.5.1. Metaphor and discourse.....	55
2.5.1.1. Metaphor in political discourse	57
2.5.1.1.1. Metaphor scenarios.....	60
2.5.1.2. Rhetorical functions of metaphor	61
2.5.1.3. Metaphorical creativity in political discourse	67
3. Corpus and methodology	78
4. Analysis.....	81
4.1. Introduction	81
4.2. Political context: Brexit.....	82
4.3. JOURNEY metaphors in British political discourse on Brexit	84
4.3.1. WALKING JOURNEY metaphors	87
4.3.2. VEHICLE JOURNEY metaphors.....	95
4.3.2.1. CAR JOURNEY metaphor.....	96
4.3.2.2. BUS JOURNEY metaphor	108
4.3.2.3. TRAIN JOURNEY metaphor	118
4.3.2.4. SHIP JOURNEY metaphor	132
4.3.2.5. PLANE JOURNEY metaphor.....	145
4.3.3. Concluding remarks on JOURNEY metaphors in British political discourse on Brexit	151
4.4. MARRIAGE/DIVORCE metaphors in British political discourse on Brexit	154
4.4.1. MARRIAGE metaphor	157
4.4.2. DIVORCE metaphor	169
4.4.3. Concluding remarks on MARRIAGE/DIVORCE metaphors in British political discourse on Brexit	202
Conclusion	205

References	208
Summary	220
Sažetak	221
Biography/Životopis	222

Abbreviations, Symbols and Font Styles

CMT	Conceptual Metaphor Theory
CTMM	Cognitive Theory of Metaphor and Metonymy
PDA	Political Discourse Analysis
CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
DHA	Discourse Historical Approach
DMT	Deliberate Metaphor Theory
ICM	Idealised Cognitive Model
CMA	Critical Metaphor Analysis
EU	European Union
EEC	European Economic Community
[...]	signals an omitted part of a quotation or an example
SMALL CAPS	conceptual metaphors, metonymies and metaphor scenarios
<i>italic</i>	highlights a creative metaphorical expression

1. INTRODUCTION

The awareness of the existence of intricate and inseparable bonds between politics and language, acknowledged even in Aristotle's and Cicero's accounts on rhetoric, has motivated the rise of interest in the study of political discourse. This has resulted in the evolvement of several current linguistic approaches to the issue of political discourse: Critical Linguistics, Political Discourse Analysis (PDA), Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Discourse Historical Approach (DHA), the approach developed by Paul Chilton, which combines Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) and CDA, etc.

A very important segment of the linguistic study of political discourse is metaphor, though the attitude towards it has undergone substantial changes, from being considered as a mere rhetorical device to the more recent acknowledgement of its cognitive nature. This special attention given to metaphor can be understood to have arisen from the fact that metaphor, as claimed by Semino (2008: 1), is a "pervasive linguistic phenomenon", occurring in different types of discourse, aimed at representing reality and achieving particular rhetorical goals (Semino 2008: 31), which is also seen as a motivation for the evolvement of different discourse approaches to the study of metaphor. Unlike the traditional Conceptual Metaphor Theory (henceforth CMT), which recognised the power of metaphor in impacting and shaping reality but was criticised for being focused on studying metaphor outside the context, these recent discourse approaches are concerned with examining metaphor from various perspectives, placing it at the heart of the discourse from which it emerges. The necessity of expanding and modifying the traditional CMT in order to account for real discourse resulted in a number of papers (Chilton and Schäffner 2002; Charteris-Black 2004, 2011; Musolff 2004; Semino 2008; Kövecses 2009c, 2010b, 2015; Neagu 2013; Ritchie 2017, etc.) which combine certain elements of CMT and the discourse approaches to the study of metaphor, which has so far proven to be the most comprehensive way of understanding the true nature of metaphor. Consequently, the context of use, i.e. real discourse in which metaphors emerge, becomes a central issue in the study of metaphor, which is particularly evident in Kövecses's papers (2010b, 2015, 2017b) in which he gives a detailed account of how contextual factors impact the emergence of metaphors in real discourse.

It is a generally accepted fact that metaphorical language characterises much of the discourse aimed at achieving persuasive effects, but it can also be claimed that political discourse takes precedence, due to its role in shaping realities by addressing intricate and

contentious issues in a society (Semino 2008, Charteris-Black 2011, Musolff 2016, 2017 a, Ritchie 2017). The reason why metaphors are very useful conceptual tools for presenting political issues is because they tend to simplify complex and abstract issues, presenting them in vivid and potentially emotional terms (Semino 2008: 124), and have a power to lead to particular conclusions and achieve the intended rhetorical goals (Musolff 2004: 32-33). As suggested by Musolff (2016: 3-4), in order to comprehend the power political metaphors have, it is essential to take into consideration their multifunctionality, which is reflected in their ability to express an evaluation of the topic, to make an emotional and persuasive appeal, to reassure the public that a perceived problem fits into familiar experience patterns and can be dealt with by familiar problem-solving strategies. In order to account for this multifunctionality, he has developed a new methodological approach, i.e. scenario analysis, which avoids the standard view of metaphor, based on domains, and chooses the “discourse-based, culturally and historically mediated version of a source domain” referred to as a metaphor scenario (Musolff 2016: 30).

Contrary to the expectation that political discourse is characterised mainly by the use of conventional metaphors, recent studies (Müller 2005, 2010; Semino, 2008; Semino et al. 2013; Hidalgo Downing et al. 2013; Hidalgo Downing and Kraljevic Mujic 2013; Musolff 2004, 2011, 2012, 2015b, 2016, 2017a, 2017c; Kövecses 2010b, 2015; Badri 2017; Ritchie 2017) reveal that metaphors in political discourse can indeed exhibit a great deal of creativity. Without disregarding the role of conventional metaphors as an important part of political discourse, more intriguing seem to be the cases of creative metaphors, which, as Semino (2008: 124) notes, are used more deliberately to argue particular points in particular contexts, which, at the same time, puts an emphasis both on the crucial role the specific contexts have in motivating the choice of metaphors and on possible effects those creative metaphors have on the audience. It is also essential to note that Kövecses’s (2015) exhaustive study of metaphorical creativity within the realms of CMT proves to be very useful for understanding the emergence of creative metaphors in political discourse, especially due to the emphasis he puts on context as a major source of motivation for the use of novel and unconventional metaphors, together with Musolff’s methodological approach, i.e. scenario analysis.

Even though the aforementioned studies of metaphorical creativity in political discourse highlight different aspects of metaphorical creativity, ranging from the cognitive mechanisms that motivate the emergence of metaphorical creativity (especially the context) and metaphor scenarios to the rhetorical power of creative metaphors, there seems to be a lack

of studies that investigate metaphorical creativity by combining its various aspects. Hence, it can be claimed that any systematic study of metaphorical creativity in political discourse requires an approach that would incorporate all the important aspects of metaphorical creativity. This means that a proper account of metaphorical creativity in political discourse needs to include the study of creative metaphors at the level of conceptual domains, which means investigating the cognitive mechanisms involved in the emergence of metaphorical creativity, the study of creativity at the level of metaphor scenarios, the study of the role of context in motivating metaphorical creativity, as well as the study of rhetorical goals creative metaphors intend to achieve.

1.1. The aims of dissertation

The present dissertation aims to examine the emergence of metaphorical creativity in British political discourse on Brexit, using the cognitive linguistic theory of conceptual metaphor and Musolff's (2016) theory of metaphor scenarios. More specifically, the dissertation investigates metaphorical creativity which arises from three cognitive mechanisms proposed by Kövecses (2005, 2010a, 2010b, 2015): source-related creativity, target-induced creativity and context-induced creativity. Furthermore, in order to demonstrate that creative metaphors in the present analysis are context-induced, the dissertation pays special attention to identifying different contextual factors that motivate the emergence of creative metaphors in this particular kind of discourse. Considering the fact that metaphors have rhetorical power with which they shape political reality, the cognitive linguistic theory of conceptual metaphor is combined with Musolff's (2016) theory of metaphor scenarios in order to clarify specific rhetorical goals creative metaphors have in British political discourse on Brexit.

Based on the aforementioned aims of dissertation, the following research questions can be formulated:

- How do creative metaphors emerge in British political discourse on Brexit? Which cognitive mechanisms are responsible for their emergence? Which conceptual elements of the metaphor domains participate in creative elaboration of metaphors?
- How do metaphor scenarios emerge and what is their role in the emergence of metaphorical creativity?

- In what ways does context impact metaphorical creativity? Which contextual factors play a significant role in the emergence of creative metaphors?
- What rhetorical power do creative metaphors have and which rhetorical aims can be achieved in political discourse through the creative use of metaphors?

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1. Historical overview of figurative language studies

The studies of metaphor and metonymy have had a very long tradition. For more than two millennia they have been the object of interest in philosophy, rhetoric, poetics, etc. It is important to emphasise that, throughout this long period of time, the particular attention was dedicated to metaphor, whereas metonymy was not differentiated from it and was usually studied within the realms of metaphor studies (Gibbs 1994: 321). Since different scholars have been engaged in these studies, the present chapter will give an overview of the most important theories that contributed to the eventual development of Cognitive Theory of Metaphor and Metonymy (henceforth CTMM).

The first acknowledgement of a special position that metaphor and metonymy have in language can be traced back to Greek philosophers such as Plato, who considered metaphor a strong rhetorical device which makes art mere illusion and Aristotle, who famously declared that the greatest thing by far is to be a master of metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 190). It was Aristotle who predominantly influenced the emergence of the traditional theory of metaphor and metonymy. As claimed by Gibbs (1994: 210), Aristotle provided the first scholarly treatment of metaphor, the main tenets of it being that metaphor is regarded as a matter of words, deviant from literal usage and based on similarity. At the same time this was the starting point for other approaches to evolve.

Throughout centuries numerous scholars, such as St Thomas Aquinas, Hobbes, Locke, Vico, Kant, Nietzsche, Coleridge, Blumenberg, Weinrich, etc., dealt with the issue of metaphor and thus contributed to the traditional theory of metaphor and metonymy. Some regarded metaphor and metonymy as positive, while others attributed them a negative value. What generally characterises all these approaches is the view that metaphor, as a figure of speech, is confined to language alone and is used only in poetics and rhetoric for ornamental purposes. Some of them, such as Hobbes and Locke, declared metaphor an enemy of the truth and literal meaning (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 190). Lakoff and Turner (1989: 135-136) emphasise that most scholars dealing with metaphor were misled by the Literal Meaning

Theory¹ and similar doctrines and they failed to look for generalisations at the conceptual level. Lakoff (1993: 202) explains that the real problem lies in the fact that “the classical theory was taken so much for granted over the centuries that many people didn't realize that it was just a theory”. Not only was it considered true but it also “came to be taken as definitional”.

Among all the philosophers studying metaphor and metonymy, Jäkel (1999: 12-18) mentions Kant (1781, 1783, 1786, 1787, 1790) Blumenberg (1960, 1971, 1979a, 1989) and Weinrich (1958, 1963, 1964, 1967, 1976b) as the ones being closest to the contemporary theory of metaphor, referring to them as the first predecessors of CTMM. All three focused on the cognitive function of metaphors, but Weinrich (1958) went even further by formulating an explicit domain hypothesis and introducing the terms “image domain” and “recipient domain”, the equivalents of the source and target domain of CTMM.

The twentieth century witnessed other attempts to rehabilitate metaphor, such as the one made by analytic philosophers like Black (1962), Beardsly (1962, 1978) and Henle (1958). They tried to show that metaphor is “cognitively meaningful no less than the literal, but even 'more' cognitive and 'more' meaningful than the literal” (Stern 2008: 264). Especially important is Max Black who, based on the foundations laid by I.A. Richards² (1936), developed his “Interaction view of metaphor”³ (Semino 1997: 200-201).

However, according to Lakoff (1993: 204), the most immediate predecessor of CTMM is Michael Reddy who, in his essay *The Conduit Metaphor* (1979), discussed metaphor for communication and established the view that ordinary English is largely metaphorical, opposing the traditional view that metaphor is only a matter of poetic or figurative language:

Reddy showed, for a single, very significant case, that the locus of metaphor is thought, not language, that metaphor is a major and indispensable part of our ordinary, conventional way of conceptualizing

¹ The Literal Meaning Theory focuses on language only. The basic idea behind this theory is that ordinary conventional language, referred to as literal language, is semantically autonomous and thus capable of making reference to objective reality. Consequently, ordinary conventional language can in no way be metaphorical. Such theory is in accordance with the common philosophical view that all concepts are reflections of objective reality and cannot be metaphorical (Lakoff and Turner 1989: 114-115).

² In Semino (1997:200) we find a quote from I.A.Richards (1936: 94) which summarises his approach to the function and structure of metaphor: “In the simplest formulation, when we use a metaphor we have two thoughts of different things active together and supported by a single word, or phrase, whose meaning is a resultant of their interaction.” Furthermore, his labels for the two elements involved in metaphorical connections, tenor and vehicle have been widely adopted.

³ “In the theory developed by Black, the interaction triggered by metaphor involves, on the one hand, the tenor (or, in Black's terms, the principal or primary subject) and, on the other, the 'system of related commonplaces' (Black 1962: 41) or 'implicative complex' (Black 1979: 28) associated with the vehicle (or the secondary subject)”. (Semino 1997: 201)

the world, and that our everyday behavior reflects our metaphorical understanding of experience. (Lakoff 1993: 204)

The real foundations of CTMM were laid in 1980 by Lakoff and Johnson's seminal *Metaphors We Live By*, which was a big challenge to the traditional view of metaphor. What characterises their approach is that they dismissed the idea of metaphors being a matter of language only. On the contrary, they (1980:3) discovered that metaphors are a matter of thought rather and that they are pervasive in our everyday life. This was also a starting point for further research in this field, such as in Lakoff (1987, 1993), Lakoff and Turner (1989), Lakoff and Johnson (1999), Kövecses (2002, 2005, 2006, 2015), Grady (1997, 2007), Gibbs (1994), etc. The impact of this new theory of metaphor was so massive that it affected not only the area of linguistics but the entire abstract human thought, including science, and especially the foundations of the Western philosophical tradition, which is objectivist in nature (Lakoff and Johnson 1999: 129). It is best summarised by Lakoff and Johnson (1999: 3) who state the three postulates of cognitive science: “The mind is inherently embodied. Thought is mostly unconscious. Abstract concepts are largely metaphorical”.

2.2. Cognitive theory of metaphor and metonymy

CTMM rests upon the following basic assumptions presented by Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 3):

- Metaphors are pervasive in everyday life, not just in language, but in thought and action.
- Conceptual system, which we are normally unaware of, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature and plays a central role in defining our everyday realities.
- The way we think, what we experience, and what we do every day is very much a matter of metaphor.

What is also important to note about CTMM is the attention that was given to metonymy, which was mostly disregarded in traditional approaches. Metonymy was now recognised as a process different from metaphor and studied with all its characteristics. Therefore, the rest of this chapter will be dedicated to describing the metaphor and metonymy, respectively, within the realms of CTMM.

2.2.1. Conceptual metaphor

The emergence of CMT, which recognised the conceptual nature of metaphor, brought forward a very important distinction that was undermined in the traditional theory of metaphor. It is the distinction between a conceptual metaphor and metaphorical linguistic expressions. Conceptual metaphor is, as Lakoff and Johnson (1999: 123) put it, “centrally a matter of thought” and it will be explained in more details in what follows. Metaphorical linguistic expressions, however, are simply “a reflection of metaphorical thought” (Lakoff and Johnson 1999: 123), “words or other linguistic expressions that come from the language or terminology of the more concrete conceptual domain” (Kövecses 2002: 4) and they in fact “reveal the existence of the conceptual metaphors” (Kövecses 2002: 6).

Within CMT various definitions of metaphor emerged. What connects all of them is the definition of metaphor given by Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 5): “The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another.” For instance, Gibbs (1994: 207) talks of metaphor as a “fundamental mental capacity by which people understand themselves and the world through the conceptual mapping of knowledge from one domain onto another”. In the same light, Kövecses (2002: 4) defines conceptual metaphor as “understanding of one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain”. In Kövecses (2015: 2), there is a further explanation of this definition, according to which domains of experience are represented in mind as concepts given as mental frames or cognitive model. These frames, the source and the target frames, are connected by a set of correspondences, or mappings. Another definition comes from Barcelona (2003: 211) who describes metaphor as “the cognitive mechanism whereby one experiential domain is partially mapped onto a different experiential domain, the second domain being partially understood in terms of the first one”. There are other definitions of metaphor within CMT as well, but the important thing is that all of them share the same basic terminology which includes domains, mappings and understanding.

Recently, there have been new trends in metaphor theory which Steen (2011:1) refers to as the new contemporary theory of metaphor, which uses all previous knowledge about metaphor, gives new interpretations and poses new questions. Of special importance here is an improved definition of metaphor which apart from conceptual and linguistic dimension also includes a communicative dimension:

Metaphors are not only a matter of thought (with conceptual structures bridging conceptual domains or mental spaces) and a matter of language (with linguistic expressions in context indicating at least one aspect of such cross-domain mappings in thought), but also of communication, with linguistic expressions in

context suggesting whether the metaphor has a specific value to the interlocutors as a distinct communicative (typically: rhetorical) device – or not. (Steen 2015: 2)

As the author (2015:2) himself highlights, this actually means that “language users can display metalinguistic attention, awareness and skills about the way language structures, in this case metaphors, are used”, which implies that, in real communication, it sometimes happens that speakers or writers consciously use metaphors. This idea contradicts the traditional CMT view of metaphor as an automatic and unconscious phenomenon and has led to the development of Deliberate Metaphor Theory (henceforth DMT)⁴ (Steen 2011).

2.2.1.1. *Conceptual domains*

The aforementioned definitions reveal that conceptual domains play an essential role in metaphor understanding. Therefore, Kövecses (2002: 4) explains that a conceptual domain refers to “any coherent organization of experience”. The two domains involved in metaphorical understanding are source domain and target domain. Source domain, which Barcelona (2003: 211) also calls “donor domain”, is the conceptual domain that is more physical and from which we draw metaphorical expressions to understand another conceptual domain. Target domain, in Barcelona (2003: 211) referred to as “recipient domain”, is more abstract and is understood in terms of the source domain (Kövecses 2002: 4; Kövecses 2005: 5). The relationship between these two conceptual domains is determined by the principle of unidirectionality, according to which the metaphorical process goes from the more concrete conceptual domain to the more abstract, but not the other way around (Kövecses 2002: 6). There are certain aspects of human experience that are more frequently used as source and target domains. Kövecses (2002: 16-20) states thirteen most frequent sources based on the *Cobuild Metaphor Dictionary* and his own findings: HUMAN BODY, HEALTH AND ILLNESS, ANIMALS, PLANTS, BUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION, MACHINES AND TOOLS, GAMES AND SPORT, MONEY AND ECONOMIC TRANSACTIONS (BUSINESS), COOKING AND FOOD, HEAT AND COLD, LIGHT AND DARKNESS, FORCES AND MOVEMENT AND DIRECTION. He also offers a list of eleven most common target domains: EMOTION, DESIRE, MORALITY, THOUGHT, SOCIETY/NATION,

⁴ DMT has been developed by Gerard Steen (2011, 2015), as a reaction to the shortcomings of the standard CMT, mainly reflected in its lack of interest in communicative aspect of metaphor use. As Steen (2015: 5) emphasises, DMT does not ignore or disregard the standard CMT but, instead, it ought to be seen as an extension of CMT, aimed at improving and adjusting it. By focusing on the communicative aspects of metaphor use, Steen (2011) develops a three-dimensional model for metaphor, consisting of linguistic, conceptual and communicative properties of metaphor, which is considered apt for accounting for all important aspects of metaphor.

POLITICS, ECONOMY, HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS, COMMUNICATION, TIME, LIFE AND DEATH, RELIGION AND EVENTS AND ACTIONS. As already mentioned, source domains are based on concrete aspects of our experience and in that way they enable understanding the ones that are much more abstract and could be hard to understand in any other way.

Even though the appropriate conceptual structure involved in conceptual metaphors is most frequently termed as a domain, Kövecses (2017c: 1) mentions other terms employed with the same purpose, such as image schemas (Lakoff 1990, 1993), frames (Lakoff 1996, Kövecses 2006), scenes (Grady 1997), mental spaces (Fauconnier and Turner 2002), schemas (Lakoff and Turner 1989) and scenarios (Musolff 2006, 2016). In order to clarify this terminological confusion⁵, Kövecses (2017c: 2) proposes that metaphors simultaneously function on four levels of schematicity: the level of image schemas⁶, the level of domains⁷, the level of frames⁸ and the level of mental spaces⁹. He refers to this new framework as “multi-level view of conceptual metaphor”. Furthermore, the author suggests that the four levels form a schematic hierarchy in which metaphors range from the highest level of image schema, through domains and frames, to the lowest level of mental spaces. It is emphasised that the mappings always occur on the same level, which means that domains correspond to domains, frames to frames, mental spaces to mental spaces. Since these levels are connected vertically, the lower levels are more specific versions of the higher levels. The conclusion is

⁵ Kövecses (2017c: 2) explains that the terminological confusion is “a reflection of a serious deep-seated theoretical-conceptual dilemma; namely, the difficulty of identifying the appropriate conceptual unit, or structure, that participates in the formation of conceptual metaphors”.

⁶ Kövecses (2017c: 4) defines image schemas based on four features established by Hampe (2005: 1-2). Image schemas are thus described as “directly meaningful preconceptual structures, highly schematic gestalts, continuous analogue patterns, internally structured, consisting of only a few parts”. Furthermore, due to their schematicity, image schemas range over the entire conceptual system making concepts and experiences meaningful. According to Lakoff (1987: 267-268), some of the most common image schemas include CONTAINERS, PATHS, LINKS, FORCES, BALANCE, UP-DOWN, FRONT-BACK, PART-WHOLE, CENTER-PERIPHERY, etc.

⁷ Domains are at a level immediately below image schemas and are not analogue, imagistic patterns of experience. They are information-rich because they have many more parts than image schemas (Kövecses 2017c: 5)

⁸ Frames are less schematic conceptual structures than domains. The difference in schematicity is what defines the differentiation between the two. Frames involve more conceptually specific information than domains and they elaborate particular aspects of a domain. For example, several distinct frames, such as PERCEPTION, INGESTION and EXERCISING can elaborate the BODY domain (Kövecses 2017c: 5).

⁹ Kövecses (2017c: 6) uses Fauconnier’s (2007: 351) definition of mental spaces as “very partial assemblies constructed as we think and talk, for purposes of local understanding and action”. They are claimed to be “structured by frames and cognitive models” and “connected to long-term schematic knowledge, such as the frame for walking along a path, and to long-term specific knowledge” (Fauconnier 2007: 351). Thus, mental spaces are even more specific than frames and function at a very specific and conceptually rich level. It has also been claimed that mental spaces are “online representations of our understanding of experience in working memory, whereas frames and domains are conventionalized knowledge structures in long-term memory” (Kövecses 2017c: 6).

that no single conceptual structure can be chosen because metaphors involve all four at the same time¹⁰ (Kövecses 2017c: 23-24).

2.2.1.2. Mappings

Another essential element of conceptual metaphor is mapping. Mapping refers to a set of systematic correspondences that exist between a source domain and a target domain. In this way, constituent elements of two domains are brought into correspondence, transferring the properties of the source domain onto the target domain. Kövecses (2005: 26) explains that the correspondences between two domains make up a conceptual metaphor. The connection that exists between two conceptual domains can be stated as a formula A is B, where A stands for a target domain and B stands for a source domain. The conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY will be used to explain the nature of these correspondences¹¹. Here are some of the linguistic expressions that Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 44-45) present:

- a. Look *how far we've come*.
- b. We're *at a crossroads*.
- c. We'll just have to *go our separate ways*.
- d. We can't *turn back now*.
- e. I don't think this relationship is *going anywhere*.
- f. *Where* are we?
- g. We're *stuck*.
- h. It's been a *long, bumpy road*.
- i. This relationship is a *dead-end street*.

If we take a more detailed look at one of these sentences, for instance “We'll just have to *go our separate ways*”, we will see that the expression *go our separate ways* infers the process of travelling to a destination, whereas “We” implies travellers, all of which are parts of the domain of journey. However, the context¹² in which one may encounter such an expression

¹⁰ For further information on this issue, see Kövecses (2017c).

¹¹ In accordance with the conventions of cognitive linguistics, small capital letters will be used for conceptual metaphors, while italics will be used for metaphorical linguistic expressions.

¹² It is important to note that the traditional CMT does not pay attention to the role of context in which conceptual metaphors emerge. However, recent studies in CMT, which are more focused on studying conceptual metaphor in the real discourse (Kövecses 2014b, 2015, 2017a, 2017b; Semino 2008; Semino et al. 2013; Hidalgo Downing et al. 2013; Hidalgo Downing and Kraljevic Mujic 2013; Müller 2005, 2010; Musolff 2016; Gibbs and Lonergan 2009), highlight the role context plays in motivating the choice of a particular conceptual metaphor.

will clarify that it is about love, not journey. Therefore, the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY enables the understanding of the abstract concept of love in terms of a more concrete concept of journey. Travelling corresponds to events in a love relationship, destination corresponds to a goal/ goals of a love relationship, and travellers correspond to lovers. Kövecses (2002: 7) gives a set of mappings between constituent elements of the source and target domain:

Source: JOURNEY		Target: LOVE
the travellers	=>	the lovers
the vehicle	=>	the love relationship itself
the journey	=>	events in the relationship
the distance covered	=>	the progress made
the obstacles encountered	=>	the difficulties experienced
decisions about way to go	=>	choices about what to do
the destination of the journey	=>	the goal(s) of the relationship

According to Lakoff (1993), Barcelona (2003) and Grady (2007), two types of systematic correspondences exist in mappings. On the one hand, there are ontological correspondences, which correlate entities of a target domain with that of a source domain. On the other hand, there are knowledge or epistemic correspondences between two domains, in which knowledge about a source domain is mapped onto knowledge of a target domain, allowing us to understand a particular target domain (e.g. LOVE) by using the knowledge used for understanding a particular source domain (e.g. JOURNEY). As Barcelona (2003: 212) notes, these knowledge or epistemic correspondences “normally entail further ontological correspondences”. In the same fashion, Kövecses (2005: 7) explains that it often happens that source domains map ideas onto the target domains beyond the basic correspondences, calling these additional mappings “entailments” or “inferences”. He provides the example of conceptualising love as a journey, in case of which the vehicle corresponds to the relationship, and the knowledge about the vehicle is used in understanding the relationship. All this indicates that the traditional view that metaphor is exclusively based on similarity does not hold; in some cases (as in LOVE IS A JOURNEY) it is difficult to identify any kind of similarity

between two conceptual domains. This proves that metaphor is not only a matter of language, but also of thought, and that language simply reflects the mappings that constitute the conceptual metaphor. Otherwise, each of the different metaphorical linguistic expressions would be a different metaphor, which is clearly not the case. Lakoff (1990: 49) concludes that in the case of the metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY we actually have one metaphor, in which love is conceptualised as a journey. “It is a unified way of conceptualizing love metaphorically that is realized in many different linguistic expressions.” (Lakoff 1990: 49)

The major constraint on metaphorical mappings is the so-called “Invariance Hypothesis” according to which, metaphorical mappings preserve the image-schema structure of the source domain so that it is in accordance with the image-schema structure of the target domain. Lakoff (1993: 215) proves this by claiming that, for instance, source domain interiors correspond to target domains interiors, and source domain exteriors correspond to target domain exteriors. In other words, “if both domains share, at least in parts, their image-schematic structure, then the mapping is possible” (Barcelona 2003: 203). However, Barcelona (2003: 213) notes that the Invariance Hypothesis needs more precision, adding that it is not just image-schematic structure of the target domain that requires preservation, but also associated conventional knowledge about the target domain. Kövecses (2002: 104) also highlights that one of the downsides of the Invariance Hypothesis is the fact that it does not solve the problems of “illegitimate transfer from the source to the target”, suggesting Grady’s theory of primary metaphors as an alternative solution¹³. Highlighting that the Invariance Hypothesis is limited to cases of metaphors based on image schemas, Ruiz de Mendoza (1998) formulated the Extended Invariance Principle, according to which “the generic-level structure of the metaphoric target has to be preserved in a way that is consistent with the generic-level structure of the source” (Ruiz de Mendoza and Usón 2007: 37). The authors (2007: 38) further note that in order to account for any potential oddities, Ruiz de Mendoza and Santibáñez (2003) formulated the Correlation Principle, according to which metaphoric mappings are constrained on the basis of the implicational structure of source and target elements. One more principle exists, i.e. the Mapping Enforcement Principle, which ensures that “no item in the target will be discarded from a mapping system if there is a way to find a corresponding item in the source” (Ruiz de Mendoza and Usón 2007: 38). By examining the metaphor in discourse, Musolff (2012: 305) emphasises the role the immediate and wider contexts also play in constraining the sense in which a metaphorical utterance is understood.

¹³ The theory of primary metaphors will be further discussed in 2.2.1.3.

Additionally, he notes that the Invariance Hypothesis would be considered circular if the cognitive constraining power of source and target domains is considered pre-established, suggesting that “rather than underlying discourse, the mapping process is the product of discourse” (Musolff 2012: 305).

The nature of the mappings obtained between two conceptual domains is reflected in the absence of a total correspondence between the domains, which, if existed, would mean that one concept is the other concept, and not understood in terms of it. Since this is not what happens in mappings, the conclusion arises that the mappings are partial. This means that only some elements of a source domain are mapped onto a target domain.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Kövecses (2002) introduce the terms “metaphorical highlighting” and “metaphorical hiding”, which apply to the target domain. Metaphorical highlighting refers to bringing into focus only some aspects of a target concept in the process of conceptualisation. At the same time, the remaining aspects of the same concept are out of focus, which is called metaphorical hiding. As Kövecses (2002: 80) notes, “highlighting and hiding presuppose each other”. Furthermore, Kövecses (2002: 79-80) also introduces another property of metaphorical mapping, i.e., “metaphorical utilization”, which applies to a source domain. This means that only some aspects of a source domain are “utilized” in understanding a target domain. Kövecses (2002: 83) observes:

... when we talk about utilization and highlighting in connection with a source and a target, respectively, we talk about two sides of the same coin. The utilized and highlighted aspects of a source and target are brought together in a conceptual metaphor through a detailed set of mappings between some of the elements in the source and target domains.

According to Kövecses (2002: 83-90), the reason behind these processes is explained by Grady (1997) who differentiates two kinds of metaphors: primary metaphors and complex metaphors. Since primary metaphors are motivated independently of complex metaphors, they in fact determine the elements which will be mapped from a source to a target.

Kövecses (2002, 2005) goes further by introducing two important characteristics of a source and a target domain, i.e., “scope of the source” and “range of the target”. What he means by the scope of the source is “the range of cases, that is, the target domains, to which a given source concept applies” (Kövecses 2002: 108). For example, the source domain of WAR can apply to various targets like ARGUMENT, LOVE, LIFE, etc. The range of target refers to “the range of source domains in conceptual metaphors that a language/culture has available for a

particular target” (Kövecses 2006: 121). Thus, the target domain of LIFE can be conceptualised as a JOURNEY, WAR, BUILDING, etc.

2.2.1.3. *Kinds of metaphor*

Conceptual metaphor, as complex an issue as it is, requires a proper classification. There are many ways in which conceptual metaphors can be classified, focusing on different aspects of conceptual metaphors. The first to be discussed is a detailed classification suggested by Kövecses (2002, 2015), which, as he claims, has a particularly important role in CMT. He distinguishes six types of classification: conventionality, function, nature, level of generality, complexity and grounding. Before going into details about different kinds of metaphors, it is important to remember that conceptual metaphors refer to understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another one, whereas metaphorical linguistic expressions are realisations of conceptual metaphors in language.

The issue of conventionality is of major importance when it comes to the classification of metaphors and it has been studied by various scholars (Lakoff 1993; Gentner and Bowdle 2001; Kövecses 2002; Drulák 2004; Lukeš 2005; Steen 2007; Charteris-Black 2004, 2011, Semino 2008). It refers to the level to which a metaphor is established and entrenched among the speakers of a particular language. Therefore, a metaphor can be termed conventional if the speakers of a language use it effortlessly in their normal, everyday communication. The examples of such metaphors would be ARGUMENT IS WAR, LOVE IS A JOURNEY, THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS, IDEAS ARE FOOD, etc. Conventionality applies to both conceptual metaphors and metaphorical linguistic expressions. Thus, Kövecses (2002: 30) remarks: ”Conventional conceptual metaphors ... are deeply entrenched ways of thinking about or understanding an abstract domain, while conventional linguistic expressions are all worn, cliched ways of talking about abstract domains ... both can be more or less conventional”. Nevertheless, in certain situations, unconventionalised linguistic expressions are used to express a conventional conceptual metaphor, which is defined as an unconventional or novel metaphor. Kövecses (2002: 31) gives the example of the highly conventional metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY which was used in an unconventional way by Frost. Thus the expressions from the poem “two roads diverged” and “I took the one less travelled by” are far from being the usual way people speak about life. Unconventional conceptual metaphors are less easy to find, but Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 149) mention one such metaphor, LOVE IS A COLLABORATIVE

WORK OF ART, even though they do not provide any metaphorical linguistic expression. Furthermore, besides the standard classification of metaphor as conventional and unconventional, Drulák (2004: 9) introduces the third type of metaphor, i.e. sedimented metaphor, which is communicated as a literal statement and is not seen as a metaphor at all.

The first classification based on cognitive function of metaphor was developed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). According to this classification, three kinds of metaphor can be distinguished: structural, ontological and orientational. Structural metaphors are those that enable speakers to understand a target domain by means of the structure of a source domain. For instance, Kövecses (2002: 33) mentions the concept of time being structured in terms of the concepts of motion and space. Therefore, we have the conceptual metaphor TIME IS MOTION due to which we understand time in terms of physical objects, their locations, and their motion. Ontological metaphors give an ontological status to general categories of abstract target concepts, which basically means viewing experiences in terms of objects, substances, and containers in general (Kövecses 2002: 34). They serve as a basis for structural metaphors, helping us, for instance, to understand abstract entities in terms of physical objects. To support this claim Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 27) bring forward an example THE MIND IS AN ENTITY, which can be elaborated as THE MIND IS A MACHINE. One form of ontological metaphor is also personification, in which nonhuman entities are given human qualities. For example, computers can be given the qualities of humans “The computer *went dead* on me” (Kövecses 2002: 35). Orientational metaphors are concerned with giving concepts spatial orientations, which originate from the experience we have with our bodies in the physical environment. These spatial orientations include: up-down, in-out, front-back, on-off, deep-shallow, center-periphery, etc. The example of such metaphor can be found in Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 14), i.e., HAPPY IS UP, from which arises metaphorical linguistic expression “I’m feeling *up* today”. According to Kövecses (2002: 35-36), this metaphor can be called “coherence metaphor” because one of its jobs is to make target concepts coherent in our conceptual system.

Based on the nature of metaphor, a distinction can be made between metaphors that are based on knowledge and those based on image. The main feature of metaphors based on knowledge is that “basic knowledge structures constituted by some basic elements are mapped from a source to a target” (Kövecses 2002: 37). Most of the metaphors belong to this category, such as: LOVE IS A JOURNEY, IDEAS ARE FOOD, AN ARGUMENT IS WAR, etc. According to Lakoff and Turner (1989: 89) and Kövecses (2002: 37), image-schema metaphors are those

in which conceptual elements of image schemas get mapped from a source to a target, and not knowledge structures. The basis of image schemas lies in our interactions with the world, which occur repeatedly. Image schemas created in this way are involved in metaphorical structuring of our abstract concepts. One such example is the motion schema that underlies the concept of a journey. Moreover, there are also metaphors that are not based on image schemas but on rich images, and are called image metaphors. These metaphors often occur in poetry but also in other kinds of discourse (Kövecses 2002: 38).

Based on the criterion of generality, Lakoff and Turner (1989) and Kövecses (2002) distinguish two kinds of metaphors, generic-level and specific-level metaphors. Generic-level metaphors are marked by highly general properties. As Lakoff and Turner (1989: 81) remark, their generality is reflected in two ways: “they do not have source and target domains, and they do not have fixed lists of entities specified in the mapping”. The examples of such metaphors would be *EVENTS ARE ACTIONS* or *GENERIC IS SPECIFIC*. Kövecses (2002: 40) adds that these metaphors have “special jobs designed for them in the working of our metaphorical conceptual system”. On the other hand, there is a majority of metaphors (e.g. *LOVE IS A JOURNEY*, *AN ARGUMENT IS WAR*, *IDEAS ARE FOOD*) which can be named specific-level metaphors, since they employ specific-level concepts, and are underlined by generic-level metaphors.

Kövecses (2002: 117) adds one more kind of metaphor classification, i.e., the one based on the level of complexity. Thus, he makes a distinction between simple or primary metaphors¹⁴ and complex metaphors. It is claimed that simple or primary metaphors constitute mappings in complex metaphors, whereas the opposite is not possible. For instance, complex metaphors such as *THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS*, *SOCIETY IS A BUILDING*, *LIFE IS A BUILDING*, are constituted by simple or primary ones, such as *ABSTRACT CREATION IS PHYSICAL BUILDING*, *ABSTRACT STRUCTURE IS PHYSICAL STRUCTURE*, *ABSTRACT STABILITY IS PHYSICAL STRENGTH*.

In Kövecses (2015: 3), there is a distinction based on grounding or the basis of metaphor. He notes that metaphors may be grounded either in analogical relationship between two domains, as in *LIFE IS A THEATRE PLAY*, or on bodily correlations in experience between the domains, as in *ANGER IS HEAT*.

¹⁴ Grady (2007: 194) also discusses the issue of primary metaphors, referring to them as "natural or even inevitable consequences of recurring associations in daily life". He also indicates that the importance of recognition of primary metaphors has led to "The Neural Theory of Language" and "neural" version of CMT (Lakoff and Johnson 1999).

Among the recent metaphor classifications there is the one proposed by Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez Hernández (2011) who distinguish four level of classification: the nature of source domain, the level of genericity, complexity and the nature of the mapping system. According to the nature of the source domain metaphors can be of two types: non-structural and structural. Non-structural metaphors have three subtypes: orientational, ontological and imagistic. On the other hand, structural metaphors can be non-situational and situational. Non-situational metaphors include topological, such as image-schematic and image-based metaphors, and non-topological ones, whereas situational include non-scenic and scenic metaphors (Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez Hernández 2011: 10).

Classification based on the level of genericity includes three types of metaphors: low level metaphors, created by making well-entrenched, coherent links between elements of encyclopaedic knowledge, primary level metaphors, directly grounded in bodily experience, and high level metaphors, created by deriving structure common to multiple low-level models (Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez Hernández 2011: 12-13).

In an attempt to refine the distinction between primary and complex metaphors established by Grady (1997), Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez Hernández (2011: 15) also distinguish primary and complex metaphors. What they add is a subdivision of complex metaphors into compound and non-compound metaphors¹⁵.

Based on the nature of metaphorical mappings, which can be made of one basic correspondence or many correspondences, there are two types of metaphors: one-correspondence and many-correspondence metaphors. In the case of one-correspondence metaphors “the source domain either contains a single concept ... or a conceptual cluster that puts in perspective a prominent attribute of the source ... that is mapped onto the target thus highlighting a corresponding attribute in the target” (Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez Hernández 2011: 18). On the contrary, in many-correspondence metaphors the source domain comprises a set of related concepts which allow us to reason about different aspects of the target domain.

Within the realms of the new contemporary theory of metaphor, Steen (2007, 2008, 2009, 2011) and Steen et al. (2010) propose a three-dimensional model of metaphor, which “allows for the study of every metaphor from three complementary angles, metaphor in language, thought, and communication” (Steen 2011: 38-39). What this means is that together with the

¹⁵ For further explanation of compound and non-compound metaphors, see Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez Hernández (2011: 15-17).

linguistic and conceptual level of metaphor study, proposed in the traditional CMT, there is also the communicative level of metaphor study. At the linguistic level, three kinds of metaphors are distinguished, direct, indirect and implicit metaphors, whereas at the conceptual level the distinction is made between conventional and novel metaphors. A special attention has been given to the communicative level of metaphor study, at which Steen (2011: 36-37) introduces a distinction of metaphors based on the notion of deliberateness, which, as he claims, has been ignored in the traditional CMT. Therefore, he distinguishes deliberate and non-deliberate metaphors. Deliberate metaphor is used to describe an intentional use of metaphor for achieving particular communicative purposes, whereas all other metaphors that do not have this role are termed non-deliberate. Steen (2011: 37) explains: “The opposition between deliberate and non-deliberate metaphor is about the presence or absence of a change in perspective on the target domain that is communicatively shared between the producer and the recipient...” What this means is that, in the case of deliberate metaphor, the sender invites the addressee to “step outside the dominant target domain of the discourse and look at it from an alien source domain” (Steen 2011: 37). As an example, the author (2011: 37) uses the simile “Science is like a glacier”, in which the addressee has to step aside the target domain of science and look at the local discourse topic from the perspective of the alien source domain of glaciers. On the other hand, non-deliberate metaphor does not invite the addressee to change perspective on the local discourse topic. Therefore, in the example “Lakoff attacked Glucksberg”, the addressee does not need to access the source domain of war in the interpretation of the utterance because this metaphor is a conventional way of talking about an academic debate.

Ritchie (2017) takes modality and cognitive/discursive function as a criterion for establishing a slightly different classification of metaphors. Within this classification, he (2017: 241-242) distinguishes five categories: metaphors, metonyms, metaphorical stories, lexical metaphors and metaphors in other modes-visual metaphors. Metaphors are defined as a category of communication in which “an idea or concept from one realm of experience is used to express something about an idea or concept from an entirely different realm of experience”, whereas metonyms are a category of communication in which “a representation of an idea or concept from one realm of experience is used to express something about an idea or concept from a different but related realm of experience” (Ritchie 2017: 241-242). Metaphorical stories¹⁶ are seen as a subcategory of communication in which a vehicle story is mapped onto

¹⁶ Metaphorical stories will be discussed in more details in the chapter 2.5.1.1.

a topic story from a totally different domain. Lexical metaphors, defined as a subcategory of specifically linguistic communication, in which metaphors are expressed in words or brief phrases, are of two kinds, static/descriptive metaphors and story metaphors. While static/descriptive metaphors involve experiencing a topic concept as a vehicle concept with no story implied, story metaphors refer to a word or phrase that implies or activates a metaphorical story (Ritchie 2017: 42). Finally, metaphors in other modes or visual metaphors can imply any of the above categories. Here, a distinction is made between visualised metaphorical stories, which “contain images and, sometimes, language that refers to and potentially activates a metaphorical story”, and visualised lexical metaphors, which “depict or represent lexical metaphors, usually idiomatic but sometimes novel lexical metaphors” (Ritchie 2017: 242-243).

2.2.1.4. *The basis of metaphor*

After having taken a completely different course concerning metaphor, cognitive linguistics was faced with the fundamental question of what serves as a basis upon which metaphors emerge. Contrary to the traditional view that metaphor is based on a similarity between the two entities, the cognitive linguistic view holds an experientialist view, without entirely rejecting the fact that pre-existing similarity can in certain metaphors work as the basis. What this means is that conceptual metaphors are mostly based on a different range of human experiences, which is what various cognitive linguists who discuss this issue (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Lakoff 1987; Lakoff 1993; Grady 1999; Kövecses 2002; etc.) agree upon.

The most comprehensive review of the stances aforementioned authors hold can be found in Kövecses (2002: 67-76). According to him, experiential factors reflect a similarity which is not literal, objective and pre-existing, as claimed in the traditional approaches. He thus lists different ways in which conceptual metaphors are grounded in experience:

- a) **Correlations in experience.** This is best demonstrated in the example of the conceptual metaphor MORE IS UP, in which there is a correlation between quantity and verticality. This is based on the everyday experience of increasing the amount of a substance which consequently leads to the rise in the level of the substance. It is manifested in linguistic expressions such as: “the prices *go up*” or “unemployment figures are *high*”. The correlation in experience is seen in other metaphors as well:

PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS, LIFE IS A JOURNEY, ANGER IS HEAT, etc., in a more or less direct way.

- b) **Perceived structural similarity.** It refers to some non-objective similarities that are perceived between the structure of the two conceptual domains. For instance, there is structural similarity in the case of the metaphor LIFE IS A GAMBLING GAME, in which actions in life have some consequences and the relationship between actions and consequences is perceived as a gambling situation.
- c) **Perceived structural similarity induced by basic metaphors.** In this case, ontological metaphors, which are seen as very basic, can induce the perception of structural similarity between two conceptually distant domains. The conceptual metaphor IDEAS ARE FOOD is, for instance, based on the structural similarity induced by ontological metaphors used for understanding the human mind, which again originate from nonmetaphorical assumptions about the human body.
- d) **Source as the root of the target.** There are two versions of this type of experiential basis. The first one is called “biological root”, in which the sources rely on the properties of biological experiences, such as, for example, mother-child relationship in the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A BOND. The second one is referred to as “cultural root”. For instance, in the metaphor SPORT IS WAR the target domain took its historical origin as the source domain, because many sports in fact emerged from fighting and war.

Kövecses leaves open the possibility of there being other kinds of motivation for conceptual metaphors.

2.2.1.5. *Metaphor systems*

A huge number of conceptual metaphors that underlie the human conceptual system is organised into two large metaphor systems. Kövecses (2002) mentions two such systems: The Great Chain of Being metaphor and Event Structure metaphor. The Great Chain of Being metaphor system is concerned with the metaphorical conceptualisation of objects, or things. There is a hierarchical order of entities, or things and the metaphorical conceptualisation goes in both directions, i.e., things that are higher in the hierarchy can be understood via things lower in the hierarchy, and vice versa. This system also has a subsystem, called Complex Systems metaphor in which target concepts, such as function, stability, development and

condition, are understood as four source domains: MACHINE, BUILDING, PLANT and HUMAN BODY, respectively. The Event Structure metaphor system deals with the metaphorical conceptualisation of events and changes of states. Here, the aspects of events (states that change, causes that produce changes, change itself, etc.) are conceptualised metaphorically as location, force and motion. Even though these metaphor systems do not account for all things and events, yet a large number of them do belong to these systems.¹⁷

2.2.2. Conceptual metonymy

Metonymy, just like metaphor, has over centuries been the object of interest and studies, and regarded simply as a figure of speech, pertaining to language only. Traditional approaches, as noted by Radden and Kövecses (1999: 17), describe it as a figure of speech in which the name of one thing is used for the name of something else with which it is associated. It was frequently studied together with metaphor, and, as Gibbs (1994: 321) emphasises, throughout the history of the studies of metonymy, there was no agreement as to what exactly distinguishes metonymy from metaphor. Moreover, he adds that some theorists have even considered metonymy as a subclass of metaphor. A significant change happened in 1956 when Roman Jakobson, in his article *Two Aspects of Language and Two Aspects of Aphasic Disturbance*, elevated metonymy from the position of little-regarded rhetorical device to a status equal to metaphor, regarding it as its “contrary” (Surette 1987: 557). Even though cognitive linguistics has not focused on metonymy as much as on metaphor, yet, it can be claimed that CTMM has built upon Jakobson's notion of equality of metaphor and metonymy and has contributed to a gradual rise in interest in metonymy studies.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 35-40) were the ones who have recognised the conceptual nature of metonymy and considered it as a part of our everyday thinking, grounded in experience, structuring our thoughts, language, actions and attitudes in a systematic way. Furthermore, they differentiated metonymy from metaphor, describing it as a referential device that enables us to use one entity to refer to another and, at the same time, emphasising its function of providing understanding. This marked the beginning of cognitive linguistic research into the subject of conceptual metonymy, which was further developed in the works of many linguists (Lakoff 1987; Radden and Kövecses 1999; Kövecses 2002; Barcelona

¹⁷ For a more detailed account of how metaphor systems work, see Kövecses (2002: 121-139).

2003; Dirven 2003; Goossens 2003; Taylor 2003; Littlemore 2015; Brdar 2017; etc.), demonstrating that metonymy is even more fundamental cognitive mechanism than metaphor.

The idea behind all the approaches within the cognitive linguistic view of conceptual metonymy is best summarised by Radden and Kövecses (1999: 17) who present it in the form of three different assumptions of cognitive nature of metonymy:

1. Metonymy is a conceptual phenomenon. – This fact was demonstrated in Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) claim about the pervasiveness of metonymy in our everyday thinking, language, actions and attitudes. Radden and Kövecses (1999: 18) add that all metonymies are ultimately conceptual in nature and that the majority of them do not show up in language.
2. Metonymy is a cognitive process. – This is reflected in the functions metonymy performs, especially referential function of metonymy, which involves mentally accessing one conceptual entity, a target point, via another conceptual entity, a reference point (Radden and Kövecses, 1999: 19).
3. Metonymy operates within an idealized cognitive model. – Lakoff (1987: 68) introduced the framework of an idealised cognitive model (henceforth ICM), which he defines as a complex structured whole, a gestalt.¹⁸ Radden and Kövecses (1999: 20) explain that the ICM concept includes both the encyclopaedic knowledge of a particular domain and the cultural models, and that it is not restricted only to the worlds of reality, knowledge or language, but may cut across all these ontological realms.

This brings us to the issue of providing an appropriate and comprehensive definition of metonymy. Taking into consideration the aforementioned assumptions about cognitive nature of metonymy, Radden and Kövecses (1999: 21) provide their definition of metonymy: “Metonymy is a cognitive process in which one conceptual entity, the vehicle, provides mental access to another conceptual entity, the target, within the same idealized cognitive model.”

What this definition highlights is that metonymy operates within one conceptual domain, unlike metaphor. Kövecses (2002: 144-145) gives a more detailed account of the notions

¹⁸ Lakoff (1987: 68) states that each ICM uses four kinds of structuring principles: propositional structure, image-schematic structure, metaphoric mappings and metonymic mappings, adding that each ICM structures a mental space, as described by Fauconnier (1985).

encompassed by the definition. The vehicle entity is the one that directs attention and provides mental access, whereas the target entity is the one to which attention and mental access are provided. For instance, in the example “I’m reading *Shakespeare*”, the vehicle entity would be *Shakespeare*, and the target entity would be *one of Shakespeare’s works*. These two entities are said to be “close” to each other in conceptual space because they belong to the same ICM, and this is in fact what enables the metonymical process itself. Kövecses (2006) builds upon all his previous work and provides what he calls “a more precise” definition of metonymy, for which Littlemore (2015: 9) claims to be the most widely agreed upon.

Metonymy is a cognitive process in which a conceptual element or entity (thing, event, property), the vehicle, provides mental access to another conceptual entity (thing, event, property), the target, within the same frame, domain, or idealized cognitive model (ICM). We can conceive of this as a “within-domain mapping”, where the vehicle entity is mapped onto the target entity. (Kövecses 2006: 99)

Based on his claim that there exist three types of connections, or mappings, “through-connection”, “as-if-connection” and “is-connection”, Kövecses (2015: 19-20) notes that in the case of metonymy the conceptual connection between the entities is established by means of one entity being mentally activated by or through another entity, which is clearly a “through-connection”. There are two kinds of “through-connections” or metonymic mappings: outward-looking metonymic mappings, which activate an entity that is outside the primary domain of the source entity, and inward-looking metonymic mappings, which activate something inside their primary domain. Based on these distinctions Kövecses (2015: 20) offers a new definition of metonymy:

In metonymy, we access entity 2 through entity 1 by means of a “through-connection”.

Entity 1 and 2 are concepts (subdomains) or, in the case of entity 2, aspects of concepts, and the two are in the same frame, or idealized cognitive model. The mapping can be either inward-looking or outward-looking. If it is outward-looking, it can result either in entity 1 referring to entity 2 or in entity 1 highlighting an aspect of entity 2. If it is inward-looking, entity 1 highlights an aspect of the same entity.

Taking into consideration Croft’s (1993) view that metonymy highlights a domain within a complex domain matrix¹⁹ and Langacker’s (1987: 148-150) distinction between basic and abstract domains²⁰, Barcelona (2003: 220-222) argues that a more comprehensive term for the elements involved in metonymy is domains, rather than entities. Therefore, he suggests

¹⁹ According to Croft (2003: 168), a domain matrix is the combination of domains simultaneously presupposed by a concept. Furthermore, it is claimed that although in metonymy mappings occur within a domain matrix, it is also possible for metonymy to occur across domains within a domain matrix (Croft 2003: 178).

²⁰ Langacker (1987: 149) defines a basic domain in the following way: “By definition, basic domains occupy the lowest level in hierarchies of conceptual complexity: they furnish primitive representational space necessary for the emergence of any specific conception.” Abstract domain, is on the other hand defined as “Any nonbasic domain, i.e. any concept or conceptual complex that functions as a domain for the definition of a higher order concept” (Croft, 1987:150).

that a domain linked by metonymy should be referred to as a subdomain, which is a part of the overall experiential domain within which metonymy operates. For instance, in the example “She's just a *pretty face*” a subdomain is a body part (a face) and it stands for the whole domain (a person). Based on all his investigation into the issue of metonymy, Barcelona (2003: 246) suggests the following, as he calls it, “broad, schematic” definition of metonymy: “Metonymy is a mapping of a conceptual domain, the source, onto another domain, the target. Source and target are in the same functional domain and are linked by a pragmatic function, so that the target is mentally activated.”

Taking into consideration what these relevant studies into the subject of metonymy reveal, Brdar (2017: 55) tries to capture the nature of metonymy by providing a complex definition:

Metonymy can be seen as a cognitive operation of conceptual elaboration based on the part-whole relationship that is triggered by the use of an expression (or metonymic vehicle) that is associated with a certain conceptual cluster (or metonymic source) within a conceptual domain so that the activation of the source conceptual cluster opens up a mental space that is dynamically expanded or reduced so as to come as close as possible to fitting the conceptual gabarits by the co(n)text of use, in the course of which the mental space thus opened and elaborated also comes very close in terms of its contents to another conceptual cluster (or metonymic target) within the same conceptual domain that may be or is typically associated with another expression.

The author (2017: 55-56) highlights that the importance of this complex definition lies in the fact that it proves to be very beneficent when it comes to understanding numerous facts observed in the study of metonymy. Therefore, understanding metonymy in this way provides several benefits, which can be summarised as follows:

- Metonymy is clearly seen as an intra-domain phenomenon, which excludes the necessity of dealing with the issue of identifying domains and subdomains and also resolves the problem of PART FOR WHOLE metonymies.
- The assumption that any mapping takes place is eliminated.
- It explains the fact that the metonymic source and vehicle as a unit are not necessarily permanently affected and that polysemy is not an automatic consequence of metonymy.
- Besides accounting for conceptual metonymies that are or can be manifested linguistically, it is also possible to consider conceptual metonymies in other modalities.
- The dynamic nature of metonymy, i.e. the modulation of metonymic meanings as the context changes in unfolding discourse, is more appreciated.

When it comes to the way conceptual metonymy manifests itself both in our conceptual system and in language, first, it is important to draw a line between a conceptual metonymy, which is a matter of thought and conceptual system, and metonymic linguistic expressions, which are manifestations of conceptual metonymy in language.²¹ The second important fact is that metonymic linguistic expressions do not appear as random and disorganised. Rather, as Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 37) claim, they are systematic in their organisation, which is seen from the following set of examples taken from Kövecses (2002: 144):

THE PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT (THE AUTHOR FOR THE WORK)

I'm reading *Shakespeare*.

She loves *Picasso*.

Does he own any *Hemingway*?

THE PLACE FOR THE EVENT

America doesn't want another *Pearl Harbour*.

Let's not *El Salvador* become another *Vietnam*.

Watergate changed our politics.

AN OBJECT USED FOR THE USER

We need a better *glove* at third base.

The *sax* has the flu today.

What can be seen from this set of examples is that one kind of entity (THE PRODUCER/THE AUTHOR, THE PLACE, AN OBJECT USED) “stands for”, or provides a mental access to another kind of entity (THE PRODUCT, THE EVENT, THE USER), and that these entities are referred to by metonymic linguistic expressions (e.g. *Picasso*, *Pearl Harbour*, *glove* are used to refer to *one of Picasso's works*, *military strike*, *a person* respectively).

Before proceeding into the discussion of different types of metonymy, one more issue regarding metonymy deserves to be mentioned. It commonly happens that metonymies

²¹ As it has been the case with metaphor, small capital letters will be used for conceptual metonymies, whereas italics will present metonymic linguistic expressions.

interact with each other resulting in what Dirven (2003) and Littlemore (2015) call metonymic chaining, in which one metonymy leads to another. Littlemore (2015: 6-7) provides the following examples:

Put the kettle on. I'll be home by five o'clock.

Now dry your eyes and we'll *put the kettle on*.

It is clear that in the first example *put the kettle on* refers to the process of making a cup of tea. In certain contexts, this metonymy can lead to an evolvment of yet another related metonymy in which *put the kettle on* gains an additional meaning of drinking tea together while discussing one's problems. Closely related to this is the issue of serial metonymy discussed by Frank (2015) following the research done by Nerlich and Clarke (2001). Thus, Frank (2015: 76) explains that serial metonymy refers to metonymic chains that are either synchronic, which means that all of senses of the polysemous lexeme are accessible to the speakers, or diachronic, where some links in the chain may be missing and are not accessible to the speakers.

2.2.2.1. *Types of metonymies*

There are numerous ways in which metonymies are classified in cognitive linguistic literature, each contributing in some way to the overall picture of metonymy. Different authors use different criteria for metonymy classification, such as metonymy-producing relationships, relationship between metonymic expression and its referent, degrees of metonymicity, pragmatic function, etc.

The first criterion to be discussed is metonymy-producing relationship proposed by Radden and Kövecses (1999), which is, according to Littlemore (2015: 20), “the most exhaustive and influential taxonomy ... proposed to date”. Radden and Kövecses (1999: 30-37) thus claim that there exist two types of metonymy-producing relationships or two conceptual configurations: Whole ICMs and its part(s) and Part of an ICM. The first configuration applies to ICMs that include the Scale ICM, the Constitution ICM, the Event ICM, the Category- and- Member ICM, the Category- and- Property ICM, and the Reduction ICM. This configuration leads to metonymies in which either a whole ICM is accessed via its part, or a part of an ICM is accessed via its whole, which gives rise to two kinds of

metonymies, WHOLE FOR PART and PART FOR WHOLE. The second configuration includes different parts of ICMs: the Action ICM, the Perception ICM, the Causation ICM, the Production ICM, the Control ICM, the Possession ICM, the Containment ICM, the Location ICM, the Sign and Reference ICM and the Modification ICM. In this case, there is a relationship between conceptual entities that function as parts within an ICM producing PART FOR PART metonymy.

The second classification is presented by Ruiz de Mendoza and Diez Velasco (2003: 496-497) and is based on the criterion of relationship between metonymic expression and its referent. They distinguish two types of metonymies: “target-in-source”, which would correspond to PART FOR WHOLE metonymy, and a “source-in-target”, which corresponds to WHOLE FOR PART metonymy. Unlike Radden and Kövecses (1999), they do not include PART FOR PART metonymy, explaining that for them this type of metonymy is just an instance of metonymic domain inclusion where the target is a subdomain of source.

The degree of metonymicity is another important type of metonymy classification proposed by Barcelona (2003: 227-228). According to this view, there are three types of metonymy: schematic, typical and prototypical. Schematic metonymy involves a mapping of the source onto the target while both of them belong to the same overall domain. Typical metonymy refers to a schematic metonymy whose source and target are clearly distinct. What marks prototypical metonymies is that they involve typical metonymies with individual entities as targets and as referents²².

There is also a classification based on pragmatic function of metonymy whose main proponents are Panther and Thornburg (2004: 102-104). They distinguish three types of metonymy: referential, predicational and illocutionary metonymies. Referential metonymies are based on the idea that metonymies are seen as a phenomenon of referential shift, i.e. they are tied to the referential act. They use the example “*The Pentagon* has issued a warning” to explain that the metonymy PLACE FOR INSTITUTION is used to identify the intended referent of *the Pentagon*. In predicational metonymies the authors state that a potential event is metonymically linked to its occurrence in reality, which they exemplify in “*General Motors* had to stop production”. In this case, “the necessity or obligation to stop production evokes

²² According to Littlemore (2015: 56), Handl (2011) improves the model proposed by Barcelona (2003) by bringing in the notion of ‘underspecified meaning’ and claiming that a very large number of metonymies have underspecified meaning. “In these metonymies, the basic sense of the vehicle term is retained and contributes to the contextual meaning of the expression, meaning that both the basic meaning and the contextual meaning are present.”

the actual occurrence of the event of stopping production (OBLIGATION TO ACT FOR ACTION)” (Panther and Thornburg 2004: 103). In the case of illocutionary metonymies, “an attribute of a speech act can stand for the speech act itself in the same way that an attribute of a person can stand for the person” (Panther and Thornburg, 2004: 104). For instance, in utterance “I would like you to close the window” the request to close the window is metonymically evoked by the wish expressed by the speaker.

Dancygier and Sweetser (2014: 100-101) distinguish two types of metonymy: categorial metonymy and frame metonymy. Categorial metonymy rests upon the relationship between a larger category and a smaller subcategory, in which the smaller category stands for a larger one, or the larger category takes on the label of the subcategory, or vice versa. The proof of this being the relationship of correlation lies in fact that membership in the smaller category correlates entirely with membership in the larger one, and membership in the larger category frequently correlates with membership in the smaller category. In the case of frame metonymy, the metonymic relationship is obtained between parts of the same frame. Here, also presence of a frame correlates with presence of parts of the frame, and vice versa.²³ One important and previously discussed kind of frame metonymy is PART-WHOLE metonymy which is, according to the authors, also called meronymy or paronymy.

2.2.2.2. *Motivation of vehicle and target*

Radden and Kövecses (1999: 44-52) discuss what motivates the choice of particular vehicles and targets and distinguish two kinds of principles: cognitive and communicative principles. Both principles are in fact in accordance with the very nature of metonymies, which is both cognitive and communicative.

Cognitive principles are reflected in three general determinants (Radden and Kövecses 1999: 44-52): human experience, perceptual selectivity and cultural preferences. Human experience includes the following set of principles: SUBJECTIVE OVER OBJECTIVE, CONCRETE OVER ABSTRACT, INTERACTIONAL OVER NON-INTERACTIONAL and FUNCTIONAL OVER NON-FUNCTIONAL. The list of principles related to perceptual selectivity includes: IMMEDIATE OVER NON-IMMEDIATE, OCCURRENT OVER NON-OCCURRENT, MORE OVER LESS, DOMINANT OVER LESS

²³ According to Dancygier and Sweetser (2014: 123), both types of metonymies are recognised cognitive modes, evidenced in innovative usages, polysemy patterns, known historical-change patterns and form abbreviations.

DOMINANT, GOOD GESTALTS OVER POOR GESTALTS, BOUNDED OVER UNBOUNDED and SPECIFIC OVER GENERIC. The principles under cultural preferences are: STEREOTYPICAL OVER NON-STEREOTYPICAL, IDEAL OVER NON-IDEAL, TYPICAL OVER NON-TYPICAL, CENTRAL OVER PERIPHERAL, INITIAL OR FINAL OVER MIDDLE, BASIC OVER NON-BASIC, IMPORTANT OVER LESS IMPORTANT, COMMON OVER LESS COMMON and RARE OVER LESS RARE.

There are two communicative principles that determine the choice of a metonymic vehicle: the principle of clarity and the principle of relevance. (Radden and Kövecses 1999: 50-51) The communicative principle that ensures the clarity in communication is CLEAR OVER OBSCURE, whereas the principle of relevance can be stated as RELEVANT OVER IRRELEVANT, or more precisely, SITUATIONALLY MORE RELEVANT OVER SITUATIONALLY LESS RELEVANT.

It is important to say that these principles do not act on their own, but rather: “...several cognitive and communicative principles are involved in a given instance of metonymy” (Radden and Kövecses 1999: 52).

2.2.3. Differences between metaphor and metonymy

Ever since Jakobson (1956) drew a distinction between metonymy and metaphor as two different ways of conceptualising the world, numerous linguists have explored and identified a number of differences between the two.

First of all, the difference is made based on the concept of domains proposed by linguists such as Langacker (1987), Lakoff (1987), Croft (2003), Barcelona (2003), Panther and Thornburg (2003), etc. What this means is that metonymy is described as a mapping within a single domain, whereas metaphor involves mappings across domains. Croft (2003: 178) thus claims that “metonymy occurs only within a domain matrix”, also referred to as domain highlighting, and metaphor involves “a mapping between two domains that are not part of the same matrix”. Furthermore, Barcelona (2003: 221) explains that both metonymy and metaphor are unidirectional when it comes to the projection from one domain onto another, adding that a large number of metonymies are, however, reversible, which does not imply bidirectionality. He also emphasises one fact that needs to be taken into account, i.e. that “the mapping that occurs in metonymy is asymmetrical, whereas that occurring in metaphor is symmetrical” (Barcelona, 2003: 225-226). While the aforementioned authors emphasise the notion of mapping in the case of metonymy, Brdar (2017: 54) argues that such

notion may be abandoned, adding that metonymy ought to be treated as “a discourse-driven inference or pragmatic function (Fauconnier 1997), arising in the course of domain expansion or reduction (in the sense of Ruiz de Mendoza 1999, 2000)”. The author does not negate the existence of “some sort of two-way traffic” but argues that the inferences, which steer customization, are impacted by the information based on the text and the context, resulting in the domains being created with regard to their function.

There also exists another difference, which is based on the notion of similarity and contiguity. One of the authors dealing with this issue is Kövecses (2002: 146-147), who explains that metonymy is based on the relationship of contiguity, which means that two entities are in each other's proximity. On the other hand, in metaphor, there is a relationship of similarity between two concepts, which can range from real similarity to perceived resemblance and correlation in experience. In the same light, Dirven (2003: 92) mentions that the difference between metonymy and metaphor rests upon the principle of conceptual contrast, or more precisely, “the interplay of conceptual distance and closeness, or vice versa”. In this case, metonymy is marked by conceptual closeness which corresponds to the notion of contiguity, while metaphor, despite the notion of similarity which underlies it, is said to involve two concepts that are distant from each other, in the sense that one domain is abstract and the other one is concrete.

Kövecses (2002: 148) notes that metonymy and metaphor also differ in their function. He claims that, even though, metonymy is used for the purposes of understanding to some extent, this function is not central. The main function of metonymy is:

... to provide mental, cognitive access to a target entity that is less readily or easily available ... a more concrete or salient vehicle is used to give or gain access to a more abstract or less salient target entity within the same domain. (Kövecses 2002: 148)

In contrast, the function of understanding of one thing in terms of another is what lies at the centre of metaphor.

2.2.4. Interaction of metaphor and metonymy

Even though there are some major differences between metaphor and metonymy, it has generally been agreed that the boundaries between them are very often far from being clear-cut. The thorough investigation of the relation between the two has revealed a number of ways in which they interact.

A detailed account of the interaction between metaphor and metonymy is found in Barcelona (2003: 241-245). He claims that there are two types of patterns of interaction: interaction at the conceptual level and purely textual co-instantiation of a metaphor and metonymy in the same linguistic expression. More important is the first type which has two subtypes: a) the metonymic conceptual motivation of metaphor, which occurs frequently, resulting in a significant number of metaphors based on metonymy (e.g. ANGER IS THE HEAT OF A FLUID, motivated by metonymies in which certain physiological effects of anger stand for this emotion), and b) the metaphorical conceptual motivation of metonymy, found in metonymic interpretations of a linguistic expression that are possible only within a co-occurring metaphorical mapping (e.g. EAR FOR ATTENTION which occurs in metaphorical mappings in which attention is the target domain). The second type of interaction refers to the case when a metaphor and metonymy co-occur in the same linguistic expression, but they are conceptually independent from each other. “Their co-occurrence is, thus, not due to the fact that one of them motivates the other conceptually, but due to the fact that they are compatible.” (Barcelona 2003: 245)

Taylor (2003) introduces the notion of a metonymy-metaphor continuum which ranges from literal, over metonymical, to metaphorical, which Radden (2003: 412-413) uses to discuss metaphor-metonymy interaction in the case of metonymy-based metaphors. He focuses on the stages in metonymy-metaphor continuum where metonymy shades over into metaphor. Therefore, he finds four types of metonymic sources for metaphor: a common experiential basis, implicature, category structure and cultural models.

Goossens (2003) offers his view of metaphor-metonymy interaction and introduces a special term, *metaphonymy*, to encompass all different ways in which metaphor and metonymy interact. He distinguishes four patterns of interaction: metaphor from metonymy, metonymy within metaphor, metaphor within metonymy and demetonymisation in a metaphorical context. The first two types are the current ones, as he notes, while the remaining two are treated as exceptional. Goossens also makes one more distinction when it comes to *metaphonymy* and mentions two types: *integrated metaphonymy*, in which metaphor and metonymy are combined in one expression, and *cumulative metaphonymy*, in which metaphor is derived from metonymy or vice versa (Goossens 2003: 369).

Ruiz de Mendoza and Galera-Masegosa (2011: 10) comment on Goossens’s (2003) metaphor-metonymy interaction patterns, referring to them as “metonymic developments of a

situational metaphoric source”, and note that there are other forms of interaction between metaphor and metonymy. They propose four interaction patterns: metonymic expansion of a metaphoric source, metonymic reduction of a metaphoric source, metonymic expansion of a metaphoric target and metonymic reduction of a metaphoric target²⁴.

Hidalgo Downing (2016: 109-112) also discusses the interconnection which exists between metaphor and metonymy, highlighting that, in discourse, metonymies can appear in connected chains and thus motivate metaphors, which is why metonymy has been referred to as “enabler of metaphor” (Hidalgo Downing 2016: 109). The author (2016: 111-112) illustrates the interaction of metaphor and metonymy in the example taken from graffiti in the female bathrooms of the Universidad Complutense in Madrid:

Podrán cortar todas las flores pero nunca podrán parar la primavera. Wold Revolution! [sic]
(Italics in the original)

They can cut all the flowers but they will never stop the spring. World Revolution!

As Hidalgo Downing (2016:112) notes, the example reveals the establishment of a target-in-source metonymic relationship in which FLOWERS stand for SPRING, which then enables the emergence of conceptual metaphors such as SPRING IS WORLD REVOLUTION, FLOWERS ARE PROTESTERS, CUTTING IS SILENCING OR KILLING and CUTTING FLOWERS IS KILLING OR SILENCING PROTESTERS.

2.3. Metaphor variation

For a clearer picture of metaphorical creativity, it is important to understand the notion of metaphor variation²⁵ and the role it plays in creating novel metaphors, which has been discussed by Kövecses in many of his works. Kövecses (2005, 2006, 2009a, 2014b) emphasises that variation rests upon the notion of context, which plays an important role in shaping the conceptual system, and distinguishes two kinds of dimensions that are found in metaphor variation: the cross-cultural and within-culture dimensions.

²⁴ For further explanation of the four interaction patterns, see Ruiz de Mendoza and Galera-Masegosa (2011: 11-14).

²⁵ Kövecses (2005, 2006) does not disregard the established fact that metaphor rests upon embodiment, which confirms its universal nature, but he also argues that one cannot ignore the fact that metaphor also demonstrates different kinds of variations in its use. For more information see Kövecses (2005, 2006).

The cross-cultural metaphor variation is, as Kövecses (2005, 2006) notes, one of the most natural and obvious kinds of variation. It can be found in different forms. Congruence is one of the forms, in which specific-level metaphors in a particular culture are congruent with a generic-level metaphor, shaped by the culture itself. Another form of variation is called alternative metaphors, and it, in the first place, refers to “... the range of conceptual metaphors (or, more precisely, the range of source domains) that languages or cultures have available for the conceptualization of particular target domains” (Kövecses 2006: 158-159). This phenomenon is known as “the range of target”. However, it is also possible to have a situation in which a number of target domains exist to which a source domain can apply, which is termed “the scope of source” (Kövecses 2005: 72). The next form of cross-cultural metaphor variation is preferential conceptualisation. Kövecses (2005: 82) explains that it can happen that different cultures or languages have the same conceptual metaphors for a particular target domain, but the speakers of languages are the ones who choose particular metaphors over others. The three forms of variation discussed here can be said to account for the majority of cases of metaphor variation across cultures. Yet, Kövecses (2005: 86) mentions one more possibility, i.e. unique metaphors, in which both target and source domains are culturally unique. However, he notes that these cases are not as common as the previously mentioned ones.

Just as metaphors vary across different cultures, they can also vary within the same culture. Within-culture variation has dimensions which include: social, ethnic, regional, style, subcultural, diachronic, developmental and individual dimensions. Kövecses (2005: 88-113) offers a detailed explanation for each of these dimensions, of which we only give a very brief account. The social dimension captures all the social differences that exist within a society, such as the differentiation between men and women, young and old, middle class and working class, etc., which are considered to affect the metaphorical conceptualisation. When it comes to the ethnic dimension, it is claimed that metaphorical conceptualisation can vary in different ethnic groups, which is especially noticeable in societies with a huge segregation based on ethnicity. Regional dimension refers to the variations of metaphorical conceptualisation that exist in regional varieties of the same language. These regional varieties include local or national dialects. As far as the style dimension is concerned, there are many factors involved, such as: audience, topic, communicative setting, medium, etc. All of them have the power to cause the variation in metaphor use. Subcultures are an integral part of each culture and society and they distinguish themselves in various ways from the mainstream culture. Thus

the subcultural dimension refers to the specific metaphors different subcultures develop based on these differences. Three most common kinds of subculture are discussed by Kövecses (2005): religious groups, literature and psychotherapeutic discourse. The diachronic dimension of metaphor variation suggests that the metaphorical conceptualisation of various concepts underwent changes over the course of time and language development. The developmental dimension is closely tied to the age of children, which affects their metaphorical conceptualisation and comprehension. Finally, the individual dimension includes all the differences in experience that individuals have and that can directly affect their metaphorical conceptualisation, resulting in their own idiosyncratic metaphors that can range from the novel ones to versions of already-existing metaphors (Kövecses 2006: 164). The individual dimension is considered to play a special role when it comes to metaphorical creativity, but the role of other factors is not to be undermined either.

Kövecses (2005, 2009a, 2010b, 2014, 2015) claims that there is one principle that stands behind the entire notion of metaphor conceptualisation and reconciles two forces in the creation of metaphors universality and variation. He calls this principle “the pressure of coherence”. What this actually means is that speakers are under two kinds of pressures in their attempt to be coherent with the factors of the conceptualisation of the world. The first kind of pressure comes from the embodiment which can activate the use of certain metaphors that are grounded in embodied experience. These are termed correlational metaphors and their major characteristic is that they are not prone to changes across time and culture, and are thus universal. Hence, this kind of pressure explains universality found in metaphors. The second kind of pressure comes from the context in which metaphorical conceptualisation occurs. This means that the production of metaphors can be inspired by the contextual factors, and that speakers try to be coherent with different aspects of the communicative situation (Kövecses 2015: 115). Therefore, variation found in metaphors is primarily caused by this kind of pressure. Kövecses (2015: 14) builds on his previous research on this topic and claims that these two kinds of pressures are not opposing forces in metaphor creation. They are, instead, treated as the origins or sources for the emergence of metaphors.

One more issue regarding metaphor variation that needs to be discussed is what causes metaphors to vary. Kövecses (2005: 231-258) gives an extensive account of the causes of metaphor variation. Two large groups of causes are distinguished: differential experience and differential cognitive preferences or styles. Differential experience has its own causes or subcases, as claimed in Kövecses (2014b): awareness of context, differential memory and

differential concerns and interests. Awareness of context includes awareness of the physical, social and cultural context, as well as awareness of the immediate communicative situation. Differential memory refers to the memory of objects and events shared by a community or an individual, whereas differential concerns and interests refer to the general attitude with which groups or individuals are predisposed to act in the world (Kövecses 2014b: 24-25). Differential cognitive preferences or styles include a number of cognitive processes such as: elaboration, conventionalisation, specificity, transparency, experiential focus, viewpoint preference, prototype categorization, framing, metaphor vs. metonymy preference, etc. All these processes are equally available in all languages and cultures, but there are differences in the degree of their actual application in a language or a culture, which is what brings about variation in the metaphorical conceptualisation. Kövecses (2005: 258) particularly highlights that creativity is considered as yet another very important cognitive process that acts as a cause of metaphor variation in an obvious and pervasive manner.

2.4. Metaphorical creativity

Since the development of CMT, the focus has been mainly placed on the exploration of conventional cases of conceptual metaphor that are part of our conventional conceptual system. Cases of creative use of metaphor were only briefly discussed, for example in Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 139), who mention the existence of imaginative and creative metaphors which are outside our conventional conceptual system and give our experience a new understanding. The example they discuss is the metaphor LOVE IS A COLLABORATIVE WORK OF ART, which is a novel one but seems to be entirely in accordance with our experiences of love, making them coherent. The authors also presented an insight that will play a very significant role in the future exploration of metaphorical creativity, i.e. that "... new metaphors make sense of our experience in the same way conventional metaphors do: they provide coherent structure, highlighting some things and hiding others" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 139). They also recognised the power these new metaphors have in creating a new reality, and not only offering a view of a pre-existing one. Therefore, they claim: "If a new metaphor enters the conceptual system ... it will alter that conceptual system and the perceptions and actions that the system gives rise to" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 145).

The first comprehensive account of metaphorical creativity can be found in Lakoff and Turner's 1989 book *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*, in which

they focus on examining the cases of creative use of metaphor in poetry. The authors acknowledge that metaphors are available to everyone, not only to poets, but the difference is that poets use those basic metaphors in new and unusual ways. The fact that creative metaphors used in poetry are based on the conventional ones is what makes them comprehensible to ordinary people. Lakoff and Turner (1989: 67-72) distinguish four mechanisms that lead to the production of poetic creative metaphors: extending, elaboration, questioning and composing. Extending is described as a major mode of poetic thought in which a conventional metaphor is extended through the usage of the unused aspects of the source domain. They define elaboration as "... the nonconventional elaboration of schemas, by filling in slots in unusual ways ..." (Lakoff and Turner 1989: 67). In the case of questioning, poets question the boundaries of the usual metaphorical understanding of concepts. Composing is defined as one of the most powerful mechanisms, which includes the formation of composite metaphors, i.e. using two or more different metaphors in the same sentence or passage (Lakoff and Turner 1989: 70). It can be argued that this was a starting point for the evolvement of interest in the field of metaphorical creativity from various authors such as Kövecses (2005, 2010, 2015), Semino (2008), Müller (2005, 2010), Hidalgo Downing et al. (2013), Hidalgo Downing and Kraljevic Mujic (2013), Jones (2016), etc.

Kövecses (2005: 259-267) deals with the issue of creativity within the realms of CMT and introduces the term "figurative creativity", which captures three basic cognitive operations: metaphor, metonymy and blending. In discussing metaphorical creativity he also discusses the mechanisms presented by Lakoff and Turner (1989), but he emphasises that they do not pertain to poetic language only, which is also acknowledged by other authors (Semino 2008, Müller 2005, 2010, Hidalgo Downing et al. 2013, Hidalgo Downing and Kraljevic Mujic 2013, Jones 2016) dealing with metaphorical creativity, whose views are discussed in this section. What he claims is that all the mechanisms, except for questioning, are also used by ordinary people in their everyday conceptualisation. Furthermore, Kövecses introduces one more mechanism called "negation" or "canceling", in which "... a certain metaphorical way of conceptualizing a target is canceled or replaced by an opposite metaphorical image" (Kövecses 2005: 262). Based on all his discoveries about metaphorical creativity, he provides the following definition:

By metaphorical creativity I mean the production and use of conceptual metaphors and/or their linguistic manifestations that are novel or unconventional (with the understanding that novelty and unconventionality are graded concepts that range from completely new and unconventional through more or less new and unconventional to well-worn, entrenched and completely conventional cases). (Kövecses 2010: 664)

Starting from Lakoff and Turner's (1989) study, Semino (2008) suggests that a proper account of metaphorical creativity ought to consider both the conceptual and linguistic levels of metaphors, highlighting that the latter one has previously been undermined. In her view, a metaphorical expression can be regarded as novel when its metaphorical meaning in a particular context of use is not one of the conventional senses of the expression (Semino 2008: 53). Apart from studying metaphorical creativity in literature, she also demonstrates that creative metaphors characterise other genres too, such as political speeches, advertising and scientific writing.

Müller (2005, 2010) acknowledges the complexity of the notion of metaphorical creativity. Taking into consideration that the category of creative metaphor involves literary examples, such as novel and poetic metaphors, the author seeks the way to extend the category beyond that and include other types of discourse that are not considered to be very creative, such as political discourse. In that sense he provides the following definition:

If we understand conventionality in terms of expectations within a given discourse or genre, we can define "creative metaphors" as expressions which draw attention to their metaphoricity because they deviate creatively from conventional ways of expressing things and thoughts within a particular discourse or genre. (Müller 2010: 323)

Furthermore, considering the fact that creative metaphors serve a practical function, this definition needs to be supplemented by an important social aspect, which means that for a metaphor to be creative, it has to be accepted and explored by the social environment, i.e. the audience. Otherwise, it fails its purpose (Müller 2005: 57, Müller 2010: 323-324).

Hidalgo Downing et al. (2013: 200) also extend the category of metaphorical creativity to real discourse and approach this issue by combining the insights from CMT and discourse-based approaches. They view metaphorical creativity as a phenomenon that involves cognitive, semantic and discourse-pragmatic, contextual features. Moreover, relying on Sternberg's (1999) definition of metaphorical creativity as the capacity to produce phenomena which are novel and adaptive, Hidalgo Downing and Kraljevic Mujic (2013: 134) find that an important characteristic of creative metaphors in real discourse is that most of them are not necessarily novel, but rather, constitute adaptations of already existing conventional metaphors and their combinations, as well as of other cognitive phenomena. Based on these claims, Hidalgo Downing (2016: 108) further emphasises the impact of context on metaphorical or metonymic creativity:

... since novelty, understood as original and unexpected, and appropriateness, understood as adaptive concerning a specific task, point to the contextual nature of metaphoric and metonymic creative acts, and to the fact that such acts receive the ‘value’ of being creative by specific social communities.

Finally, recent trends in discourse analytical approach to creativity surpass the formal aspects of creative language, including creative metaphors, expanding into the area of language use in social contexts with the purpose of creating new kinds of social identities and social practices. What distinguishes this approach from the linguistic ones is that it is more concerned with the way in which “linguistic resources are used to engage in creative actions – actions that somehow reconfigure or reshape social relationships” (Jones 2016: 62).

2.4.1. Creativity based on conceptual domains

Kövecses (2005) distinguishes two types of metaphorical creativity based on conceptual domains: creativity based on the source domain and creativity based on the target domain.

Creativity based on the source domain is also called source-related creativity and can be of two kinds: source-internal and source-external creativity. In the case of source-internal creativity, the target is understood by using the unused source-internal conceptual material. It involves the cases of elaboration and extending found in Lakoff and Turner (1989). The example Lakoff and Turner (1989: 67) use to illustrate this is the conventional metaphor DEATH IS SLEEP found in Hamlet’s soliloquy “To die to sleep? Perchance to dream!” Here dreaming is used as an extension of the source domain of SLEEP. When it comes to source-external creativity, it can be associated with the phenomenon presented by Kövecses (2005), which is known as the range of target. It means that in the process of metaphor conceptualisation new, additional source domains are available to a particular target domain. Kövecses (2005: 70-71) explains this by providing the example of the metaphor given by Ning Yu (1998), HAPPINESS IS FLOWERS IN THE HEART, which means that the target domain of HAPPINESS has received an additional, new source domain, that of FLOWERS IN THE HEART.

The second type of creativity is the one based on the target domain, also called target-induced creativity, which Kövecses (2010b: 665) defines as “... a particular target that is conventionally associated with a source “connects back” to the source taking further knowledge structures from it”. He exemplifies this case with the metaphor, provided by Musolff (2001), EUROPE IS A BUILDING, in which a metaphorical expression, such as “fire exit”, is selected from the source domain of BUILDING based on the knowledge about the

target domain. Semino (2008) introduces the term topic-triggering, which refers to the cases when a source domain is triggered by some aspects of the target domain, or by the topic, which corresponds to target-induced creativity. Furthermore, Semino (2008) notes that Koller (2004a) also discusses the same phenomenon, using the term topic-triggered metaphors. This is exemplified in an extract from the speech of a Republican Rudolph Giuliani, mayor of New York at the time of the 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centre, who refers to Saddam Hussein as “a weapon of mass destruction” in order to defend the US administration’s decision to go to war in Iraq in 2003. Though never actually found, the weapons of mass destruction were used as the major justification for going into this war and overthrowing Saddam Hussein’s regime. Therefore, Giuliani’s use of this very notion is clearly triggered by the knowledge about the target domain, since the real-world connection between Saddam Hussein and weapons of mass destruction was still very strong (Semino 2008: 105).

2.4.2. Context-induced creativity

As already indicated, the previous two types of metaphorical creativity have been introduced and discussed in Kövecses (2005). In his 2010b paper, he suggests the existence of the third type of creativity which has not been systematically explored within the realms of CMT, i.e. creativity induced by the context in which metaphorical conceptualisation occurs. Kövecses (2010b: 665) termed it context-induced creativity and the metaphors that emerge in that way context-induced metaphors. Considering the role that context plays in metaphor variation and the fact that metaphorical creativity acts as one of the causes of variation, it is natural to assume that contextual factors play a major role in the production of creative metaphors. There are five contextual factors that commonly produce unconventional and novel metaphors: 1) the immediate physical setting, 2) what we know about the major entities participating in the discourse, 3) the immediate cultural context, 4) the immediate social setting and 5) the immediate linguistic context (Kövecses 2015: 99).

Besides the already discussed topic-triggering, in her exploration of the usage of creative metaphors in political discourse, Semino (2008) also discusses the notion of situational triggering. Situational-triggering refers to any nonmetaphorical connection that exists between a particular metaphorical source domain and some aspect of the relevant situational context, which can include the speaker, the setting, etc. If compared to the

classification given by Kövecses (2010b), situational triggering seems to capture a part of context-induced creativity. For example, Silvio Berlusconi, who was the owner of AC Milan at the time of its great accomplishments, uses FOOTBALL metaphors to refer to the nation and thus consciously exploits his association with football to suggest that what he did for AC Milan can also be done for Italy, and that the nation ought to trust him in the same way as the members of his football team do. This shows how existing nonmetaphorical associations of the source domain can be exploited or reinforced by situation-triggered metaphors, adding rhetorical strength to the speaker's/writer's arguments (Semino 2008: 105-106). Moreover, Semino (2008: 124) notes: "Indeed, the role of the specific context of use is crucial in order to understand the possible motivation for the choice of a particular metaphor, and its possible effects on listeners or readers." Some of the contextual factors that Semino (2008) discusses include the topic of the discourse, situational context, experiences and individual dimension, which is reflected in variation in different genres, works by different authors and individual texts. Furthermore, Semino et al. (2013) explore the phenomenon of recontextualisation in order to account for the power of context in the emergence of creative metaphors. They suggest that the change of context can bring changes to the previously established metaphors and thus adapt them so that they are able to realise their functions in accordance to the new demands of a new context of use. The authors also highlight the role of conceptualisers or creators and their ability to exploit and extend the existing metaphors: "... the original creators of the metaphors were successful in providing metaphors that fulfilled those functions for their own purposes, and that others could creatively exploit to fulfil their own specific needs in different contexts" (Semino et al. 2013: 57). They also argue that a consideration of genre and situational context can help to explain the different ways in which metaphors are recontextualised in different domains of activity, particularly in terms of differences and changes in function (Semino et al. 2013: 44). In that sense, Hidalgo Downing et al. (2013: 201) argue that interaction between context-motivated variation in metaphor and embodied universal cognitive concepts, such as image schemas, plays a crucial role in the emergence of creative metaphors. It can be said that context includes both the sender and receiver, which foregrounds the interactive and performative nature of metaphorical interpretation and understanding, together with all the complexities this may involve in certain types of discourse with regard to cognitive, social and cultural factors (Hidalgo Downing and Kraljevic Mujic 2013: 135).

In his 2005 article, in which he investigates creative metaphors in political discourse, Müller emphasises the complexity of this notion and suggests the existence of a continuum of the degrees of creativity, highlighting the importance of context. He (2010: 321-332) gives a more detailed account of creativity, trying to extend it beyond the literary examples of novel or poetic metaphors, as set by Lakoff and Turner (1989). He explores metaphorical creativity within a particular discourse or genre, emphasising the importance of the context of production. He suggests five levels of analysis that ought to be taken into consideration: co-textual, which implies that the immediate textual surroundings may highlight the metaphor; textual, in which metaphor is highlighted because of its role in an overall text structure; context, which foregrounds the metaphor, as in the case of topic-triggered metaphors; conceptual, which consists of elaboration, extension and composing of novel mappings; discourse, which includes intertextuality, extension, elaboration. All these levels may provide information that might play an important role in assessing metaphorical creativity (Müller 2010: 324-325).

Musolff does not focus on the issue of context directly. However, in his studies of metaphors in political discourse, he has recognised that the metaphor variation depends on some contextual factors. Musolff (2004: 79) identifies the importance of reconsidering context which both constrains the metaphor use and allows for variation. He is more specific in his book *Political Metaphor Analysis* (2016) where he identifies that metaphors can be grounded in users' own life experiences together with a focusing effect, which makes it possible to access knowledge/experience frames that can be creatively applied to the target topic (Musolff 2016: 33). Furthermore, it has been noticed that "even within relatively homogenous cultural groups, variation was found to be pervasive" (Musolff 2016: 134), which the author ties to sociocultural factors.

Gibbs and Lonergan (2009) highlight the fact that metaphors are no longer seen as decontextualised entities that are studied in isolation. As products of discourse, metaphors are entirely contextualised and inseparable from the contexts in which they emerge. Thus they claim:

... we do not simply imply that discourse contexts give specific meanings to metaphors, as if metaphors are pre-existing entities of language and thought, with context adding seasoning to flavour each specific metaphor as it is used. Instead, and more dramatically, metaphors are inseparable from context because there is no division between metaphor and discourse, given that metaphors are both products of discourse and creators of discourse. (Gibbs and Lonergan 2009: 251)

Badri (2017: 223-230) deals with the issue of context-induced metaphorical creativity within the framework set by Kövecses (2015). However, in exploring metaphorical creativity in online interactive talk, the author claims that this framework has overlooked the role of very important contextual variables, communicative intention and ideology, which apparently play a significant role in shaping creative metaphors in discourse.

2.4.2.1. The role of the contextual factors in metaphorical creativity

The constant interaction between the conceptual system and the context from which it emerges produces a change in the conceptual system, causing this change to be used in the next application of the system (Kövecses 2014b: 21). This brings about variation in the metaphorical conceptualisation and, consequently, it motivates the production of creative metaphors. It was this fact that put the role of the context into focus of recent metaphor investigation. The change of interest can be attributed to the constant criticism that the standard CMT was disregarding the real discourse, which is claimed to manifest the metaphorical conceptualisation in the best possible way. Kövecses was among the first scholars who explored this issue in several of his recent works and offered a quite extensive study of the role the context has in motivating the creation of novel and unconventional metaphors in real discourse, which is the reason why his classification of contextual factors will be used in this dissertation. He emphasises that the context is in fact a major source of motivation for the use of novel metaphors. Kövecses (2015: 97-116) deals with the issue of context and, with the purpose of clarifying the issue, he distinguishes two basic kinds of context: global and local contexts. In Kövecses (2017a, 2017b) there is yet another type of classification which will also be discussed in this section.

2.4.2.1.1. Global contexts

Global contexts encompass contextual factors that affect the metaphorical conceptualisation of all members of a language community. These factors include: physical environment, social setting, cultural setting, differential memory and differential concerns and interests.

Physical environment as a kind of global context involves all the differences in the physical environment in which people live such as: geography, landscape, flora and fauna,

dwellings, other people. Since people are continuously in contact with all these factors, their metaphors may vary from one language, or its variety, to another. A good example is when a language developed in a certain physical environment is moved to a very different one. This is what happened to English which was moved to a very different physical environment of North America. Consequently, metaphorical language was slightly changed in accordance with the new environment (Kövecses 2015: 100).

Social setting also shapes the metaphorical understanding in a community. For instance, the difference between men and women, which is a part of every society, causes their metaphors to vary. Kövecses (2015: 100) gives the example of Annette Kolodny's (1975, 1984) study in which she shows that men and women had different metaphorical conceptualisation of the frontier in the period between 1630 and 1860. While men viewed the frontier as a virgin land to be taken, women viewed it as garden to be cultivated.

Cultural setting includes "... the unique and salient concepts and values that characterize particular (sub)cultures – together with the governing principles of a given culture or subculture" (Kövecses 2015: 101). These governing principles directly affect the domains of experience and thus metaphorical conceptualisation gets affected too. A good example is provided in the study of Boers and Demecheleer (1997, 2001) who claim that the concepts of HAT and SHIP are more metaphorically productive in English, whereas the concepts of SLEEVE and FOOD seem to be more productive in French due to the salience of these concepts in the aforementioned cultures (Kövecses 2015: 101).

Differential memory incorporates the memory of major and minor events that occurred in the past of a particular society, culture, group or individual, which are encoded into the language. In the study conducted by Niki Köves (2002), it has been demonstrated that Hungarians, due to their war history, tend to conceptualise life using the metaphors LIFE IS WAR and LIFE IS A COMPROMISE. On the other hand, Americans, who do not have a history of wars like Hungarians, view life in terms of the metaphors LIFE IS A PRECIOUS POSSESSION and LIFE IS A GAME (Kövecses 2015: 101).

Differential concerns and interests refer to a different set of concerns and interests that characterise a particular society. Thus Americans are claimed to be prone to action rather than passivity, which can explain a frequent use of sports and game metaphors. This does not mean that other nations do not use these metaphors. It is just that Americans use them more

frequently than others and, therefore, have a more extensive range of target concepts (Kövecses 2015: 101-102).

2.4.2.1.2. Local contexts

According to Kövecses (2015: 102-112), metaphorical conceptualisation can also be affected by more immediate local contexts. He also emphasises that global and local contexts form a continuum that ranges from the most immediate local contexts to the most general global ones. Local contexts are of several kinds: the immediate physical setting, the knowledge about the main entities in the discourse, the immediate cultural context, the immediate social setting and the immediate linguistic context.

If the physical environment, as a global context, influences the choice of metaphors in a particular culture or society, it is natural then to assume that the immediate physical setting has an even greater impact. In Kövecses (2015: 102-103), several parts of the immediate physical setting are mentioned: the physical events and their consequences, the various aspects of the physical environment and the perceptual qualities that characterise the setting. The author discusses an example of how the physical events and their consequences affect the metaphorical conceptualisation and possibly trigger the extension of already existing conventional conceptual metaphors. He analyses a statement by an American journalist who interviewed Fats Domino, a famous New Orleans musician, after the hurricane Katrina struck New Orleans. In this interview he used a metaphorical statement “The 2005 hurricane *capsized* Domino’s life”, which is based on the general metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY and a more specific one LIFE IS A SEA JOURNEY. Kövecses (2015: 103) thus suggests that the choice of SEA JOURNEY as the source domain could be influenced by the role of the sea in the hurricane, and the choice of the verb *capsize* could also be the result of the still visible consequences of the hurricane.

The major entities of a discourse include the speaker (conceptualiser), the hearer (addressee) and the topic, all of which can prompt a speaker/conceptualiser to choose a particular metaphor. The example of how the knowledge a speaker/conceptualiser has about himself/herself can affect the selection of metaphor is found in Kövecses (2015: 104-105). It is the example from the area of therapy or psychological counselling, where the cases of novel and unconventional metaphors are frequently found. The author takes the case of a

photographic artist Frank Jump, suffering from AIDS, but who has outlived his expected life span. He metaphorically connects his illness and his art of photographing old painted mural advertisements in New York, even though he is not conscious of that at first. The conceptual metaphor employed here is SURVIVING AIDS DESPITE PREDICTIONS TO THE CONTRARY IS FOR THE OLD MURAL ADVERTISEMENTS TO SURVIVE THEIR EXPECTED “LIFE SPAN”. This is obviously a novel and unconventional metaphor that results from what the conceptualiser knows about himself. The confirmation that the knowledge about the addressee also prompts novel metaphors is found in the article in which the author addresses the new coach of the English football team, an Italian Fabio Capello. In his recommendation that David Beckham should play in the match against Switzerland, he says: “Beckham is a good footballer and a nice man; *e una bella figura*”. Here, Beckham is compared to a figure or shape, but the usage of Italian shows that the knowledge about the language of the addressee must have had an impact on the choice of the metaphor (Kövecses 2015: 105-106). Finally, the influence of the topic on the metaphorical conceptualisation can be demonstrated in the example of an article about the cyclist Lance Armstrong, who was involved in the doping scandal. One of the crisis management experts said that his confessions had not been sufficient up to that point, claiming that Armstrong was still “in the mountain stage”. The choice of the MOUNTAIN STAGE metaphor has clearly been influenced by the expert’s knowledge that Armstrong had participated in Tour de France races, which have several mountain stages (Kövecses 2017b: 316). Personal concerns are considered to be a special case here. Kövecses (2015: 107) gives the example of how one’s professional interests may lead a person to use the source domains that are based on one’s professional interests. The example is from Hungarian newspapers in which the author, an electric engineer, comments on the relationship between Hungary and Europe using electricity and electric circuitry as source domains.

Immediate cultural context, such as the set of specific ideas, values, practices, artefacts that characterise a particular language community, can actively participate in influencing the choice of metaphors. Kövecses (2017b: 310-311) proves this claim in the statement by Bill Whalen, from *San Francisco Chronicle*, in which he talks about Arnold Schwarzenegger during his campaign. Particularly interesting are two unconventional and novel metaphors: “This is the Rise of the Machine[s]”, “not Attack of the Clones”. What motivated the speaker to use these metaphors is the fact that the films mentioned are known to everyone in California and the USA, hence being a part of the immediate cultural context.

As Kövecses (2015: 109-110) claims, the social context involves a variety of relations: the social relationships between the participants of the discourse, gender roles of the participants, various social occasions in which the discourse takes place, etc. Each one of them can possibly be involved in prompting the choice of a particular metaphor. For instance, in the article about Fats Domino, who lost his house in the Hurricane Katrina, the author of the article uses the following metaphorical expression: “The rock “n” roll pioneer rebuilds his life”, which is an instance of the LIFE IS A JOURNEY conceptual metaphors. The choice of this particular metaphor is due to the social situation of Domino rebuilding his house. The general conclusion that can be drawn from this is:

... There is a particular social setting and there is a particular target meaning that needs to be activated. If the meaning can be activated by means of a metaphorical mapping that fits the actual social setting, speakers/conceptualizers will prefer to choose that mapping (together with the linguistic expressions that are based on the mapping). (Kövecses 2015: 110)

There are cases when novel and unconventional metaphors are selected by the impact of the immediate linguistic context. Kövecses (2015: 110-111) uses the text from *The Times* in which the following metaphorical expressions are found: “tilt the balance-and Mr Hain-over the edge”. The first metaphorical expression “tilt the balance” is a case of conventional metaphor. As for the second metaphorical expression, “and Mr Hain-over the edge”, the word “tilt” can be supplied despite being omitted because it has already been used in the first expression. When compared to the first one, this metaphor is much more unconventional and novel. What caused the emergence of the second metaphor is the word “tilt” used in the first one. It can be concluded that “... the phonetic shape of an expression in discourse can function as an elicitor of a metaphorically used expression in the same discourse, provided that the condition of fitting the required conceptual metaphor is also met” (Kövecses 2015: 111). Furthermore, some metaphor-based puns²⁶ are considered to be a special case of how the immediate linguistic context can influence the selection of metaphors.

2.4.2.1.3. Other types of contexts

Apart from the general distinction between global and local contexts, Kövecses (2017a, 2017b) also offers the classification of contexts based on the major areas of human interaction with the world. According to this more recent classification there are four kinds of contexts, which also have their subtypes. The first one is the situational context, also called the

²⁶ For more information, see Kövecses (2015: 111-112).

extralinguistic context, and it includes the subtypes such as the cultural situation, the social situation and the physical setting. The second type includes the conceptual-cognitive context. It consists of a number of subtypes: conceptual system, ideology, memory of events and things and concerns and interests. The third is the discourse context, which includes the immediate linguistic context (also termed co-text), previous discourses on the same topic and the knowledge about the main elements of the discourse (Kövecses 2017b: 312-316). The fourth one is the bodily context, which does not affect the metaphorical conceptualisation only globally and universally, but can also motivate the emergence of metaphors locally as well. It consists of the form, functioning and the state of the human body. For instance, as Casasanto (2009) finds, left-handed people prefer to use the MORAL IS LEFT, whereas right-handed people prefer MORAL IS RIGHT (Kövecses 2017a: 15-16). Apart from offering a new classification of contextual factors, Kövecses (2017a: 16) also establishes the view that the standard CMT ought to be reformulated along contextualist lines, which implies that all metaphors result from contextual factors of some kind. Furthermore, he claims that all the various types of contexts can be regarded as culture since "... the conceptual system through which we interpret reality lends culture specificity to not just the situation context as culture but also to all the other types, including the body" (Kövecses 2017b: 322).

It is important to note that the contextual factors presented here do not function independently in real discourse. What frequently happens is that several of them are found to function in combination and thus influence the use of metaphors in particular discourse situations.

2.4.2.2. Operationalising metaphorical conceptualisation in context

Kövecses (2017b) proposes a set of cognitive mechanisms that enable the production of metaphors in a discourse situation under the impact of context. There are four such mechanisms: cognitive/construal operations, local versus global context, contextual priming and conceptual pathways.

A particular cognitive/construal operation is chosen among many by a speaker in a certain context. These cognitive/construal operations include: schematisation/abstraction, attention/focusing, prominence/salience, perspective, metonymy, metaphor, mental spaces

and conceptual integration. It frequently happens that several of them are used to constitute alternative choices for the construal of a situation (Kövecses 2017b: 318).

The influence of the global and local contexts has already been discussed. For the present purpose, we will remind ourselves that global context implies knowledge shared by an entire community of conceptualisers and enables them to draw entrenched metaphors from long-term memory. On the other hand, local context implies specific knowledge in a specific communicative situation which enables the conceptualisers either to select metaphors from among the existing ones or to create novel metaphors (Kövecses 2017b: 318-319).

Priming is a cognitive process based on the simulation of some experience in a given context. This means that the experiences in the global or local contexts can prompt or prime the use of either conventional or novel metaphors in a certain discourse situation. As Kövecses (2017b: 320) says, "It is shared experience (the dynamically evolving common ground in a situation) that enables the production and comprehension of metaphors in discourse".

Conceptual pathways consist of several conceptual metaphors and metonymies which are necessary for understanding the intended meaning of a certain metaphor. They are very important in establishing the connection between two, at times, very distant meanings. A particular metaphorical meaning can be conveyed if a specific target-domain meaning is expressible by the context-induced source-domain meaning, provided that a particular conceptual pathway can be established between the two meanings. The example provided is taken from Semino's (2008) study of the metaphors used by different participants of G8 summit meeting in 2005, which was accompanied by a huge concert called Live 8. One such metaphor is produced by Dr. Kumi Naidoo who said that the concert Live 8 produced "the roar", whereas the G8 only "a whisper". The metaphor "whisper" emerges from the physical- (social) context in which it was produced, i.e. a very loud concert as opposed to a quiet summit meeting. The pathway required in this case consists of the following metaphors and metonymies: INTENSITY IS STRENGTH OF EFFECT, EMOTIONAL RESPONSES FOR THE EMOTIONS, ANGRY BEHAVIOUR FOR ANGER/ARGUMENT and EMOTION FOR DETERMINATION TO ACT. All of them are necessary for the proper understanding of the metaphor, especially INTENSITY IS STRENGTH OF EFFECT, because it establishes the connection between the degree of loudness of the verbal behaviour and the intensity of the determination to act (Kövecses 2017b: 320-321).

According to Kövecses (2017b: 317), these cognitive processes function together and seem to be a prerequisite for the production of a particular metaphorical expression in a discourse situation. Thus, in order for context to impact the production of metaphor, the speaker chooses metaphor from a variety of cognitive operations, the speaker is then exposed to various contextual factors and is primed by one or several contextual factors that can conceptually be matched to the intended target domain by means of an appropriate conceptual pathway (Kövecses 2017b: 322).

2.5. Political discourse

Human political engagement has been the subject of interest and study ever since the ancient times, due to the role that politics has always had in shaping societies. Since much of the political activity rests upon achieving rhetorical goals, such as persuasion, the special importance has been given to political discourse, which best demonstrates the intricate and inseparable links that exist between politics and language. The acknowledgement of this fundamental connection has motivated much of the exploration in this area of study. Subtle indications of the relationship between politics and language can be found in Aristotle's accounts on rhetoric, which was considered to be an essential part of citizenship in ancient Greece (Dunmire 2012: 735). Fairclough (2012: 18-20) thus claims that it was Aristotle who established the connection between human power of speech and their political nature by claiming that the purpose of speech is to make distinction between what is useful and harmful and what is just or unjust. Furthermore, Aristotle's views lead one to conclude that the political genre of deliberation is what sets political discourse apart from other types of discourses. In a similar fashion, Cicero assigned rhetoric the role of "a powerful political weapon for shaping political belief and action" (Dunmire 2012: 735), highlighting that the essence of the citizen's duty was to cultivate the power of speech (Chilton 2004: ix).

Through centuries, the attitude towards the power of language has undergone various changes. Thus, Chilton (2004: ix) notes that the eighteenth century Europe deeply distrusted the potential of language. However, the twentieth century witnessed the renewal of interest in the issues of language. According to Wilson (2001: 400), the figure that emphasised the political potential of language in more recent times was George Orwell, who studied the ways in which language may be used for political manipulation of people's minds. Scholarly interest in political discourse studies started in the early 1980's and 1990's and resulted in the

emergence of various areas of studies such as Critical Linguistics, Political Discourse Analysis, Critical Discourse Analysis, Discourse Historical Approach, etc. The idea of an inseparable bond between politics and language has been emphasised even more in the works of recent political discourse scholars such as Fairclough (1995, 2012), Wilson (2001), Chilton and Schäffner (2002), van Dijk (2002), Chilton (2004), Koller (2004, 2009), Charteris-Black (2011), etc. The most encompassing seems to be the explanation given by Charteris-Black (2011: 4): “Language is the lifeblood of politics: it is debatable whether language would have developed in the first place without politics and certain that politics would have never developed without language.”

Regarding the meaning of politics and political discourse, Chilton and Schäffner (2002: 4-5) explain that the definition of politics varies according to one’s situation and purposes, but that there are two broad strands found in both the traditional study of politics and discourse studies of politics. According to one stance, politics is seen as a struggle for power, whereas the other sees politics as cooperation. Moreover, as Chilton and Schäffner (2002: 5) note, crosscutting these two stances, there is yet a distinction between micro and macro levels. The micro level includes conflicts of interest, struggle for dominance and efforts at cooperation between different kinds of social groups. On the other hand, macro level involves the political institutions of the state, the purpose of which is to resolve the conflicts of interest, but also to assert the power of a dominant individual or group. Semino (2008: 85) agrees that the domain of politics is difficult to define and suggests that it involves a variety of individuals, groups, institutions, activities, genres and discourses, adding that “at the core of politics ... are processes that involve the acquisition, maintenance, negotiation, exercise and loss of power in local, national and international contexts”. Charteris-Black (2011: 4) considers that acquiring, maintaining and sustaining power are the main concerns of politics and claims that politics is “... about how resources are allocated and how social actions are harmonised to predetermined purposes”. Fairclough (2012: 1) sees politics as being mainly about making choices of how to act in particular circumstances, emphasising that these choices are based upon practical argumentation.

Based on Fairclough’s (1996: 71) definition of discourse as “any spoken or written language use conceived as social practice”, Koller (2004: 18) provides her own definition, in which discourse means “the totality of interrelated texts, both written and spoken, which are produced about a particular domain”. In a similar way, Semino (2008: 1) refers to discourse as

“naturally occurring language use”, which includes real instances of speech or writing that emerge in particular circumstances and with particular aims.

Just as it is the case with politics, political discourse seems to be equally difficult to grasp. Thus, Wilson (2001: 398) explains the reflexive and ambiguous nature of the term political discourse, suggesting two possibilities. While in one case it might involve a discourse that is itself political, in the other it can refer to an analysis of political discourse as simply an example of discourse type, without being explicitly related to political content or political context. The author especially highlights the confusion created by some definitions that consider almost all discourse political, which may lead to the overgeneralisation of the concept of political discourse. A possible solution to this problem is delimiting political discourse to political contexts and political actors²⁷, i.e. “politicians, political institutions, governments, political media, and political supporters operating in political environments to achieve political goals” (Wilson 2001: 398). Fairclough (2012: 17-18) holds the same view but he argues that political contexts play a central role in defining a discourse as political, adding that even the discourse of political actors which is outside the political contexts is not considered to be political. Furthermore, he explains that political contexts incorporate the institutional dimension, which involves political contexts within parliaments and governments, as well as weakly institutionalised contexts such as internet discussion forums where governments are publicly criticised for their actions. However, Dunmire (2012: 738) notes that Wodak and de Cilia (2006) extend the concept of political discourse to everyday language which is constantly infiltrated in institutionalised politics, whereas Chilton (2004) describes political discourse as being determined situationally and eventually a matter of interpretation.

As already indicated, the growing interest into the exploration of political discourse has resulted in the emergence of several linguistic approaches to the issue of political discourse. The first to be discussed is Political Discourse Analysis (henceforth PDA) which emerged in the late twentieth century as a comprehensive research area²⁸ with the aim of exploring linguistic and discursive aspects of political discourse. Dunmire (2012: 745) states that the main purpose of PDA is “elucidating the role discourse plays in a range of political

²⁷ Wilson (2001:399) further claims that even though delimitations often prove to be useful, they are, nevertheless, problematic because they are difficult to maintain in exact terms. Even though the balance is difficult to maintain, it is up to analysts to clearly set their motivations and perspectives.

²⁸ Dunmire (2012: 735) argues that PDA is both interdisciplinary, in the sense that it includes methods, frameworks and contents of other disciplines, and multidisciplinary, in the sense of bringing together multiple disciplines in its investigation of socio-political issues and phenomena.

contexts and practices, as well as the intrinsically political nature of discursive practice”. The author also mentions van Dijk’s (1997) account of how PDA can refer to both, analysis of political discourse and critical approach to discourse analysis, which essentially means that PDA is “concerned with understanding the nature and function of political discourse and with critiquing the role discourse plays in producing, maintaining, abusing, and resisting power in contemporary society” (Dunmire 2012: 736). Moreover, Fairclough (2012: 17) contributes to PDA by introducing a new approach which views political discourse as primarily argumentative discourse²⁹.

The next approach, that also emerged by the end of the twentieth century, as a branch of applied linguistics, primarily in the works of Fairclough (1985) and van Dijk (1990), is Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA). Stenvoll (2008: 36) mentions two ideas behind CDA suggested by van Dijk (1990): bringing more focus to socio-political structure in linguistic and socio-psychological studies of language and encouraging more empirical text analysis within social scientific discourse analysis. Based on what Fairclough (2010) said about CDA, Merkl-Davies and Koller (2012: 180) explain that CDA is “an interdisciplinary approach to analysing written and spoken texts that views language as a form of social practice and focuses on the way in which social and political domination are constructed, reproduced, or challenged, by text or talk”. On the other hand, Musolff (2016: 3) provides a much more concise definition by referring to CDA as an approach concerned with studying the relationship between ideology and power relationships. What matters most and makes it more appealing to the researchers is the fact that CDA becomes, as Neagu (2013: 17) puts it, “an overarching approach comprising a cluster of methods of discourse analysis”, or as Dunmire (2012: 740) notes, an approach with a quite diverse analytic frameworks which include sociolinguistics, ethnography and linguistic anthropology, discursive and social psychology, conversation analysis and pragmatics. This is also what makes CDA compatible for combination with CMT, which is the issue to be discussed later in this chapter.

Another approach that deserves to be mentioned is Discourse-Historical Approach (henceforth DHA), whose major proponent is Ruth Wodak (2001, 2009). Musolff (2016:4) states that, according to Wodak (2001), the aim of this approach is to integrate linguistic, social and historical methods in order to achieve an in-depth triangulation of language use in its full sociohistorical context. Fairclough (2012: 21-22) also acknowledges the contribution

²⁹ For more information of this integrated new approach, see Fairclough (2012).

that this approach has had to the study of political discourse, but marks this approach as taxonomical, rather than analytical. He quotes Wodak's (2009) classification of politics into several fields of action³⁰, each of them being associated with a different set of political sub-genres, which in fact demonstrates the extensive diversity of political discourse.

Finally, among the influential approaches to the analysis of political discourse is the one advocated by Paul Chilton (2004). What is particularly important here is the fact that the author combines a cognitive approach with the ones aimed at analysing political discourse as a social phenomenon, emphasising that political discourse, apart from being a social phenomenon, is also a cognitive phenomenon. Starting from van Dijk's (2002) claim that political discourse is a product of individual and collective mental processes (Chilton 2004: 50), Chilton (2004: 28) argues that "... language and political behaviour can be thought of as based on the cognitive endowments of the human mind rather than as social practices ...". The importance of the role of metaphor in political discourse has also been recognised, with the emphasis on its cognitive nature. His approach has brought about further research in the area of political discourse combining CMT and CDA in order to account for the extensive use of metaphor in political discourse.

The common thread that links all these approaches is the interconnection of linguistic and social aspects of political discourse. This proves to be very significant for the study of metaphor in political discourse, which surpasses the boundaries of the traditional CMT, which limits metaphor to its conceptual nature exclusively, and extends to the study of metaphor in real discourse in which it actually occurs.

2.5.1. Metaphor and discourse

So far, the paper has dealt with metaphor within the realms of CMT, which highlights its cognitive nature and places metaphor at the centre of human conceptual system by claiming that metaphors are not only a matter of language but also a matter of thought. However, there is more to metaphor than the standard CMT can account for. Recently, more and more emphasis has been put on studying metaphor in context, i.e. real discourse in which it is

³⁰ These fields of action include: "lawmaking procedures; formation of public attitudes, opinion and will; party-internal formation of attitudes, opinion and will; inter-party formation of attitudes, opinion and will, organization of international/inter-state relations; political advertising; political executive and administration; political control" (Wodak 2009: 41 in Fairclough 2012: 21).

actually found (Koller 2004, 2009; Semino 2008; Semino et al. 2016; Gibbs and Lonergan 2009; Musolff 2006, 2012, 2016; Charteris-Black 2004, 2011, etc.), which sheds new light on the standard CMT view of metaphor, offering new perspectives and possibilities.

In the light of discussing metaphor in discourse, Semino (2008: 1) presents metaphor as a “pervasive linguistic phenomenon” performing a variety of functions, occurring in different types of discourse, from informal interactions to political or scientific discourse. When it comes to the functions of metaphors in discourse, the most important one is the representation of reality and its particular aspects (Semino 2008: 31). It has also been recognised that metaphors perform rhetorical goals in discourse, as well as that they play an important role in providing coherence of a particular text in which they occur. Furthermore, Semino et al. (2016) combine cognitive and discourse-based approaches, apply them to a corpus-based study of metaphors, and thus introduce an integrated multi-level framework, which includes three levels of generality in metaphor analysis, conceptual metaphors, metaphor scenarios and linguistic metaphors. In doing so, they focus on the framing function of metaphor³¹, emphasising that:

... the framing implications of metaphors in discourse can only be adequately explained by considering more specific sub-domain conceptual structures we refer to as scenarios, and by allowing for the emergent and context-sensitive properties of specific (groups of) expressions as used by members of particular discourse communities (Semino et al. 2016: 18).

As it has already been discussed in chapter 2.4.2., Gibbs and Lonergan (2009: 251) also highlight the importance of studying metaphors in the contexts in which they occur. This brings about an important conclusion that much of our thinking is closely connected to “acts of speaking and writing, or communicating, where it may not be possible to strip away the conceptual from pragmatic, or thoughts away from the discourse concepts in which they occur” (Gibbs and Lonergan 2009: 260).

Koller (2004: 3) advocates an integrated approach to the study of metaphor in discourse that combines cognitive theories of metaphors and critical approaches to language and discourse. The reason is that both areas of study can benefit from each other, metaphor research by focusing more on socio-cultural and ideological functions of metaphor, and critical approaches by taking into account cognitive aspects. In Koller (2009: 120), this

³¹ The authors provide the explanation that the notions of frame and framing have been used in a variety of fields, which subsequently makes it difficult to have a single definition. Thus they define frame as “a portion of background knowledge that (i) concerns a particular aspect of the world, (ii) generates expectations and inferences in communication and action, and (iii) tends to be associated with particular lexical and grammatical choices in language” (Semino et al. 2016: 3).

approach is referred to as an integrated critical cognitive analysis of discourse, the focus of which is on the role of metaphor in linking cognition with language use as a social practice.

Charteris-Black (2004, 2011) offers one more kind of an integrated approach inspired by CMT and CDA, i.e., Critical Metaphor Analysis (henceforth CMA). CMA has been identified as an important and inter-disciplinary approach which enables one to see connections across unrelated areas of human enquiry (Charteris-Black 2004: 246). The approach is aimed at analysing metaphors and identifying the intentions and ideologies underlying language use. There are three stages in this approach: identification, interpretation and explanation of metaphors (Charteris-Black 2004: 45). To put it more precisely, CMA enables one to “identify which metaphors were chosen and explain why these metaphors were chosen, by illustrating how they contribute to political myths” (Charteris-Black 2011: 47).

2.5.1.1. *Metaphor in political discourse*

Metaphor has always had an important place in political discourse, though the attitude towards it has undergone substantial changes, from viewing it as a rhetorical device in the time of Aristotle, to the more recent recognition of its cognitive nature. As previously discussed, the most recent approaches are concerned with examining metaphor from several perspectives, placing it at the very heart of the discourse from which it emerges. Even though different kinds of discourses are taken into consideration, it can be argued that political discourse takes precedence, most probably due to the role politics plays in shaping realities. The present section will give a short overview of how the study of the role of metaphor in political discourse developed from primarily standard CMT approach to the more recent one, based on the combination of CMT with discourse approaches and corpus linguistics.

From its very beginnings, CMT has acknowledged the power metaphor has in influencing our experiences and realities, and subsequently politics itself. However, CMT studied metaphor outside the context or the real discourse from which it emerges, mostly relying on the examples that were invented. One of the founders of CMT, George Lakoff, was among the first ones to implement CMT into the realm of political discourse. He has conducted a research about the impact political metaphors have upon society. In a number of his works, Lakoff (1991, 1995, 1996, 2009) has indicated that the political reality is largely shaped by various conceptual metaphors, which are used for achieving different purposes.

Nevertheless, due to the fact that CMT has recently been criticised for its disregard of real discourse, the necessity has arisen to expand and modify the field of CMT, as Kövecses (2009c) notes, by taking into consideration pieces of real discourse in which metaphors occur. This change has brought about the need to combine CMT with some recent approaches to discourse analysis and corpus linguistics. In that sense, Walter and Helmig (2008: 119) state: “... only the combined analysis of discourses and metaphors can lead to a comprehensive understanding of the social construction of reality”. Furthermore, they (2008: 129) claim that it is the political function of metaphors that imposes this necessity of analysing them within discourse and not as a separate phenomenon.

It can be claimed that Chilton and Schäffner’s 2002 paper was one of those works that marked the beginning of serious research into this field. Even though the focus is not on metaphor, they still acknowledge its role in providing a conceptual structure for a systematised ideology, as well as providing intertextual and intratextual coherence to political discourse. As a result, in cross-cultural communication, the use of metaphors in political discourse can lead to further cognitive elaboration or misunderstandings and political controversy (Chilton and Schäffner 2002: 29). Chilton (2004: 203-204) emphasises that political discourse involves metaphorical reasoning, relying significantly on spatial cognition. He adds that some source domains from spatial cognition, such as container and path schema, seem to be used repeatedly in political discourse.

Later publications witnessed a wide range of works dealing with particularities regarding the use of metaphorical language in political discourse. Thus, Charteris-Black (2004) analyses the role that metaphor performs in language by examining examples taken from the political discourse, as well as press reporting and religion. His view of studying metaphor in (political) discourse, known as CMA, relies on combining linguistic, pragmatic and cognitive dimensions of metaphor in order to supply metaphor analysis with missing parts of metaphor contexts and to account for ideological and rhetorical aspects of metaphor (Charteris-Black 2004: 2). In Charteris-Black (2011), special attention is dedicated to examining ideological potential of metaphor with the aim of contributing to political rhetoric.

Semino (2008) attempts to develop an approach based on CMT, CDA, Stylistics and Corpus Linguistics to demonstrate that the study of (political) discourse has to be complemented by the study of the functions metaphors perform in particular discourse. In the case of political discourse, rhetorical and persuasive functions of metaphor are recognised as

being particularly important, as well as providing intertextual and intratextual coherence. Since politics is an abstract and complex domain of experience, the author has identified the most common target domains from this area: the current state of affairs; causes and solutions to problems; plans and policies; future states of affairs including positive and negative scenarios; various types of participants and entities in the political domains; the in-group as opposed to the out-group; politics and political action themselves (Semino 2008: 90-91). Semino (2008: 92) notes that the most frequent metaphorical source domains that can be used in the political domain of experience include: PATH/JOURNEY, CONTAINERS, SPORTS, WAR and PEOPLE.

In a similar way, Neagu (2013) incorporates cognitive theories and CDA into her study of political metaphor, with the aim of examining pragmatic aspect of metaphor and its persuasive function, whereas Musolff (2016) uses the insights from CMT, CDA and Corpus Linguistics in his attempt to explore communicative function of metaphor in political discourse. Moreover, Musloff (2004, 2006, 2016) provides new insights into the study of metaphor in political discourse by introducing a new methodological approach called scenario analysis. Since this approach will be applied to the analysis of the examples in this thesis, a more detailed account of it will be given in the upcoming section.

Ritchie (2017) uses the examples from political discourse to extend the analysis of metaphors to the analysis of metaphorical stories, which he considers to be crucial to discourse analysis, especially political discourse. Starting from the claim made by Abbot (2008) that both our thinking and discourse are organised around master-plots (e.g. betrayal, revenge, rags-to-riches, a quest...), Ritchie (2017: 29) argues that politicians, marketers, and other persuasion professionals shape narratives to activate these master-plots. This means that discourse, both political and marketing, is full of stories, which report actual events either from the teller's or someone else's experience, and which are often used metaphorically, especially for persuasive purposes (Ritchie 2017: 120). He (2017: 1) highlights that the importance of metaphorical stories lies in the fact that they contribute to the proper understanding of many metaphors, which can often be fully understood only through the implied stories.

2.5.1.1.1. Metaphor scenarios

Based on the aforementioned study of the communicative function of metaphor in political discourse, Musolff (2004, 2006, 2016) introduces scenario analysis as a new methodological approach, predominantly based on corpus-based studies of naturally occurring political discourse³². The basic idea behind this new approach is avoiding the standard view of metaphor, based on domains, and choosing a metaphor scenario³³ as “an intermediate analytical category between the level of the conceptual domain as a whole and its individual elements” (Musolff 2004: 13) and the “discourse-based, culturally and historically mediated version of a source domain” (Musolff 2016: 30). Thus, metaphor scenarios do not undermine the role of the category of metaphorical mappings but only complement it by providing “the main story-lines or perspectives along which the central mappings are developed and extended” (Musolff 2004: 18). This means that both central mappings and scenarios need to be identified within domains in order to capture attitudinal and argumentative trends in particular discourse communities (Musolff 2004: 28). Furthermore, it has been noted that the difference between these two categories lies in their contrasting cognitive status. While central mappings are “cognitively necessary implications of metaphors in a domain”, there exists no “logical or ontological ‘necessity’ for the use of any particular scenario” (Musolff 2004: 19). Though the cognitive status of metaphor scenarios does not amount to that of central mappings, metaphor scenarios are considered to be an essential feature of metaphor use in public discourse because they “help to shape the course of political debates and conceptualizations of political target topics by framing the attitudinal and evaluative preferences in the respective discourse communities” (Musolff 2006: 28). Taking into consideration all these facts, Musolff (2016: 30) provides the following definition of a metaphor scenario:

A scenario is a set of assumptions made by competent members of a discourse community about the prototypical elements of a concept, that is, participants, ‘dramatic’ story lines and default outcomes, as well as ethical evaluations of these elements, which are connected to the social attitudes and emotional stances that are prevalent in the respective discourse community.

The author (2006: 36) highlights that these source-related assumptions are an integral part of the “conceptual package” that is mapped onto the respective target concepts, which allows

³² The author (2016: 31) highlights that the category of scenario is not “posited a priori for theoretical purposes but is chiefly motivated by data, specifically, the frequency, distribution and collocation clusters of MIP-VU criteria-compatible lexical and phraseological items”.

³³ It has been noted in Musolff (2004, 2006, 2016) that the category of scenario is based on Fillmore’s (1975) notion of conceptual scene and Lakoff’s (1987) definition of scenario as a subtype of idealised cognitive models (ICMs).

matching inferences about the participants and courses of action at the target level. Furthermore, these inferences contain “encyclopaedic and socioculturally mediated information to be deduced from general schematic domain structures”. Hence, at the scenario level, attitudinal biases and political preferences of discourse communities are revealed (Musolff 2006: 35).

The examples Musolff (2004, 2006, 2016) deals with come from his study of a bilingual corpus of British and German public debates about the European Union. He investigated the FAMILY metaphors used for the conceptualisation of the European Union and discovered the presence of recurrent concepts such as FAMILY, LOVE RELATIONSHIP and MARRIAGE, referring to relationships among the member state or between single states and the whole EU. Thus, for instance, the introduction of the euro is seen “either as a *wedding* or as the *birth* of the EU-*parent-nations’ baby*”, France and Germany are seen as “the *couple*”, other nations as having “*love relationships*” with the euro but never being “an *established couple*” (Musolff 2004: 16). The author (2004:17) explains that these conceptual elements do not account for all possible concepts from LOVE-MARRIAGE-FAMILY domain but form conceptual clusters that focus on a few aspects of common-sense knowledge and experience these relationships involve. These clusters create metaphor scenarios, such as THE FATE OF THE EU COUPLE, THE CHILDHOOD OF THE EURO-BABY, SOLIDARITY (OR THE LACK OF IT) WITHIN THE EC/EU FAMILY. Since at this level evaluative arguments and judgements related to EU politics are expressed, it is necessary to identify both central mappings and metaphor scenarios, in order to get a full account of metaphor use in political discourse.

2.5.1.2. *Rhetorical functions of metaphor*

That metaphor performs very important rhetorical functions was acknowledged in the works of Greek and Roman classical authors. Among the most prominent ones is certainly Aristotle, whose views of rhetoric and the role of metaphor in achieving rhetorical functions were among the most influential when it comes to the study of the field of rhetoric. In the study of metaphor, through the lens of discourse approaches, the persuasive function of metaphor has frequently been highlighted. Persuasion is thought to be inseparable from the rhetoric itself. In that sense, Charteris-Black (2011: 13) explains that even though the definition of rhetoric necessarily involves the idea of persuasion, the difference between them exists. While persuasion refers to the use of language with the pre-existing intention of encouraging one to

accept a particular point of view, rhetoric refers to the methods used in the process of persuasion. The importance of persuasion is especially prominent in political discourse, which revolves around the idea of changing the political reality by means of persuading the audience to accept a particular political stance. This is where metaphor comes to play a central role, since it is metaphor that mainly enables one to achieve rhetorical goals.

The mechanism that stands behind the rhetorical power of metaphor has been recognised from the very beginning of the study of metaphor within the realms of cognitive linguistics. Thus, Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 156) claim that metaphors have entailments through which certain aspects of reality are highlighted, whereas others remain hidden. In this way metaphors establish the coherence of our experiences:

Metaphors may create realities for us, especially social realities. A metaphor may thus be a guide for future action. Such actions will, of course, fit the metaphor. This will, in turn, reinforce the power of the metaphor to make experience coherent. In this sense metaphors can be self-fulfilling prophecies (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:156).

The authors use the example of the WAR metaphor used by President Carter who was dealing with the energy crisis. This particular metaphor evoked a range of metaphorical entailments, such as “enemy”, “threat to national security”, “setting targets”, etc. At the same time, other aspects of reality were hidden and this produced a rhetorical effect: “The metaphor was not merely a way of highlighting reality; it constituted a license for policy change and political and economic action” (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 156). Moreover, they emphasise that people in power impose their metaphors on others, which is evident in the aforementioned case. Besides President Carter’s WAR metaphor, Amory Lovins used another metaphor in his attempt to solve the energy crisis, i.e., HARD ENERGY PATH and SOFT ENERGY PATH. However, President Carter was more powerful at the time and managed to impose his metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 157). Lakoff continues to explore this issue in a number of his works. For instance, in his 1992 paper, Lakoff discussed the great power of metaphors in creating political reality as well as their possibly dangerous rhetorical effects. He used the example of the gulf crisis in which President Bush used two different metaphors, thus creating two different scenarios: the Rescue Scenario and the Self-Defence Scenario. Each one offered an entirely different view of the political situation. Eventually, as the author indicates, the administration used the first scenario in order to provide a moral justification for going to war. Furthermore, Lakoff (1995) discovered that two opposing views in American politics, conservative and liberal view, are based on the difference in conceptualising morality. Both base their views on the same NATION IS FAMILY metaphor, but their priorities differ. While

conservatives develop the Strict Father model, which gives them a better understanding of the basis of their politics, liberals take the Nurturant Parent model and appear to be less successful in defining what structures their politics. Lakoff (1995: 209) indicates that, as a consequence, liberal's rhetoric is not as carefully structured and effective as the conservative one.

Charteris-Black (2004) uses the foundations laid by the standard CMT, but realising some of its shortcomings, he upgrades the theory of metaphor by emphasising the necessity of taking into consideration a pragmatic perspective, since metaphors are in fact used in a specific discourse, which impacts their role. He takes the insights from CDA, combines it with CMT and develops his approach to metaphor study known as CMA. His argument for the necessity of such an approach is that CMT hides a dimension of metaphor concerned with metaphor selection in particular types of discourse, which CMA reveals, claiming that this choice is actually governed by the rhetorical aim of persuasion (Charteris-Black 2004: 247). Persuasion plays a special role in political discourse, aimed at achieving political power. A careful observance of the language politicians use for persuasive purposes reveals an extensive use of metaphors. Charteris-Black (2011) discusses several reasons that stand behind such rhetorical effectiveness of metaphor. Thus, he (2011: 18) notes:

I will argue that metaphor is an effective rhetorical means for persuading because metaphors work by transferring what is already known to understand things that are less well-known and therefore activates pre-existing knowledge... Metaphor is therefore a crucial means for accessing the 'voice within'.

The author also emphasises the power metaphor has in influencing evaluation and creating associations that have emotional meanings and, at the same time, contain implicit cause and effect arguments (Charteris-Black 2011: 311-312), as well as its vagueness that offers multiple interpretations, which in turn can absolve politicians from any responsibility (Charteris-Black 2011: 44). Even though the aim of using metaphor is persuasion, not all politicians achieve this goal in the same way. Charteris-Black (2011: 316) identifies several rhetorical methods such as the ability to sound right, the ability to demonstrate right intentions and the ability to tell the right story.

Furthermore, Charteris-Black (2009, 2011) argues that metaphors are also used for ideological³⁴ purposes, where mythic elements play a significant role. It has been claimed that

³⁴ "An ideology is a set of meanings through which a particular group is able to form and sustain itself; it therefore serves to create group identity by establishing and reinforcing shared meanings within the group and by communicating this group identity to others as an act of self-legitimization. An ideology claims that what is in

“the ideological potential of metaphor works by accessing powerful underlying cultural evaluations that originate in personal, social and national struggle” (Charteris-Black 2011: 31-32). Ideological function of metaphor is frequently realised through the activation of unconscious emotional associations, thereby contributing to the creation of a myth, which, in turn, achieves its persuasive function by providing the hearers with stories that express aspects of the unconscious (Charteris-Black 2011: 22, 28). Based on the claim that ideology involves consciously formed set of beliefs, attitudes and feelings, whereas in the case of myth these are only partially conscious, the author (2009: 102) gives the following insight:

I propose that metaphor shares with ideology and myth the discourse function of persuasion and indeed connects them to provide an expressive resource for communicating both the cognitively oriented dimension of ideology as well as the emotionally oriented dimension of myth.

To confirm his claims, the author analyses several examples of metaphor use by politicians, one of them being the animal metaphors used by Fidel Castro to depict the Cuban relationship with the USA. Thus, Charteris-Black (2009: 105) uses the shark metaphor for the USA and the brave fish metaphor for Cuba and evokes feelings of heroism and courage.

Musolff (2004) partially agrees with what Lakoff and Johnson (1980) suggest about the power of metaphor to create political reality and their theory of metaphorical entailments³⁵. He goes further from their standard CMT, combining it with CDA, and suggests the necessity of taking into consideration actual discourses in which metaphors occur. Musolff (2004: 32-33) argues that political metaphors are integral aspects of argumentative reasoning, the purpose of which is to prove a contested issue and legitimise a certain action. Hence, metaphors are considered to have a power to lead to particular conclusions. Due to this and the fact that politicians intend their ideas to be as persuasive as possible, metaphors appear to be very popular in political discourses as a means of achieving rhetorical goals. This idea is even more elaborated in his more recent publications (2012, 2015, 2016, 2017b). Thus, Musolff (2016: 3-4) emphasises that, in order to study the power of political metaphors, it is essential to take into consideration their multifunctionality, which is reflected in their ability to express an evaluation of the topic, to make an emotional and

the interest of the group is in the interest of all; it is a representation of what is truthful *for some* as being truthful *for all*.” (Charteris-Black 2009: 99-100)

³⁵ Musolff (2004: 32) argues that Lakoff and Johnson’s explanation of the process by which metaphors are accepted is circular and can apply only to those metaphors whose source implications are confirmed in the target domain by actions that suit the words. However, he notes that in real political discourse, it is not natural to expect an unproblematic acceptance. By using the example of Thatcher’s rejection of the LEAVING TRAIN metaphor, the author demonstrates that it is possible to accept a metaphor mapping without subscribing to all of its entailments.

persuasive appeal, to reassure the public that a perceived problem fits into familiar experience patterns and can be dealt with by familiar problem-solving strategies. In order to account for this multifunctionality, he has developed a new methodological approach, i.e. scenario analysis, as discussed in 2.5.1.1.1. To prove that metaphor scenario structure is indeed used for achieving pragmatic and rhetorical effects, the author presents the example of the metaphorical scenario *BRITAIN AT THE HEART OF EUROPE*, used to describe the nature of the relationship between Britain and the European Union. Originally positively biased, the metaphor was reassessed and reversed into a rather negative view of the aforementioned relationship by Eurosceptics, who thus attempted to achieve their political goals. According to Musolff (2017a: 642), once more it has been demonstrated that political discourse, apart from being concerned with factual information, is very much about rhetoric, emotion arousal and interactional influence. Another, more striking example that supports Lakoff's (1992) claim that metaphors can kill, has been discussed in Musolff (2015a, 2016). It is the employment of dehumanising metaphors, such as *PARASITE* metaphor used for Jews during the Holocaust, which eventually turned into "a genocidal reality" (Musolff 2016: 79). Examples like this one have led Musolff (2016) to agree with Steen's (2008) notion of deliberate metaphor, which implies that it is possible to have conscious discourse strategies whose aim is to produce rhetorical effects, though he puts more emphasis on social rather than psychological aspects. This changes the perspective of the speakers and their responsibility for the use of particular metaphors:

The picture of the average metaphor user that emerges from these analyses is not at all of an 'unconscious' follower of discourse customs who automatically adopts entrenched concepts or frames, but that of someone who makes communicative choices and is aware of their contextual implications and their wider and sociopolitical and practical effects (Musolff 2016: 92).

Semino (2008) also acknowledges the rhetorical power of metaphor, seeing it as a linguistic and conceptual tool used for persuasive purposes. Her idea of the role of persuasion in politics does not differ from the generally accepted one, which holds that the easiest way to gain political power is to bring the hearers to accept the views suitable to a particular group or an individual; and one of the easiest way to achieve this is certainly via metaphor. She also explores the frequently debated issue of metaphor, discourse and ideology and agrees that the intricate relationship does exist between these. To illustrate her point, Semino (2008: 87-90) discusses the example of the metaphor used for the arrival of new asylum seekers to Britain. Their arrival is metaphorically represented as a natural disaster, i.e. flood, which creates the image of a potentially very dangerous situation. It has been noted that the metaphorical use of

“flood” seems to reflect the writer’s view of the situation, which is presented in such a natural way that the readers can associate themselves with it. Furthermore, she emphasises that the FLOOD metaphor can be combined with other negative mental representations of immigration, as well as with negative attitudes and opinions, and thereby create a particular ideology, which will be socially accepted by particular groups³⁶.

More recent research has been directed towards analysing the rhetorical power of metaphor in different areas of political discourse. Thus, Neagu (2013: 31) sees metaphors as “persuasive definitions”, which constitute the premises on which the practical argument is built and steer the argument towards a particular conclusion, and, consequently, often serve the interests of politicians. Her area of study has included the 2008 Presidential debates by Barack Obama and John McCain. She analyses and interprets the instances of metaphors they used while addressing different topics such as: the financial crisis, energy independence, the health care system, education and military conflicts. One of the examples deals with the metaphors Barack Obama and John McCain employed to represent the financial crisis. It has been noted that both of them tend to see the crisis as a natural force which is likely to be unpredictable, which has resulted in the metaphors such as FINANCIAL CRISIS IS AN EARTHQUAKE or FINANCIAL CRISIS IS A DISEASE. As Neagu (2013: 40) notes: “The meaning focus of these metaphors draws on the need for a healthy nation in the political arena which means economic stability, military strength, ability to communicate, and to solve any differences that may appear”. Furthermore, the use of these metaphors creates the image of a future president as a benefactor or a surgeon, who has the ability to save the nation. Similarly, Ilie and Ștefănescu (2015) analyse rhetorical functions of metaphors used in Romanian discourse on the 2014 political crisis. They identify and study the interdiscursive and rhetorical strategies that politicians and political journalists use to shape the audience’s view of and produce their reaction to the crisis (Ilie and Ștefănescu 2015: 143). Díaz-Peralta (2018) deals with the ideological patterns that have an impact on conceptualisation and also text production by investigating the opinion articles published in the Spanish newspaper *El País* during 2013. The study has shown that the metaphors employed by the authors of the articles are consciously used to delegitimise the conservative government and provoke a reaction against the current political situation. The author notes that to achieve this goal, they use a group ideology which is a reflection of the dark and negative past, which is clear from the

³⁶ For more examples of how rhetorical power of metaphor works, see Semino (2008: 87-123).

metaphorical scenarios such as FRANCO'S DICTATORSHIP, STATE CATHOLICISM, THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH (Díaz-Peralta 2018: 15).

2.5.1.3. Metaphorical creativity in political discourse

The use of metaphor in political discourse has for a long time been associated primarily with rhetorical and persuasive functions. Due to its practical role and involvement in the real world, it was not expected that political discourse could account for any form of metaphorical creativity, which has always been associated with literature. Regarding metaphor use, political discourse received rather negative evaluation and was accused of using "stale metaphors" (Orwell 1968: 134 in Müller 2005: 54) and using metaphors carelessly which resulted in accumulating "meaningless ready-made phrases" (Eppler 1992 in Müller 2005: 54). However, the tendency of recent studies (Müller 2005, 2010; Semino, 2008; Semino et al. 2013; Hidalgo Downing et al. 2013; Hidalgo Downing and Kraljevic Mujic 2013; Musolff 2004, 2011, 2012, 2015b, 2016, 2017a, 2017c; Kövecses 2015; Badri 2017; Ritchie 2017) to extend metaphorical creativity beyond literary genre to real discourse has brought about a more serious exploration of creative metaphors in political discourse. Therefore, it has been discovered that metaphors in political discourse can indeed exhibit a great deal of creativity, even though this type of creativity is not of the same kind as in literature.

In accordance with his view on the role of context in studying metaphorical creativity in discourse, as discussed in 2.4.2., Müller (2005, 2010) offers a valuable insight into the use of creative metaphors in political discourse by studying one of its segments, i.e. political speeches. As Müller (2010: 232) explains, analysing metaphorical creativity in political discourse involves a broader understanding of creativity than in literary discourse, since creative metaphors in political discourse also serve practical functions such as persuasion. Furthermore, it has been noted that, apart from the linguistic dimension, metaphorical creativity also involves the social dimension, i.e. context and audience. This means that metaphor does not manage to achieve its political-communicative purpose unless it is accepted and explored by an audience (Müller 2005: 57). In his 2005 paper, Müller analysed examples of creative metaphors from political speeches produced in 2004 by two Swiss politicians, Federal Councillor Moritz Leuenberger and Federal Councillor Christoph Blocher. The instances of creative metaphors were grouped according to six basic strategies of creative use: combining a metaphor with another figure of style, making the audience aware of a

metaphor, combining compatible metaphors, elaborating metaphorical mappings, expanding metaphorical mappings and creating novel mappings. Due to the space limitation, only one of the strategies will be discussed here, i.e. combining compatible metaphors. The author explains that compatibility refers to matching conceptual mappings. What is at work here is the combination of several metaphorical expressions which are usually conventional on their own but can become creative if their mappings are combined in a novel way or if they are extended to the aspects that are not conventionally used. The first example is from Blocher's speech:

- (1) Das neue Gericht, [...], stellt eine erste *Säule* des neu *gebauten* – oder zumindest grundlegend *renovierten* – Justizgebildes dar, zu dem Volk und Stände mit ihrem JA vom 12. März 2000 den *Grundstein gelegt* haben. (Christoph Blocher, 16 September, 2004)

The new court is a first pillar in the newly constructed – or at least radically renovated – judicial structure for which the people and states have laid the foundation.

What enables the combination of the metaphorical expressions used here, such as “pillar”, “constructed”, “renovated” and “laid the foundation”, is the common conceptual mapping POLITICAL STRUCTURES ARE BUILDINGS. It can be inferred that, in cases such as this one, creativity emerges from the combination and interaction of different metaphorical mappings. The second example is from Leuenberger's speech:

- (2) Sie fordern simpler *Strickmuster* oder wollen das *Strickwerk* gerade ganz *auftrennen*. (Moritz Leuenberger, 15 January, 2004)

They demand simpler knitting patterns or want to unravel the knitting.

It has been noted that “stricken” [knitting] may be conventionally employed in German to denote the fabrication of something abstract like a story or an image. However, it does not include the notion of unravelling the fabrics. This is a clear example of the extension of a conventional metaphorical mapping (Müller 2005: 60-61). The author further highlights that the aforementioned strategies neglect the social aspect of creativity, i.e. a creative co-production by the audience. There are cases when particular political metaphors develop lives of their own by being interpreted and discussed by journalists or politicians, mostly for the purpose of achieving persuasive effects (Müller 2005: 63). The results of the study have

demonstrated that creative metaphors are used in political speeches, but the extent varies from speech to speech, and as Müller (2005: 68) notes: “Politicians may not be creative in their profession; their speeches, however, can be”.

Semino’s (2008) study of metaphors in discourse has made a significant contribution to understanding metaphorical creativity as a widespread phenomenon in different discourse genres, including political discourse. Just as Müller (2005) notes that creativity exists in clines, Semino (2008: 219) also makes a distinction between creative metaphorical expressions that can be related to conventional metaphors and metaphorical expressions that realise unconventional or radically novel conceptual mappings. One of the examples discussed in her book comes from the speech delivered in 2003 by the British Prime Minister, Tony Blair, at the Labour Party Conference in Bournemouth. What preceded his speech was public criticism of his decision to take the country to war in Iraq, which for some meant betraying the traditional principles of the Labour Party. Even though some expected him to apologise for the decision, he defended it in the following way:

- (3) Get rid of the false choice: principles or no principles. Replace it with the true choice. Forward or back. I can only go one way. I’ve not got a reverse gear. The time to trust a politician the most is not when they’re taking the easy option. Any politician can do the popular things. I know, I used to do a few of them. (Tony Blair, 20 September, 2003)

Here, Blair spoke of the right and false choices in terms of the forward and backward movement, employing the JOURNEY metaphor, which is highly conventional and pervasive in English. One of the most creative metaphors in this extract is the REVERSE GEAR metaphor, in which Blair describes himself a motorised vehicle. He thus tried to suggest that he would choose the forward, modern, progressive option and that he had enough strength to carry it forward, no matter it was a more difficult and less popular option. This metaphor was very striking for media commentators and other politicians, which resulted in its extension with the aim of criticising Blair. Thereby, the anchorman on the BBC evening news exploited the metaphor as follows:

- (4) but when you are on the edge of a cliff it is good to have a reverse gear. (20 September, 2003)

This example shows another aspect of JOURNEY metaphor scenario, suggesting that when a vehicle reaches a point in a journey when it would be fatal to move forward, it would be good to have a reverse gear, and thus avoid a catastrophic end to the journey. The leader of the opposition, Michael Howard, extended the metaphor scenario even further in the following example:

(5) Six months ago, the Prime Minister stood before his party conference and said, with all the lip-quivering intensity for which he has become famous:

‘I can only go one way. I’ve not got a reverse gear.’

Today, we could hear the gears grinding as he came before us, lip quivering one again, to eat all those words that he has pronounced so emphatically for so long. Who will ever trust him again? (Michael Howard, 20 April, 2004)

In this case, Blair’s behaviour is described as a vehicle audibly struggling to stop or change direction, which is again the metaphor extension with a high persuasive power. Additionally, it has been claimed that the extension of metaphor, as in the examples provided, contributes to intertextual and intratextual coherence³⁷ (Semino 2008: 81-85).

The idea that metaphorical creativity in real discourse does not necessarily involve novel and unconventional mappings has been explored further and it has been suggested that many metaphors rely on and use already existing metaphorical expressions in a more creative manner or with a different meaning. The term recontextualisation has been used by Semino, Deignan and Littlemore (2013) and Hidalgo Downing, Kraljevic Mujic and Núñez-Perucha (2013) to account for this phenomenon. Recontextualisation can be defined as “the capacity of metaphor to act as an instrument that adapts already existing or familiar concepts and experiences, in order to yield new meanings and new experiences” (Hidalgo Downing and Kraljevic Mujic 2013: 134). Semino et al. (2013: 42) make use of Linell’s (2009) classification of recontextualisation into three types: recontextualisation within the same conversation or text, recontextualisation in which one text or piece of spoken discourse may reuse or allude to elements of other specific texts or discourses, and more abstract forms of

³⁷ Semino (2008: 106-108) relies on the explanation provided by Chilton and Schäffner (2002: 29) that intertextual coherence refers to the achievement of coherence across texts, whereas intratextual coherence refers to establishing coherence within texts. Metaphor has been claimed to have a special role in this process. For instance, a certain metaphor can provide a conceptual structure for a systematised ideology that is expressed in many texts and thus establish intertextual coherence, or it can be locally extended and used throughout a text and thereby create intratextual coherence of that particular text. Both conventional and novel metaphors can contribute to coherence, but Semino (2008: 108) adds that the more conventional metaphors tend to reflect shared, common sense ways of talking and thinking, while the novel ones exploit conventional ways of talking and thinking to achieve particular rhetorical effects.

recontextualisations. The first two appear to be applicable to use, reuse and transformation of metaphors within or across texts or discourse events. The aforementioned authors agree that the reason that stands behind metaphorical creativity through recontextualisation is the inherent flexibility (Cameron 2011 in Semino et al. 2013: 41) or the instability and fuzziness (Hidalgo Downing and Kraljevic Mujic 2013: 136) of metaphorical expressions, which means that metaphors can emerge or be reused in different contexts. One of the examples from political discourse is presented in Semino et al. (2013: 46-51), where they discuss the process of recontextualisation of the metaphor coined by a prominent Italian journalist Indro Montanelli regarding the protracted political dominance of Silvio Berlusconi.

(6) Perché Berlusconi è una di quelle malattie che si curano con il vaccine. E per guarire da Berlusconi ci vuole una bella dose di vaccine di Berlusconi. (Indro Montanelli, March 2001)

Because Berlusconi is one of those diseases that are treated with a vaccine. And in order to be treated from Berlusconi we need a good dose of Berlusconi vaccine.

Here, Berlusconi is metaphorically described as a disease, while his future political demise is metaphorically described as requiring a vaccine. The metaphorical immunisation thus corresponds to Berlusconi's winning the next election and being able to govern Italy long enough for the Italian electorate to decide not to elect him again (Semino et al. 2013: 46-47). Even though Montanelli died in the same year, his VACCINE metaphor has been reused in a variety of contexts. In some cases, it has been reproduced in its original sense, whereas in others it has been adapted and extended beyond its original sense and formulation. One such example of recontextualisation comes from an online forum which is part of the website of the left-of centre organisation L'Ulivo (The Olive Tree), associated with Romano Prodi, who defeated Berlusconi's coalition in the 1996 and 2006 elections.

(7) Re: Il vaccine di Montanelli di pianogrande, il 24/04/2009, 22:57

Il vaccine va inoculate in piccolo dosi e (se non sbaglio) parzialmente disattivato. Berlusconi non è niente di tutto questo.

Subito dosi massicce e ben vitali.

Gli italiani, invece di vaccinarsi, si sono intossicati.

Adesso siamo nella fase della dipendenza.

A quell punto is ha un bel dire: "Smetto quando voglio." [...]

Intanto, l'opposizione non avrà ancora tirato fuori gli anticorpi.

I linfociti grossi saranno in lotta con quelli più piccolo e li accuseranno di essere estremisti e velleitari.

I globuli bianchi accuseranno i globuli rossi di essere nostalgici ed ingénue. [...]

Re: Montanelli's vaccine by pianogrande, 24 April, 2009, 22:57

The vaccine needs to be injected in small doses and (if I am not mistaken) partly deactivated.

Berlusconi is nothing of the sort.

Massive and fully active doses from the start.

Instead of being immunized, the Italians have been poisoned.

Now we are in the phase of addiction.

At that point it's easy to say: "I can give up whenever I want." [...]

In the meantime, the opposition will not yet have developed the antibodies.

The large lymphocytes will be in a struggle with the smaller ones and will accuse them of being extremist and unrealistic.

The white blood cells will accuse the red blood cells of being nostalgic and naïve. [...]

As the metaphorical expressions used in this extract suggest, Montanelli's original metaphor has been recontextualised, creatively extended and transformed. The original scenario has been developed into several different scenarios where the process of immunisation went wrong, resulting in an inadequate production of antibodies, poisoning and addiction. Furthermore, the errors of Italy's left-wing opposition have been described metaphorically via a related scenario of conflict among different components of the body's immune system (Semino et al. 2013: 49). The authors further note that the process of recontextualisation of Montanelli's VACCINE metaphor primarily involves changes in the explanatory and evaluative aspects of the metaphors, both serving its persuasive function (Semino et al. 2013: 51).

Musolff's concern is not metaphorical creativity itself. Nevertheless, in a number of his studies (2004, 2011, 2012, 2015b, 2016, 2017a, 2017c) there are examples of metaphors which are being creatively extended and elaborated. In his study of emerging metaphorical scenarios in political discourse, Musolff (2016: 52) comments:

... the metaphor usage varies between background usage, that is, brief mentioning of some source-lexical material without further elaboration to extended and intertextually productive scenario formulations that expressed a strong evaluative bias, narrative structure and also had programmatic functions (e.g. as political promises and commitments).

In addition, he argues that for a scenario to be successful, it ought to allow for new, meaning-changing applications that make the metaphor more convincing (Musolff 2016: 138). Two important facts regarding the nature of metaphor have been highlighted in his studies. First, metaphor is flexible enough for variation and creative reformulation (2017a: 644) and second, metaphor can survive in public discourse for a very long time through continuous reinvention in non-conventional uses (Musolff 2017a: 649). The example which will be presented here, taken from Musolff (2017a: 644-648), analyses the frequently used BRITAIN AT THE HEART OF EUROPE metaphor, which was originally used by the Prime Minister John Major, as an optimistic promise in his speech in Germany in 1991:

(8) Our government will work at the very heart of Europe with its partners in forging an integrated European community. (John Major, 12 March, 1991)

The ‘heart-as-centre’ concept is in fact a highly conventionalised idiom and its metaphorical vividness is minimal (Musolff 2017a: 645). However, in the following years this metaphor was used repeatedly, which resulted in scenario development, and consequently creative extensions of the original metaphor. The following example is from an *Independent* article in which the ‘heart’ idiom was extended and developed into a creative metaphor.

(9) One British metaphor, at least, has ceased to beat. John Major said in Bonn in March 1991, that he wanted to put Britain “where we belong, at very heart of Europe”... Neither Mr Major nor, increasingly, others in Europe, have been speaking in quite this way ... An editorial ... earlier this year suggested that if Mr Major wanted to be at the heart of Europe, it was, presumably, as a blood clot. (*The Independent*, 11 September, 1994)

The author of the article reused the original metaphor by creatively extending it, activated its implicit body domain-related metaphoricity through using metaphorical expressions “ceased to beat” and “blood clot”, and thus revealed a discrepancy between Major’s rhetorical promise and political reality (Musolff 2017a: 646). Another elaboration of the same metaphor appeared as a criticism of the Labour government under Tony Blair who claimed the same metaphor as their pro-EU slogan.

(10) The litany passes from government to government. A Britain at the heart of Europe. [...] But hold the stethoscope and listen carefully, for the heart has some curious murmurs. [The important debates in Brussels] bear no relationship to the

British “debate”, hearts, livers, gall bladders and all. (*The Guardian*, 1 December, 1997)

Once again, more creative elaborations, heart murmurs and reference to other organs, were used to discredit the slogan, emphasising its meaninglessness.

Kövecses’s account of metaphorical creativity has been previously discussed in more details. For the present purpose, it would be useful to remind ourselves that the author distinguishes three sources of metaphorical creativity, source domain, target domain and context, of which context seems to be the most powerful one. The example to be considered here is from his 2015 study in which he explored how different contextual factors impact the emergence of creative metaphors in discourse. Thus, considering how knowledge about major entities in the discourse influences the use of metaphor in discourse, Kövecses (2015: 103-104) provides the following example from political discourse:

- (11) Sir, The letters about odd headlines ... remind me of an all-time favourite. In the early 1980’s Michael Foot became a leader of the Labour Party. He was also a co-founder of CND and pushed for nuclear disarmament. Mr Foot travelled to Brussels to chair a lobby group in the European Parliament to construct a plan to get rid of the bomb as part of the European election policy. From this came the headline “Foot heads arms body”. (*The Times*, Letters to Editor, 30 January, 2008)

In this case, it is the knowledge about the topic that influenced the speaker/conceptualiser to use a novel and unconventional metaphor and produce the creative headline “Foot heads arms body”. The speaker’s/conceptualiser’s knowledge about the topic includes various entities, such as Foot and disarmament and Mr Foot being the chair of the committee that deals with the issue of disarmament. All this knowledge provided the speaker/conceptualiser with the opportunity to create a humorous headline deliberately (Kövecses 2015: 104). Another interesting example from the same study demonstrates how different personal concerns or interests of the speaker/conceptualiser can impact their choice of metaphor in discourse. The following example is from a reader’s letter to the editor of a Hungarian newspaper, *Magyar Nemzet*. The reader is an electric engineer who comments on the political situation concerning Hungary’s new relationship with Europe in the late 1990’s (Kövecses 2015: 107).

- (12) *Otthon vagyunk*, otthon lehetünk Európában. *Szent István* óta bekapcsolódtunk ebbe a szellemi áramkörbe, és váltzó intenzitással, de azóta benne vagyunk

– akkor is, ha különféle erők időnként, hosszabb-rövidebb ideig, megpróbálták kirángatni belőle. (*Magyar Nemzet*, 12 June, 1999)

We are, we can be at home in Europe. Since Saint Stephen we have been *integrated/connected* to this intellectual/spiritual *electric circuit*, and with *varying degrees of intensity*, but we have been in it – even though various powers, for more or less time, have tried to yank us out of it. (Italics in the original)

The metaphorical expressions encountered in this passage (*integrated/connected*, *electric circuit*, *varying degrees of intensity*) clearly reflect the professional interest of the author of the letter. The target domain, which is Hungary's new relationship with Europe in the wake of major political changes in the country in the 1990's, takes a rather unconventional source domain of electricity and electric circuitry, which was made possible due to the professional interest of the person who did the thinking about this particular target domain. (Kövecses 2015: 107)

Badri (2017) reanalyses examples from Musolff (2004: 127-128) to explain how, among other factors, speaker's intention has an effect on the choice of metaphors and metaphorical creativity in discourse. He analysed the examples from a short dialogue in which two politicians, Weizsäcker and Gorbachev, use the same metaphor EUROPE AS A COMMON HOUSE.

- (13) [R.v.W.: It is an important point of reference that helps us to see *how things should be organized in the common European house, especially as regards the rights of reciprocal visits from one apartment to another*.
- M.G.: You are quite right, but *not everyone might like to receive visitors at night*.
 - R.v.W.: We are not particularly happy either that *a big ditch runs right through one communal living-room*] (Italics used by Badri 2017)

Badri (2017: 229) suggests that the metaphor created a common ground for the interlocutors, enabling them, at the same time, to express their opposing views by using creative elaborations of the common metaphor. In the first example, *rights of reciprocal visits from one apartment to another*, an unmapped element of the source domain of living together in the common house was used by the speaker and it was influenced by the speaker's communicative intention, i.e. to promote the view of Europe as a common house for European nations. The second speaker made a creative elaboration of the first speaker's metaphor to express his criticism of the notion. Finally, the first speaker used the original metaphor with a

creative combination of “ditch” and “living room” to express his strong disagreement towards the criticism of the second speaker. It has also been argued that all these various creative elaborations made the conversation cohesive and, at the same time, they exposed the incoherence in terms of presenting incompatible views³⁸.

The final example in this section will be discussed through the lens of a recent approach which focuses on metaphorical story and which, as its proponent, Ritchie (2017: 1-2) notes, has not received much attention among metaphor researchers and scholars. As previously mentioned, Ritchie (2017:1) proposes that many metaphors invoke stories in our mind and that these metaphorical stories become an essential part of our full understanding of metaphors. He also notes that political discourse, especially political speeches, seem to be abundant in metaphorical stories, mostly because of the persuasive effects they create (Ritchie 2017: 120). Even though he does not explicitly discuss metaphorical creativity, Ritchie (2017: 124) mentions that speakers are often quite inventive in transforming common metaphors into stories, which are sometimes quite elaborate. What also needs to be mentioned is the emphasis the author puts on contextual knowledge, which to a great extent determines how metaphors and metaphorical stories will be processed (Ritchie 2017: 149). There can be substantial differences in the knowledge of relevant context and thus contextual factors, such as prior beliefs and motivated reasoning, need to be taken into consideration, since they can have a strong impact on contextual knowledge (Ritchie 2017: 237). As one of the examples of how metaphorical stories work in political discourse, the author chose a segment from the 2012 Republican Presidential primary debate in which Governor Rick Perry referred to Mitt Romney as a “*vulture capitalist*”. At first, this may be understood as simply associating Romney with some of the qualities of this bird, such as ugly, smelly and ungainly. However, considering common cultural knowledge of vultures as spotting a dying animal, circling around and, eventually descending and stripping the flesh off the animal’s bones, together with the political and historical context, it seems inevitable to look for a more elaborated interpretation of the metaphor. For a better understanding it is also important to know that in his campaign Romney claimed to have managerial competence because he is a co-owner of a venture capital firm, whose job is buying failing companies, whose assets are sold if the company fails to be rehabilitated within a short period of time. As a consequence, there are

³⁸ Badri (2017: 229) adopts Musolff’s (2004) claim that the same metaphor can both create cohesion between conceptualisers and reveal incoherence at the level of perspectives. He further claims that metaphorical coherence is not only reflected in speakers’ use of the same metaphor but also in how their worldviews determine the way speakers exploit available entailments to serve their stances, which means that novel elaborations are tightly determined by the goals and communicative intentions of the speaker.

massive layoffs of the company's employees. Having all this in mind, it now becomes easy to map the vehicle story of vultures onto the topic story about venture capitalists³⁹, which is what Perry did in his statement. Perry also made reference to the situation that happened in two South Carolina companies, which were bought by Romney's company and eventually closed down, by using the metaphorical expression "*picked their bones clean*", which can only be understood as metaphorical reference to some kind of a predator. This demonstrates that Perry intended the phrase "*vulture capitalist*" to be the index to a metaphorical story. The author indicates the further potential of extending the metaphorical story. Just as vultures play an important role in preventing the spread of diseases by disposing of rotting corpses, in the same way apologists of venture capitalists can claim to play a similar role in the economy (Ritchie 2017: 133-136).

³⁹ Ritchie (2017: 135) notes that the mapping is reinforced by the alliteration of "venture" and "vulture", making the metaphor more memorable and probably contributing to its rapid spread by making it more interesting to repeat and discuss.

3. CORPUS AND METHODOLOGY

The aim of this dissertation is to study metaphorical creativity in British political discourse on Brexit. The definition of political discourse adopted in the dissertation is the one provided by Wilson (2001: 398). According to this definition, political discourse is discourse which involves “politicians, political institutions, governments, political media, and political supporters operating in political environments to achieve political goals”. In order to demonstrate how metaphorical creativity in British political discourse on Brexit emerges, the dissertation will present two different case studies. The first case study deals with creative instances of the JOURNEY metaphor, whereas the second case study focuses on metaphorical creativity evident in the MARRIAGE/DIVORCE metaphor. The JOURNEY metaphors are divided into two categories, the WALKING JOURNEY metaphor and the VEHICLE JOURNEY metaphors. The VEHICLE JOURNEY metaphors are further divided into five groups, depending on the type of the vehicle involved, the CAR JOURNEY metaphor, the BUS JOURNEY metaphor, the TRAIN JOURNEY metaphor, the SHIP JOURNEY metaphor and the PLANE JOURNEY metaphor. Though the MARRIAGE metaphor and the DIVORCE metaphor are put together because they belong to the same FAMILY metaphor, for the purpose of the analysis, they are studied separately. Apart from studying the cognitive mechanisms that lead to the emergence of creative metaphors and the role of metaphor scenarios, both case studies also investigate various contextual factors that motivate the emergence of metaphorical creativity, as well as the rhetorical goals of creative metaphors.

The texts from which the examples of metaphorical creativity in British political discourse on Brexit have been isolated and analysed come from the Google News Archive database, which contains full texts from British newspapers written in English. The data was searched for in different British electronic news media sources during the period prior to and following the Brexit vote (2016-2018). Since the database is huge, the examples were searched by key words based on the source and target domain concepts, such as *Brexit*, *journey*, *marriage* and *divorce*. Considering the fact that the JOURNEY metaphor and the MARRIAGE/DIVORCE metaphor are very frequently used in political discourse, important for the search were the central conceptual mappings and scenarios for the WAY-MOVEMENT-SPEED and LOVE-MARRIAGE-FAMILY metaphors provided by Musolff (2004), which were then extended to the words related to the unused aspects of the JOURNEY and MARRIAGE/DIVORCE source domain, such as different vehicles, people involved in a journey, type of path/road, married couple, children, elements of a divorce procedure, etc. For example, in the search for

the articles containing the examples of the CAR JOURNEY metaphor, the key word *Brexit* was combined with the key words taken from Musolff's (2004: 42) table 6, which provides a list of conceptual elements of the WAY-MOVEMENT-SPEED source domain together with the lexemes associated with each conceptual element, such as *car*, *racing car*, *engine*, *juggernaut*, *driving seat* and *road*. Apart from using the lexemes found in the table, the search was facilitated by using some additional lexemes related to the CAR JOURNEY source domain: *car journey*, *car driver*, *motorway*, *backseat driver*, *car crash*, *steering wheel*, *drunk driving*, etc. After finding the texts that contained the key words, the entire texts were carefully read with the aim of finding the metaphorical expressions which are creative instances of these particular metaphors. The same procedure was applied in both case studies. The number of texts selected for the analysis in both case studies is thirty-six, twenty-three texts in the case of JOURNEY metaphors and thirteen texts in the case of MARRIAGE/DIVORCE metaphors. These are the articles from different British electronic news media, *the Independent*, *the BBC*, *Politico*, *the Economist*, *the Herald*, *the Guardian*, *Daily Express*, *New Statesman*, *the Daily Mail*, *Politics Home*, *ITV News*, *Brexit Central*, *insider.co.uk*, *Tribune*, *the Sun*, *Lincolnshire Reporter*, *the Huffington Post*, *the CNN*, *the Spectator*, *the Irish Times*, *the Sunday Times* and *the Daily Mirror*.

The criterion for determining whether a metaphorical expression is conventional or creative is based on Semino's (2008) and Müller's (2005) claim that conventionality and creativity are graded phenomena which exist in clines. The contemporary study of metaphor in discourse involves the use of a complete method for the identification of metaphor at the level of word use, based on the extensive corpus-linguistic research and known as the metaphor identification procedure (MIP), proposed by the Pragglejaz Group⁴⁰. Since the

⁴⁰The name Pragglejaz derives from the initials of the first names of the ten scholars who formed the group: Peter Crisp, Ray Gibbs, Alan Cienki, Gerard Steen, Graham Low, Lynne Cameron, Elena Semino, Joseph Grady, Alice Deignan and Zoltan Kövecses. The procedure for the identification of metaphorical which they propose is the following:

1. Read the entire text-discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.
 2. Determine the lexical units in the text-discourse.
 3. (a) For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, that is, how it applies to an entity, relation or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (contextual meaning). Take into account what comes before and after the lexical unit.
 - (b) For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. For our purposes, basic meanings tend to be
 - More concrete (what they evoke is easier to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell and taste);
 - Related to bodily action;
 - More precise (as opposed to vague);
 - Historically older.
- Basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit.

present analysis is not quantitative but qualitative, the application of this method only did not seem appropriate. Instead, in accordance with the approach used by Semino (2008), based on the metaphor identification procedure (MIP) proposed by the Pragglejaz Group, creative metaphorical expressions are those whose metaphorical meanings have not become lexicalised and cannot be found in dictionaries. On the other hand, all those metaphorical expressions whose metaphorical meanings have become lexicalised and can be found in dictionaries together with nonmetaphorical meanings are regarded conventional. Parts of the texts which contain the metaphorical expressions that seem relevant for the analysis were extracted and the author judged their metaphoricity by checking their meaning in the online versions of Cambridge English Dictionary, Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English and Collins English Dictionary. Lexical units whose meaning in the dictionary differed from the contextual meaning were marked as metaphorical.

After identifying creative metaphorical expressions, the first part of the analysis will examine the metaphors underlying those metaphorical expressions and the mappings between conceptual domains. Particular attention will be given to studying the cognitive mechanisms that enable the emergence of metaphorical creativity, i.e. source-related and target-induced creativity, by identifying the additional unused conceptual elements of source domains, in terms of which metaphors are creatively elaborated. The analysis of metaphors at the level of conceptual domains will be complemented by metaphor scenarios, emerging from the additional mappings between domains and providing elaborate story lines along which the mappings are extended (Musolff 2004). Furthermore, since the case studies deal with metaphorical creativity emerging in real discourse, the role of the context in the emergence of creative metaphors will be examined. More precisely, the case studies will focus on identifying particular contextual factors that motivate the choice and creative elaboration of metaphors, as well as on identifying and discussing the rhetorical goals creative metaphors intend to achieve.

(c) If the lexical unit has a more basic current-contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it.

4. If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical. (Pragglejaz group 2007: 3 in Semino 2008: 11-12)

4. ANALYSIS

4.1. Introduction

It is a generally accepted fact that metaphorical language characterises much of the discourse aimed at achieving persuasive effects, particularly political discourse, which mostly addresses intricate and contentious issues in a society (Semino 2008, Charteris-Black 2011, Musolff 2016, 2017a, Ritchie 2017). The reason why metaphors are very useful conceptual tools for presenting political issues is because they tend to simplify complex and abstract issues and present them in vivid and potentially emotional terms (Semino 2008: 124). Though conventional metaphors represent an important part of political discourse, more intriguing seem to be the cases of creative metaphors, which, as Semino (2008: 124) notes, are used more deliberately to argue particular points in particular contexts, which, at the same time, puts an emphasis on the crucial role the specific contexts have in motivating the choice of metaphor and its possible effects on audience. Hence, Brexit, a very complex process of Britain's withdrawal from the EU, has become a controversial and widely discussed issue in British media. What contributes to its controversy is deeply rooted British Euroscepticism, which has portrayed Britain in the eyes of Europe as an outsider, mostly sceptical and reluctant when it comes to the European integration process. As it is always the case with complex political situations that are likely to produce a political crisis, the language used to talk about Brexit relies heavily on metaphors, both conventional and creative ones, which enable the speakers/writers to communicate their ideas more effectively. Such an abundance of metaphorical language is generally characteristic of the political discourse on the relations among the EU member states and has been the object of recent studies within the realms of cognitive linguistics (Musolff 2000a, 2004, 2006, 2010, 2011, 2017a, 2017b; Đurović 2009; Đurović and Silaški 2018; Drulák 2015; Berberović and Mujagić 2017; Werkmann and Buljan 2013, Šarić 2005).

The aim of the present analysis is to examine the use of creative metaphors in British political discourse on Brexit, using the cognitive linguistic theory of conceptual metaphor. Since, according to Musolff (2004, 2006, 2016), Semino et al. (2016) and Kövecses (2017c), analysing metaphor only in terms of mappings between conceptual domains is too general and does not suffice when it comes to the use of metaphor in real discourse, it is necessary to extend the metaphor analysis to the individual level of metaphor scenarios as defined by

Musolff (2016). The reason is that metaphor scenarios contain far more conceptual material, such as entities/participants, roles and relationships, possible goals, actions and events, and evaluations, attitudes, emotions, etc. (Semino et al. 2016: 12). Furthermore, due to the important role context plays in the choice of metaphors, the present analysis will pay special attention to identifying different contextual factors that motivate the emergence of creative metaphors in British political discourse on Brexit, following the classification of contextual factors as provided by Kövecses (2015, 2017b). By combining the analysis of creative metaphors at the level of conceptual domains and metaphor scenarios, a fuller picture of the rhetorical power creative metaphors exhibit is created.

4.2. Political context: Brexit

One of the most debated issues in British politics in the last couple of years has certainly been Brexit, i.e. the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the European Union (henceforth the EU), which occurred on 23 June 2016. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the word Brexit is a blend of the words *British* or *Britain* and *exit*. As claimed by Moseley (2016), the word Brexit was coined in 2012 by Peter Wilding, the founder and director of the British influence think tank and one of the campaigners for the United Kingdom to remain in the EU in June's referendum. He wrote about Brexit eight months before the then Prime Minister David Cameron had announced the upcoming referendum. Wilding explained that the inspiration came from Grexit, Greece's possible exit from the Eurozone. Prior to the analysis of creative metaphors used in British political discourse on Brexit, it is important to understand the complex processes in British politics that contributed to the realisation of Brexit.

After the Second World War, there was a need to unite the war-torn Europe, devastated by extreme nationalism. According to Tarnavskiy (2017: 39), British politicians have always been regarded as the most sceptical ones concerning the European integration processes. Yet, the one who inspired the idea of a United States of Europe was the renowned British politician Winston Churchill. However, Churchill's view of the role of Britain in that process was marked by mild Euroscepticism. Being both geographically and mentally far from Europe, Britain was seen only as a guarantor and a witness in that process but not as a member or participant, because, as Churchill said: "We are with Europe, but we are not Europe" (Johnson 2015: 229 in Tarnavskiy 2017: 40). When the European Coal and Steel

Community was founded in 1951, Britain was reluctant about the invitation to join its founders and, to everyone's surprise, refused to sign the Treaty of Rome in 1957. Facing some economic difficulties, Britain applied to join the European Economic Community (henceforth the EEC) in 1961, but its entry was vetoed twice by the French President Charles de Gaulle. Britain finally joined the EEC in 1973 under the lead of the Conservative Prime Minister Edward Heath. However, this caused a lot of dissatisfaction and resulted in the 1975 referendum on leaving the EEC, in which 67 percent of voters supported Britain's continued membership in the EEC (Wilson 2014). All these events, together with diverse attitudes, contributed to the emergence of Euroscepticism as a central and widely contested issue in British politics. It was further developed by the British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher who expressed her disappointment with the European project and changed the public discourse on the European integration within Britain, thus inspiring a new generation of Eurosceptics (Tarnavskiy 2017: 42-43). Even though it is often associated with Conservative Party, particularly Margaret Thatcher, Euroscepticism has had its proponents among both the Conservatives and Labour party members. Depending on the difference in views exhibited by different Prime Ministers, Britain's role in the European integration processes ranged from the fervent opposition to any form of engagement to milder forms of Euroscepticism and eventually to the support of Britain's integration in the EU. The fact that Britain became one of the founders and full members of the EU did not bring any peace to the British political scene. D'Ancona (2016) claims that it was Norman Lamont, the former chancellor of the exchequer, who brought about the idea of Britain's withdrawal from the EU in one of the fringe meetings held in Bournemouth in 1994. It took 22 years for this idea to be developed and realised. Eventually, in the Bloomberg Speech, in January 2013, the then Prime Minister David Cameron announced that the British people would be given the opportunity to decide about the nature of the future British relationship with the EU via referendum (Wodak 2016: 11) and thus reached far beyond Margaret Thatcher's expectations, fulfilling or rather implementing her dreams (Alexander-Collier 2014: 8), as well as the wishes of numerous Eurosceptics (Tarnavskiy 2017: 51). Wodak (2016: 1) summarises Cameron's proposal as follows:

... British citizens are called to vote either to remain in an unstable and fragile EU, under the new agreements negotiated by the British Prime Minister in the early spring of 2016; or to opt out of the EU, thus choosing "Brexit", which would imply a difficult transition lasting at least two years, with unpredictable economic and social outcomes.

In the 2016 referendum, 51.2 percent of voters voted for the Britain's exit from the EU and Britain entered the process of departure, which, as Whitman (2016: 509) claims, introduced uncertainty into the 50-year-old strategy, pursued by successive British governments, to structure its political and economic engagement with Europe through the politics, policies and institutions of the EU.

Wodak (2016: 10) tries to explain the phenomenon of Euroscepticism, which subsequently led to Brexit, by claiming that, throughout history, Europe has been Britain's biggest trading partner, but also a source of existential threat, especially from Napoleonic France and Nazi Germany. This resulted in a completely different perspective Britons have of Europe from the one obtained by other member states, which see the EU in emotional terms as an important part of their identity. Britain has never developed this kind of attitude. They rather considered the EU on an essentially pragmatic and transactional basis (Wodak 2016: 20). D'Ancona (2016) explains that the main reason why the political class embraced Brexit is despair with the EU, the faith that Britain can survive on its own and the conviction that the 21st century will favour nimble states over cumbersome bureaucratic blocs.

4.3. JOURNEY metaphors in British political discourse on Brexit

Cognitive linguistic research on conceptual metaphor (Semino 2008; Charteris Black 2011; Hidalgo Downing et al. 2013; Dávid and Furkó 2015; Borčić et al. 2016; Musolff 2017a, 2017b) has demonstrated that JOURNEY metaphors are one of the most prevalent metaphor types, which can be ascribed to the fact that the experience with journeys is one of the most familiar kinds of experience to most people. This also applies to the area of politics, in which, as Semino (2008: 117) notes, JOURNEY metaphors appear to be discursively systematic, especially in relation to plans, policies and the histories of nation states. In order to understand the significance of JOURNEY metaphors for political discourse, it is necessary to consider the basic structure of this metaphor, as well as its actual realisation in political discourse.

First of all, it is important to bear in mind that JOURNEY metaphors belong to the EVENT STRUCTURE metaphor, which was first explored by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and recognised as one of the most basic conceptual metaphor systems. Based on their study, Kövecses (2005: 43) explains that the significance of this metaphor system is reflected in the fact that it structures different aspects of events, such as state, change, cause, action and

purpose in terms of a small set of physical concepts, such as location, force and movement. It has been highlighted that the EVENT STRUCTURE metaphor is very complex, comprising the following conceptual metaphors: STATES ARE LOCATIONS, CHANGES ARE MOVEMENTS, CAUSES ARE FORCES, ACTION IS SELF-PROPELLED MOTION, PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS, MEANS ARE PATHS, DIFFICULTIES ARE IMPEDIMENTS, EXTERNAL EVENTS ARE LARGE MOVING OBJECTS, EXPECTED PROGRESS IS A TRAVEL SCHEDULE, LONG-TERM PURPOSEFUL ACTIVITIES ARE JOURNEYS. He (2005: 47) further notes that the motivation for the emergence of these submappings is provided by correlations in bodily experience, since, for instance:

... states of objects obtain at a particular location, movement leads to change of location, forces often affect objects in visible ways, if we want to achieve a purpose, we often have to move to particular destinations, and sometimes we have to make choices among paths that lead to destinations to achieve our goals.

Similarly, Semino (2008: 92) and Hidalgo Downing et al. (2013: 203) argue that JOURNEY metaphors invoke the PATH image schema, or, as Kövecses (2006: 210) puts it, the SOURCE-PATH-GOAL schema, which is based in our physical experience of motion in space. According to Hidalgo Downing et al. (2013: 203), the PATH image schema has three basic properties: a starting point, contiguous points and an ending point, which correspond to the structural elements “source”, “path” and “goal” (Kövecses 2006: 210), adding that the clarity these elements exhibit is the reason why journeys are such a potent source domain for metaphors. This image schema provides a way of metaphorically constructing goals as destinations, ways of reaching goals as movement forward, problems as obstacles and success or failure as reaching or failing to reach a destination. It appears to construct the basic structure of the very complex JOURNEY domain, which also comprises richer and more culture-specific knowledge about travellers, vehicles, modes of travel, impediments to travel and so on (Semino 2008: 92), which further enrich the process of evaluation and meaning construction (Hidalgo Downing et al. 2013: 203). Furthermore, Semino (2008: 92) emphasises Grady’s (1997) view that any complex JOURNEY metaphor, for instance, LIFE IS A JOURNEY metaphor, derives from the combination of more basic primary metaphors, such as PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS and ACTION IS SELF-PROPELLED MOTION, which suggests that any kind of purposeful activity can be metaphorically constructed as a journey.

When it comes to its presence in political discourse, as Charteris-Black (2011: 47) argues, the JOURNEY metaphor provides a mental representation that allows the various aspects of political experience to be understood and expressed through embodied experience of movement. Thus, JOURNEY metaphors in political communication are claimed to refer to

the predetermined objectives of policy, implying that one needs to have a clear idea in the mind of where one would like to be at some point in the future. This also implies some type of planned progress and assumes a conscious agent who will follow a fixed path towards an imagined goal. Political leaders seem to find this directionality very important because they are aware of the need to appear to have planned intentions if they want to succeed rhetorically (Charteris-Black 2011: 316-317). The author (2011: 47) adds that these metaphors are rhetorically attractive to politicians and leaders because of their potential to be turned into a whole scenario, where they can represent themselves as ‘guides’, their policies as ‘maps’ and their supporters as ‘fellow travelling companions’. Borčić et al. (2016: 86) find that MOVEMENT/TRAVEL metaphors create a picture of a politician with clear goals, making recipients aware that achieving these goals sometimes requires patience and overcoming possible obstacles, which all contributes greatly to the frequency with which these metaphors occur in political discourse. Dávid and Furkó (2015: 9) also discuss various elements of real journeys that are exploited in the political metaphor of journey:

Agents of political scenes are conceived of as if they were participants (either crew or passengers) of journeys linking sources with goals covering paths, passing landmarks, with all concomitant vehicles of a journey scenario from costs, through the quality of the trip completed to its outcome.

Moreover, they (2015: 12) claim that this dynamic nature of a journey frame, including numerous potential vehicles, allow for a principled way of producing novel scenarios of political relevance rooted in acts of travelling. This idea can be correlated with Charteris-Black’s (2011) assumption that our rich knowledge of journeys contributes to the richness of the JOURNEY source domain. In other words, considering our knowledge that journeys can be long or short, that they can be over easy or difficult terrain, that journeys can involve a different mode of travel – foot, horse, cart, car, train, spaceship, which in turn determines the speed movement, that the choice of mode of travel and the nature of the terrain also determine the amount of effort that is required to reach the destination, it becomes easier to appreciate the richness of this source domain (Charteris-Black 2011: 316-317). This can also contribute to the creative extension of JOURNEY metaphors when used in political or any other type of discourse.

The SOURCE-PATH-GOAL schema, which lies at the basis of JOURNEY metaphors, emerges under the influence of our elementary bodily experience of walking along a path. This means that the conceptual metaphor POLITICAL PROCESS IS A JOURNEY is essentially motivated by embodiment, which is in accordance with the standard CMT. However, as Kövecses (2015: 50-51) proposes in his “pressure of coherence” theory, embodiment is only

one type of pressure put on a conceptualiser. There is yet another type of pressure coming from the context, both linguistic and non-linguistic. He thus concludes that both universal embodiment and nonuniversal context affect the way people conceptualise the world in real communicative/discourse situations, adding that the outcome of these two pressures depends on which pressure proves to be stronger in particular situations. Likewise, it can be claimed that the creative instances of metaphors to be presented in this study are fundamentally based on embodiment, but their creativity emerges from the impact of different contextual factors.

Within his study of the EU corpus, Musolff (2017a, 2017b) conducted a preliminary survey of 145 UK press articles from the period January 2016 - September 2016. The survey has shown that JOURNEY is certainly among the most prominent and recurrent source concepts used to conceptualise the political situation revolving around Brexit (the remaining concepts are: FIGHTING/WAR, NATURAL DISASTER, DIVORCE, GAMBLE and BODY/HEART). Though JOURNEY metaphors are generally conventional, it does not mean that they do not exhibit any creative potential. Apart from the basic cross-domain mappings emerging from the POLITICAL PROCESS IS A JOURNEY metaphor, in which a political process is conceptualised as a journey, politicians as guides or travellers, political goals as destinations, difficulties in a political process as obstacles, progress made as distance covered and so forth, many novel elements are introduced to creatively extend these basic mappings and, consequently, the conventional metaphor itself. This happens under the influence of various discourse factors and with the aim of achieving different rhetorical goals. The present study will show that the JOURNEY source domain is very flexible and can be extended to produce creative instances of metaphor use. The first part of the analysis will deal with creative instances of the WALKING JOURNEY metaphor, whereas the second part will be concerned with the VEHICLE JOURNEY metaphors. The latter one will be divided into five subsections dealing with a different vehicle used for conceptualisation of Brexit: the CAR JOURNEY metaphor, the BUS JOURNEY metaphor, the TRAIN JOURNEY metaphor, the SHIP JOURNEY metaphor and the PLANE JOURNEY metaphor.

4.3.1. *WALKING JOURNEY metaphor*

The general metaphor A POLITICAL PROCESS IS A JOURNEY has several variations depending on the type of journey involved. One such instance is the metaphor A POLITICAL PROCESS IS A WALKING JOURNEY, which simplifies the understanding of the abstract and complex notion of a political process by bringing into correspondence its characteristics with the characteristics

of a walking journey. It does so by mapping the conceptual elements of the WALKING JOURNEY source domain, such as travellers, path, obstacles, etc., onto the conceptual elements of the POLITICAL PROCESS target domain, such as politicians, political process, difficulties in a political process, etc. Besides the level of conceptual mappings, the level of metaphor scenarios is very important for a proper account of this metaphor. One of the most basic and the most frequent JOURNEY metaphor scenarios is the WALKING JOURNEY scenario, which is defined by Musolff (2004: 45) as A GROUP OF STATES CO-OPERATING IN A POLITICAL PROCESS ARE TRAVELLING TOGETHER ALONG A PATH. The author (2004: 46-47) further explains that, besides being a general scenario, it consists of various roles and story-lines, which can be grouped into two sets: PROGRESS ALONG A PATH (with its characteristics of being EASY/FAST or DIFFICULT/SLOW depending on the existence of OBSTACLES) and DIFFERENCES OF SPEED. For the purpose of understanding metaphorical creativity, both of these levels seem to be of great importance, and only the combination of these can give a full account of how creative metaphors actually emerge.

Contrary to the expectations based on Musolff's (2004) findings that the WALKING JOURNEY metaphor scenario is among the most frequent ones in the political discourse on the EU, the present study has revealed that there are few examples of creative use of the WALKING JOURNEY metaphor in the British political discourse on Brexit. The first use of this metaphor in our corpus was recorded in May 2017 and is attributed to the chief EU negotiator Michael Barnier who tried to warn Prime Minister Theresa May that the process of negotiating Brexit might be very complicated and might require a great deal of persistence. Even though the term Brexit does not appear in the part of Mr Barnier's speech presented in the example that follows, it is important to note that Mr Barnier did make a clear reference to Brexit in other parts of his speech which were quoted in the same article.

- (1) Saying that he found the No10 meeting "cordial", Mr Barnier went on: "On a personal basis I had the opportunity to discuss a shared passion with Theresa May which is rambling and hiking in the mountains."

He added: "*If you like walking in the mountains you have to learn a number of rules. You have to learn to put one foot in front of the other, because sometimes you are on a steep and rocky path.*"

“You also have to look what accidents might befall you –falling rocks. You have to be very careful to keep your breath, you have to have stamina, because it could be a lengthy path and you have to keep looking at the summit.”

Mr Barnier said he wanted to build an “entente cordial” that will last well beyond Brexit, but he attacked those – without naming names – who had suggested there would be no consequences to the UK’s withdrawal. (Joe Watts, *the Independent*, 3 May 2017)

Looking at the example from the general level of conceptual domains, it can be observed that the WALKING JOURNEY source domain has been used for the comprehension of the target domain THE PROCESS OF BREXIT, resulting in the metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A WALKING JOURNEY. However, a closer look at the example reveals that the WALKING JOURNEY source domain has been extended to the unused source-internal conceptual element involving the specific type of the journey, i.e. hiking, which has resulted in an unconventional case of metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS HIKING. The cognitive mechanism responsible for this kind of metaphorical creativity is what Kövecses (2010b: 664) termed source-related creativity. Consequently, the conceptual elements of the source domain HIKING have been mapped onto the conceptual elements of the target domain THE PROCESS OF BREXIT, providing the structure for the emergence of the specific scenario, which focuses on the rules mountaineers need to obey when hiking, and can thus be called the HIKING scenario. The scenario utilises the conceptual material of the source domain and creates an image in which Britain and the British government are presented as mountaineers, who in the process of negotiating Brexit, have to be very cautious due to the obstacles, such as *steep and rocky path* and *falling rocks*, and have to observe a number of rules, such as to *put one foot in front of the other*, *look what accidents might befall*, *be very careful to keep your breath* and *have stamina* and *keep looking at the summit* regardless of *a lengthy path*. These creative metaphorical expressions reveal how the unused aspects of the source domain, recruited from our rich encyclopaedic knowledge about the domain (specific type of obstacles which require a particular way of walking and physical and psychological fitness), can be mapped onto the target domain and thus participate in producing a creative scenario. As Kövecses (2017c: 17) claims, the cognitive mechanism that can explain the usage of these “unexpected items” in real discourse is target-induced creativity. What happens is that once a particular source domain, in this case HIKING source domain, is used to structure a target, i.e. THE PROCESS OF BREXIT, the target can connect back to the source and take further knowledge structures from

it (Kövecses 2010b: 665). Considering all this, it can be claimed that the passage as a whole implies the scenario in which a mountaineer sets on a difficult journey and thus has to be careful and obey a set of rules if he/she wants to reach the summit. The first rule the mountaineer must learn is to be careful *to put one foot in front of the other, because sometimes you are on a steep and rocky path*. Besides a problematic path, there are other potential dangers for the mountaineer, such as *falling rocks*. The second rule for the mountaineer is to keep his/her breath, have stamina and always focus on the final goal because the journey is very long, demanding and full of obstacles, which can distract the mountaineer. This scenario enables the comprehension of the situation in which Theresa May, metonymically standing for the British government and the entire nation, has entered a very complicated process of negotiating the terms of Brexit with the EU. Therefore, she must be aware that such negotiating processes require patience, wisdom and attentiveness. Negotiations of this kind are mostly characterised by various problems, in this case, multiple losses on Britain's side, and they have to be handled with great wisdom and care, without those in charge being distracted from the ultimate goal of the entire process, i.e. Britain's independence from the EU.

Mr Barnier's HIKING metaphor was reused in the article by Charlie Cooper but further elaborated by the inclusion of new conceptual elements.

(2) *One rule of hiking that Barnier missed though – always be prepared. For May, holding the election is the equivalent of packing the right crampons, walking sticks and safety helmet.*

It looks like she is going to need them. (Charlie Cooper, *Politico*, 3 May 2017)

The source and the target domains are the same as in the original metaphor. However, based on the knowledge about the HIKING source domain, the author extends the source domain by including its unused element of the safety equipment required for this type of journey. This was possible due to the ability of the target domain of reconnecting to the source and drawing some further, unused elements from its structure, which results in the emergence of a creative metaphor, which is a case of target-induced creativity. Hence, the existing HIKING scenario, with all the implied rules, has been enriched by an additional rule for mountaineers. According to the author, Mr Barnier forgot to mention the necessity of packing the equipment such as *the right crampons, walking sticks and safety helmet*. The reference to all these pieces of equipment implies that the journey is expected to be very difficult and full of obstacles and

thus the mountaineer has to take all the security measures to ensure a safe journey. The pieces of safety equipment mentioned in the metaphorical expression can be understood as a reference to the precautionary measures that Theresa May ought to take or has already decided to take, in order to prevent hampering the Brexit negotiation process by both the local and the EU politicians, who have opposed Brexit from the very beginning. This especially refers to Theresa May's surprising announcement from April 2017 that she intended to call early general election, which, she hoped, would grant her a mandate and power to handle the process of Brexit without any obstacles coming from the politicians with the opposing views.

After discussing how the creative instances of the HIKING metaphor emerge in these two examples, it is important to see which contextual factors impact their emergence. Several of them seem to be at work here. In example (1), Mr Barnier himself explained the reasons for his choice of metaphor. He highlights that he and Theresa May share an interest for mountaineering. Since the interest is mutual, motivation can be claimed to come from two sources. The first contextual factor is an element of the conceptual-cognitive context and is termed concerns and interests. Thus, Mr Barnier has been motivated to use this particular metaphor because of his personal concern and interest for walking in the mountains. At the same time, his knowledge about the main elements of discourse, i.e. his and Theresa May's shared interest, as an element of the discourse context, has served as the second contextual factor that has prompted the author to use the metaphors. Example (2) reveals yet another type of impact, that of the discourse context, manifested in the effect of the previous discourse on the same topic. It is clear that the author of the metaphor in example (2) relies on the metaphor originally used by Mr Barnier, but he extends its source domain by including the additional element of the equipment for mountaineers.

The analysis of the two cases of the metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS HIKING at the level of conceptual domains and scenarios contributes to the understanding of rhetorical goals that are achieved through its use. It can be argued that Mr Barnier used the metaphor in order to express his view of how the situation regarding Brexit might develop in the future. The fact that he chose a creative metaphor adds vividness and clarity to its understanding. By referring to the interest in mountain walking which he shares with Ms May, he makes an emotional appeal and creates a sense of solidarity, encouraging Ms May, and by extension the entire British nation, to accept and endure all the difficulties in order to achieve the ultimate goal. In accordance with the claim that JOURNEY metaphors generally tend to emphasise purposeful and positive experiences (Charteris-Black 2011), the present metaphor can also be claimed to

convey a positive representation of the process of Brexit. This is especially evident in the metaphorical expression *it could be a lengthy path and you have to keep looking at the summit*, which emphasises the aforementioned idea that no matter how difficult the journey is, it is the final destination that is important and worth every possible sacrifice. Therefore, Britain has to be ready to endure all the difficulties that the process of leaving the EU requires, in order to achieve the ultimate goal of gaining its independence. Unlike Mr Barnier who intended his metaphor for Ms May primarily, Charlie Cooper, as a journalist, reused and creatively elaborated the same metaphor in order to warn the readers about the problems that the Prime Minister and the entire country must deal with. Thus, by adding *the right crampons, walking sticks* and *safety helmet*, the author wishes to question whether the British government representatives are fully aware of what problems lie ahead of them in the negotiating process and whether they are taking all the measures to ensure the completion of the process of Brexit.

The reference to the same metaphor is found in the article written by Mark Mardell in September 2017, reporting on the conclusions from the Ambrosetti Forum held in Italy. It focuses on the speech delivered by Mr Barnier, who used some elements of the HIKING metaphor again, in the context of discussing the position of the EU in the process of negotiating the terms of Britain's withdrawal from the Union.

(3) Michel Barnier concluded by pointing out again that he was, like Theresa May, *a walker, a mountaineer used to taking one step after another, watching out for problems but always with his eyes fixed on the peaks.*

The EU is determined that it will not stumble just because one member of the team is giving up on getting to the summit, particularly when it thinks that member never really believed in the sunny uplands in the first place. (Mark Mardell, *the BBC*, 3 September 2017)

As seen from the examples, the change of the context in which Mr Barnier reused his own metaphor caused him to adapt and elaborate some elements of the metaphor beyond its original use, resulting in the production of slightly different metaphorical expressions. In the metaphor found in the first paragraph, both the source and the target domain have undergone certain changes. The greatest change occurred in the target domain which has been completely altered, so that in this case, MR BARNIER, metonymically standing for the EU as its Chief Negotiator in the process of Brexit, is the target domain. When it comes to the source

domain, a particular part of the structure of the original source domain has been preserved. However, instead of employing a more general source domain HIKING, Mr Barnier focuses on one of its aspects, that of the TRAVELLER, or more precisely the MOUNTAINEER, which brings about the metaphor MR BARNIER IS A MOUNTAINEER. This is also the case of the target-induced creativity, in which the target domain, MR BARNIER, selected the element of the source domain that seemed most suitable in this context of use. Consequently, the elements of the source domain have been mapped onto the target, resulting in the emergence of the MOUNTAINEER scenario, which, as it has already been mentioned, selects particular aspects of the source while neglecting the others. The metaphorical expressions, *taking one step after another*, *watching out for problems* and *always with his eyes fixed on the peaks*, clearly highlight the aspects of attentiveness and concentration that are essential for a successful mountaineer. Furthermore, it can be claimed that the scenario presenting a mountaineer walking in the mountains watchful of every step, dealing with the upcoming obstacles, but always concentrated on reaching the final goal, i.e. *the peaks*, metaphorically presents Mr Barnier, who deals with the Brexit negotiation process in a very careful way, paying attention to all the details, always bearing in mind the expected outcome.

An even more interesting case of creative elaboration of metaphor is evident in the second paragraph, in which the author of the article reused Mr Barnier's metaphor in order to summarise the conclusions from the Ambrosetti Forum. However, in this case, different aspects of the source and target domains have been employed. Instead of MR BARNIER, THE EU, with all its individual members, appears as the target domain. The knowledge that one of the aspects of the MOUNTAINEER source domain is the case of a group of mountaineers travelling together, has been used to create a new source domain, i.e. A TEAM OF MOUNTAINEERS. The emergence of the creative metaphor THE EU IS A TEAM OF MOUNTAINEERS has once again been enabled by means of the target-induced creativity. Considering the fact that the EU has multiple members, it is obvious that the target domain structure required a source domain that could account for this aspect, which has led to the activation of the most suitable element of the source domain, i.e. A TEAM OF MOUNTAINEERS. The mappings created between the two domains contribute to the creation of the scenario in which the EU is perceived in terms of a team of mountaineers who are focused on reaching the summit, despite all the difficulties and obstacles. Based on the knowledge about the source domain, the emerging A TEAM OF MOUNTAINEERS scenario highlights some of the unused elements of the source domain, such as determination in reaching the goal despite all the problems and the possibility that one

member of the team may decide to withdraw, which is evident in the following metaphorical expression: *The EU is determined that it will not stumble just because one member of the team is giving up on getting to the summit. Additionally, the metaphorical expression particularly when it thinks that member never really believed in the sunny uplands in the first place* indicates that the scenario utilises one further aspect of the source domain that can be ascribed to the leaving member of the team, the initial lack of trust in the possibility of reaching *the sunny uplands* (the goal of every mountaineer), resulting in the lack of motivation for putting any effort into the journey. All these elements of the scenario have been used to metaphorically present the EU's determination to protect its own interests and ideals, even though Britain, one of its most important members, decided to leave, emphasising the lack of belief in the EU that Britain has always had.

Since in example (3) Mr Barnier reused his own metaphor, the same contextual factors seem to be at work as in example (1), personal concerns and interests in hiking and the knowledge about the main element of discourse, i.e. Ms May's and Mr Barnier's mutual interest in hiking. However, the original metaphor was changed first by Mr Barnier, in the sense of putting himself and as the target domain, and then by Mr Mardell, the author of the article, who put the EU as the target domain. The question that arises here is what might have caused this change. The answer to this question lies in the social context. In contrast to the occasion in which he produced the metaphor for the first time, which was the Downing Street meeting with Ms May, the occasion in which Mr Barnier reused and changed the original metaphor was the Ambrosetti Forum held in Italy. His audience were the elite EU politicians and Mr Barnier discussed the issue of Brexit from the perspective held by the EU officials. Thus, it can be claimed that the social context, i.e. the social situation, acted as the contextual factor that influenced the author to adapt and produce the metaphor that fits his audience's point of view. In case of Mr Mardell's reuse and elaboration of the metaphor, it is the immediate linguistic context (co-text) and the knowledge about the topic, as elements of the discourse context, which motivated metaphorical creativity.

The change of the target domains in these metaphors, bringing into focus the EU instead of Britain, has resulted in the change of the rhetorical goals of the metaphors. Mr Barnier creatively exploited different aspects of the same source domain to give his view of the process of Brexit negotiations from the EU perspective. He again utilised the emotional element by drawing back to the shared interest between Ms May and himself, but this time for the purpose of reinforcing the image of himself, as the EU Chief Negotiator, and the entire

EU as the parties determined to protect their own interests in the negotiating process. Mr Mardell's creative elaboration of Mr Barnier's metaphor served as a comment and a summary of the discussions held at the Ambrosetti Forum. It is the EU's struggle to protect its ideals that has been positively represented by the JOURNEY metaphor in this case, as opposed to the positive representation of the British struggle for independence, which has been given in example (1). Furthermore, by presenting Britain as the member of the team who is *giving up on getting to the summit* and who *never really believed in the sunny uplands in the first place*, Mr Barnier criticises Britain for deciding to withdraw from the EU, which contradicts his previously expressed view of Brexit. All this serves as an indicator of how a particular metaphor can be reused and creatively elaborated in different ways with the purpose of achieving entirely different rhetorical goals.

4.3.2. VEHICLE JOURNEY metaphors

Among the variations of the general metaphor A POLITICAL PROCESS IS A JOURNEY there are also metaphors that involve various modes of travel, which are, for the purpose of this analysis, subsumed under the general term the VEHICLE JOURNEY metaphors. The knowledge that journeys can be conducted in different types of vehicles, such as cars, buses, trains, ships, aeroplanes, bicycles, has contributed to the emergence of several vehicle-specific metaphors: the CAR JOURNEY metaphor, the BUS JOURNEY metaphor, the TRAIN JOURNEY metaphor, the SHIP JOURNEY metaphor, the AEROPLANE JOURNEY metaphor, the BICYCLE JOURNEY metaphor. The reason for the emergence of these metaphors is that each one of them highlights particular conceptual aspects which simplify the understanding of various aspects of complex political processes by bringing them into correspondence with the characteristics that travelling in different vehicles entails. Thus, the conceptual elements of a VEHICLE source domain, such as, for instance, a type of vehicle, travellers on the vehicle, path, speed, obstacles, are mapped onto the conceptual elements of the POLITICAL PROCESS target domain, which include a political process itself, politicians, the way in which a political process is conducted, problems in a political process, etc. The complete understanding of how metaphors, especially the creative ones, emerge can be achieved only by including the individual level of metaphor scenarios, which, when compared to metaphorical mappings between two domains, are richer in conceptual material, which is then utilised for the production of more creative instances of metaphors. When it comes to the aforementioned vehicle-specific types of metaphor, in his

study of the EU corpus, Musolff (2004: 44) identified the scenarios for each of the metaphors in question. Due to their similarity, both CAR JOURNEY and BUS JOURNEY metaphors have a single scenario A GROUP OF STATES CO-OPERATING IN A POLITICAL PROCESS ARE PARTICIPANTS IN A CAR JOURNEY (e.g. MOTOR, CAR-TYPE, BUS, COACH, DRIVER, PASSENGERS, MOTORWAY). Travelling by train is different from travelling by car or bus, which results in a separate scenario for the TRAIN JOURNEY metaphor, A GROUP OF STATES CO-OPERATING IN A POLITICAL PROCESS ARE PARTICIPANTS IN A TRAIN JOURNEY (e.g. LOCOMOTIVE, WAGONS, TRAIN DRIVER, TRAIN PASSENGER). In the case of the MARITIME JOURNEY metaphor, the scenario is A GROUP OF STATES CO-OPERATING IN A POLITICAL PROCESS ARE PARTICIPANTS IN A MARITIME JOURNEY, either on ONE SHIP or in a CONVOY (e.g. PARTS OF A SHIP, CAPTAIN, HELMSMAN, SHIP PASSENGER, INDIVIDUAL SHIPS). The scenario for the AEROPLANE JOURNEY metaphor is A GROUP OF STATES CO-OPERATING IN A POLITICAL PROCESS ARE PARTICIPANTS IN A JOURNEY BY AIR (e.g. AEROPLANE, PILOT, PASSENGER), whereas the BICYCLE JOURNEY metaphor has the following scenario A GROUP OF STATES CO-OPERATING IN A POLITICAL PROCESS ARE PARTICIPANTS IN A BICYCLE JOURNEY (e.g. RIDERS ON A TANDEM).

In accordance with Musolff's (2004) findings that the VEHICLE, or as he refers to it the MEANS OF TRAVEL, source domain is rather popular in the political discourse on the EU politics, the present study has also revealed the frequent presence of this particular source domain in British political discourse on Brexit. The following vehicle-specific metaphors have been identified: the CAR JOURNEY metaphor, the BUS JOURNEY metaphor, the TRAIN JOURNEY metaphor, the SHIP JOURNEY metaphor and the PLANE JOURNEY metaphor and each one of them will be studied in a separate section of this chapter.

4.3.2.1. *CAR JOURNEY metaphor*

The study of the selected corpus has revealed that the CAR JOURNEY metaphor has been one of the frequently employed metaphors in British political discourse on Brexit. Apart from the conventional metaphorical expressions, there have also been cases of creative use of the CAR JOURNEY metaphor, which is what the present analysis aims to demonstrate. The first example is taken from the *Economist* article, published in October 2016. The article discusses the disadvantages of Brexit, as well as some possible dangers for the future of Britain. More precisely, it criticises the Prime Minister Theresa May for putting her party's interest and

wishes before those of the country, in her decision to go for hard Brexit, which might cause some serious consequences for Britain.

(4) *The destination was decided in June, by simple majority: Britain is leaving the European Union. The journey, however, will be complex and perilous, beset by wrong turnings, chicanes and elephant traps.*

With 64m Britons in the back seat, perhaps that is why Theresa May has avoided talking about the road ahead. But at the Conservative Party conference this week the new prime minister could delay no longer. In a speech that thrilled party activists, she declared that she will invoke Article 50 of the EU treaty by the end of March, triggering a two-year countdown that should see Britain leave the union in early 2019. She also hinted that she would be prepared to steer Britain towards a harder sort of Brexit, involving a wide separation of labour, product and financial markets...

... A Brexit of some sort looms and Mrs May will determine its course. If Britain is not to suffer a car crash, she must ignore the back-seat drivers and fix her eyes firmly on the road ahead. (The Economist, 8 October 2016)

Analysing the example at the general level of conceptual domains reveals that the target domain THE PROCESS OF BREXIT has been comprehended in terms of the CAR JOURNEY source domain, resulting in the metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A CAR JOURNEY. A more detailed examination of the example indicates that there is more to the source domain than an ordinary car journey. The CAR JOURNEY source domain utilises an unused source-internal conceptual element, which involves the level of complexity and safety that characterises the journey. Therefore, the emerging metaphor is THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A DANGEROUS CAR JOURNEY. Such extension of the source domain has been enabled by the specific cognitive mechanism called source-related creativity. Furthermore, the conceptual elements of the DANGEROUS CAR JOURNEY source domain have been mapped onto the conceptual element of THE PROCESS OF BREXIT target domain, providing the structure for the emergence of the specific DANGEROUS CAR JOURNEY scenario, at the level of which the creative elaboration of the existing metaphor occurs. The DANGEROUS CAR JOURNEY scenario uses the conceptual material from the source domain and creates the image in which the Prime Minister Theresa May and consequently entire Britain are on a rather dangerous car journey with a firmly set aim and destination: *Britain is leaving the European Union*. The journey is full obstacles, such as *wrong turnings*,

chicanes, elephant traps, which only further increase the degree of responsibility the driver has in this journey because of *64m Britons in the back seat*. The awareness of the responsibility for such a huge number of travellers explains why *Theresa May has avoided talking about the road ahead*. Apart from the obstacles, there are other distractions coming from *the back-seat drivers*, and it might end in *a car crash* unless the driver is able to *ignore the back-seat drivers and fix her eyes firmly on the road ahead*. Underlying these metaphorical expressions are the additional mappings established between the target domain and the unused aspects of the source domain, such as the special types of obstacles, distractions, possible consequences and concentration and attentiveness demanded from the driver. This is a clear indicator of how conceptualisers rely on the vast encyclopaedic knowledge about the source domain and take its unused aspects in order to produce a creative scenario. The whole process in which THE PROCESS OF BREXIT target domain reconnects to the DANGEROUS CAR JOURNEY source domain, using the unused conceptual elements of the source domain that are most suitable for conceptualising the target domain is enabled by the cognitive mechanism, called target-induced creativity. All these metaphorical expressions can be said to create a scenario of a *complex and perilous* car journey to an agreed destination, with many obstacles lying ahead, such as *wrong turnings, chicanes* and *elephant traps*. The journey gets even more complicated by the presence of multiple *back-seat drivers* who distract the car driver by telling him/her how to steer the vehicle. Though the driver is responsible for the fellow travellers, the only way to avoid a *car crash* is to be highly concentrated, i.e. *ignore the back-seat drivers*, and extremely attentive, i.e. *fix her eyes firmly on the road ahead*. This scenario has been used to represent a complex situation in which Theresa May, metonymically standing for the British nation, is in charge of leading the procedure of Britain's withdrawal from the EU, which makes her responsible for the future of the nation. However, the process itself is problematic and has to be handled with extra care by Theresa May, as a person in charge of Brexit. She has to be prepared to deal with numerous bureaucratic problems involved in the process of Brexit and to ignore some unnecessary advice and pressures, including the ones coming from her own political party, if she wants to avoid terrible consequences for her country.

The idea of Theresa May being the car driver in the Brexit journey disturbed by a backseat driver was also used by *Herald's* journalist Michael Settle. His article is a reaction to the statement of the Home Secretary Amber Rudd, who openly criticised the Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson, presenting him as a back-seat driver who interferes with the Prime

Minister's plans on Brexit. The problem with Boris Johnson is that he had published an article in which he presented his plan for, as he called it, "glorious" Brexit, which was not entirely in accordance with the Prime Minister's plans and thereby caused a wave of disagreement among his colleagues.

(5) *Theresa May has finally put her foot down on Brexit.*

After Boris Johnson's "backseat driving" antics, the Prime Minister declared that "this Government is driven from the front"...

... Knowing that Mrs. May is now in a delicate and weak position, Mr Johnson feels confident he can shout his instructions to make sure the PM keeps on the hard Brexit highway, safe in the knowledge that the Tory leader could not sack the Government's No 1 Brexiter; better to have him in the car, asking "are we there yet" than having him throw stones from the pavement and become a magnet for the disaffected.

Yet, the word at Westminster is that the Secretary of State is intent at some appropriate point to jump the car and cry "betrayal".

The thinking is that Mr Johnson will, at the right moment, position himself on the outside, so that when Maymobile careers off the road, it will be the London MP, untainted by all the zigging and zagging of the Brussels negotiations, who jumps back into the driving seat to steer the vehicle towards his "glorious Brexit"; possibly with no deal at all come 2019.

Of course, Mrs May can only hope that by putting her foot down now, the back-seat driver shuts up and endures the ride towards Brexit and the post-2019 transition.

On the other hand, given all the uncertainty, putting her foot down might just mean Mrs May hits the accelerator towards a Brexit car crash. (Michael Settle, the Herald, 19 September 2017)

Just like in the previous example, the same target domain THE PROCESS OF BREXIT has been mapped onto the source domain CAR JOURNEY, producing the metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A CAR JOURNEY. Furthermore, the target domain connects back to the source domain and takes some of its unused conceptual elements, based on the rich knowledge about the source domain, which is the case of target-induced creativity. The variety of conceptual mappings which are established between different elements of the source domain and the target domain can be said to prompt the emergence of one CAR JOURNEY scenario, which has been creatively elaborated in several ways, depending on whose point of view it presents.

The first elaboration of the scenario is from the perspective of the Prime Minister Theresa May, who is certain that the process of Brexit is under her control. In this version of the scenario, the additional elements of the source domain that have been recruited are the change of speed and control over the car. By employing the CAR JOURNEY metaphor, she perceives herself as a confident driver who decides to accelerate the car and thus *puts her foot down on Brexit*. Referring back to *backseat driving*, the metaphorical expression used by the Secretary of State Amber Rudd, Theresa May explains that her Government *is driven from the front*, thus denying any kind of influence coming from Boris Johnson. All this suggests that the ones who control the process of Brexit are in fact Theresa May and her Government and that they are in no way under the influence of Boris Johnson.

The second scenario elaboration is from the perspective of Boris Johnson, who seems convinced that he has a big impact on the entire process through his role of a backseat driver. This version of the scenario is rather complex because it includes the extension of the source domain to a number of unused conceptual elements. The first way in which the source domain has been extended is by means of the unused conceptual element referring to the specific type of the road, i.e. *the hard Brexit highway*. This is evident in the metaphorical expression in which Boris Johnson, perceived as *a backseat driver*, *can shout his instructions to make sure the PM keeps on the hard Brexit highway*, which suggests that Boris Johnson is convinced his impact on the process of Brexit is so strong that he can determine its development. Specifying the type of the road incorporates a new dimension of the speed with which the process of Brexit ought to be performed, which, in the case of the *highway*, is much higher than it would normally be. Furthermore, the fact that the *highway* has been described as *hard* can be understood as a reference to hard Brexit, a Brexit arrangement in which Britain loses access to the single market and the customs union in exchange for full control of its borders and freedom of making new trade deals. The second extension of the source is by means of the so far unused dimension of the conceptual element, *a backseat driver*. The metaphorical expression *better to have him in the car, asking "are we there yet"* contains one of the typical questions asked by a backseat driver, indicating his/her impatience about reaching the destination. This new element, recruited from the vast knowledge of the source domain, indicates Boris Johnson's impatience about bringing the process of Brexit to its conclusion. The idea of Boris Johnson as a backseat driver constantly asking the same question is juxtaposed to the image created by the third elaboration of the scenario. So far the scenario has been extended in terms of the elements that are an essential part of any car journey, such

as a road and a fellow passenger. Here, it is a new and unexpected conceptual element of the source domain, i.e. the person who is not a direct participant in the journey but acts as an obstacle for a passing car. Boris Johnson is thus depicted as a person who *throw[s] stones from the pavement*, which implies that unless he remains an actor in the process of Brexit, he might easily turn into an obstacle, hindering the process. The fourth conceptual element involved in the elaboration of the scenario is the idea of a car crash. As suggested by the metaphorical expression, the car driven by Theresa May, referred to as *Maymobile*, *careers off the road*. By means of this metaphorical expression, Theresa May has been presented as incompetent and likely to endanger the process of Brexit. In such a situation, Boris Johnson is perceived as a very skilled driver who is unaffected by *the zigging and zagging* of previous drivers. The repeated and sharp changes of direction of a car, presented here in the metaphorical expression *the zigging and zagging*, have been used with the aim of metaphorically presenting all the bad decisions and actions taken in the process of negotiating Brexit. The fact that Boris Johnson was not included in the negotiating process is what makes him competent enough to *jump back into the driving seat to steer the vehicle towards his “glorious Brexit”*. Thereby, if Theresa May proves to be mistaken with her decisions about handling Brexit, Boris Johnson is expected to intervene and put to action his plan for a “glorious Brexit”.

The third way in which the CAR JOURNEY scenario has been elaborated is from the Government's position. In this case, the additional conceptual element of the source domain is the way of starting a car whose battery is dead. Thereby, the Secretary of State has been depicted as being ready to *jump the car* if required, which implies the possibility that the battery in the car might cease to function. From this, it can be inferred that, due to disagreements, the process of Brexit might be stopped, which will require the appropriate reaction from the Government representative.

The concluding part of the passage reactivates the already existing elaborations of the CAR JOURNEY scenario and it seems like a continuation of the scenario from the beginning of the passage. The conceptual elements of the source domain that have been reused here include a car driver, the change of speed and a backseat driver. The reference has again been made to the concept of accelerating the car, i.e. Theresa May *putting her foot down*, but this time the purpose has been clarified. It is the hope that *the back-seat driver shuts up and endures the ride towards Brexit*, which means that Theresa May succumbed under the pressure coming

from Boris Johnson and made a risky decision to enhance the process of Brexit. The concept of increasing the speed of the car has further been elaborated by means of using the metaphorical expression *Mrs May hits the accelerator*, which implies that the action of accelerating the car is performed in a sudden and forceful manner. One more conceptual element of the source domain has been reused, a car crash, which creates an unexpected conclusion of the initially created scenario. Hence, Theresa May's decision of *hitting the accelerator*, i.e. finalising the process of Brexit as soon as possible at any cost, might eventually lead to a *Brexit car crash*, which implies a possible disastrous outcome for Britain.

All the conceptual elements involved in these creative elaborations of the CAR JOURNEY scenario have been used with the aim of metaphorically presenting the current political situation in which Theresa May hopes to prove her power over the process of Brexit and silence the critics, particularly Boris Johnson, by making decisions that would finalise the process as soon as possible. On the other hand, Boris Johnson, as the major critic, believes he can have a big impact on the process too. Moreover, it is better to have him included in the process, despite the criticism he expresses, than to have him turned into an enemy that would hinder the process of Brexit. Such a complicated situation between Theresa May and Boris Johnson can either provoke the intervention of the Secretary of State or make an opportunity for Boris Johnson to take control of the process of Brexit, handling it in accordance with his plans. The danger that overshadows the entire situation is that if Theresa May continues with her decision to accelerate the process of Brexit in hope of silencing Boris Johnson, Britain might very easily suffer serious consequences after leaving the EU.

The following example, taken from Rafael Behr's 2017 article published in *the Guardian*, also elaborates the idea of Theresa May being metaphorically represented as a car driver by questioning her aptness for driving. In his attempt to criticise the actions taken by Theresa May in negotiating the terms of Brexit with the EU, which he finds completely inadequate and even dangerous, the author uses the CAR JOURNEY metaphor to present her as a person who is not capable of doing the job properly.

(6) *Friends don't let friends go Brexiting without a mandate. But where are Theresa May's friends? The British Prime Minister staggers towards negotiations with the European Union (EU) like a drunkard crossing a car park – bold pace, wobbly gait. She is in no political condition to go behind the wheel. This is when partners are meant to intervene...*

... *Hand over the keys, Mrs May. You've had enough.* (Rafael Behr, *the Guardian*, 14 June 2017)

The same source and target domains have been used in this example too. However, the focus has been placed onto different aspects of the CAR JOURNEY source domain by means of the target-induced creativity, in which the target domain reconnects to the source domain to take the unused conceptual elements, such as drunk driving and a driver's inability to drive due to the state of drunkenness. Thus, the existing CAR JOURNEY scenario has been creatively elaborated by the inclusion of these conceptual aspects of the source domain. The first metaphorical expression, *Friends don't let friends go Brexiting without a mandate*, is based on the 1980's anti-drunk driving slogan *Friends Don't Let Friends Drive Drunk*. Thereby, the correspondence has been created between *Brexiting without a mandate* and drunk driving, which refers to the dangerous ways of handling Brexit negotiations by the Prime Minister and her insistence on hard Brexit. The metaphorical expression *without a mandate* has been used with the purpose of emphasising the fact that Theresa May became the Prime Minister not because she won a mandate in the general election but because her predecessor David Cameron resigned. Moreover, even after she called an early election, she managed to gain a mandate with a very slight majority and was advised by her political opponents to resign due to such bad results. Another element taken from the slogans includes *friends* who are expected to advise their friends against insensible actions. In this case, *friends* can be understood as a reference to Theresa May's political partners who seem to approve of her actions instead of urging her to reconsider her political actions in negotiating the terms of Brexit. The scenario is further elaborated by introducing the conceptual element of a drunk driver together with his/her characteristic walking style. This creates the image of Theresa May as a typical drunk driver who *staggers towards negotiations with the European Union (EU) like a drunkard crossing a car park – bold pace, wobbly gait*, emphasising her incompetence and incapability of handling negotiations with the EU. Just as the state of drunkenness makes a driver unable to drive, i.e. *to go behind the wheel*, Theresa May's assumed incompetence makes her politically inapt of proceeding with Brexit negotiations. The concluding remark in the article brings the scenario to a close by issuing an order to the driver to *hand over the keys*, which can be understood as a plea for Theresa May to withdraw from the Brexit process before endangering Britain's position in negotiations with the EU. The act of returning the keys additionally implies the existence of another person who could take her position and manage it more competently.

The emergence of the creative metaphors used in the present examples has been significantly influenced by the interplay of various contextual factors. Examples (4) and (5) are good indicators of how an element of the discourse context can prompt the emergence of creative metaphors. Accordingly, the contextual factor that has primarily motivated the creative elaborations of the CAR JOURNEY metaphor is the previous discourse on the same topic. What this means is that the CAR JOURNEY metaphor has already been used in the previous discourse on Brexit, which represents a good ground for the reuse and creative elaboration of this metaphor. In the case of example (5), there is one particular statement which served as a motivational factor for the use of creative metaphor, i.e. the statement by the Secretary of State Amber Rudd in which she presented Theresa May's role in the process of Brexit as *driving the car* and Boris Johnson's role as *backseat driving*. The same contextual factor can be said to partially impact the production of the metaphor in example (6), but its creativity has been ascribed to another contextual factor as well. The introductory statement *Friends don't let friends go Brexiting without a mandate*, which is based on the anti-drunk driving slogan *Friends Don't Let Friends Drive Drunk*, indicates that the creative metaphor, presenting Theresa May as *a drunkard crossing a car park*, has clearly been based on the aforementioned slogan, adapting it creatively to fit the scenario in which Brexit has been conceptualised as a car journey. The slogan was initially produced in America in 1983, as a part of the anti-drunk driving campaign, and gained popularity in Britain as well, becoming a part of the established cultural values. Therefore, example (6) demonstrates how the cultural setting, as an element of the situational context, plays an important role in the production of creative metaphors.

To be able to understand the rhetorical goals of creative metaphors, it is necessary to adhere to the kind of approach which combines different levels of metaphor analysis, that of the level of conceptual domains and the scenario level. Even though the three metaphors presented in this part of the analysis are all creative instances of the CAR JOURNEY metaphor, they are not in accordance with the general tendency of JOURNEY metaphors to present positive accounts of political processes. Contrary to the expectations, these examples of the CAR JOURNEY metaphor convey a negative representation of the process of Brexit. The negative portrayal has been further emphasised by the creative metaphors, adding vividness and clarity. All three instances can be understood as a persuasive warning about fatal consequences Britain might suffer if the process of Brexit is not managed in an appropriate manner. Moreover, the metaphors in all three examples have been used to express criticism of

the Prime Minister Theresa May and her decisions and actions in managing the process of Brexit. However, each of the examples can be said to express a different level of criticism. Thus, in example (4), Theresa May has been criticised for being influenced and distracted by different actors in the process of negotiations to such an extent that it might bring bad consequences unless she *ignores the back-seat drivers and fixes her eyes firmly on the road ahead*. Though the same kind of criticism has been expressed in example (5), the increased likelihood of a fatal end, i.e. *a car crash*, has been emphasised. The strongest criticism of Theresa May's incompetence has been identified in example (6), in which she has been presented as *a drunkard crossing a car park*, and consequently urged to resign and let more competent people deal with Brexit negotiations. Overall, what the authors of these articles wanted to achieve is to persuasively argue that if Theresa May and her Government are not careful and wise enough in making important decisions regarding Brexit, the country might be in danger of facing an unfavourable outcome of Brexit negotiations.

The example that follows shows how the combination of two scenarios can facilitate understanding of a complex process of Brexit negotiations. In September 2017, the *Daily Express* published the article written by the journalist Joey Millar, who comments on the role of the EU by reporting the words of Miles Saltiel, the writer for the think tank.

(7) *He likened the EU's red-line Brexit issues to a car driver ditching his steering wheel during a game of 'chicken' - a reckless move aimed to guarantee victory but which most likely signals his own doom.*

Mr Saltiel said: *"Think of Brussels' position-papers as though the steering-wheel thrown out of the car by fifties dragsters playing 'chicken'.* Then again, the UK is able to exploit sixty years of EU shakedowns, leaving it unpopular with other international traders. (Joey Millar, *Daily Express*, 2 September 2017)

As the metaphorical expressions used in the example indicate, the GAME source domain, which is frequently used for comprehension of political processes, has been applied to the target domain, THE PROCESS OF BREXIT, resulting in the metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A GAME. The cognitive mechanism, source-internal creativity, which enables the source domain to extend to an unused source-internal conceptual material has led to the extension of the GAME source domain to a specific kind of game, i.e. the game of chicken. This has resulted in the emergence of the creative metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS THE GAME OF CHICKEN. The mappings between the two domains produce the GAME OF CHICKEN scenario which selects the

aspects of the game that could be helpful in understanding the process of Brexit. The game of chicken is, in fact, a game theory which involves two drivers driving their cars towards each other at a very high speed. Continuing along the path means that they will bump into each other and the one who steers away is the loser, i.e. the chicken. However, if none of them steers away the consequences are fatal. The knowledge that the game of chicken involves cars leads to the further extension of the source domain to the elements of a car journey, which results in the creation of the CAR JOURNEY scenario. The combination of the GAME OF CHICKEN scenario and the CAR JOURNEY scenario, i.e. the knowledge about the game and car journeys in general, has created ample conceptual material for the target domain to choose from, once it connects back to the source domain. As a result of target-induced creativity, the source domain has been extended to certain additional and unexpected conceptual elements, such as the perilous driving of two cars towards each other, likely to end fatally, and especially the act of disposing of the steering wheel, which is a dangerous game technique of ensuring the victory. In the context of the situation regarding Brexit negotiations, the two actors in the game of chicken are Britain and the EU. The reference to this very game suggests that both sides in negotiations are determined not to change their stances and conditions. However, the metaphorical expression in which the driver, referring in this case to the EU, has been described as *ditching his steering wheel during a game of 'chicken'* implies that the EU has shown more determination to win in this game by making a move of *ditching [the] steering wheel*, which means the EU leaves no room for any kind of disadvantage or loss in negotiating the terms of Brexit. Thus, the combination of the scenarios creates the image of two participants driving cars in the game of chicken. Both of them are heading towards each other at high speed, expecting the other to eventually steer away and lose the game. One of the participants decides to make a risky move in order to secure the victory and disposes of the steering wheel, which means that there is no chance for the car to steer away. The driver hopes that the opponent will be intimidated by this move and will rather accept a defeat than a fatal end. The purpose of creating this elaborate image is to clarify the complexity of the current political situation in Britain, in which Britain and the EU are negotiating the terms of Brexit, determined to get as many benefits as possible at the cost of the other side. Desperate to win in this negotiation process, the EU sets very strict conditions which Britain has to accept, though they are detrimental, in order to withdraw from the Union. However, Britain still has a chance to avoid these conditions by taking advantage of the conflicts within the EU.

The combination of these same metaphors and metaphor scenarios has been reused in the article written by Ben Chu in October 2017, aimed at creating a rather pessimistic picture, in which Britain will face great losses in Brexit negotiations if it persists in leaving the EU with no deal.

- (8) The reality is that Brexiteers grossly misjudged the post-Brexit balance of negotiating power between the UK and the EU before the vote. And they continue to misread the situation now if they believe waving a no-deal scenario in the face of the EU will prove an effective strategy.

If the Brexit negotiations are a game of chicken, it is a contest between a juggernaut and a Mini. (Ben Chu, *the Independent*, 15 October 2017)

Though the source domain and the target domain have generally remained the same, the target domain uses its ability of reconnecting to the source domain and utilises the rich knowledge about the source domain to extend it to the conceptual element of a specific type of car, which is a case of target-induced creativity. Thereby, the CAR JOURNEY scenario has been enriched by the inclusion of two types of car, *a juggernaut* and *a Mini*. The choice of these particular cars seems to be in accordance with the author's aim of representing an unfavourable situation Britain is in. Thus, representing the EU in terms of a huge and powerful vehicle, such as *a juggernaut*, implies that the EU exhibits a great deal of power and control in Brexit negotiations. On the other hand, the fact that Britain has been presented in this scenario as one of the smallest cars, i.e. *a Mini*, is a clear sign of its weakness. Incorporation of the elaborated CAR JOURNEY scenario into the GAME OF CHICKEN scenario, invokes an image of two cars heading towards each other, one of them being a powerful *juggernaut* and the other one a small *Mini*, in which the *Mini* is obviously doomed to a tragic end. The aim of combining these two scenarios is a metaphorical representation of the Brexit negotiation process between Britain and the EU, in which Britain's position is so weak that it is unable to make any favourable deal with the apparently stronger EU. Moreover, the danger exists that Britain might suffer serious consequences by losing all the benefits it had as a member of the EU.

Among the contextual factors that motivate the emergence of creative metaphors, culture has played a crucial role in the emergence of metaphorical creativity in examples (7) and (8) in two ways. First of all, in both examples, the knowledge about the game of Chicken, a well-established part of British culture, has been utilised to present the relationship between Britain and the EU in Brexit negotiations. The second element of the cultural context, found

in example (8) is a typical British car Mini, an icon of British popular culture in 1960s, which has been used as a means of portraying a weak position Britain has in the negotiating process with the EU.

Through the analysis of the combined effect of A GAME OF CHICKEN and A CAR JOURNEY scenarios, it becomes easier to understand the rhetorical goals intended by the usage of the metaphor in question. Even though the same metaphor has been used, the context of use and the author's view of the issue determine the intended rhetorical goals. In example (7), the two scenarios have been used with the aim of conveying a positive representation of the position Britain has in the process of Brexit negotiations. Here, the EU's determination to set very strict negotiation terms for Britain has been criticised as being a reckless act, such as *the steering-wheel thrown out of the car by fifties dragsters playing 'chicken'*, that Britain can take advantage of. The fact that creative elaborations of the metaphor have been employed adds to the vividness and persuasive effect of the metaphors. On the other hand, example (8) uses the same metaphors with a completely different purpose. Here, the rhetorical goal is to persuasively express criticism of Britain's decision to withdraw from the EU without any deal and to warn about potential consequences that such a stance might have. These two examples clearly indicate how the same metaphors can be adequately adapted to achieve completely opposite rhetorical goals, depending on the author's intention and the context of use.

4.3.2.2. BUS JOURNEY metaphor

The BUS JOURNEY metaphor⁴¹ has also been commonly employed and creatively elaborated in the political discourse on Brexit. Before proceeding with the analysis of the metaphors which involve the BUS source domain, it is necessary to explain the notion of the Brexit bus, which will facilitate the comprehension of the metaphors used. During the EU Referendum campaign, the Vote Leave camp hired a bus, which was painted red and had the following pro-leave inscription: "We send the EU £ 350 million a week. Let's fund our NHS instead. Vote Leave." As the examples will demonstrate, various types of reference to this bus have

⁴¹ Though in the study of the EU corpus Musolff (2004: 44) puts both the CAR JOURNEY and the BUS JOURNEY metaphors into a single scenario A GROUP OF STATES CO-OPERATING IN A POLITICAL PROCESS ARE PARTICIPANTS IN A CAR JOURNEY (e.g. MOTOR, CAR-TYPE, BUS, COACH, DRIVER, PASSENGERS, MOTORWAY), the present study deals with them separately. The reason is that both of these metaphors, when elaborated creatively, highlight particular aspects of the target domain in accordance with the conceptual elements unique to each of the corresponding source domains.

been made by politicians and journalists, with different kinds of creative extensions of the source domain.

The following example is from the article written by Ed Smith, soon after the Referendum, addressing the immediate consequences of Brexit evident in the society in general, and the world of politics in particular.

- (9) We once imagined, ironically, that the Brexit movement would be vulnerable to cynical exploitation by careerist politicians who were keen to make a name for themselves. *They would climb aboard the Brexit bus, take an easy ride, and get off higher up the mountain.* Quite the reverse. Politicians have not ridden to power on the back of Brexit; Brexit has ridden to power on the back of them, breaking them in the process. (Ed Smith, *New Statesman*, 17 July 2016)

Starting at the general level of conceptual domains, it can be claimed that the correspondence has been established between the target domain THE PROCESS OF BREXIT and the source domain A BUS JOURNEY, leading to the emergence of the metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A BUS JOURNEY. The process of mapping some of the elements of the source domain onto the elements of the target domain has resulted in the emergence of the BUS JOURNEY scenario. It is at the level of scenario that creative elaboration of the metaphor occurs. This is possible due to target-induced creativity, a cognitive mechanism which enables the target domain THE PROCESS OF BREXIT to reconnect to the BUS JOURNEY source domain and utilise some of its additional, unused conceptual elements, based on the rich knowledge about the source domain, and thus creatively extend the source domain. The additional elements which extend the source domain are travellers, the quality of the journey and a journey destination. Hence, the first element in the metaphorical expression presents the British careerist politicians, who wanted to get some important political positions due to their support of Brexit, as the travellers who *climb aboard the Brexit bus*, which will take them to the desired destination. The next element in the metaphorical expression provides additional information about the quality of the journey, described here as *an easy ride*, implying a smooth journey with no obstacles on the path. It has been used to present the expectation of such careerist politicians that advocating Brexit would be the best possible way of getting better political positions without any effort invested. The final element in the metaphorical expression gives an explanation about the destination of the journey, i.e. *higher up the mountain*, which directly presents the high career goals these politicians aspire to. However, the expectation of having

an easy ride contradicts the desired destination, *higher up the mountain*, which in fact presents the contradiction between the careerist politicians' expectations of obtaining important political positions easily and the reality in which a lot of effort is demanded to be politically promoted to a higher position. A careful analysis of all these elements of the metaphorical expression used in this example reveals that the metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A BUS JOURNEY has been used not to conceptualise the entire process of Brexit, but only one of its segments, i.e. the intention of the careerist politicians to use Brexit as a means of getting promoted in their political careers. This is not surprising because career success is most commonly understood in terms of a journey, usually to a high latitude destination. Thus, the scenario portrays a group of travellers who get on the bus, expecting that the journey to the mountain will be smooth and without any obstacles, in order to present the situation in which careerist politicians engage into the pro-Brexit campaign, hoping that their support of Brexit is sufficient for them to be promoted to higher political positions.

When it comes to the contextual factors that prompt the emergence of the creative instances of the more general BUS JOURNEY metaphor, it can be claimed that, in this particular example, a single contextual factor has played a crucial role. Hence, metaphorical creativity evident in example (9) can be said to arise from the situational context, more precisely, the immediate physical setting. What this essentially means is that the shared perceptual experience of seeing the Brexit bus during the campaign enabled the author to produce creative elaborations of the BUS JOURNEY metaphor.

The proper understanding of the conceptual domains and the scenario they create clarifies the rhetorical goals of the metaphor in question. The image of a smooth bus journey to a destination in the mountain, portrayed by the BUS JOURNEY scenario, is in accordance with the general purpose of journey metaphors to raise morale and create a feeling of optimism, thus being focused on the end point of the journey (Charteris-Black 2011: 68). However, this optimistic image of the bus journey has been used by the author of this article for an entirely different purpose. Instead of highlighting the benefits that careerist politicians hoped to gain after the Brexit referendum, the author uses the metaphor to present the reality which completely contradicts their expectations. By using the creative metaphor to express this contradiction, the author manages to bring in the elements of persuasiveness and vividness, creating at the same time a humorous effect, for the purpose of expressing criticism and conveying a negative representation of such negative political ambitions.

Another interesting use of the Brexit bus concept is found in the letter written to Theresa May by the representatives of British in Europe coalition. The coalition expresses the concerns of 1.2 million Britons living in the EU about their rights after Brexit. *The Guardian* publishes the following part of the letter.

- (10) “If Michel Barnier, the European parliament and the EU27 member states see that *the UK government is willing to throw us, our rights, our livelihoods and our children under the Brexit bus*, they will have no confidence that it will recognise and protect the rights of the 3 million or any other post-Brexit obligations in the future,” said campaign group British in Europe, which represents 11 citizens groups across the EU. (Lisa O’Carrol, *The Guardian*, 23 September 2017)

This example is an instance of the same metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A BUS JOURNEY and the same BUS JOURNEY scenario. Nevertheless, the vast knowledge about the BUS JOURNEY source domain provides ample conceptual material which creates a possibility for the original source domain to be creatively extended. Target-induced creativity is at work again, enabling the target domain to choose among various conceptual elements of the source, selecting the ones that seem to be the most suitable for a particular discourse situation. In this example, the chosen conceptual element of the source domain presents one of the most negative aspects of a bus journey, i.e. the possibility of someone being run over by a bus, which perfectly reflects the issue addressed by this article, i.e. the British government’s lack of concern about the post-Brexit rights of a huge number of Britons living in the EU. The metaphorical expression *the UK government is willing to throw us, our rights, our livelihoods and our children under the Brexit bus* is a case of creative elaboration of the already existing conventional metaphorical expression, which has become very popular in political discourse. The expression is “to throw someone under the bus”, which, as the Cambridge English Dictionary definition suggests, means “to do something harmful to somebody else in order to gain an advantage for yourself”. Much of the original meaning has indeed been preserved in this metaphorical expression but the creative metaphor has the power of adding to the meaning by creating a very vivid image of people, their rights, livelihoods and children being literally thrown under the bus. The scenario thus creates an image of people and their possessions being thrown under the bus by the authorities, in order to present the problems and worries of Britons living in the EU regarding their rights after Brexit. The British government’s talks with the EU about the terms of Brexit do not include enough concern about the rights of 1.2 million Britons living in the EU countries. As a consequence, these people are in danger of

losing some of their rights, which will affect the quality of their lives and the lives of their children. This is felt as an act of the government's betrayal of its own people.

The immediate physical setting, as an element of the situational context, manifested in the presence of the Brexit bus, has motivated the production of metaphorical creativity in this example as well. Additionally, the discourse context, or more specifically, the immediate linguistic context (co-text) has also played an important role here. Hence, the use of the metaphorical expression *the UK government is willing to throw us, our rights, our livelihoods and our children under the Brexit bus* can be understood as a creative elaboration of the idiomatic expression "to throw someone under the bus". Since the idiomatic expression incorporates the act of harming someone in order to gain some advantages, which is a sort of betrayal, it was easy to supply this expression with the notion of Brexit and incorporate the meaning of the act of betrayal being committed by the government, which does not show enough concern for its people who live in the EU and is ready to disregard their rights and interests.

Rhetorically, this creative metaphor has been used by its authors as a means of expressing concern about their future in the EU after Britain's withdrawal from it. The troublesome image of people being thrown under the Brexit bus, which is implied by the metaphor scenario, has been used for the purpose of making an emotional and persuasive appeal to the audience, particularly Theresa May whom the letter had been sent to, in order to draw attention to their problem and urge the Prime Minister and her government to action. At the same time, the metaphor has been intended as a form of criticism of the government's actions during Brexit negotiations, in which they demonstrated neglect of the rights of the British citizens who live in the EU.

The most creative example involving the BUS JOURNEY metaphor comes from the *Daily Mail* article authored by Lord Wolfson a year after the Referendum. He studied carefully the possible effects of leaving the EU. As a Leave supporter and a chief executive of the clothing retailer Next, he believes that Brexit could revive the British economy, provided that the negotiation process is conducted properly and without haste. Yet, he expresses his concern about the danger of the process of leaving the EU going wrong by using the BUS JOURNEY metaphor.

- (11) Think of *a coach hurtling down the motorway. Fifty-two passengers wanted to make the journey, the other 48 didn't. A couple of the 52 are screaming at the driver to go faster. A handful of the 48 are shouting at her to turn back.*

The more the pedal-to-the-metal merchants urge the driver to step on the gas, the more panicked the reverse-gear gang become. Their panic simply spurs on the speed demons to exhort her to accelerate even more which in turn – well, you get the picture.

The vast majority of us – both Leavers and Remainers – accept that we are on the road to Brexit. The question is, or should be, how best to get there without a crash...

... The other lot are no better. They blithely assert that Brexit is simple, easy-peasy. *We must roar ahead at full speed with barely a glance at the road map, whatever the consequences.*

Each extreme encourages the other side's intransigence. *The over-optimists fear delay will give the pessimists time to turn the bus around* so they urge the Government on...

... Do we want an open or closed Brexit? *Do we want this journey to end in free-trading uplands or a protectionist dead end?*

... To return to our journey analogy, *there are hairpin bends and narrow tracks. We can't go careering along hell for leather.* There is a huge amount of complex work to be done...

... Brexit can be a success or a failure – and the approach we take will make the difference. *It's not a race. Let's slow down and make sure we get there safely.* (Lord Simon Wolfson, *the Daily Mail*, 24 June 2017)

The metaphor which underlies all the metaphorical expressions in this passage is THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A BUS JOURNEY. However, careful observation of the metaphorical expressions reveals that the BUS JOURNEY source domain has been creatively extended to the unused source-internal conceptual material, which is a case of source-related creativity. The new source-internal conceptual element referring to the complicated situation in the bus caused by both the passengers and the bus driver has been utilised to comprehend the target domain. Therefore, the BUS JOURNEY source domain, enriched by the conceptual material selected from the knowledge about the source domain, changes into a more specific form, the FRANTIC BUS JOURNEY. Such extension of the source domain has resulted in the emergence of the creative metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A FRANTIC BUS JOURNEY. Consequently, the

mappings established between the FRANTIC BUS JOURNEY source domain and THE PROCESS OF BREXIT target domain provide the structure which enables the emergence of the specific FRANTIC BUS JOURNEY scenario, which focuses on all the individual elements that make the bus journey and the situation inside the bus chaotic. In the FRANTIC BUS JOURNEY scenario, the target domain reconnects to the source domain and, based on the rich knowledge about the source domain, selects the most convenient conceptual elements, which results in the creative extension of the source domain. The cognitive mechanism that enables the entire process is target-induced creativity. The various unused conceptual elements, recruited from the encyclopaedic knowledge about the source domain itself, which the source domain has been extended to, will be identified and analysed here.

The first conceptual element refers to a specific type of the bus selected for this journey, i.e. *a coach*, which is in itself indicative. The Cambridge English Dictionary defines “coach” as a motor vehicle with comfortable seats used to take people on journeys. Thereby, the choice of the *coach* implies that the journey is going to be a long one. When this knowledge about the source domain element is transferred to the target domain, it can be deduced that the process of Brexit is going to take a long time to complete. The next conceptual element provides further information about the speed of this journey, which is captured in the metaphorical expression *a coach hurtling down the motorway*. Contrary to the fact that long journeys most commonly involve travelling at a moderate speed, this coach has been driven at a very high speed and in an uncontrollable manner, which consequently leads to the conclusion that the process of leaving the EU, expected to be a long one, is developing too quickly and it is becoming too complex for the government to handle and is very likely to get out of their control. As if the image of a coach moving uncontrollably at a high speed is not enough, the scenario is reinforced by the conceptual element which involves the passengers who cause further problems on the journey. In the metaphorical expression *fifty-two passengers wanted to make the journey, the other 48 didn't*, two kinds of passengers have been mentioned, the ones who want to go on this journey and the ones who do not. The number of those who want to make the journey is 52, which is highly symbolic and refers to 52 per cent of the voters who voted Leave in the Referendum. In the same way, 48 passengers who do not want this journey represent 48 percent of Britons who voted Remain. Besides the coach going down the motorway at an uncontrollable speed, some of the passengers cause additional problems on this journey, which is evident from the following metaphorical expression: *A couple of the 52 are screaming at the driver to go faster. A handful of the 48 are shouting at*

her to turn back. The first group refers to those who keep insisting that the hard Brexit must be delivered as soon as possible, while the other one represents those who advocate that the process of Brexit should be stopped and the relationship with the EU should be re-established. Apart from the passengers, the reference has been made to the driver who has been described to be under a lot of pressure coming from the passengers who cannot agree on whether they want to continue to the fixed destination or return. The use of the pronoun *her* indicates that the driver is female, and though not explicitly mentioned, it can be understood to refer to the Prime Minister Theresa May, who is in control of the process of Brexit. All the metaphorical expressions used so far indicate that Theresa May is in a complicated position; she is the one who has to make important decisions in the process of negotiating the terms of Brexit, despite the diverse wishes and urges coming from the opposing sides.

The image of the problematic journey has been continued in the following metaphorical expression: *The more the pedal-to-the-metal merchants urge the driver to step on the gas, the more panicked the reverse-gear gang become*. The metaphorical expression *pedal-to-the-metal merchant* refers to the group among Remainers insisting on Brexit. The expression *pedal-to-the-metal* derives from the idiom “to put pedal to the metal”, which is in the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English defined as to drive a car, truck very fast. In this way, their insistence on speeding up the journey, i.e. Britain’s exit from the EU, is emphasised even more, with the addition of the element of impatience. On the other hand, the other group is in panic. They are referred to as *the reverse-gear gang*, which immediately reminds of the metaphor originally used by Tony Blair in 2003 to describe himself as a progressive leader who does not have a reverse gear. The use of the same metaphor ties the group of pro-remain activists to Tony Blair, who is also known to be a proponent of remaining in the EU. Therefore, the pro-remain activists, presented as *the reverse gear gang*, get panicked by the urges coming from the pro-leave proponents, i.e. *pedal-to-the-metal merchants*, whose influence on the driver, Theresa May, seems to be stronger than theirs. Moreover, the next metaphorical expression, *their panic simply spurs on the speed demons to exhort her to accelerate even more*, suggests that their panic motivates the pro-leave proponents to be even more persistent in their aims. Here, they are referred to as *the speed demons*, a strong expression which carries a negative connotation, especially because of the word *demons*, meaning evil creatures. This highlights that their influence on Theresa May is so strong and devilish-like that she cannot resist and continues leading the country in the process of leaving the EU with such haste that it can easily turn into a disaster.

After creating the scenario of this frantic bus ride, with two groups of passengers fighting for the influence on the driver, the author switches the attention of the readers to the remaining passengers on the bus, i.e. the majority of both Leavers and Remainers, who are excluded from the direct participation in this chaotic situation around Brexit but they are aware of being *on the road to Brexit*. It seems that they all accept the fact that the Brexit bus will continue to its destination, i.e. that Britain will eventually leave the EU. In the metaphorical expression *the question is, or should be, how best to get there without a crash*, the additional conceptual element, referring to the possible outcome of the journey, i.e. *a crash*, has been employed to suggest that the remaining passengers on the Brexit bus are aware of the possible dangers such a chaotic journey might cause. Yet, they seem rather passive, since the only thing they do is acknowledge the upcoming consequences.

In the next part, which makes a comparison between two extreme groups, the ardent Leavers are presented as wanting to *roar ahead at full speed with barely a glance at the road map, whatever the consequences*. Besides the repeated stress on the haste with which they want to exit the EU, a new conceptual element, *the road map*, has been introduced, with the meaning of a detailed plan for a successful Brexit. A bare glance at the road map, i.e. disregarding the plan, highlights arrogance, irresponsibility and neglect of all the consequences for the country. The reason for such behaviour is their fear that the Remainers will manage to make the driver *turn the bus around*, i.e. they are afraid that if they do not succeed to influence the process of Brexit, as they want, the opposing side will use that to restore Britain's membership in the EU.

Another conceptual element of the source domain, used as a means of creatively elaborating the scenario, involves a journey destination. The metaphorical expression includes two possible destinations, i.e. two possible outcomes of Brexit. The first destination, *free-trading uplands*, is at a higher geographical position. Based on the metaphor GOOD IS UP, the high latitude of the destination can be understood as a positive outcome of Brexit. The second destination, *a protectionist dead end*, is completely opposite. The reference to a street without an exit can be understood as a negative outcome of Brexit. This implies the danger of Britain being stuck in an unfavourable position because of the rushed decisions and lack of a clear plan.

The scenario has further been elaborated by the conceptual element which refers to the obstacles on the journey. As political processes are generally far from being simple, multiple obstacles which add to the complexity of the journey, such as *hairpin bends* and *narrow tracks*,

have been employed here to suggest the complexity of the process of Brexit. The use of *hairpin bends*, U-shaped bends in a road forcing the driver to turn almost 180 degrees in order to continue travelling, means that the government and the Prime Minister need to be very cautious and even consider changing some plans, like, for instance, the set transition period. *Narrow tracks* create another obstacle on the journey and require driving with particular care. Subsequently, the process of Brexit needs to be conducted carefully and with the reconsideration of certain decisions. If the journey is full of such obstacles, it is expected that the driver will be very vigilant. However, the metaphorical expression *we can't go careering along hell for leather* suggests something different. The expression is based on the idiomatic expression "hell for leather", which is in the Cambridge English Dictionary defined as going as fast as one can. Thus, it seems to fit perfectly in the scenario in which the driver is rather inattentive, driving the Brexit bus at a high speed regardless of all the obstacles, and it further highlights the idea that the complexity of the process of Brexit requires a very serious approach.

The concluding remark in this article is based on the conceptual element of a competition between two vehicles, which is expected when the vehicles are driven at such a high speed. Thus, the metaphorical expression *it's not a race* implies that Brexit is not to be taken as a competition between two opposing sides, Leavers and Remainers, because its outcome will affect the entire country. Instead, the metaphorical expression *let's slow down and make sure we get there slowly* utilises the conceptual element of safety measures which need to be taken to avoid the dangerous consequences of the reckless driving. This implies the necessity of ending the process of Brexit, which would be safe and beneficial for everyone.

Apart from the immediate physical setting as a common contextual factor for all three examples, in this particular case, three additional contextual factors have affected the author's choice of metaphor and its creative elaborations. First of all, it can be argued that the discourse context, i.e. the previous discourse on the same topic, plays the role of a motivational factor in this case, since, as the aforementioned examples have demonstrated, the BUS JOURNEY metaphor has proved to be productive in the political discourse on Brexit. The second contextual factor comes from the conceptual-cognitive context and includes personal interests and concerns of the author. Lord Wolfson, the author of this article, is known for his concern for the economic growth of the country. Among his special interests, especially in the current situation, are structural reform of the roads and public transport system. Thereby, it can be claimed that this particular interest has also served as a motivating factor for choosing one of

the JOURNEY metaphors. The third contextual factor which has had a great impact on the choice of the metaphorical expression *the reverse-gear gang*, is the knowledge about the topic, as an element of the discourse context. Since the metaphorical expression refers to a group of pro-remain activists, the knowledge about one of its famous proponents, Tony Blair, has prompted the creative use of metaphor evident in this metaphorical expression. More precisely, it is the knowledge about Tony Blair's 2003 speech in which he metaphorically presented himself and his progressive political views as a car without a reverse gear.

The knowledge that journeys are generally social rather than solitary endeavours (Charteris-Black 2011: 69) has been rhetorically exploited in the case of the metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A BUS JOURNEY. However, contrary to the expected rhetorical purpose of JOURNEY metaphors to create solidarity in order that positively evaluated purposes may be successfully attained (Charteris-Black 2011: 67), here, the metaphor has been used to highlight the negative experience in the process of Brexit negotiations. Instead of solidarity among fellow travellers, the metaphor emphasises their fighting for dominance over the driver and the journey itself, which refers to the fight for power and influence in Brexit negotiations between pro-Leave and pro-Remain politicians. The reality seen by everybody else, except for those politicians, brings into focus another aspect of the JOURNEY domain, i.e. obstacles on the journey which have to be accepted and dealt with in order to reach the final destination. This aspect has been rhetorically exploited with the aim of giving purpose to all the difficulties (Charteris-Black 2011: 68) which characterise the process of Brexit from the very beginning and to motivate the politicians and the nation to endure all the problems so to be able to complete the process of Brexit in the best possible way.

4.3.2.3. *TRAIN JOURNEY metaphor*

The next in the series of the VEHICLE JOURNEY metaphors, which has been commonly utilised for the comprehension of the concept of Brexit, is the TRAIN JOURNEY metaphor. Apart from the instances of conventional metaphorical expressions, the cases of creative metaphorical expressions, which differ in the degree of their creativity, have also been identified in the selected corpus. The first to be analysed is an example from the article published in *Politics Home* by Sebastian Whale, in which he presents the MP Tom Brake's view of Brexit.

- (12) As reality hits home, revealing the damage being caused to the country by Brexit and the government's abject failure to address some of the most significant

underlying causes of Leave voters' dissatisfaction – such as poor housing and a lack of quality jobs and training – *more people will want to stop, and get off, this Brexit train to calamity.* (Sebastian Whale, *Politics Home*, 15 September 2017)

At the level of conceptual domains, it can be argued that the target domain THE PROCESS OF BREXIT has been conceptualised in terms of the TRAIN JOURNEY source domain, leading to the emergence of the metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A TRAIN JOURNEY. Contrary to the expectation that a train journey leads the passengers towards a desirable destination, in this case, the destination is not so favourable. This change of focus is possible due to the richness of knowledge about the source domain. First of all, it is the unused source-internal conceptual material from the TRAIN JOURNEY source domain, such as the knowledge that a train journey might head towards a disaster that has enabled emergence of the metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A TRAIN JOURNEY TOWARDS A CALAMITY. The cognitive mechanism that stands behind this process is source-related creativity. This way, it is possible to establish the mappings between the target domain THE PROCESS OF BREXIT and the source domain A TRAIN JOURNEY TOWARDS A CALAMITY, which subsequently leads to the emergence of the scenario A TRAIN JOURNEY TOWARDS A CALAMITY. It is at the scenario level that creative elaborations of metaphors occur by means of utilising the additional conceptual element of the TRAIN JOURNEY TOWARDS A CALAMITY source domain that is appropriate for the target domain. The main conceptual element that has been used to extend the source domain, i.e. the travellers in a journey by train, is evident in the metaphorical expression *more people will want to stop, and get off, this Brexit train to calamity.* The concept of travellers has further been extended by means of the knowledge that travellers, dissatisfied by the journey and afraid of its possible fatal end, might want to stop the journey by leaving the train. The choice of this particular conceptual element has been motivated by THE PROCESS OF BREXIT target domain, which has the ability to reconnect to the source domain TRAIN JOURNEY TOWARDS A CALAMITY and take further knowledge structures that are suitable for the target domain itself. This is a clear example of target-induced creativity. Hence, based on the knowledge about the target domain, i.e. that the process of Brexit might end terribly for Britain and that many Britons wish the process to be reverted, it was natural to use the conceptual element of the source domain which involves the travellers who want the journey to stop so that they can leave the train. In this creative elaboration of the scenario, a train full of passengers heading towards a calamity has been used to present a number of fatal consequences Brexit might cause for Britain and its nation. As more and more passengers become aware of the danger, their

eagerness to leave the train grows. This reflects the situation in which, most Britons, including those who initially voted Leave, are realising that the process of Brexit might not only end the way nobody expected but also aggravate the situation even more. Consequently, more and more Britons want the process of Brexit to be stopped.

The next example comes from the article written by Robert Peston, a pro-Remain oriented journalist. Though the general TRAIN JOURNEY metaphor has been used again, creative elaboration of the metaphor brings other aspects of a train journey into focus.

- (13) In fact the chatter among some ministers and Tory grandees is that 29 March 2019 may well not turn out to be that day of destiny that is its billing - and that *the fast train to Brexit may, like privatised rail, hit a timetabling crisis* which keeps the UK in the EU for a few months longer. (Robert Peston, *ITV News*, 26 June 2018)

Generally speaking, just like in the previous example, the metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A TRAIN JOURNEY has been utilised again. However, a closer look at the example reveals a slight change in terms of the destination of the journey, which now gets more specified and refers directly to Brexit itself. Thereby, the target domain BREXIT is conceptualised in terms of the source domain A JOURNEY DESTINATION, resulting in the metaphor BREXIT IS A JOURNEY DESTINATION. Furthermore, it can be noted that the first form of creativity noted in this example is source-related creativity. Thus, the source domain has been specified by the inclusion of the source-internal conceptual element referring to the speed of the train, which brings forward the metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A FAST TRAIN JOURNEY. This means that the mappings between THE PROCESS OF BREXIT target domain and A FAST TRAIN JOURNEY source domain have been established, which results in the emergence of the FAST TRAIN JOURNEY scenario. The analysis at the level of the emerging scenario offers a valuable insight into the ways the metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A FAST TRAIN JOURNEY has been creatively elaborated. In the FAST TRAIN JOURNEY scenario, the conceptual material from the source domain has been used to create an image in which Britain is on a fast train journey towards a fixed destination, i.e. Brexit. However, a completely unexpected and seemingly contradictory element of the source domain has been employed. Though the train has been described as a fast one, and expectedly punctual, it has been highlighted that the fast train leading to Brexit is, *like privatised railway*, very likely to *hit a timetabling crisis*. This part of the metaphorical expression makes reference to the recent timetable crisis in privatised train companies in England due to the change of schedule, which caused numerous problems for

the commuters, such as unprecedented delays. The reason why this entirely unexpected conceptual element of the source domain has been used lies in the fact that it is the knowledge about the target domain that motivates the selection of the appropriate conceptual elements of the source domain. At the time when the article was published, the public was becoming aware that the date set for the end of the process of Brexit would have to be prolonged. Based on this knowledge, the target domain reconnected to the source domain and selected the *timetabling crisis* as the most appropriate conceptual element. The cognitive mechanism that has enabled this form of metaphorical creativity is target-induced creativity. Hence, in this scenario, Britain has been portrayed as a traveller in a fast train journey with a firmly set destination, i.e. Brexit. Despite the great speed, there is still a possibility that the train might *hit a timetabling crisis*, i.e. not reach the destination on time. Such metaphorical representation seems to be very suitable for the comprehension of Brexit deadline, which was initially set for 29 March 2019. However, as the process of Brexit started, it became clear that such deadline might not be met, and that Britain will have to remain a member of the EU longer than expected.

The emergence of the creative metaphors in these two examples has been significantly impacted by contextual factors. Example (12) is a good indicator of how the previous discourse on the same topic, as a part of the discourse context, can motivate the author to express his attitudes about Brexit using the frequently used TRAIN JOURNEY source domain. Metaphorical creativity exhibited in example (13) has been prompted by one of the elements of the situational context, i.e. the social situation. It can be claimed that the emergence of the metaphorical expression *the fast train to Brexit may, like privatised rail, hit a timetabling crisis* has been impacted by the recent crisis in British railways, marked by numerous problems for the commuters caused by the change of schedule.

The analysis of the creative metaphors at these two levels clarifies the rhetorical goals they intend to achieve. Both examples have been used with the aim of emphasising the negative aspects of Brexit but to a different degree. The creative metaphor used in example (12) conveys a strongly negative representation of Brexit, portraying the entire process of Brexit as being doomed to failure. By presenting Brexit as a *train to calamity*, which more and more people want to *get off*, the author both criticises the decision to leave the EU and warns about potential consequences of such decision, emphasising the growing change of attitude towards Brexit among dissatisfied Britons. On the other hand, example (13) conveys a negative representation of Brexit in a way that is both less intense and entirely different from

the one in the previous example. Here, it is not the entire process of Brexit that has been criticised but only one aspect of it. What the author finds problematic is that Britain will have to stay in the EU longer than expected because it seems impossible to meet the deadline set for the finalisation of the process of Brexit.

Unlike the previous two examples, which focus only on Brexit and its downsides, in the following example, the emphasis has been put on the EU, while Brexit has been presented in a positive light. The example comes from the article written by Stanley Johnson, the former Conservative MEP. The author uses creative elaborations of the TRAIN JOURNEY metaphor in order to discuss Mr Juncker's new vision of the future of the EU. Before analysing the metaphorical expressions, it is important to clarify why the author expresses dissatisfaction with Mr Juncker's plans for the EU. As the author himself explains, he was a supporter of the Remain camp but he changed his mind when Mr Juncker addressed the European Parliament and presented his vision of the EU with a single government, directly-elected EU ministers with EU-wide responsibilities, including finance and defence, which he considered to be unacceptable for Britain.

(14) *Mr Juncker's Federal Express is heading down the track at an ever-increasing speed in a direction we really don't want to go. Even if Britain stayed on board, I doubt if we would be able to change the points on the track ahead, or even slow the train down.* (Stanley Johnson, *Brexit Central*, 4 October 2017)

As previously indicated, instead of THE PROCESS OF BREXIT as the target domain, here, it is THE FUNCTIONING OF THE EU that has been used as the target domain, while the source domain is again A TRAIN JOURNEY. This gives rise to the conceptual metaphor THE FUNCTIONING OF THE EU IS A TRAIN JOURNEY. However, a more detailed examination of this example indicates that the TRAIN JOURNEY source domain has been extended to the unused source-internal conceptual element involving a specific type of train, the Federal Express. The Federal Express is a train known for causing the 1953 Pennsylvania Railroad train wreck. The cause of the wreck was a failure in the train's brake system due to which the train could not decrease its speed. As the train was approaching the station, there were attempts to redirect the train by changing the points on the track, as well as to decrease the speed, but both of them failed. Eventually, the train overran the end of the track, running into the concourse. Here, the target domain THE EU has been brought into correspondence with the source domain THE FEDERAL EXPRESS, which brings forward the creative metaphor THE EU IS THE FEDERAL EXPRESS. The cognitive mechanism that enables this form of metaphorical creativity is source-related

creativity. Thereby, the conceptual elements of THE FEDERAL EXPRESS source domain have been mapped onto the conceptual element of THE EU target domain. This way, the structure for the emergence of the specific creative FEDERAL EXPRESS scenario has been provided. Since the scenario focuses on the problems the Federal Express had on its journey, the additional elements of the source domain which have been employed include the speed, the direction and procedures required to decrease the speed of the train. By utilising the unused conceptual material of the source domain, the scenario creates an image in which the EU has been conceptualised as a train, THE FEDERAL EXPRESS, which is *heading down the track at an ever-increasing speed in a direction we really don't want to go*, without possibility for Britain, as a passenger on the train, *to change the points on the track ahead, or even slow the train down*. This scenario describes the complicated relationship between Britain and the EU, in which Britain does not agree with much of the functioning of the EU, considering it wrong and possibly fatal for the Union itself, and harmful for its member states and, assured that it cannot prevent such an outcome, decides to leave the EU before anything bad happens. The usage of the additional and unused conceptual material of the source domain is prompted by the target domain itself, resulting in target-induced creativity, which is evident in this example.

As already indicated in the analysis, the creative metaphor in this example is based on the actual event of the famous Federal Express train wreck that happened in the USA in 1953, which the majority of Britons are familiar with. This clearly demonstrates how the choice of metaphor has been triggered by context. In this case, the contextual factor is the memory of events and things, an element of the conceptual-cognitive context.

When it comes to the rhetorical goals the creative metaphor intends to achieve, the analysis of the metaphor at the level of conceptual domains and scenarios reveals that the metaphor focuses on the negative representation of the EU and positive representation of Brexit. The author uses the elements of the tragic event with the Federal Express to express his view of the situation in the EU. He portrays the EU negatively, highlighting the possibility of a tragic end of the EU if it continues functioning in the way planned by Mr Juncker. At the same time, this serves as a justification for Brexit. The author justifies Britain's decision to leave the EU by presenting it as a passenger on the train who is wise enough to leave the train before the train crash. Thereby, the metaphor is aimed at persuading the audience that Brexit is indeed a good choice made by Britons and that Brexit is apparently the only way for the

country to be saved from the potentially catastrophic end towards which Mr Juncker's EU is moving.

The following example brings back the idea that Brexit might have a disastrous end, which is not entirely new since it has already been implied in the example (12). What makes this example different is that the danger of the bad outcome of Brexit gets more specific by being conceptualised in terms of THE TRAIN WRECK.

(15) With one year to go, will Brexit happen? Nothing is certain in politics but *the United Kingdom is aboard a slow and unstoppable train to the exit door from the European Union.*

Claims that the referendum campaign was rigged, rows over where European regulations should rest in Holyrood or Whitehall, threats of rebellion over fishing rights, *nothing, it seems, can stop the train wreck that will smash through the buffers at midnight Brussels time – 11 pm here – on March 29 next year.*

A lot could still derail Brexit but there are three big political reasons why it won't be stopped at Westminster station. (Torcuil Crichton, *insider.co.uk*, 29 March 2018)

The metaphorical expressions used in the present example rest upon the metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A TRAIN JOURNEY. This means that THE PROCESS OF BREXIT target domain is once again brought into correspondence with the TRAIN JOURNEY source domain, resulting in a number of mappings between the conceptual elements of the two domains, which vary in the degree of creativity. For the purpose of providing a better understanding of how metaphorical creativity emerges at the level of domains and scenarios, the metaphorical expressions used in this example will be divided in three parts, in the order of their appearance in the text. Each of these three parts represents different conceptual elements which have been used with the purpose of creatively extending the TRAIN JOURNEY source domain, resulting in metaphorical creativity. Though analysed separately, the analysis will demonstrate that all of them are in fact tied together with a common aim.

The first metaphorical expression in this example, *the United Kingdom is aboard a slow and unstoppable train to the exit door from the European Union*, consists of two parts, each of them based on a different metaphor. The first part, *the United Kingdom is aboard a slow and unstoppable train*, rests upon the conceptual metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A TRAIN JOURNEY. Thereby, the conceptual elements of the source domain such as the train and the traveller are mapped onto the conceptual elements of the target domain such as Brexit and

Britain. These mappings provide the structure for the emergence of the TRAIN JOURNEY scenario in which Brexit is presented as a train, while Britain is a passenger on the train. Apart from these mappings, there are additional unused conceptual elements of the source domain, providing extra details about the train, such as the speed of the train and the possibility of controlling the train. The rich encyclopaedic knowledge about the source domain provides a wide range of the additional conceptual elements of the source domain, but what determines the selection of certain conceptual elements instead of others is the target domain. Hence, based on the knowledge about THE PROCESS OF BREXIT target domain, i.e. that Brexit is expected to be a long process which cannot be stopped, the target domain connected back to the TRAIN JOURNEY source domain and selected those conceptual elements that seemed to be most suitable to enable the proper conceptualisation of the target domain. This is a case of target-induced creativity. Thus, the metaphorical expression *a slow and unstoppable train* appears to be an appropriate way to suggest that, though the process of Brexit is slow, it can in no way be stopped. The second part of the same metaphorical expression, *to the exit door from the European Union*, is based on a different kind of metaphor, THE EU IS A BUILDING, which has frequently been employed in political discourse about the EU (Musolff 2000a). Here, the target domain THE EU has been conceptualised in terms of the BUILDING source domain. The mappings established between the two domains create the BUILDING scenario. The cognitive mechanism target-induced creativity has been used again, enabling the target domain to select an additional conceptual element of the source domain, i.e. *the exit door*, from the rich knowledge about the source domain itself. From the combination of these two conceptual metaphors and their corresponding scenarios, it can be implied that Britain has been conceptualised as one of the residents in the EU building, who has decided to leave the building and embarks on a slow train that will surely take it out of the EU.

The next metaphorical expression, *nothing, it seems, can stop the train wreck that will smash through the buffers at midnight Brussels time*, reinforces the idea that the train which leads Britain out of the EU cannot be stopped. While in the previous metaphorical expression this fact was seen in a positive light, as a guarantee that nothing can prevent the finalisation of the process of Brexit, here it highlights that the final outcome of the failure to stop the train will be a train wreck. This metaphorical expression indicates that the TRAIN JOURNEY scenario has been further elaborated by means of extending the source domain to its unused conceptual element, that of the train wreck, which implies that Britain will inevitably be at major loss after leaving the EU. Even the concept of the train wreck has been further creatively

elaborated to include the additional element of smashing the buffers, which adds to the seriousness of the train wreck. Smashing the buffers, whose purpose is to protect the train by reducing damage in a crash, means that the damage that Britain will suffer after Brexit will be severe and in no way reduced. The selection of the additional conceptual elements of the source domain has been impacted by the target domain which utilises the knowledge structures about train journeys and train wrecks for the comprehension of the situation that might emerge as a result of Brexit, which is a clear manifestation of target-induced creativity.

The third metaphorical expression in this example employs other conceptual elements of the TRAIN JOURNEY source domain, which creates a slightly different representation of the situation around Brexit from the one presented so far. First, after presenting Brexit as an unstoppable train that will reach its destination but will inevitably end in a train wreck, the author introduces a different conceptual element, i.e. the possibility of derailing the train. This way, the TRAIN JOURNEY scenario undergoes another change. The metaphorical expression *a lot could still derail Brexit* does not exclude the element of the train wreck, but the additional implication is that the train will not reach its final destination; it will be derailed during the journey not in the end, as suggested by the previous metaphorical expression. It means that the process of Brexit could be stopped in the progress, without ever reaching its finalisation, which will again be detrimental for Britain. The second conceptual element introduced in this metaphorical expression refers to the specific train station, i.e. *there are three big political reasons why it won't be stopped at Westminster station*. Hence, the reference to Westminster station, a London Underground station in the City of Westminster, is very indicative. The fact that the author uses the knowledge that the British government resides in the City of Westminster to suggest that the train *won't be stopped at Westminster station* implies that the process of Brexit will not be obstructed at Westminster, the meeting place of the British Parliament, due to a fundamental disagreement on the issue of Brexit among MPs.

The TRAIN JOURNEY scenario, creatively elaborated in terms of all these conceptual elements, creates an image of a traveller on a slow but unstoppable train towards a fixed destination. Since the train is unstoppable, it is expected that the train will not be able to stop, even when it arrives at the destination, which will result in a train wreck so severe that even the buffers will be smashed. However, the train wreck has not happened yet because the train is still on the way to the destination. This creates another possibility, i.e. that the train might be derailed before it reaches the destination. Even though it is not specified what might cause this derailment, it is clear that it will not be Westminster station where the train will be

stopped. This elaborate scenario has been employed for the purpose of facilitating the understanding of the situation in which Britain's decision to withdraw from the EU requires time to be implemented. However, the determination to leave the EU at all costs might turn against Britain, causing substantial damage to the country. Though there are still some possibilities to stop the entire process, it seems certain that such a decision will not come from the British government, so divided in their positions on Brexit that they cannot make a unanimous decision.

Two days after the Referendum, Andrew Rosthorn published an article in *Tribune* criticising the decision to leave the EU. What strikes as interesting is his very creative elaboration of the TRAIN JOURNEY metaphor.

(16) *Like the four runaway Alaskan locomotives in Andrei Konchalovsky's 1985 survival thriller, the United Kingdom is now in the hands of two dangerous men.*

But our runaway train hasn't hit anything yet.

Our members of parliament have the power to stop the train.

Even as the train was picking up speed out of the freight yard and heading down the main line on Friday morning, the barrister David Allen Green offered them consolation in his Financial Times blog ...

... When the British prime-minister walked out on Boris Johnson and Michael Gove last Friday morning, most knew he was not going to be around to 'steady the ship'. He was the engine driver who had failed to set the throttle to idle before locking the brakes on the mighty GP40 switcher.

Like Sara [Rebecca de Mornay], the loco hostler who had been asleep in the warm cab of another loco in the doomed train, we woke up on Friday morning with no plan.

Sara's predicament was bad. She was aboard a runaway train with Manny the bank robber and Buck the rapist.

Our Boris and Michael were not so absolutely villainous as Manny and Buck, just two former journalists who had proved themselves in the referendum to be no worse than ambitious liars and wild fantasists.

Nevertheless, *we are all heading through an Arctic blizzard for a chemical works on a bad curve beyond a trestle bridge...*

... The first thing is *to keep the fingers of those two former journalists off the procedural button that triggers Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty.*

We now need our dazed and scared members of parliament *to get their hands on all the available brakes, air and dynamic, the brakes that were engineered into our half-written constitution for just this kind of crisis.* (Andrew Rosthorn, *Tribune*, 25 June 2016)

The underlying metaphor is the TRAIN JOURNEY metaphor, i.e. THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A TRAIN JOURNEY. However, the metaphor has been extended very creatively in several ways. First of all, the TRAIN JOURNEY source domain has been extended to the unused source-internal conceptual material involving the specific situation on the train journey, i.e. the idea a runaway train, which has resulted in the emergence of the creative metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A JOURNEY ON A RUNAWAY TRAIN. The cognitive mechanism responsible for this kind of metaphorical creativity is source-related creativity. Hence, the conceptual elements of the TRAIN JOURNEY source domain have been mapped onto the conceptual elements of THE PROCESS OF BREXIT target domain, which provides the structure for the emergence of the scenario, focused on the particularities which characterise a journey on a runaway train. This scenario can be termed the RUNAWAY TRAIN scenario. The scenario utilises the conceptual material of the source domain and creates an image in which Brexit is perceived as a runaway train. Moreover, in this very rich scenario, the correspondence has been established between Brexit and the specific runaway train, from the 1985 film *Runaway Train* directed by Andrei Konchalovsky, which was taken by two dangerous criminals who escaped from prison. The choice of *the four runaway Alaskan locomotives in Andrei Konchalovsky's 1985 survival thriller* adds to the gravity of the situation Britain is in due to Brexit. The fact that the RUNAWAY TRAIN scenario relies on the film plot has enabled the creative elaboration of the scenario by means of employing various unused conceptual elements of the source domain from the rich encyclopaedic knowledge about the source domain. The choice of the conceptual elements of the source domain depends on the target domain, which reconnects to the source domain, recruiting the conceptual elements necessary for the proper comprehension of the target domain. This results in target-induced creativity which is evident in this example too.

The first conceptual elements of the source domain which have been utilised refer to the passengers on the train and the persons who control the train. The scenario, therefore, portrays Britain in the process of Brexit as a traveller on the runaway train *in the hands of two dangerous men*, which refer to two dangerous politicians, Boris Johnson and Michael Gove. The difference between the film and reality is that the Brexit runaway train *hasn't hit anything yet*. This makes a contrast between the Brexit runaway train and the runaway train from the film, which hit the wagon of another train as it was progressing down the track without possibility to be stopped. Contrary to this situation, the Brexit train has just started going down the track and no accident has happened yet, which means that the process of Brexit is in its starting phase and a lot can still be done. The next metaphorical expression indicates that the MPs, as the travellers on this train, *have the power to stop the train*, which implies that the final decision about Brexit is to be made in the Parliament, which has the power to overturn the decision and stop the dangerous process from developing further. The conceptual elements used in the metaphorical expression *the train was picking up speed out of the freight yard and heading down the main line on Friday morning* include the speed of the train and its movement down the track, suggesting that the process of Brexit started on Friday morning, the day of Referendum, before the voting took place. The expression *out of the freight yard*, which is in the Collins English Dictionary defined as a place on a rail network where freight trains are made up or broken down, has been used to allude to the political circles where the idea of Brexit was originally created and released in the Referendum campaign.

So far, the idea of a driverless train has been created. However, the next conceptual element of the source domain refers to the driver of the train, including the precautionary actions he/she needs to take. The then Prime Minister, David Cameron has been described as *the engine driver who had failed to set the throttle to idle before locking the brakes on the mighty GP40 switcher*, which is again a direct reference to the film, in which the driver died of a heart attack before taking all the precautionary measures to ensure that the train is stopped. David Cameron did not die, but he was the one who announced Referendum for the first time, kept his promise, but decided to resign after the Referendum was finished, leaving the country to other, unskilful politicians, like Boris Johnson and Michael Gove. Not only did the driver leave the train, but he also failed to take all the necessary measures to slow the train down before locking the brakes, which is captured by the metaphorical expression *failed to set the throttle to idle*. This implies that David Cameron left Britain to handle the process of

Brexit without taking any precautions to ensure that the country goes through this process safely.

In the next metaphorical expression, the conceptual element of a traveller on the train has been used again. Besides the aforementioned ones, there is another passenger on the train, i.e. the British nation, which has been presented as one of the film characters: *Like Sara [Rebecca de Mornay], the loco hostler who had been asleep in the warm cab of another loco in the doomed train, we woke up on Friday morning with no plan.* The situation in which Sara, one of the characters in the film, who was also one of the passengers on the runaway train, finds herself is used to comprehend the situation of Britons on the day of Referendum. Just like she was first unaware of the gravity of the situation and had no clear plan about how to stop the train, Britons were also confused by the choice they were given in the Referendum and completely unaware of what the Leave vote really meant. The reference has again been made to the previously mentioned dangerous men who control the train. Thus, Sara's situation was aggravated because *she was aboard a runaway train with Manny the bank robber and Buck the rapist.* In the same way, Britain entered the process of Brexit with two not so respectable politicians, Boris Johnson and Michael Gove, who, as the author comments, *were not so absolutely villainous as Manny and Buck.* The fact that they do not totally correspond to two dangerous criminals from the film does not alleviate the difficult position Britain is in.

To express the seriousness of the situation, the author continues with creative elaboration of the metaphor by utilising another conceptual element of the source domain, i.e. the dangerous obstacle on the way, which is obvious in the metaphorical expression: *we are all heading through an Arctic blizzard for a chemical works on a bad curve beyond a trestle bridge.* Again, one of the crucial scenes from the film has been evoked. In the film, the train was going through the blizzard and approaching a tight and perilous curve near a chemical plant, which could cause the train to crash in the immediate proximity of the plant and cause a chemical explosion. Likewise, Britain's journey on the runaway Brexit train might end in the chemical explosion, i.e. the final result of Brexit will not be that favourable.

Finally, after creating the extremely negative scenario of Brexit, the author brings in some positivity by suggesting that it is not yet late to stop the runaway Brexit train. This means that the source domain has been extended to its unused conceptual element of the measures necessary to prevent a train crash. Here, in order to prevent the Brexit train crash, the safety measures include: *the procedural button that triggers Article 50 of the Lisbon*

Treaty, all the available brakes, air and dynamic and the brakes that were engineered into our half-written constitution for just this kind of crisis. All these are intended to save Britain from the collapse that the process of Brexit might cause.

In example (15), two contextual factors can be said to serve as motivational factors for the emergence of the creative metaphor. The first one is the element of the discourse context, i.e. the previous discourse on the same topic, in which the TRAIN JOURNEY metaphor has previously been employed for the conceptualisation of Brexit. The effect of the second contextual factor, the immediate physical setting, which belongs to the situational context, is evident in the metaphorical expression *it won't be stopped at Westminster station*. The fact that Westminster is the place where the British Parliament meets and discusses the issue of Brexit has motivated the author to metaphorically refer to this fact as Westminster station at which the Brexit train will not be stopped. Another element of the situational context, the cultural context, has served as motivation for the emergence of the creative metaphor in example (16). As previously mentioned, the entire metaphor scenario in this example is based on the plot of the famous 1985 film *Runaway Train* directed by Andrei Konchalovsky, which the majority of the audience are familiar with. It is thus clear that this film, as a part of culture, has provided the author with ample conceptual material for presenting Brexit as a fatal decision.

When it comes to the rhetorical power of creative metaphors, examples (15) and (16) will be studied together because of the similarity of the rhetorical goals they intend to convey. Though JOURNEY metaphors tend to present purposeful activities with a positive outcome, in both examples, the creative metaphors have been used to convey a very negative representation of Brexit in a vivid and persuasive way. By invoking the disturbing image of the fatal train crash, the metaphors make an emotional appeal to the audience in order to achieve a persuasive effect and shape the audience's attitude towards Brexit. By drawing attention to the crisis caused by Brexit, the metaphors are also used as a means of warning about potential consequences. The two examples differ in expressing the severity of those consequences. While in the metaphor in example (15) the train is likely to end in *the train wreck that will smash through the buffers*, example (16) provides an even more devastating end in which the train is *heading through an Arctic blizzard for a chemical works on a bad curve beyond a trestle bridge*. Besides, the predominantly negative representation of Brexit and its consequences, both examples offer a form of optimistic belief that there are still some

politicians who have the strength to use all the power they have to save Britain from the catastrophic end.

4.3.2.4. *SHIP JOURNEY metaphor*

According to Musolff⁴² (2000b: 67), MARITIME JOURNEY metaphor is frequently found in public discourse and seems to have a long tradition of use in political writing, dating back to Aristotle, who presented the citizens' contributions to the state as sailor's work on a ship. Grady et al. (1999: 108-109) also identify the NATION-AS-SHIP metaphor as a conventional metaphor, ubiquitous in popular discourse and based on fundamental metaphorical mappings, such as ACTION IS A SELF-PROPELLED MOTION, COURSES OF ACTION ARE PATHS, TIME IS MOTION, A SOCIAL RELATIONSHIP IS PHYSICAL PROXIMITY, CIRCUMSTANCES ARE WEATHER, STATES ARE LOCATIONS, etc. More specifically, they note that NATION-AS-SHIP metaphor includes the cross-domain correspondences, in which national policies/actions correspond to ship's course, determining national policies to steering the ship, national success/improvement to forward motion of the ship, national failures/problems to sailing mishaps and circumstances affecting the nation to sea conditions. In the series of vehicles that are used metaphorically in talking about Brexit-related issues, SHIP also appears as a frequent source domain. The common target domains are BREXIT, BRITAIN and THE EU. The correspondences established between these concepts are further elaborated, resulting in the examples which demonstrate various degrees of metaphorical creativity.

The first example comes from the article which was written as a reaction to a poster that appeared in Brussels, depicting a fictional character Tintin in a burning boat and titled *Tintin and the Brexit Plan*. The part containing the metaphorical expression is, in fact, a comment made by one senior EU diplomat about Britain's decision to leave the EU.

(17) "If the ship is sinking, is it not only natural to call for rescue?" said one senior EU diplomatic source told The Telegraph.

⁴² Musolff (2000b) investigates the argumentative potential of SHIP JOURNEY and CONVOY metaphors in the public debates about the European integration process in Britain and Germany. The study of the corpus reveals that SHIP JOURNEY metaphors constitute the second-largest group of metaphors and, together with general journey/movement imagery, they form one of the main metaphors fields in Euro-debates (Musolff 2000b: 68). The author further emphasises that the EU or one of its institutions is presented as "a ship where all crew members must fulfil their respective tasks and co-operate under one command if they want to finish the journey successfully" (Musolff 2000b: 70).

"We are still not giving up hope that the United Kingdom decides not to leave us."
(Natasha Clark, *the Sun*, 21 March 2017)

The analysis of the metaphorical expression used in this example demonstrates that the target domain THE PROCESS OF BREXIT has been conceptualised in terms of the SHIP JOURNEY source domain, which results in the general metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A SHIP JOURNEY. However, a more detailed analysis of the metaphorical expression indicates that the SHIP JOURNEY source domain has been extended to one of its unused source-internal conceptual element, i.e. a sinking ship, which is a case of source-related creativity. This change in the source domain comes together with a slight change in the target domain as well. Instead of utilising more general target domain THE PROCESS OF BREXIT, the target domain becomes more specific and includes BRITAIN only. Such creative extension of the source domain and the slight change of the target domain have led to the emergence of the more creative instance of metaphor, BRITAIN IS A SINKING SHIP. This creative metaphor necessarily involves the establishment of mappings between the conceptual elements of the source domain and the target domain. These mappings provide the structure for the emergence of the scenario, which can be termed the SINKING SHIP scenario. In this scenario, the target domain selects one particular conceptual element of the source domain, i.e. the possibility of calling for rescue, in order to present Britain as *the ship [which] is sinking* and in urgent need *to call for rescue*, which implies that Britain's decision to withdraw from the EU is considered wrong and detrimental for the country itself. What the EU expects is that Britain will realise that the only way to solve the problems is to turn to the EU for help, which implies the decision to stop the process of Brexit and remain a part of the EU. The cognitive mechanism that has enabled the source domain to connect back to the source domain and take this unused conceptual element, based on the vast knowledge about the source domain itself, is target-induced creativity.

That the SHIP metaphor is a common way of talking about Brexit among the EU officials is demonstrated in the example taken from Jean Claude Juncker's speech. The same SHIP (BOAT) source domain has been used again but this time for the comprehension of a different target domain.

(18) Mr Juncker, the most senior official in Brussels, said he did not like Brexit because he wanted "*to be in the same boat as the British*".

"*The day will come when the British will re-enter the boat, I hope,*" he said following an EU summit.

Former UKIP leader Nigel Farage said: "*The ship will have sunk by then.*" (*The BBC*, 10 March 2017)

The first metaphorical expression used in this example derives from a common English idiom *to be in the same boat*, which is in the Collins English Dictionary defined as to be in the same unpleasant situation or share the same problems as somebody else and is thus a conventional metaphor. Nevertheless, Mr Juncker slightly altered the original meaning in applying the idiom to the post-Brexit relationship between Britain and the EU. Such alteration of meaning can be considered a creative elaboration of the conventional metaphor. Here, *to be in the same boat* has been used in the sense of being in the same situation, which is not necessarily an unpleasant or problematic one. What is being implied is that it is in the interest of the EU that Britain remains its member, as much as it ought to be in the interest of Britain. Thus, the SHIP (BOAT) has served as a source domain for the conceptualisation of the target domain THE EU, resulting in the metaphor THE EU IS A SHIP (BOAT). The mappings between the conceptual elements of the source and target domain provide a structure for the SHIP (BOAT) scenario. It is at the scenario level that the creative extension of the source domain occurs. Target-induced creativity is a cognitive mechanism that enables the extension of the source domain to its unused conceptual elements which are selected by the target domain. The first conceptual element of the source domain in terms of which the source domain has been extended is the concept of travellers on a ship (boat). Thereby, if THE EU is conceptualised as A SHIP (BOAT), then it is natural to conceptualise BRITAIN as A TRAVELLER ON THE SHIP (BOAT). The next conceptual element includes the possibility of leaving and re-entering the ship (boat), which is not part of the original meaning of the aforementioned idiom but results from the creative extension of the source domain, which is evident in the metaphorical expression *the day will come when the British will re-enter the boat*. The scenario thus portrays a ship (boat) with multiple travellers. One of the travellers has decided to leave the ship (boat), which is regretted by the remaining passengers. Since the decision to leave is considered unwise and even harmful, they hope that the traveller will return to the security the ship (boat) provides, upon realising the disadvantages of leaving. The aim of the scenario is to present the EU's view on Brexit as a bad choice and to express hope that Britain will realise the disadvantages of Brexit and will eventually re-join the EU.

So far, the metaphorical expressions have been used to present the idea of the EU in a positive light. This is not surprising considering the fact that they were produced by Mr Juncker, the EU senior official, and they reflect the EU vision of Brexit. On the other hand, the British side looks at the same situation from a different perspective, which is evident in

the metaphorical expression produced by the former UKIP leader Nigel Farage. He responds to Juncker's statements by elaborating the existing metaphor and utilises the unused conceptual element of the source domain, i.e. the possibility for a ship to sink, as indicated in the metaphorical expression *the ship will have sunk by then*. Unlike the safe ship (boat) presented in the previous scenario, here, the same ship is seen as completely unstable and in danger of being sunk. In such a situation, the traveller's decision to leave the ship is considered very wise and all the possibilities of returning to the ship are excluded. This suggests that the metaphorical ship, referring to the EU, will have sunk by the time Britain changes its mind, i.e. it is more likely that the EU will cease to exist than that Britain regrets its decision.

The contextual factor that can be considered to prompt the use of these two and all other cases of the SHIP JOURNEY metaphor presented in the analysis is the immediate physical setting, as a part of the situational context. The fact that Britain is an island state, separated from the rest of Europe by the English Channel, and that ships comprise much of the transportation means with the continent makes the SHIP metaphor a natural choice in the discussion of the relations between Britain and the EU. Such perceptual experience provides the conceptualisers with the source domain appropriate for the metaphorical representation of complex political issues such as Brexit. Apart from this mutual contextual factor, the analysis of these two examples has revealed the existence of other contextual factors responsible for the emergence of metaphorical creativity. In example (17), another element of the situational context is at work, the cultural situation. It has already been noted that the article was written as a reaction to the Tintin poster that appeared in Brussels to comment on the position of Britain due to Brexit. The poster, showing a burning boat, is titled *Tintin and the Brexit Plan*. Tintin is the main character in the comic *The Adventures of Tintin*, created by a Belgian cartoonist Georges Remi and thus presents a product of Belgian culture, also serving as a motivating factor for the use of this very metaphor. Example (18) demonstrates how an element of the discourse context, the immediate linguistic context (co-text), impacts the creative elaboration of the metaphor. The idiom that Mr Juncker used in his first sentence, *to be in the same boat*, served as a basis for the creative extension of the source domain by including the element of re-entering the boat, normally not a part of the original idiom, which also applies to the statement of Nigel Farage that *the ship will have sunk*.

The two examples discussed so far have one common characteristic; both of them come from the EU diplomats and present the EU's position on Brexit. The general attitude the EU has towards the entire situation regarding Britain's decision to leave is marked by the

view of Brexit as a very detrimental process for Britain, as well as by the strong belief that once Britain becomes aware of all disadvantages, it will stop the process of withdrawal and remain a member of the EU. In accordance with this attitude, the rhetorical goal that both examples tend to achieve is to convey a negative representation of Brexit, emphasising its potential consequences. Though the rhetorical goal is the same, the metaphors used to achieve it are different. In example (17), it has been done through the representation of the process of Brexit as a ship that is sinking, whereas in example (18) it has been achieved through presenting the EU as a ship (boat), which offers security and protection, and Britain's decision to leave the ship (boat) as an unwise and potentially dangerous venture. Furthermore, example (18) contains an additional metaphorical expression with a completely different rhetorical function. By elaborating the metaphor initially used by Mr Juncker to present the EU as a ship (boat), Mr Farage creates an opposing view of the EU, i.e. as a ship bound to sink. This creative elaboration of the metaphor has been aimed at conveying a negative representation of the EU and implicitly a positive representation of Brexit.

Another creative instance of metaphor comes from the *Independent* article, written by Holly Baxter in July 2016, as a criticism of the post-Brexit resignations given by the politicians who were very prominent during the Referendum campaign. It especially focuses on the latest resignation by Nigel Farage, who was a strong proponent of Brexit during the campaign, but who decided to withdraw when the situation became more serious and the implementation of Brexit had to be done.

- (19) A lot of unbelievable things have happened in UK politics in the past week and a half, but *our three most prominent politicians from the EU referendum debate flinging themselves like rats off a sinking ship* is probably the most astonishing...

... Cameron, Farage and Johnson collectively crafted one of the most tumultuous weeks in the history of modern British politics. Every one of them is responsible for the uncertain future we now face and we're watching them remove themselves from positions of responsibility, one by one. Financially battered, racially divided, politically damaged and chronically demoralised, *we've been left marooned on a tiny island by a bunch of bickering schoolboys waving off Farage as he sails away into the sunset.*

So long, Nigel, and thanks for all the fish. (Holly Baxter, *the Independent*, 4 July 2016)

At the beginning of the passage, the author made a metaphorical reference to the resignation of the three politicians as *our three most prominent politicians from the EU referendum debate flinging themselves like rats off a sinking ship*. The metaphorical expression used here is based on an English idiom *like the rats fleeing a sinking ship*, which means to leave when the situation becomes difficult. The metaphor underlying the metaphorical expression is a conventional metaphor, but its importance lies in the fact that it served as a basis for further creative elaboration. Thus, the target domain THE PROCESS OF BREXIT has been conceptualised in terms of the source domain A SINKING SHIP, which results in the metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A SINKING SHIP. The mappings between the two domains provide the structure for the SINKING SHIP scenario in which the three politicians leave the sinking Brexit ship. The scenario is then creatively elaborated in the sense of extending the SINKING SHIP source domain to its unused conceptual elements such as being left on the desolate island, which is evident in the metaphorical expression *we've been left marooned on a tiny island by a bunch of bickering schoolboys waving off Farage as he sails away into the sunset*. The image of the travellers who are forced to leave the ship and try to find rescue on a small desolate island makes reference to the situation in which Britain is left by its own politicians and remains isolated from the rest of the EU, not only geographically, but also politically and economically. The ones to blame are *a bunch of bickering schoolboys*, i.e. the already mentioned politicians who were very loud while urging people to vote Leave, but leave them when they are needed most. The fact that they are understood as *a bunch of bickering schoolboys* indicates their political immaturity, manifest in their decision to resign in the face of upcoming difficult negotiations with the EU on the terms of Brexit. Since the special focus has been placed on Nigel Farage's resignation, his withdrawal from the process brings forward another unused conceptual element of the source domain, i.e. the possibility of leaving the desolate island. Thus, the existing scenario in which Britain is *left marooned on a tiny island* is extended by introducing the conceptual element of a leader. Here, it is Nigel Farage, the last among those who left Britain in the process of Brexit, who has been presented as the leader who *sails into the sunset*, i.e. escapes and leaves the travellers alone on the island, which is a clear reference to his political behaviour after Brexit. After succeeding in his attempt to promote Brexit as the best solution for Britain, which eventually caused the country to suffer significant damage, he decides to resign and leave the country in problems that are about to grow once the negotiation process with the EU starts. In the light of this, the metaphorical expression with which the article ends seems most natural. The expression *So long, and thanks for all the fish* is taken from the title of the fourth book of *The Hitchhikers*

Guide to the Galaxy fiction series written by Douglas Adams. The title is the message left by dolphins when they left the planet Earth just before it was destroyed. The author of the article incorporated Nigel Farage into this expression *So long, Nigel, and thanks for all the fish*, creatively extending the scenario to the point at which Britain and its people, embittered by his betrayal, are waving to Nigel Farage as he is sailing away and leaving them *on a tiny island* and saying these words of farewell. This serves as sarcastic gratitude of the nation for leaving the country with so many problems. The creative extension of the source domain in terms of all the elements discussed here has been impacted by the target domain, which is a classic example of target-induced creativity.

Together with the immediate physical setting, as a common contextual factor for all examples, the discourse context, i.e. knowledge about the main elements of discourse, is one of the contextual factors that seems to be at work in example (19). In the opening of the article, the author mentions an event that happened during the Referendum campaign. As a part of his pro-Leave campaign, Nigel Farage floated down the Thames in a boat to support a flotilla of fishing boats trying to urge the Parliament to take back control of British waters. It seems clear that the knowledge about this event had an impact on the author when it comes to the choice of the metaphor. It can also be argued that the immediate linguistic context (co-text), reflected in the use of the idiom *like the rats fleeing a sinking ship*, has also served as a motivating factor for the elaboration of the existing metaphor. The situational context appears as a motivating factor too. As already discussed, the use of the last metaphorical expression *So long, Nigel, and thanks for all the fish* derives from the title of the fourth book of *The Hitchhikers Guide to the Galaxy* fiction series written by Douglas Adams, a product of culture, which, as a part of cultural situation, influences the author to creatively extend the source domain.

As the selection of the source domain such as SINKING SHIP indicates, the creative metaphor used in this example has been employed rhetorically to present the process of Brexit in a negative light and to express strong criticism of the decision of the three British pro-Leave politicians to resign after the Referendum, and particularly Nigel Farage, who showed an excessive form of enthusiasm for Brexit during the campaign. The choice of the conceptual element, which involves the situation of being left by the leader on a small desolate island, serves as an emotional and persuasive appeal to the audience, drawing their attention to the crisis produced by Brexit and false promises made by the leaders who resigned.

In September 2017, *The Guardian* published an article by Natalie Nougayrède in which she discussed the difference in perception of Brexit in Britain and the EU. In describing how the European side perceives Brexit, she very creatively employs and extends the SHIP source domain in multiple ways.

(20) On the continent, an altogether different metaphor applies. *Picture a ship sailing off from a port where it was well anchored, and the port's many inhabitants wanting to make sure that ship is neither carrying cannons that it may shoot back at them, nor equipment that would make it impossible for the port to thrive.*

Those on land also want to know that the departing ship's captain won't seek to return as if nothing has changed, and won't demand a say in how the place develops without abiding by all the locally agreed rules.

*The departing ship is watched with both sadness and concern, but there is no rush to take on its navigation problems. That all of the land-people may not always agree on everything changes little. They're aligned in letting the port authority discuss an orderly way out for the ship, and they're keen to keep close contact with it in the future – but within conditions they consider non-negotiable. (Natalie Nougayrède, *the Guardian*, 2 September 2017)*

By looking at the passage as a whole at the general level of conceptual domains, it becomes clear that the target domain THE PROCESS OF BREXIT has been conceptualised in terms of the source domain A SHIP JOURNEY, which means that the underlying metaphor is THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A SHIP JOURNEY. Due to the mappings established between the source and the target domain, the structure for the SHIP JOURNEY scenario has been provided. Within the scenario, multiple extensions of the source domain to its unused conceptual elements happened, based on the knowledge about the source domain. The selection of the conceptual elements of the source domain occurs under the impact of the target domain which reconnects to the source domain and takes additional elements suitable for the conceptualisation of the target. This leads to target-induced creativity, which is evident in the metaphorical expressions in this example. There are multiple conceptual elements used for the creative elaboration of the metaphor and they will be discussed in the order of their appearance in the text.

The first unused conceptual element of the source domain involves the departure of a ship, which is evident in the metaphorical expression *a ship sailing off from a port where it*

was well anchored. Based on the knowledge about the source and the target domain, the correspondence has been established between Britain's process of withdrawal from the stability and security which the EU membership guarantees and a ship departing from a secure port, which means that Britain has been conceptualised as a departing ship, while the EU has been conceptualised as a secure port. The metaphorical expression *the port's many inhabitants* reveals the next unused conceptual element of the source domain, i.e. the inhabitants of the port from which the ship departs, which can be understood as referring to the remaining EU member states. Their role is to make sure that the process of withdrawal does not bring any bad consequences for the EU, which has been suggested in the following metaphorical expression: *the port's many inhabitants wanting to make sure that ship is neither carrying cannons that it may shoot back at them, nor equipment that would make it impossible for the port to thrive.* Thus, the unused conceptual elements of the source, i.e. different pieces of ship equipment, have been employed here to present the ship as a possible threat for the inhabitants of the port. The ship equipment includes *cannons* that can be used to *shoot back at them* and *equipment that would make it impossible for the port to thrive*, both of them being used to make reference to the possible negative consequences that the EU might face due to Brexit, which they want to avoid. Such creative elaboration of the SHIP JOURNEY scenario facilitates the comprehension of the current Britain-EU relationship, in which Britain started the process of withdrawal from the EU, whereas other member states are preoccupied with preserving the values, prosperity and integrity of the EU. The next conceptual element introduced here is that of the ship's captain, which has been used with reference to the British Prime Minister whose duty is to bring the process of Brexit to completion. Furthermore, the ship's captain represents an additional threat for the port's inhabitants. The two courses of actions that the port's inhabitants want to prevent include the possibility of the ship's captain *seek[ing] to return as if nothing has changed* and *demand[ing] a say in how the place develops without abiding by all the locally agreed rules.* This means that after completing the process of Brexit, it is undesirable for Britain to wish to return to the EU or interfere in the EU's decision making. The next metaphorical expression unexpectedly introduces an emotional element into the scenario. The fact that *the departing ship is watched with both sadness and concern* implies an emotional attachment the port's inhabitants feel for the departing member, which facilitates the comprehension of the significant role of Britain as one of the founders of the EU. However, despite their strong conviction that the ship is going in the wrong direction, *there is no rush to take on its navigation problems.* Navigation has thus been introduced as another conceptual element of the source domain used for the creative

elaboration of the metaphor and it represents all the difficulties Britain will have to deal with in the process of Brexit. In the conclusion of the passage, it has been highlighted that despite their different views, all the port's inhabitants are united in allowing *the port authority discuss an orderly way out for the ship*. The authority of the port is a conceptual element of the source domain which has been used for the conceptualisation of the EU authorities, members of the negotiating team, whose job is to negotiate the terms of Brexit that would protect the interests of the EU. Consequently, the intention of the port's inhabitants to *keep close contact with it in the future* is only possible *within conditions they consider non-negotiable*, which implies that the good relationship between the EU and Britain depends on the terms set by the EU. Hence, despite the feelings of sadness and concern about Britain's future outside the EU, the main job of the EU representatives is to negotiate the terms of Brexit that would not harm the EU in any way.

Metaphorical creativity in example (20) has been motivated by two contextual factors. The first one is the immediate physical setting, as already indicated. The next contextual factor is the memory of events and things, as an element of the conceptual-cognitive context, which provides a suitable source domain for metaphorical conceptualisation. The event that played a significant role in the motivation of this metaphor is the previously discussed 'Brexit Flotilla' from June 2016, organised by the Leave bloc as a part of the Referendum campaign. The article does not explicitly mention this event but it features the picture of the event at the very beginning of the article, which shows a boat decorated with British flags and the inscription *The only way is ... Brexit*.

Metaphorical creativity evident in this example has its rhetorical goals. First of all, the author uses creative extensions of the SHIP JOURNEY source domain to express the view that the EU has regarding the issue of Brexit, which is mainly marked by the sense of fear about the consequences the EU might have to face due to Brexit. Next, by making reference to various kinds of threats that the departing ship might cause for the inhabitants of the port, the author creates a negative representation of Brexit as a process that might be problematic both for Britain and the EU. Finally, the mention of the feelings of sadness and concern felt by the remaining EU member states is used with the aim of presenting the attitude of the EU towards Britain, one of its founders, in emotional and persuasive terms.

THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A SHIP JOURNEY metaphor has also been creatively elaborated by means of the elements from Daniel Defoe's famous novel *Robinson Crusoe*. In

the novel, the main character Robinson Crusoe goes to sea in search for adventure, defying his parents' wishes. He survives a shipwreck and finds himself on a remote island. He takes whatever he can from the wreck, before it sinks, and establishes a life on the island. Such metaphorical creativity comes from the article written by George Smid and published by *Lincolnshire Reporter* in September 2017.

(21) Our post-Brexit future shares common characteristics with Robinson Crusoe.
We face adversity, we are in it on our own and the position is self-inflicted.

It's a pity we do not keep a journal and do not record 'good' and 'evils' which have befallen us...

... Hard Brexit is when Robinson Crusoe found the shipwreck was washed away and he couldn't rely on the provisions taken from the marooned ship – he was there, on his own, relying on his wit and resourcefulness.

Soft Brexit is somehow assuming the stranded ship will stay there for some time (two years? five years?) and regular journeys between the shore and the ship will be maintained...

... Both positions assume that, like Robinson Crusoe, 'Britannia' will survive on her own wits and resourcefulness where the outside world, if it is considered at all, is not present or is reduced to passive observers or demoted just to acceptance of our own decision...

... At the end Robinson Crusoe concludes that "All evils are to be considered with the good that is in them, and with what worse attends them".

So, there is hope. But both Leavers and Remainers must press their respective political allies to formulate clearly Britain's future after March 2019. *Only then will providence smile on us and a rescue ship emerge.* (George Smid, *Lincolnshire Reporter*, 26 September 2017)

The metaphorical expressions used in this example rely on the general metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A SHIP JOURNEY, but the focus has been put on a different aspect of the ship journey, due to the possibility of the source domain to use the source-internal conceptual

material with the purpose of creatively extending the source domain, which is a case of source-related creativity. The source-internal conceptual element in terms of which the source domain has been extended includes a shipwreck, which leads to the emergence of metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A SHIPWRECK and the establishment of mappings between the two domains. Thus, the creative SHIPWRECK scenario emerges, in which the metaphor has been creatively elaborated in multiple ways, based on the knowledge about the famous shipwreck from the novel *Robinson Crusoe*. This has been enabled by the cognitive mechanism target-induced creativity, in which the target domain THE PROCESS OF BREXIT connects back to the SHIPWRECK source domain, using its additional, unused conceptual elements.

The correspondence between the situation in which Britain has found itself due to Brexit and the situation of Robinson Crusoe has been established at the very beginning with the metaphorical expression *we face adversity, we are in it on our own and the position is self-inflicted*. From the metaphorical expression, it becomes clear that the first conceptual element of the source domain has been a person who survived the shipwreck. Here, Robinson Crusoe has been utilised for the conceptualisation of Britain itself. This creates a scenario in which the post-Brexit problematic situation Britain has found itself in has been perceived as Robinson Crusoe's situation after surviving a shipwreck and ending up all alone on a distant and desolate island. The next metaphorical expression, *it's a pity we do not keep a journal and do not record 'good' and 'evils' which have befallen us*, is a creative extension of the original source domain and makes use of the fact that Robinson Crusoe had a journal in which he documented all his experiences on the island. Likewise, Britain should *keep a journal and record 'good' and 'evils' which have befallen us*, which metaphorically present positive and negative consequences of Brexit that need to be analysed and discussed in public.

In the next part of the example, the author explains the difference between hard Brexit and soft Brexit by making reference to the situation of Robinson Crusoe. However, the metaphor has undergone a slight change. Instead of conceptualising THE PROCESS OF BREXIT target domain in terms of the SHIPWRECK source domain, the target domain has been conceptualised in terms of another source domain A SEA STORM, which results in the emergence of the metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A SEA STORM. Here, it is THE EU target domain that has been understood in terms of the SHIPWRECK source domain, producing the metaphor THE EU IS A SHIPWRECK. The two metaphors work together in presenting hard Brexit in terms of the situation in which Robinson Crusoe *found the shipwreck was washed away*

and he couldn't rely on the provisions taken from the marooned ship and was therefore *on his own, relying on his wit and resourcefulness*. As seen from the metaphorical expression, the SHIPWRECK source domain has been creatively extended in terms of its unused conceptual element, which involves the goods that could be found on a shipwreck. Thereby, Britain has been metaphorically presented as Robinson Crusoe who realises he has to rely on his own skills because the shipwreck from which he was taking the supplies sunk, which suggests that in case of hard Brexit, Britain will be left on its own without any possibility of using the benefits granted by the EU. On the other hand, soft Brexit is associated with the hope that *the stranded ship will stay there for some time (two years? five years?) and regular journeys between the shore and the ship will be maintained*. This metaphorical expression includes another extension of the source domain in terms of the conceptual element which involves the travelling to the stranded ship regularly in order to use its goods. Thus, the shipwreck does not sink and Britain, again perceived as Robinson Crusoe, can travel regularly to the shipwreck using all the available supplies, which means that in case of soft Brexit, Britain would be able to use the benefits of the EU such the access to the European single market and the EU's customs union. The part about hard and soft Brexit has been concluded by evoking the remark from the beginning of the passage *both positions assume that, like Robinson Crusoe, 'Britannia' will survive on her own wits and resourcefulness*. However, it is important to note that the choice of the metaphorical expression 'Britannia', which is the name of the former royal yacht of the British monarch, indicates that Britain is no longer conceptualised as Robinson Crusoe. In accordance with the metaphor THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A SEA STORM, Britain is metaphorically presented here as a ship forced to go through the sea storm on its own, which once more highlights the fact that Britain will most probably be forced to deal with all the problems resulting from Brexit on itself, without relying on any kind of aid.

The author concludes the article by quoting Robinson Crusoe's optimistic concluding remark which implies that hope for a good outcome should never be lost. The conceptual element of the source domain that has been used to present this hope involves the arrival of *a rescue ship*, which refers to a positive outcome of Brexit. Such outcome is possible if a lot of effort is invested in making a good plan for overcoming problems. This means that all British politicians have to leave aside their opposing views and make a clear plan of what kind of future is the most beneficial for Britain if they want Britain to be at gain, once the process of leaving the EU is finished.

The major motivating factor in the emergence of metaphorical creativity in this example, besides the immediate physical setting, is the situational context, or more precisely, the cultural situation. It is a literary work, as a product of culture, that has provided the author with ample conceptual material for creative metaphor elaboration. As it has been mentioned earlier, Daniel Defoe's novel *Robinson Crusoe*, one of the renowned works in British literature, enabled the author to present the current Brexit situation in terms of the shipwreck that Robinson Crusoe went through.

Metaphorical creativity achieved through the creative elaboration of the metaphor by using the elements of the novel *Robinson Crusoe* has been rhetorically aimed at expressing two contesting views of Brexit. On the one hand, the idea of the shipwreck being washed away has been used to persuasively argue the negative aspects of hard Brexit. On the other hand, soft Brexit has been represented in a more positive light by associating it with the idea of the shipwreck staying in place for some time. Thus, the author faces the audience with the potential consequences of Brexit. The concluding part of the article uses the concept of the rescue ship to propose a possible solution for this complex and controversial situation, which includes the cooperation of two opposing blocks in the British government in order to negotiate the most convenient deal with the EU.

4.3.2.5. *PLANE JOURNEY metaphor*

The assumption that the discourse on Brexit, as a complex and controversial issue, is marked by a high level of metaphoricity, will be confirmed by the next two examples, which utilise the concept of the PLANE JOURNEY as a source domain, leading to the emergence of a number of related metaphors. Recent discussions on Brexit are dominated by growing scepticism regarding the Government's plan for Brexit. As the date when the process of Brexit is supposed to be finished approaches, people are becoming more and more aware of the reality that the initial promises are not likely to be fulfilled and that the Government is not sure what the final outcome of Brexit will look like. In the first example, Rafael Behr deals with this issue by employing creative elaborations of the PLANE JOURNEY metaphor.

- (22) *Those are the runways on which the Brexit plane can land. It is circling in the air because May doesn't want to tell the passengers about the destination. Wisely, she*

rejected advice from her backbenchers to ditch the plane in the sea or slam it into a cliff. The point of departure now feels very remote. Even if she wanted to go back, it isn't clear whether there is enough goodwill in the EU tank to get us there. Time is the fuel and she is running low.

And May is alone in the cockpit. No one else wants to make the announcement. Fasten your safety belts, we are starting a descent. The days when Brexit meant gazing out of the window at wispy cloud castles are over. Corbyn doesn't want to say it. Johnson can't say it. They don't want to tell the public that the options are either: a deal worse than membership or no deal, which is worse than the worst deal.

There is orderly arrival in a second-rate location, or there is a fiery crash-landing. That is what it means to honour the referendum. That is what it meant all along. There is no sunnier destination just over the horizon. But there is also no political leader with the courage to admit it. Instead we have our prime minister, afraid of the runway, without a clue how to turn the plane around, flying on empty. (Rafael Behr, the Guardian, 11 June 2018)

The metaphor underlying all the metaphorical expressions in this example is THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A PLANE JOURNEY, which emerged as a result of source-related creativity. The mappings between the source and target domain have again activated the PLANE scenario in which Brexit has been presented as a plane which circles in the air without a set destination. As a result of target-induced creativity the source domain has been extended in terms of several conceptual elements.

The first conceptual element which extends the source domain is a runway, which is evident in the metaphorical expression *those are the runways on which the Brexit plane can land*. Thus, the scenario portrays Brexit as a plane which needs to choose the best possible runway for landing, which represents multiple options that stand before Britain in the negotiating process with the EU, ranging from more optimistic to more pessimistic ones. The next metaphorical expression, *it is circling in the air because May doesn't want to tell the passengers about the destination*, introduces three conceptual elements. The first one gives information about the route of the plane, which has been described as *circling in the air*, and presents the ongoing negotiations with the EU, which do not seem to finish soon. The second conceptual element involves a captain who is unwilling to reveal the destination, which makes

reference to Theresa May's reluctance to give information about the plans for the finalisation of Brexit. The third conceptual element involves the passengers on the plane who are not informed about the destination they are travelling to, referring to the British nation who are not informed about the details regarding the outcome of Brexit. Therefore, the image created by the PLANE scenario, presenting the plane circling in the air because its captain is unsure which runway to choose for landing and refuses to give the passengers any information about the destination, has been used with the aim of understanding the current Brexit situation in which Theresa May, due to her indecisiveness about how to manage the negotiating process, keeps the situation at standstill and does not inform the nation about her future actions regarding Brexit. Though the situation presented by these two metaphorical expressions does not seem very promising, the next metaphorical expression offers a bit of optimism in stating that Theresa May at least *rejected advice from her backbenchers to ditch the plane in the sea or slam it into a cliff*, which introduces the conceptual element of a tragic accident. This is a reference to the insistence of some politicians on hard Brexit, which means withdrawal from the EU without any kind of deal that would protect British interests, which is considered to be a form of self-destruction. Further elaboration of the complicated situation on the plane is evident in the metaphorical expression *the point of departure now feels very remote*. The conceptual element which includes a departure point has been used with the reference to the position Britain had in the EU before deciding to withdraw, being one of the pillars of the Union, which now seems impossible to obtain again. The process of separation has gone so far that it seems improbable that Britain can return ever again. The probability of turning back is even more reduced because *it isn't clear whether there is enough goodwill in the EU tank to get us there*. This metaphorical expression uses the conceptual elements which involve a tank of a plane and fuel. *The EU tank* is understood as the tank of the Brexit plane, so *goodwill* is the fuel necessary for the plane to go so far to the starting point. It implies that, although the EU regretted Britain's decision to withdraw, the process has progressed so much that the EU does not seem so interested in keeping Britain its member. The next metaphorical expression incorporates one more kind of fuel necessary for the plane to continue its journey: *time is the fuel and she is running low*. This type of fuel represents the date set for the termination of Brexit. The date is approaching and Theresa May is running out of time due to her indecisiveness.

The metaphorical expression used in the next paragraph in this example uses the conceptual element which provides further information about the captain of the plane who is

claimed to be *alone in the cockpit*, with nobody to help and announce: *Fasten your safety belts, we are starting a descent*. This represents the current Brexit situation in which Theresa May is left to handle the process by herself, because of the withdrawal of the most ardent pro-Brexit politicians. The next metaphorical expression explains the situation further, *the days when Brexit meant gazing out of the window at wispy cloud castles are over*, using another conceptual element which involves the enjoyable feeling during a smooth flight. It means that everybody became aware that the initial expectations about Brexit are completely unrealistic.

In the concluding part of the passage, metaphorical creativity has been employed for the presentation of two possible outcomes of the process of Brexit, both of them being negative. The first one, *orderly arrival in a second-rate location*, extends the source domain in terms of the conceptual elements of a plane's arrival and a destination to which a plane arrives. Thus, an *orderly arrival* has been used for the conceptualisation of the completion of the process of Brexit in a set period of time, 29 March 2019, whereas *a second-rate location* makes reference to reaching not so favourable deals for Britain in the negotiations with the EU. Hence, if Britain wants to withdraw from the EU until the fixed date, it will have to compromise and accept the terms fixed by the EU, choosing a soft Brexit. The second outcome of Brexit is even more pessimistic and has been portrayed as *a fiery crash-landing*, extending the source domain in terms of the conceptual element of a landing. *A fiery crash-landing* represents hard Brexit, i.e. leaving the EU without making any deals and losing all the previous benefits Britain used to have as a member state. The conceptual element of a destination has been used again in the metaphorical expression *there is no sunnier destination just over the horizon*, which has been used to suggest that the pre-Referendum prospects of a good and prosperous future for Britain, once it leaves the EU, have proven to be unrealistic. The final remark reuses the conceptual element of a captain, evoking the image of the captain *afraid of the runway, without a clue how to turn the plane around, flying on empty*. The captain has already been described as being afraid of the landing. The new element is that now the captain does not know how to turn back, while previously the option of returning to the point of departure was unlikely due to the lack of fuel. As a result, the Brexit plane continues to fly aimlessly. This depicts an apparently unsolvable situation Theresa May is currently in, afraid of making a choice and incapable of stopping Brexit.

Equally critical towards the effects of the Government's and the Prime Minister's indecisiveness regarding the finalisation of the process of Brexit is the article written by the

Liberal Democrat MP Layla Moran published in the *Huffington Post UK* in June 2018. Concerned about the problem that British airline companies face due to Brexit, she creatively uses the PLANE JOURNEY metaphor to express her ideas on the topic.

(23) *But now the wings really are falling off Brexit Airways (this is a no-frills form of transport, destination unknown, but certainly not low-cost, with the government's own modelling suggesting the Treasury will be £615million a week worse off as a result of Brexit). Increasingly, as we head towards a Brexit crash-landing, people, including those who voted leave, will realise that the appalling job the Conservatives are making of Brexit might well cost them their own jobs.*

This is much more than a row about deceitful slogans on buses. If Brexit is a plane crash, the pilot is out of the cockpit arguing with the cabin crew while ground control is screaming "mayday, mayday". (Layla Moran, the Huffington Post UK, 27 June 2018)

The metaphor underlying this example is THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A PLANE and it has been creatively elaborated by means of various conceptual elements. The first metaphorical expression *the wings really are falling off Brexit Airways* utilises the conceptual element that is not conventionally part of the PLANE metaphor, i.e. the wings. In the PLANE scenario activated by the metaphor, the image of the Brexit plane flying in the air with the wings that are falling apart metaphorically presents the current situation in which the negotiations with the EU do not seem to be as successful as initially expected and the Government appears to be without clear objectives. This creates a perception of the entire process of Brexit falling apart and turning against Britain. Additional details are brought in the scenario with the introduction of other unconventional conceptual elements, such as type of transport, destination and cost. As far as the type of transport is concerned, it has been described as *a no-frills form of transport*, which is a kind of transport in which some non-essential features, such as a food offer, in-flight entertainment, business class seating, are removed with the aim of lowering the costs. Thus, the image of the Brexit plane as not so luxurious type of plane, created by the scenario, has the aim of presenting a rather uncomfortable process of leaving the EU that mainly affects the economy of the country. Besides the lack of luxury, the destination of this plane is unknown, which implies that the Government does not have a plan of how to handle the process of Brexit. Due to all these inconveniences, one would expect the flight to be cheap. But the cost of this flight overcomes everybody's expectations. This is a

direct reference to the costs of Brexit, which might amount to the sum of £615 million a week. A very expensive flight in a lower-budget plane, the destination of which is uncertain, with the wings that are falling off, will naturally lead to *a Brexit crash-landing*. The *crash-landing* makes reference to the vast damage reflected in the loss of many benefits that the membership in the EU grants, that might affect Britain due to Brexit. The next metaphorical expression introduces further conceptual elements, such as the pilot, the cockpit, the cabin crew and ground control, which are not conventional parts of the metaphor, and each of them refers to a particular element of the Brexit process. Although the Brexit plane is about to crash, the pilot is depicted as being *out of the cockpit arguing with the cabin crew while ground control is screaming “mayday, mayday”*. The major responsibility in negotiating Brexit falls on the Prime Minister Theresa May, who is in this case perceived as a pilot. The cockpit might be understood as negotiations with the EU on the terms of leaving. The cabin crew metaphorically presents other members of the government who have different views on how the negotiation process should be handled, while ground control might either refer to the EU or the pro-Remain British politicians and public figures trying to warn Britain of terrible consequences of Brexit. Thereby, in the scenario, the plane is heading towards a crash, but the pilot is not aware of it because of the argument with the cabin crew, most probably about which course the plane needs to take. Even though it is the pilot’s duty to call for help in such threatening situations, it is ground control who does it by calling *“mayday, mayday”* because the pilot seems to be completely unaware of a possibility of a plane crash. This can be understood as a reference to the very probable failure of the process of Brexit and the constant arguments between Theresa May and the government, which make them unaware of the upcoming danger, whereas, in the meanwhile, the only warning about the crisis comes from pro-Remain politicians and the EU.

Contextual factors have played an important role in the emergence of creative metaphors as the examples presented. It can be argued that an element of the discourse context, i.e. the previous discourse on problems that UK airline companies are facing due to Brexit, had a significant impact on the production of metaphors in both examples. More precisely, just around the time when these two articles were published, a popular issue covered in the British media was the financial loss that many airline companies were likely to suffer due to Brexit, particularly a decline of the national airline company British Airways. At the same time, it can be understood that this situation with the airline companies also acts as an element of the situational context, thus demonstrating how the social situation can prompt

the creative use of metaphors in these two examples. Furthermore, in the case of example (23), it is important to note that the article itself is dedicated to discussing the problems huge companies such as Airbus face, which resulted in the announcement of the intention to move the business abroad if the Government does not grant a decent trade deal after Brexit. This can be interpreted as yet another contextual factor belonging to the discourse context, the immediate linguistic context (co-text). The fact that the article mentioned the examples of the airline companies facing the crisis is believed to have served as a motivational factor for choosing the PLANE JOURNEY metaphor for the comprehension of Brexit in example (23).

Metaphorical creativity in these examples has been used with clearly set rhetorical goals. First of all, the pessimistic stance, which the metaphorical expressions in both examples convey, contributes to the negative representation of the process of Brexit, presenting it as potentially very dangerous for the country. In this way, the authors attempt to draw the readers' attention to the crisis and warn them about potential consequences that might result from the process handled in a wrong manner. Additionally, both authors use the creative elaborations of the PLANE metaphor in order to express strong criticism of the lack of action on behalf of the government and the Prime Minister, who seem to make no progress in negotiating a suitable deal with the EU. In the case of example (23), it is important to note that this kind of attitude can be associated with the political affiliation of the author. Being a Liberal Democrat politician, her attitude towards Brexit is greatly shaped by her party's negative perception of Brexit.

4.3.3. Concluding remarks on JOURNEY metaphors in British political discourse on Brexit

The case study presented in this part of the dissertation has dealt with the creative instances of the JOURNEY metaphor, by analysing twenty-three examples taken from British electronic news media. In the analysis of the selected corpus, two categories of the JOURNEY metaphor have been identified: the WALKING JOURNEY metaphor and the VEHICLE JOURNEY metaphors, the latter consisting of five additional subtypes: the CAR JOURNEY metaphor, the BUS JOURNEY metaphor, the TRAIN JOURNEY metaphor, the SHIP JOURNEY metaphor and the PLANE JOURNEY metaphor. Hence, the JOURNEY source domain has proven to be very rich and flexible, allowing for various creative extensions by means of its unused conceptual elements and thus leading to the emergence of metaphorical creativity.

The analysis of the creative metaphorical expressions at the level of conceptual domains focused on the cognitive mechanisms responsible for metaphorical creativity, i.e. source-related and target-induced creativity. Source-related creativity has been identified in all types of metaphors, except for the PLANE JOURNEY metaphor. Thus, for instance, by means of source-related creativity, the WALKING JOURNEY source domain was creatively extended in terms of the unused source-internal conceptual element HIKING, the CAR JOURNEY source domain in terms of A DANGEROUS CAR JOURNEY, the BUS JOURNEY source domain in terms of A FRANTIC BUS JOURNEY, the TRAIN JOURNEY source domain in terms of THE FEDERAL EXPRESS, the SHIP JOURNEY source domain in terms of A SINKING SHIP, etc. Furthermore, this form of metaphorical creativity provided more conceptual material for the target domain to use in target-domain creativity, a cognitive mechanism responsible for much of the metaphorical creativity in the examples analysed. This cognitive mechanism led to the creative extension of the source domains, by allowing the target domains to connect back to the source domains and take some additional, unused conceptual elements. Numerous conceptual elements have been identified in the analysis, some of them being, obstacles, the way of walking, physical/psychological fitness, safety equipment (the WALKING JOURNEY metaphor), a backseat driver, speed, a road, drunk driving, keys (the CAR JOURNEY metaphor), a bus driver, passengers, a road map, a destination (the BUS JOURNEY metaphor), a schedule, a train wreck, buffers, a train station (in the TRAIN JOURNEY metaphor), travellers, a port, port inhabitants, a captain, navigation (the SHIP JOURNEY metaphor), a runway, landing, a pilot, cabin crew, wings (the PLANE JOURNEY metaphor), etc.

Any study of metaphorical creativity in discourse would be incomplete without implementing the analysis at the level of metaphor scenarios, which complement the conceptual domains level, providing the main storylines along which central mappings are developed and extended (Musolff 2004: 18). The mappings between source domains and target domains provided the structure for the emergence of the corresponding metaphor scenarios. For example, the WALKING JOURNEY metaphor produced the HIKING scenario, the CAR JOURNEY metaphor produced the DANGEROUS CAR JOURNEY scenario, the BUS JOURNEY metaphor produced the FRANTIC BUS JOURNEY scenario, the TRAIN JOURNEY metaphor produced the TRAIN JOURNEY TOWARDS CALAMITY scenario, the SHIP JOURNEY metaphor produced the SINKING SHIP scenario, the PLANE JOURNEY metaphor produced the PLANE scenario, etc. Each of these scenarios created the source-related storylines that are mapped onto the corresponding target domain concepts, offering crucial information about attitudinal

biases and political preferences necessary for the comprehension of the rhetorical goals of metaphors in question.

The contextual factors that motivate the emergence of metaphorical creativity have also been examined. The claim made by Kövecses (2010b, 2015), that the context represents a major source of motivation for the use of creative metaphors in real discourse, has been confirmed here. Hence, three types of contexts have been identified in the present analysis: the conceptual-cognitive context, the discourse context and the situational context. Within the conceptual-cognitive context, two contextual factors motivated the emergence of creative metaphors, concerns and interests and the memory of events and things. The contextual factors from the discourse context include knowledge about the main elements of discourse, the previous discourse on the same topic and the immediate linguistic context (co-text), whereas the contextual factors that belong to the situational context are the immediate social setting, the immediate cultural context and the immediate physical context. Moreover, it is important to emphasise that these contextual factors do not usually function independently. It is the combined effect of different contextual factors that influenced the choice and creative elaboration of metaphors in the majority of examples covered in the analysis.

Finally, the analysis of the creative metaphors at the levels of conceptual domains and metaphor scenarios has proven to be very beneficial for the proper understanding of the rhetorical goals intended by the metaphors in question. Even though the JOURNEY metaphors are generally considered to highlight purposeful and positive experiences (Charteris-Black 2011), very few such examples have been found in the present analysis. One such example is the HIKING metaphor used by the EU official Mr Barnier, which was rhetorically aimed as an encouragement for Theresa May and the British nation to accept Brexit and endure all the difficulties it involves, in order to achieve their ultimate goal. In the majority of the examples analysed, the rhetorical goals have been mainly focused on a negative representation of Brexit, questioning the ability of the British government in handling the negotiation process, warning about the consequences Britain might suffer due to Brexit, criticising the actions of British political leaders, expressing concern about the future of Britain and highlighting the crisis produced by Brexit. In addition, the creative instances of metaphors have also been used with the purpose of giving vividness and clarity, making an emotional appeal and enhancing persuasive effects.

4.4. MARRIAGE/DIVORCE metaphors in British political discourse on Brexit

Among a number of metaphors used in political thinking and, by extension, political discourse, the FAMILY metaphor proves to have a distinguished role, especially in the conceptualisation of the nation. Lakoff (1996, 2002) delved into this issue emphasising that the NATION AS A FAMILY metaphor is a standard element of our conceptual system. The NATION AS FAMILY metaphor, according to Lakoff (2002: 154), can be stated as follows: THE NATION IS A FAMILY, THE GOVERNMENT IS A PARENT and THE CITIZENS ARE THE CHILDREN. This metaphor enables the conceptualisation of the nation based on the knowledge about a family. For example, based on the knowledge that a parent's role is to protect the children, it can be inferred that the government's role is to protect its citizens (Lakoff 2002: 155). Furthermore, Musolff (2004: 13-14) notes that the use of the FAMILY metaphor for the metaphorical understanding of the nation state has a long history in political thinking, dating back to the theories of the state developed in antiquity. What characterises this metaphor is that a sociopolitical entity is conceptualised in terms of a FAMILY with PARENTS who are MARRIED and their CHILDREN. He (2016: 25) also emphasises that the aptness of the FAMILY metaphor for the conceptualisation of the nation state is based on its positive bias. This means that FAMILY metaphor highlights relationships of love, harmony or at least solidarity among its members, which suggests that being a member of a family is essentially considered a good thing.

As the studies within the realms of CMT indicate (Musolff 2004, 2006, 2009, 2016; Dueck 2001; Wee 2001; Hülse 2006; Silaški and Đurović 2014; Đurović and Silaški 2010, 2018; Berberović and Mujagić 2017), FAMILY metaphor plays a very prominent role in political discourse in general and the EU-related political discourse in particular, referring both to the relationship among the member states and the relationship each member state has with the EU. For instance, Wee (2001) explores the MARRIAGE metaphor in the political discourse related to the Singapore-Malaysia relationship, drawing special attention to the gender roles assigned to each of the states, based on the amount of power each of them has. In her study of how the MARRIAGE metaphor was used for the conceptualisation of the unification of two Germanies, the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and the German Democratic Republic (GDR), Dueck (2001: 367) also highlights the common use of the concept of political marriage in which states are assigned a gender; the weaker GDR that was assigned a female role, whereas the stronger FRG was assigned a male role. Similarly, Đurović and Silaški's (2010) analysis of the political discourse dealing with the coalition of

two ideologically different political parties in Serbia demonstrated that the relationship between the parties was conceptualised in terms of the MARRIAGE metaphor, retaining the traditional gender division. Apart from investigating the MARRIAGE metaphor only, there are also studies which are focused on both MARRIAGE and DIVORCE metaphors. Thus, Silaški and Đurović (2014) explored how the MARRIAGE and DIVORCE metaphors were used for the conceptualisation of the relationship between Serbia and Montenegro, after Montenegro's withdrawal from the union of the two states, and how these metaphors exhibit great rhetorical power. What is particularly relevant for the present analysis, Đurović and Silaški (2018) investigated how the MARRIAGE and DIVORCE metaphors in political discourse on Brexit were used with the aim of understanding the nature of the relationship between Britain and the EU. Moreover, they also discovered that this discourse was also marked by the assignment of gender roles, in which Britain was conceived of as a wife and the EU as a husband. Berberović and Mujagić (2017) also deal with the use of the MARRIAGE and DIVORCE metaphors in political discourse on Brexit, putting the emphasis on how these conventional metaphors can be creatively stretched through conceptual blending, which leads to the emergence of creative figurative language.

In a number of his works, Musolff provides a comprehensive study of how the FAMILY metaphor is used in British political discourse for the conceptualisation of various EU matters, such as the introduction of the new currency (Musolff 2004), the relationship between Britain, Germany and France (Musolff 2006, 2009) and the British-European relationship (2016). As the aforementioned studies reveal, all these EU-related topics have been understood in terms of the FAMILY metaphor, i.e. the LOVE-MARRIAGE-FAMILY domain which consists of the following conceptual categories: LOVE, ENGAGEMENT, MARRIAGE, COUPLE, ADULTERY/MÉNAGE-À-TROIS, SEPARATION/DIVORCE, FAMILY, PARENTS, GODPARENTS, FATHER(S), MOTHER, CHILD, BROTHER and COUSINS (Musolff 2004: 15). The author (2004: 18) also provides conceptual mappings for the LOVE-MARRIAGE-FAMILY metaphors: NATION STATE IS A PERSON; TWO STATES CO-OPERATING OR 'BELONGING' TOGETHER POLITICALLY ARE PERSONS IN A LOVE RELATIONSHIP/MARRIAGE; A LARGER GROUP OF STATES CO-OPERATING OR 'BELONGING' TOGETHER ARE A FAMILY; THE RESULT OF THE STATES' CO-OPERATION IS THE FAMILY'S CHILD or, as an alternative to the last one, THE MEMBER NATIONS OF THE GROUP ARE THE CHILDREN OF THE GROUP. In accordance with his idea that central mappings are too general and need to be complemented by scenarios, which provide the main story lines or perspectives along which the central mappings are developed or extended, Musolff (2004: 18)

presents three scenarios for the LOVE-MARRIAGE-FAMILY metaphors, based on the study of the EU corpus:

- (a) the PARENT(S) scenario: PARTICULAR STATES OR GROUPS OF STATES HAVE THE ROLE OF PARENTS THAT ENDANGER, BEAR AND RAISE A CHILD OR SEVERAL CHILDREN
- (b) the CHILD(REN) scenario: PARTICULAR STATES OR GROUPS OF STATES OR SPECIFIC POLICIES HAVE THE ROLE OF INDIVIDUAL CHILDREN THAT ARE EDUCATED, NURTURED AND DISCIPLINED
- (c) the MARRIAGE scenario: TWO STATES HAVE THE ROLE OF MARRIED PARTNERS (who have previously been LOVERS/FIANCÉS); if there is AN ESTABLISHED COUPLE, FURTHER ASSOCIATED STATES HAVE ROLES VIS-À-VIS THE COUPLE (e.g. that of EXTRA-MARITAL LOVERS/SUITORS).

Similarly, in relation to the debate about the EU political issues in British media, Musolff (2016: 31) notes that PARENTS in the EU FAMILY are mostly presented as a COUPLE who experience the ups and downs of MARRIED LIFE, emphasising that these concepts build up to three mini-narratives: PARENT-CHILD relationships that relate to themes of SOLIDARITY and HIERARCHY-AUTHORITY, MARRIED LIFE of the EU couple (including all manners of MARRIAGE PROBLEMS from ADULTERY, SEPARATION, DIVORCE, to MARRIAGE OF CONVENIENCE and RENEWED NUPTIALS) and LOVE/MARRIAGE relationship (and problems) between Britain and the EU and its institutions. The second mini-narrative (MARRIED LIFE of the EU couple) best demonstrates the position Britain has in the EU. Here, the EU is depicted as a hierarchical family structure, in which either Franco-German couple or the EU Commission dominates the rest of the EU. Britain plays a contradictory role either as a potential partner in the privileged elite group (extending the couple to a triangle) or as the supplicant/hopeful or spurned lover (Musolff 2016: 32). Thereby, it is not surprising that the relationship between Britain and the EU was depicted as “a troubled marriage that is threatened by separation or divorce” (Musolff 2016: 34), even in the period before the announcement of the Referendum.

4.4.1. MARRIAGE metaphor

One of the specific instances of the more general FAMILY metaphor is certainly the MARRIAGE metaphor, which simplifies the understanding of the abstract and complex notion of a political relationship between states, by bringing into correspondence its characteristics with the

characteristics of a relationship in a marriage. What enables it are the mappings of the conceptual elements of the MARRIAGE source domain onto the conceptual elements of the target domain THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STATES, which results in the metaphor THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STATES IS A MARRIAGE. Even though the DIVORCE source domain has been dominantly used for the conceptualisation of the process of withdrawal of Britain from the EU, the analysis of the selected corpus has revealed the occurrence of the MARRIAGE source domain as well. Regardless of a small number of occurrences of the latter source domain, its significance lies in the fact that it contributes to better comprehension of the situation that eventually led to the divorce. As the analysis will indicate, the examples of metaphor involving the MARRIAGE source domain tend to portray a psychological state of a spouse/spouses prior to a divorce.

The first example of this kind to be investigated in the present analysis is taken from the article authored by Nic Robertson, a British journalist and CNN's International Diplomatic Editor, who tried to provide an overview of how the relationship between Britain and the EU developed from Britain's admission to the EU to Brexit, by employing various conceptual elements of the MARRIAGE/ROMANCE metaphor.

(24) Starved of compromise when it needed it most, Britain spent the last years with the EU in and out of relationship therapy, surviving on an insufficient drip of concessions from the bloc.

... It wasn't always this way. European suitors, known then as the Common Market, wooed a war-weary Britain, enjoying an on-again, off-again courtship that was almost derailed by a disapproving patriarch: French President Charles de Gaulle.

His death paved the way for romance to blossom. Britain's defenses were finally broken down, and in 1973, a full marriage took place. Britain finally partnered with a like-minded equal - at least that was the understanding.

First came the honeymoon: Prosperity grew, the growth gap between Britain and founding members -- Germany, France and Italy -- began slowly to close. Incrementally, the UK became less the "sick man of Europe."

Indeed, this side of the relationship blossomed until the financial crisis.

But over time, the nuptials didn't deliver the expected parity. Fisherman, farmers and car manufacturers were among the many to complain.

...Whether it was true or not, many in Britain felt their country was the one in the relationship doing all the giving.

What was once a waltz of joy between embracing lovers was becoming increasingly a stagger between estranging partners as wounds, sores, disease and imbalance were taking their toll.

...Britain's departure from the EU's arms leaves the other lovers in this struggling union to keep the dance going.

The EU, clinging ever tighter, searching for a stronger embrace, is unwilling to let any others go. (Nic Robertson, the CNN, 29 March 2017)

At the general level of conceptual domains, it is evident that the MARRIAGE/ROMANCE source domain has been used for the comprehension of the target domain THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BRITAIN AND THE EU, resulting in the conventional metaphor THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BRITAIN AND THE EU IS A MARRIAGE/ROMANCE. The reason the concepts of both MARRIAGE and ROMANCE are used is because the author depicted two different parts of the relationship between Britain and the EU: the evolvment of the relationship before Britain even became its member, as well as their relationship during Britain's membership in the EU.

In the opening of the passage, the author depicts the final stage of the relationship between Britain and the EU by employing the MARRIAGE metaphor, which is evident in the metaphorical expression *starved of compromise when it needed it most, Britain spent the last years with the EU in and out of relationship therapy*. A closer analysis of this metaphorical expression reveals that the MARRIAGE source domain has been extended to the unused source-internal conceptual element involving one specific aspect of a marriage, i.e. the fact that a marriage can become dysfunctional. Such an extension of the source domain has led to the emergence of the unconventional metaphor THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BRITAIN AND THE EU IS A DYSFUNCTIONAL MARRIAGE. This type of metaphorical creativity is source-related creativity. The conceptual elements of the DYSFUNCTIONAL MARRIAGE source domain have been mapped onto the conceptual elements of the target domain THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BRITAIN AND THE EU, providing the structure for the emergence of the specific DYSFUNCTIONAL MARRIAGE scenario, which focuses on the problems that spouses have to deal with. Based on the rich encyclopaedic knowledge about the source domain, the scenario uses the unused conceptual material of the source domain, such as the lack of compromise and the relationship counselling. The scenario thus creates an image of BRITAIN and THE EU as

MARRIED PARTNERS going through a very critical period in their marriage. First, Britain is presented as being *starved of compromise when it needed it most*, which represents its inability to reach any sensible solution for the problems with the EU. Consequently, Britain *spent the last years with the EU in and out of relationship therapy*, which refers to various kinds of attempts of reconciling the opposing views of Britain and the EU on some of the crucial issues. This creative extension of the source domain, which occurs due to the ability of the target domain of reconnecting to the source domain and selecting some of its conceptual elements, is termed target-induced creativity.

In the next part of the passage, the author provides a reminder that the relationship between Britain and the EU was not troublesome at the beginning. He thus used the ROMANCE source domain, producing the metaphor THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BRITAIN AND THE EU IS A ROMANCE. This means that the conceptual elements of the ROMANCE source domain have been mapped onto the target domain THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BRITAIN AND THE EU, which, in turn, leads to the emergence of the ROMANCE scenario, in which the creative extension of the source domain occurs, demonstrating at the same time how the instances of target-induced creativity actually emerge in real discourse. The first conceptual element involves the suitors who woo a girl into a romantic relationship, which is evident in the metaphorical expression *European suitors, known then as the Common Market, wooed a war-weary Britain*. Representation of Britain as a fragile girl wooed by European suitors metaphorically presents the period when war-torn Britain was invited to join the European Economic Community (EEC), which Britain refused, only later to reapply for the membership due to the economic crisis. In order to present this reluctance on the part of Britain, the author extended the source domain by introducing the next conceptual element, a type of courtship. Thus, the inconsistency in the relationship before Britain joining the EEC has been portrayed as *on-again, off-again courtship*. Furthermore, since Britain's first application for the membership in the EEC was vetoed by the French President Charles de Gaulle, the relationship has been described as *almost derailed by a disapproving patriarch: French President Charles de Gaulle*. By presenting the French President Charles de Gaulle as *a disapproving patriarch*, the author utilises another unused conceptual element of the source domain, i.e. the authority figure who does not approve of the relationship, which is a frequent element of love stories. Continuation of the negotiating process for Britain's membership after the death of Charles de Gaulle has been referred to as *the way for romance to blossom*. As it happens in a romantic relationship, girls are not always easy to woo, they tend to demonstrate a certain amount of

reluctance towards suitors, which is another conceptual element of the source domain used in the passage. Thereby, though Britain demonstrated reluctance to its suitors, *Britain's defenses were finally broken down*, i.e. Britain was convinced to join the ECC, which eventually ended in *a full marriage*, standing for Britain's full membership in the EEC.

From the point when Britain's accession to the ECC was metaphorically presented as *a full marriage*, the MARRIAGE metaphor comes to use again. Thus, the knowledge that spouses are expected to be compatible in terms of their views on various issues has been used to extend the source domain again in order to portray Britain's and EEC's agreed terms as Britain being *finally partnered with a like-minded equal*. The next conceptual element of the MARRIAGE source domain is that of the honeymoon, as the most beautiful way of commencing a marriage. Thus, the metaphorical expressions *first came the honeymoon* and *the relationship blossomed* refer to the initial stage of Britain's membership, marked by the growing prosperity and equality among the member states. However, after the first crisis, the situation started deteriorating gradually. The expectation that marriage grants equality of spouses is the conceptual element evident in the metaphorical expression *the nuptials didn't deliver the expected parity*, which represents the inequality that was becoming more evident after the financial crisis. Consequently, one side feels to invest more into the marriage than the other one. In this case, it was felt that *Britain was the one in the relationship doing all the giving*, from which it can be understood that the accession to the EEC cost Britain a lot more than it was anticipated.

In the concluding part of the article, the MARRIAGE metaphor has been combined with the MOVEMENT metaphor. From the metaphorical expression *a waltz of joy between embracing lovers*, it can be implied that the MOVEMENT source domain has been used for the comprehension of the MARRIAGE target domain itself, which at the same time acts as the source domain for the conceptualisation of the RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BRITAIN AND THE EU target domain. It can also be noted that the MOVEMENT source domain has been extended to the unused source-internal conceptual material, which involves a specific kind of movement, i.e. a very elegant dance characterised by harmonious and graceful movements of dancers. As a result of such creative extension of the source domain, the creative metaphor THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BRITAIN AND THE EU IS A DANCE, emerged, which is a case of source-related creativity. The mapping between the conceptual elements of the source and the target domain provided the structure for the emergence of the DANCE scenario, in which Britain and the EU are presented as both dancers and lovers who move gracefully, which is a reference to

the good relationship they had at the very beginning of their alliance. Contrary to this positive portrayal of the early relationship between Britain and the EU, the next metaphor focuses on the final stage of this relationship, prior to Brexit. Here, the MOVEMENT source domain extends to the unused source-internal conceptual material which seems more appropriate for the current relationship. Instead of the graceful movement suggested by the concept of DANCE, the concept of STAGGER, as an unsteady movement, has been employed, resulting in the metaphor THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BRITAIN AND THE EU IS A STAGGER. The emerging STAGGER scenario, presents the relationship between Britain and the EU as *a stagger between estranging partners as wounds, sores, disease and imbalance were taking their toll*. Thus, the conceptual element of partners, in this case *estranged partners*, as well the conceptual element referring to an unsteady walk, *a stagger*, have been used for the conceptualisation of the void created in political relations between Britain and the EU. The fact that health problems (*wounds, sores, disease and imbalance*), representing all kinds of problems between Britain and the EU along 43 years, are mentioned further adds to the idea of *estranged partners*, suggesting that the partners must be quite old, which is no surprise considering that their marriage lasted for 43 years.

So far, the EU has been perceived as a single entity and Britain and the EU as two partners in a relationship. However, that image of the EU has been changed, since other members states have been mentioned as well, which is evident in the following metaphorical expression: *Britain's departure from the EU's arms leaves the other lovers in this struggling union to keep the dance going*. The example represents a continued use of the MOVEMENT metaphor, now with the further extension of the source domain by means of introducing other lovers that exist in the relationship between Britain and the EU. Contrary to the previous image of two persons moving in a dance, this creative elaboration of metaphor has created an unusual image in which an entire group of people is dancing. Thus, after *Britain's departure from the EU's arms*, i.e. Britain's withdrawal from the EU, there are *other lovers*, i.e. remaining member states, who want *to keep the dance going*, which refers to their determination to maintain the existence of the Union by remaining a member state. This determination is mutual as *the EU, clinging ever tighter, searching for a stronger embrace, is unwilling to let any others go*. Here, the portrayal of the EU as a dancer who embraces strongly all the partners, determined to keep them all, has been used as a means of conceptualising the stricter attitude the EU has towards its remaining member states in order to prevent any possible withdrawal. Overall, the scenarios created by the metaphors in this

passage, which range from presenting the initial, romance stage of the relationship to the marriage stage, in which marriage problems started to appear, creating a sense of dissatisfaction and inequality between the spouses, have been used with the aim of facilitating the comprehension of all the complexities and dimensions of the intricate relationship between Britain and the EU.

The emergence of metaphorical creativity in this example has been impacted by the discourse context, or more precisely the previous discourse on the same topic. Since MARRIAGE has been used as a frequent source domain in British political discourse in general, also including the discourse on Brexit, it has served as a motivation for the further use and creative extension of the same domain in the continuation of the discussions on the topic of Brexit.

The combined analysis of metaphors at the level of conceptual domains and metaphor scenarios proves to be helpful in understanding the rhetorical goals that the example intends to achieve. Based on what Musolff (2016: 25) said about the positive bias of the FAMILY metaphor in highlighting relationships of love, harmony and/or solidarity, it can be assumed that the same applies for the MARRIAGE metaphor. This partially applies to example (24), in which the positive aspects of marriage have been used with the aim of positively representing the initial stage in the relationship between Britain and the EU, which was marked by prosperity and equality among the member states. In addition, Musolff (2016: 33) highlights that, though dysfunctional families are experienced in reality, they most probably belong to the outer margins of the prototype and he brings into question whether such relationships qualify for FAMILY status. This example, however, does not seem to be in accordance with this claim, since it has been rhetorically used for representing a negative attitude towards Britain's membership in the EU. Various marriage problems, such as lack of compromise, inequality in marriage, marriage counselling, hurtful events, have been highlighted here in order to make an emotional and persuasive appeal to the readers, trying to justify Brexit. The assignment of gender roles evident in this example is also significant for the understanding of rhetorical goals. As claimed by Wee (2001), Dueck (2001) and Đurović and Silaški (2010), this male vs female dichotomy is directly related to the notion of strength, which, in case of the application of the MARRIAGE metaphor for political relationships between the countries, means that a weaker party is given the role of a wife, whereas the role of a husband is assigned to a stronger party. Thus, the presentation of Britain as a wife and the EU as a husband in example (24) highlights the weaker position Britain was believed to have in the

EU, which is the viewpoint of Eurosceptics in general. The stronger position of the EU brings the sense of responsibility in focus. The portrayal of the EU as an unfair husband, guilty of the marriage problems, has been aimed at creating a negative representation of the EU, blaming it for all the problems that eventually led to Brexit.

The next example to be analysed here was published in the *Spectator*, two days before the Referendum took place. It was written by Niall Ferguson who, based on his own experience with a divorce, presented the problematic relationship between Britain and the EU in terms of the MARRIAGE metaphor.

(25) Now, I get how you feel. *You've reached the point when you just can't stand the EU any more. You can't stand the nagging (regulation). You can't stand the way the EU keeps inviting her friends round (immigration). You can't stand the way she takes your money (that net contribution). So enough is enough. You want out.*

At this stage, most people contemplating divorce are motivated by two things. First, they see only their spouse's defects. Secondly, they fantasize about an idealized alternative future. Often, though not always, this involves a magically perfect new partner. But the most important motivation is the dream of freedom. No more nagging! No more unwelcome guests! All that money saved!

This is the Brexit state of mind. To the committed Leave voter, the European Union has no virtues, only vices. *For some Brexiteers there is also an adorable, in-every-way-perfect girlfriend called 'the Anglosphere', a combination of all that is cute about Australia, Canada and New Zealand.*

*But, let's face it, most Brexiteers are a bit long in the tooth for a new partner, even if such a new partner existed. For them it is enough to contemplate freedom. Independence. Good old English liberty. Shut your eyes and ask yourself what image those words conjure up. Could it possibly be that yacht you've always dreamt of? Is that how you picture yourself, blithely sailing off into the sunset? (Niall Ferguson, the *Spectator*, 21 June 2016)*

Metaphorical expressions used in this example are based on the metaphor which has already been used in the previous example, THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BRITAIN AND THE EU IS A DYSFUNCTIONAL MARRIAGE. The conceptual elements of the DYSFUNCTIONAL MARRIAGE

source domain have been mapped onto the conceptual elements of the target domain THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BRITAIN AND THE EU, providing the structure for the emergence of the specific DYSFUNCTIONAL MARRIAGE scenario, which is focused on the problems that spouses have to deal with, such as, for instance, growing differences between the spouses which become hard to bear and eventually lead to a divorce. Just as spouses experience problems in a dysfunctional marriage, the political relationship between states can also become very problematic, which is what makes the DYSFUNCTIONAL MARRIAGE source domain a natural choice for the conceptualisation of the target domain RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BRITAIN AND THE EU. Based on the rich encyclopaedic knowledge about the source domain, the scenario uses the conceptual material of the source domain and creates an image of BRITAIN AND THE EU as MARRIED PARTNERS who go through a very critical period in their marriage. Creativity emerging from this creative extension of the source domain, which occurs due to the ability of the target domain of reconnecting to the source domain and selecting some of its conceptual elements, is termed target-induced creativity. A variety of conceptual elements has been employed in this example. Hence, at the very beginning of the passage, Britain is given the role of the disappointed husband who can no longer tolerate the EU, i.e. the wife. The dissatisfaction the husband feels affects his psychological and emotional state. Thus, the husband can no longer tolerate three forms of his wife's behaviour: *the nagging*, *the way the EU keeps inviting her friends round* and *the way she takes [the] money*. The author of the article clarifies in the text what these three kinds of behaviour refer to: regulation, immigration and net contribution, respectively. Inability to cope with such problems usually results in the contemplation of a possible separation. Thus, the passage continues with the portrayal of Britain as the husband thinking about divorce, motivated by *see[ing] only [the] spouse's defects* and *fantasiz[ing] about an idealized alternative future*. The ideal future can potentially be *a magically perfect new partner* or *the dream of freedom*, both believed to solve the problems of *nagging*, *unwelcome guests* and the *money* issue. The rest of the passage provides a further explanation of these two options. In case of the dream of *a magically perfect new partner*, it could be *an adorable, in-every-way-perfect girlfriend called 'the Anglosphere'*, which, as the author explains, metaphorically represents a stronger partnership with the English-speaking countries, Australia, Canada and New Zealand, which some of the Brexit proponents anticipate. The more probable option seems to be *the dream of freedom* in which Britain is portrayed as *blithely sailing off into the sunset on that yacht you've always dreamt of*, representing Britain's dream of the kind of freedom, independence and sovereignty it once had during its imperial past. Thereby, the image of a dissatisfied husband who is

irritated by his wife's bad sides and contemplates divorce, created by the scenario, has been used for the conceptualisation of a problematic relationship between Britain and the EU. After 43 years of the EU membership, Britain becomes overwhelmed by the EU's defects and the dream of a better future outside the EU, and decides for the Referendum in which the nation will decide whether to leave the EU or remain a member state.

Though it can be argued that, like in example (24), the previous discourse on the topic of Brexit has had an impact on the choice of the metaphor, there is another contextual factor that has played an even more important role. Hence, at the beginning of the article, the author noted that he was writing from his personal experience as a divorcee, which clearly supports the claim that a conceptualiser's choice of metaphor can be motivated by his/her personal experience. Thus, it can be claimed that, in this example, the creative elaboration of the MARRIAGE metaphor has been prompted by the contextual factor termed concerns and interests, which belongs to the conceptual-cognitive context.

Like the previous one, this example has also been rhetorically used for a negative representation of Britain's membership in the EU. Here, however, the negative representation has been further enhanced by listing numerous marriage problems: growing differences between the spouses, nagging, unwelcome guests, spending money carelessly and dreaming about an idealised future. The assignment of the gender roles is evident here as well. Unlike the previous example, in which Britain has been portrayed as a wife, in this case, Britain has been assigned the role of a husband, while the EU has been presented as a wife. Since the stronger party is Britain, it can be inferred that Britain is in control of the situation and has the power of imposing Brexit onto the disapproving EU. Moreover, being portrayed as a misbehaving wife, the EU seems guilty of causing the marriage problems, whereas Britain, as a disappointed husband, has been victimised. All these elements have been used with a clear rhetorical goal of making an emotional and persuasive appeal to the audience, in order to make a justification for Brexit.

The idea that, over time, spouses can develop certain qualities that each of them might find disturbing has also been used in the following example, written by Howard Jacobson and published in the *Guardian*, immediately after the Brexit referendum.

(26) *You don't divorce simply because your spouse has a number of qualities you dislike and on occasions makes your life uncomfortable. If you are reasonable, you*

view divorce as a measure of last resort. There are many steps you can take in the meantime. You might even call in a trained mediator. (Howard Jacobson, *the Guardian*, 26 June 2016)

Like in the previous example, the metaphor THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BRITAIN AND THE EU IS A DYSFUNCTIONAL MARRIAGE has been used again, which means that the DYSFUNCTIONAL MARRIAGE scenario has also been activated. Within this specific scenario, the creative extension of the DYSFUNCTIONAL MARRIAGE source domain occurs based on the rich knowledge about the source domain and the ability of the target domain to reconnect to the source and take its additional conceptual elements. Metaphorical creativity emerging in this way, as the case of target-induced creativity, is evident from the conceptual elements in terms of which the source domain has been extended. The first conceptual element is the same as the one used in the previous example and involves the concept of unfavourable qualities of a spouse. While in the previous example such qualities were represented as a justifiable reason for the termination of the relationship, in this case it is not so. On the contrary, they are represented as a general characteristic of many marriages and thus not a substantial reason for a divorce, as the metaphorical expression indicates: *You don't divorce simply because your spouse has a number of qualities you dislike and on occasions makes your life uncomfortable.* Thus, Britain has been presented as a spouse who intends to end the marriage that turned out to be dysfunctional because the other spouse, i.e. the EU, has some unfavourable qualities that Britain finds disturbing, seemingly unaware of the fact that *if you are reasonable, you view divorce as a measure of last resort.* Presenting divorce as *a measure of last resort* involves the use of another unused conceptual element involving the measures that could be taken to save the marriage such as *call[ing] in a trained mediator*, i.e. a party that is neutral and can thus approach the marriage problems more objectively. What this means is that it should have been better if Britain had reconsidered the idea of divorce, since even dysfunctional marriages can be saved with the help of marriage counselling. Thus, the metaphorical expressions have been used to present Britain's disregard of the fact that the withdrawal from the EU should have been the last option and its failure to seek help in terms of a mediator who could have helped the two sides reach a compromise without ending the four-decade-long political and economic partnership.

As in the previous example, two contextual factors can be claimed to prompt the choice of the metaphor and its creative elaboration in the present example. The first one is the

previous discourse on the same topic, an element of the discourse context, whereas the second one involves concerns and interests, as an element of the conceptual-cognitive context. Though the author did not highlight his personal experience with two divorces in this very article, it can still be suggested that it actually did prompt him to choose this particular metaphor.

The use of metaphor in this example confirms the aforementioned Musolff's (2016) statement about the positive bias of MARRIAGE metaphors, by implicitly highlighting the advantage of being married and presenting divorce as *a measure of last resort*, which could be avoided if spouses are willing to seek help. Therefore, the mention of some marriage problems has not been intended to justify Brexit, as in the previous two examples. Rather, the rhetorical aim has been to represent Brexit as a bad choice for the solution of the problems between Britain and the EU and thus try to warn the audience that the decision of withdrawal from the EU needs to be reconsidered.

The example that follows also focuses on the marriage problems that preceded the divorce, as well as the divorce itself. Since the present chapter deals with the MARRIAGE metaphor, only one part of the article, presenting the marriage problems, will be studied here, whereas the other part, dealing with the divorce, will be analysed in the next chapter. The article, written by Fintan O'Toole and published in the *Irish Times*, offers the author's overview of the essay written by Boris Johnson in which he tried to explain the reasons behind Brexit using the MARRIAGE metaphor.

(27) Cleverly, instead of attacking the EU, he depicted Britain's membership of the union as *just one of those relationships in which the lovers are bad for each other. They don't mean to be but they are.*

And he suggested that the Brits, unhappy and misplaced, had become impossible to live with: "It is wrong for us to be there - always trying to make things different, always getting in the way, always moaning." (Fintan O'Toole, *the Irish Times*, 23 September 2017)

As the metaphorical expressions used in the example indicate, the metaphor underlying all of them is the DYSFUNCTIONAL MARRIAGE metaphor. Though the metaphor is the same as in the previous examples, the conceptual elements of the source domain that have been mapped onto

the target domain include some new aspects of marriage problems. In the DYSFUNCTIONAL MARRIAGE scenario, the source domain has been creatively extended to include the emotional problems between the spouses. Thus, in the first metaphorical expression, the spouses, i.e. Britain and the EU, are described as being in *one of those relationships in which the lovers are bad for each other*. Moreover, such kind of relationship is characterised as involuntary: *They don't mean to be but they are*. What this suggests is that the cause of numerous complications and disputes in the political relations between Britain and the EU might be the incompatibility reflected in contrasting views on common issues. The awareness of such incompatibility provokes further emotional problems and Britain is depicted as being *unhappy and misplaced*. The next conceptual element in terms of which the source domain has been creatively extended involves the change in the behaviour of one of the spouses provoked by the emotional problems. This change, characterised as negative, includes three forms of problematic behaviour: *always trying to make things different, always getting in the way and always moaning*, which all make Britain a spouse *impossible to live with*. The first form of problematic behaviour, *always trying to make things different*, makes reference to Britain's diverse views on the issues related to the entire EU. The second one, *always getting in the way*, refers to the situations when Britain obstructed certain processes in the EU, whereas the third one, *always moaning*, can be understood as Britain's constant complaints about various issues, especially its position in the EU. All these creative extensions of the source domain have been enabled by the cognitive mechanism termed target-induced creativity. The image of a marriage between incompatible partners, who harm each other emotionally, has been created by the scenario with the purpose of clarifying the idea that the partnership between Britain and the EU seemed to be a wrong idea from the very beginning, due to the great differences that exist in their conception of the Union and the role of individual members, and that Brexit seems to be the best solution.

When it comes to the contextual factors that motivate the emergence of metaphorical creativity in this example, one particular text plays a significant role. In the opening of the article, the author himself mentioned that his text is a comment or a summary of the essay written by Boris Johnson, which was characterised as a break-up speech. The re-use of the original metaphor demonstrates how the previous discourse on the same topic, as an element of the discourse context, can motivate the further use and creative extension of the same domain in the continuation of the discussion on the same topic.

The rhetorical goal of negatively presenting Britain's membership in the EU and, consequently, justifying Brexit, has been achieved in this example too. An interesting thing to note is that, based on the cliché pseudo-compassionate break-up line "It's not you, it's me", all the blame was put on Britain, while the EU was absolved of the guilt for the separation. This can be understood as a form of the strategy of justifying Brexit and making it easier to bear.

4.4.2. DIVORCE metaphor

Considering the fact that the complexities of the relationship between Britain and the EU have been presented very successfully in terms of the (DYSFUNCTIONAL) MARRIAGE metaphor, it is then no wonder that the DIVORCE metaphor has proven to be very useful and appropriate for the representation of the end of the political and economic union between Britain and the EU that lasted more than four decades. The conceptualisation of Brexit as a divorce has been enabled by the conceptual mappings that occur between the DIVORCE source domain and the BREXIT target domain, which bring into correspondence the conceptual elements of the source domain and the target domain. The examples containing the DIVORCE metaphor in our corpus reveal that a major emphasis has been put on the psychological and emotional aspects of a divorce as well as on legal proceedings of a divorce. Thereby, the analysis will cover both of these aspects of a divorce, first by examining the examples which focus only on the psychological and emotional aspect of a divorce and then gradually moving towards the examples that also include the legal aspect of a divorce.

The first example to be discussed is taken from the article written by Jon Henley and published in the *Guardian*. Since the article was published on the day of Referendum, it speculates about its possible outcome. Combining the DIVORCE and MARRIAGE metaphors, the author focuses on the emotional problems that might affect both sides in the process.

(28) *So, will it be the bad-tempered breakup, a passionate, crazily romantic bid for independence and the liberty of a single life – followed, in all likelihood, by years of acrimonious wrangling over the furniture?*

Or will it be kiss and make-up: a rational decision to remain in what has, in truth, often seemed a rather tedious, restrictive, even loveless marriage of convenience – but

one, nonetheless, that has brought both parties many benefits? (Jon Henley, the Guardian, 23 June 2016)

In the first paragraph of this section, it is clear that the DIVORCE source domain has been used for the comprehension of the BREXIT target domain, producing the metaphor BREXIT IS A DIVORCE. The mapping of the conceptual elements of the source domain onto the conceptual elements of the target domain has provided the structure for the emergence of the DIVORCE scenario, at the level of which the creative extension of the source domain occurs. The cognitive mechanism that enables this is target-induced creativity. Therefore, the BREXIT target domain has the ability to reconnect to the DIVORCE source domain and use its additional unused conceptual elements, based on the knowledge about the source domain. Three such conceptual elements have been used in the present example with the purpose of explaining the kind of harm that Brexit might cause. Furthermore, these three conceptual elements represent three stages of the divorce process.

The first conceptual element involves the emotional aspect of a divorce. This is evident in the metaphorical expression *the bad-tempered breakup*, in which the complicated relationship between Britain and the EU, which ended in Britain's withdrawal from the EU, has been presented in terms of Britain and the EU being an embittered couple that goes through a very difficult divorce. What usually follows such divorce is the desire of restoring the pre-marriage lifestyle, which is the second conceptual element in terms of which the source domain has been extended. In the metaphorical expression *a passionate, crazily romantic bid for independence and the liberty of a single life*, Britain has been conceptualised as a divorcee who desperately wants back all the benefits of a single life, in order to recover from the emotional turmoil caused by the divorce, which is a reference to Britain's desperate wish of restoring the independence and sovereignty it once had. Instead of fulfilling such dreams of freedom, most divorcees end up in arguments over the unresolved issues. Based on this knowledge about the source domain, the third conceptual element involves the idea of post-divorce disputes over marginal issues. Hence, it is very likely that Brexit will be followed by *years of acrimonious wrangling over the furniture*, which metaphorically presents different kinds of arguments between Britain and the EU in the negotiation process mostly over less important issues.

The second paragraph of this section presents another outcome of the Brexit Vote using the MARRIAGE metaphor. The activation of the MARRIAGE scenario has enabled the

conceptualisation of the organisation of the Referendum as filing for a divorce. The hope still exists that Britain will change its mind and instead of divorcing the EU, it will be *kiss and make-up*, i.e. the decision to stay. Though this decision has been judged as the most rational, it does not necessarily include the improvement in the relationship between Britain and the EU, which has been presented as *a rather tedious, restrictive, even loveless marriage of convenience*. Here, the unused conceptual element is the marriage of convenience, a type of marriage which is arranged in order to gain some kind of benefit, mostly financial one. This conceptual element seems most suitable for the comprehension of all the complexities the relationship between Britain and the EU involves, since the membership in the EU means gaining different kinds of financial, practical and political benefits. Despite being described as *tedious* and *restrictive*, it has been acknowledged that the partnership between Britain and the EU *has brought both parties many benefits*.

The use of two scenarios, the DIVORCE scenario, which presents divorcees going through three stages of a divorce, and the MARRIAGE scenario, in which the couple that wanted a divorce decides to reconcile and remains in the loveless marriage of convenience due to many benefits that such marriage grants, has been aimed at presenting two possible outcomes of the Brexit referendum. One includes the possibility that Britain opts for Brexit, which will be followed by the attempt of restoring independence and sovereignty from the past, ending up in endless disputes with the EU over marginal issues, whereas the other possibility is that Britain chooses to stay in the EU, accepting to endure some of the discomforts of that partnership, in exchange for all the benefits it brings.

The idea that a divorce leaves spouses in a particular psychological and emotional state has been used in the metaphor utilised for the conceptualisation of Brexit in the following example. The example is taken from the article that Howard Jacobson, a British writer and journalist, wrote for the *Guardian*, a part of which has already been used in the previous section dealing with the (DYSFUNCTIONAL) MARRIAGE metaphor. Since the article was published three days after the Brexit referendum, the author focused on the immediate consequences felt after this metaphorical divorce.

(29) *Things go bad after a divorce and often stay that way. It is rare for the parties to return placidly to a time before they met. A bitterness lingers on. Those who call this our Independence Day, fantasising of returning to a never-never time before they*

married, when they were free, easy, single and master of their fate, are delusional. There is always another bad relationship, another tyrant, another fat cat.

... Lady Chatterley's Lover again: "The cataclysm has happened, we are among the ruins." *But no tender trysts in the gamekeeper cottage with Nigel are likely to be forthcoming. And Boris won't be venturing that far into the woods any time soon.*

Once more, virtue has been stolen with false assurances. And all parties to the seduction are diminished. Those who don't feel a pang today will feel a thousand pangs tomorrow. (Howard Jacobson, the Guardian, 26 June 2016)

The metaphor underlying the metaphorical expression used in this example is also BREXIT IS A DIVORCE, which means that the DIVORCE source domain has been used for the conceptualisation of the BREXIT target domain. Hence, the conceptual elements of the source domain have been mapped onto the conceptual elements of the target domain, which provides the structure for the emergence of the DIVORCE scenario. It is at the level of the scenario that the source domain can be creatively extended by means of using some of its unused conceptual elements that are suitable for the target domain. This is possible due to the ability of the target domain to reconnect to the source domain and take the additional elements of its conceptual structure, based on the vast knowledge about the source domain, which is termed target-induced creativity. One of the conceptual elements that dominates the entire passage is the post-divorce psychological and emotional state of the spouses. As a divorce is considered a bad thing, which brings about bad consequences, Britain and the EU are presented as the spouses who are in such a state of mind after the divorce that they wish they could restore the life they had before they met and got married, *when they were free, easy, single and master of their fate*. These qualities that belong to a pre-marriage phase of their lives represent another conceptual element in terms of which the DIVORCE source domain has been creatively extended. This conceptual element has been used for the conceptualisation of Britain's hopes for the independence and sovereignty they had before joining the EU, which the author presents as *delusional*. As it is impossible for the divorcees to restore the life they had before marriage, so Britain's hopes to restore the pre-EU state are unsubstantiated. The next metaphorical expression, *there is always another bad relationship, another tyrant, another fat cat*, utilises one more conceptual element of the DIVORCE source domain, i.e. a new bad relationship. It often happens that in their pursuit of tranquillity and happiness after the

divorce, divorcees enter other bad relationships which harm them even further. This has been used for the conceptualisation of the situation that might follow Brexit, i.e. Britain's finding other economic and political partners that would only aggravate an already bad situation in the country. Thereby, after realising the political and economic consequences of Brexit and the inability of restoring the glorious past, more probable seems the idea that Britain will be forced to enter a new bad partnership again.

In the next part of the passage, the author continues using the DIVORCE source domain but introduces the elements from D.H. Lawrence's novel *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. The elements taken from the novel and incorporated into the DIVORCE scenario are the spouses and the lovers. Thus, Britain has been given the role of Lady Chatterley, a dissatisfied and unfaithful wife, whereas the EU has the role of her husband Sir Clifford Chatterley. The knowledge about the plot of the novel, in which Lady Chatterley meets with her lover in the cottage in the woods, has enabled the author of the article to creatively extend the source domain by using the conceptual elements of an unfaithful wife and her lover(s), as the following metaphorical expressions indicate: *But no tender trysts in the gamekeeper cottage with Nigel are likely to be forthcoming. And Boris won't be venturing that far into the woods any time soon.* Here, Britain has been presented as the unfaithful wife, while Nigel Farage and Boris Johnson have been portrayed as the lovers with whom she used to meet in the cottage in the woods. What these metaphorical expressions indicate is that Nigel Farage's and Boris Johnson's ardent support of Brexit during the campaign has been understood in terms of a love affair with Britain, resulting in Britain's withdrawal from the EU. However, when the marriage is over and harsh reality strikes, the romantic relationship between the lovers is also finished and there are no more romantic meetings with Nigel or Boris. This is understood as a metaphorical representation of the post-Referendum situation in which the role of pro-Brexit campaigners such as Nigel Farage and Boris Johnson seems to be diminishing due to the real political and economic problems that Britain has to deal with in the process of leaving the EU. Continuing in the light of the novel, the author concludes the article with the metaphorical expressions in which he uses two additional conceptual elements of the source domain, the moral side of a relationship and the consequences of infidelity. The metaphorical expression *virtue has been stolen with false assurances* suggests that Britain, as the unfaithful wife, lost the morality or virtue because of the false promises given by the lovers, i.e. the most ardent Brexit supporters. Besides the loss of morality, the next metaphorical expression focuses on the consequences of infidelity, which affect all sides involved: *all parties to the seduction are*

diminished. In this case, Britain and the proponents of Brexit are represented as the *parties to the seduction*, suggesting that those who voted for Brexit, and by extension the country itself, were seduced by unrealistic promises of independence and sovereignty that Brexit will grant. Consequently, they *are diminished* and *those who don't feel a pang today will feel a thousand pangs tomorrow*, which indicates that the consequences of the mistake they made will, sooner or later, be felt by everyone in Britain. The overwhelming feeling is that Britain's betrayal of the EU will eventually bring more harm than benefits to Britain.

The contextual factor that has played a significant role in the emergence of metaphorical creativity in both examples is the previous discourse on the same topic, the element of the discourse context. Since the DIVORCE metaphor seems to be frequently used in political discourse in general and political discourse on Brexit in particular, it has motivated creative elaborations of the existing metaphor by means of introducing new conceptual elements. Furthermore, in example (29), the effects of the situational context are also evident. It is the cultural factor, or more precisely, a cultural product (an artistic work) that has motivated the emergence of metaphorical creativity in this example. The author used the elements from D.H. Lawrence's novel *Lady Chatterley's Lover* to emphasise the complexity of the relationship between Britain and the EU, by presenting Britain as Lady Chatterley and the EU as her husband Sir Clifford Chatterley.

The analysis of creative metaphors in these examples has revealed that the main rhetorical goal of employing creative metaphors is to highlight the negative aspects of Brexit. In example (28), the emotional and psychological aspects of divorce, such as *a bad-tempered break-up, a passionate, crazily romantic bid for independence and liberty of a single life and acrimonious wrangling over the furniture*, have been used with the purpose of making an emotional and persuasive appeal to the readers, in order to warn them about bad consequences that the country might face due to Brexit. The second part of the same example has a different aim. By using the idea that the spouses might start thinking rationally and change their minds about divorce, deciding to remain in a *loveless marriage of convenience* because of the benefits it grants, the author persuasively and vividly presents the rational decision to remain in the EU in a positive light, because of many benefits granted to Britain as a member state. Highlighting the bad consequences of Brexit is evident in example (29) as well, but it seems to be much stronger, as indicated by the following metaphorical expressions: *a bitterness lingers on, fantasising of returning to a never-never time before they married, another bad*

relationship, another tyrant. Moreover, the author of the article exploits the emotional associations from D.H. Lawrence's novel *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, such as *the cataclysm, the ruins, stolen virtue, parties to the seduction are diminished*, with the purpose of reassuring the readers of a perceived threat that Brexit poses to the entire country.

The DIVORCE metaphors discussed in the previous examples have been used with the aim of presenting the relationship between Britain and the EU before and immediately after Brexit. The two examples that follow are more focused on the long-term consequences of Brexit. The first such example comes from the *Guardian* article, written by Steven Poole as a reaction to Theresa May's denial of Brexit being a divorce.

- (30) May's comment, however, did not stop everyone and their dog from continuing to call Brexit a divorce. *It would necessarily be a "painful" divorce after 40 years of marriage, though some said the marriage had always been "loveless" and others hoped its ending could still be "amicable". But what exactly is the change in our status going to mean, romantically speaking? It would certainly be accounted odd if a married couple were to get divorced just so they could then enter into a "deep" and "special" civil partnership.*

... "We are leaving the European Union, but we are not leaving Europe," May assured Donald Tusk, which can only mean that she has soberly decided not to affix massive engines to the east coast of Britain and literally drive the whole island out into the middle of the Atlantic. *So the separated parties, she hopes, will continue to live next door to each other and enjoy a deep and special partnership of the most meaningful kind. In which case, what exactly was the point of the divorce, again?* (Steven Poole, *the Guardian*, 7 April 2017)

What connects the present example to the previous ones is the metaphor BREXIT IS A DIVORCE, which underlies the metaphorical expressions used in this example. Conceptual mappings between the DIVORCE source domain and the BREXIT target domain have again provided the structure for the emergence of the DIVORCE scenario, in which creative extensions of the source domain occur. The first conceptual element in terms of which the source domain has been creatively extended includes the emotional aspect of a divorce. Thus, the metaphorical expression *a "painful" divorce after 40 years of marriage* encompasses the emotional state of the divorcees during and after the divorce. The divorcees are Britain and the EU who go

through a tormenting divorce procedure, contrary to general expectations. The portrayal of Britain and the EU as divorcees whose 40-year-long marriage ends in a *painful* divorce simplifies the conceptualisation of Britain's withdrawal from the EU and termination of the 43-year-old political and economic partnership. As the next metaphorical expression indicates, this emotional suffering was not expected because what preceded the divorce was a *loveless* marriage, i.e. a very long political and economic partnership marked by various forms of animosity between Britain and the EU. Considering what kind of marriage it was, a more probable option seemed to be an *amicable* divorce, another conceptual element used to extend the source domain. An amicable divorce includes a "*deep*" and "*special*" *civil partnership* between the divorcees and brings into question the purpose of the divorce. When applied to the issue of Brexit, it suggests that Brexit is pointless if Britain continues a kind of partnership with the EU which is very similar to the membership itself. The next metaphorical expression clarifies what kind of partnership it is: *the separated parties, she hopes, will continue to live next door to each other and enjoy a deep and special partnership of the most meaningful kind*. The place where the divorcees live is another conceptual element that extends the source domain. The agreement of a very close partnership between Britain and the EU has thus been understood as an amicable divorce, after which the divorcees do not completely separate but develop a special kind of relationship, living next door to each other. Due to such behaviour of the divorcees, the divorce itself seems pointless. Thereby, Britain goes through a very difficult negotiation process with the EU, though an amicable withdrawal would be a better option. However, if Britain withdraws from the EU only to maintain a close partnership with it, which is very similar to the one before Brexit, then the withdrawal itself seems pointless.

The next example continues in a similar fashion, elaborating further on the characteristics of post-divorce life of divorcees, juxtaposing a real divorce to an amicable one. The example is taken from Fintan O'Toole's article published in the *Irish Times*. A part of this article has already been used in the previous section dealing with the (DYSFUNCTIONAL) MARRIAGE metaphor.

- (31) *Johnson's tale of the Brits as partners in a doomed marriage has a compelling moral: make a clean break. The couple who were never meant for one another will find a way to be perfectly civil, even friendly, in the future, but only if, to coin a phrase, they consciously uncouple first.*

No sentimental one-night stands, no teary evenings looking at the wedding photos, no possibility that they might, after all, give it another go sometime.

Theresa May, on the other hand, now finds herself edging towards the suggestion *that the couple should share a house for a few years and not finalise the divorce until Britain is ready to occupy the apartment it has not yet begun to build.*

... And if you're going to be as like the EU as possible, why not stay in the EU? In Johnson's metaphor, *if you're going to live in the same house, sleep together and with no one else, pay into a joint bank account and do your share of the domestic chores, why get divorced at all?* (Fintan O'Toole, *the Irish Times*, 23 September 2017)

As in the previous cases, all the metaphorical expressions in this example are instances of the BREXIT IS A DIVORCE metaphor. The source domain has been extended here in two ways, by using the source-internal conceptual material, which is the case of source-related creativity. The first one is based on the knowledge about a real divorce, whereas the second one is based on the knowledge about an amicable divorce. Considering this, it can be claimed that two scenarios emerge, the CLEAN BREAK scenario and the AMICABLE DIVORCE scenario, in which various unused conceptual elements of the source have been employed to creatively extend the source domain and thus produce creative metaphors.

The CLEAN BREAK scenario, which emerges from the metaphor BREXIT IS A CLEAN BREAK, presents Britain and the EU as *partners in a doomed marriage* and *partners who were never meant for one another*, which implies that their political and economic partnership, which lasted for 43 years, was wrong from the beginning. Hence, the most natural solution for such problems is a divorce, *a clean break*, which metaphorically presents Brexit. This kind of divorce is seen as a precondition of maintaining a *perfectly civil* and *even friendly* relationship in the future, i.e. retaining some elements of the partnership with the EU. Moreover, based on the encyclopaedic knowledge about the source domain, additional conceptual elements of the source domain, such as the occasional intimate relationship between the divorcees, feelings of regret, remembrance of the old times, as well as the possibility of reconciliation, have been used with the purpose of providing a further explanation of what a real divorce actually means. Thus, *a clean break* has been explained as the exclusion of any kind of relationship between the divorcees such as *sentimental one-night stands* or *possibility that they might, after all, give it another go sometime*, and feelings of regret, such as *teary evenings looking at*

the wedding photos. In the case of Brexit, *sentimental one-night stands* can be understood as a reference to maintaining a close partnership between Britain and the EU, *teary evenings looking at the wedding photos* represent the regret Britain might feel because of Brexit, whereas *possibility that they might, after all, give it another go sometime* has been used for the conceptualisation of Britain's potential wish to become the EU member again. The scenario thus creates an image of incompatible spouses who are expected to divorce on amicable terms, with the exclusion of any kind of future relationship which would resemble the previous one, the purpose of which is to facilitate the understanding of Britain's and the EU's dissatisfaction with their 43-year-long political and economic partnership, which eventually resulted in Brexit. It was expected that such withdrawal needs to be satisfactory for both sides, as well as definite, without a possibility of maintaining some of the benefits of the partnership with the EU, expressing any kind of regret, or re-joining the EU.

In the AMICABLE DIVORCE scenario, emerging from the metaphor BREXIT IS AN AMICABLE DIVORCE, it has been suggested that the divorce should not be finalised immediately. From the rich knowledge about the source domain, the conceptual element which involves divorcees living in the same house for some time has been utilised for the conceptualisation of Brexit. As the metaphorical expression indicates, *the couple should share a house for a few years and not finalise the divorce until Britain is ready to occupy the apartment it has not yet begun to build*. The couple here represents Britain and the EU, and the idea that they *should share a house for a few years* can be understood as retaining the benefits of the partnership with the EU despite Brexit. A precondition of such a relationship is *not finalis[ing] the divorce*, i.e. not finalising Brexit, before Britain is completely prepared for independence, presented here as Britain being *ready to occupy the apartment it has not yet begun to build*. Moreover, this implies that Britain entered the process of Brexit unprepared for a political and economic change that it needs to go through and consequently needs more time than initially anticipated. That leaving the EU on such conditions seems pointless has been highlighted in the conclusion of the article: *if you're going to live in the same house, sleep together and with no one else, pay into a joint bank account and do your share of the domestic chores, why get divorced at all*. Based on the previously used conceptual element which involves living in the same home, this metaphorical expression extends the source domain even further by introducing additional conceptual elements. The first one includes the idea of having an intimate relationship with the former spouse. Thus, the metaphorical expression *sleep together and with no one else* refers to maintaining the partnership with

Europe only, despite the formal withdrawal. The next conceptual element is a joint account that married couples usually have. What is unusual in this case is that the divorcees continue to *pay into a joint bank account*, which portrays a situation in which Britain continues the economic partnership with the EU. Besides *a joint bank account*, divorcees also participate in *domestic chores*, which is the next conceptual element that creatively extends the source domain and metaphorically presents the responsibilities Britain will have towards the EU even after Brexit. When all these aspects of an amicable divorce are considered, they resemble a marriage rather than a divorce, which is why doubts about such divorce exist. Overall, the scenario presents a different kind of divorce, the one in which divorcees remain in the same house, continuing to live in the same way as before, until all the preparations for their independent lives are finished. The goal of this unusual scenario is to present Brexit that would include as many elements of the full membership in the EU as possible, which brings the entire purpose of Brexit into question.

As in the case of the previous two examples, the discourse context, i.e. the previous discourse on the same topic, has motivated the choice and creative elaboration of the DIVORCE metaphor in examples (30) and (31). Since example (31) is taken from the same article as example (27), it has already been noted that one particular text motivated the emergence of metaphorical creativity. It is Boris Johnson's essay, characterised as a break-up speech, in which the MARRIAGE/DIVORCE metaphor was originally employed.

Besides focusing on negative aspects of Brexit, example (30) has rhetorically been aimed at questioning the purposefulness of Brexit. Metaphorical expressions such as *live next door to each other* and *enjoy a deep and special partnership of the most meaningful kind* have been used in this example to demonstrate that the nature of the post-Brexit relationship between Britain and the EU will remain the same. Therefore, the rhetorical goal of the creative metaphor used in this example is to draw attention to and, at the same time, to question the purpose of going through all the difficulties that the process of Brexit involves if nothing will change. The rhetorical goal of questioning the purposefulness of Brexit is also evident in example (31), which presents Theresa May's view on Brexit. The author provides more details regarding the nature of the post-Brexit relationship between Britain and the EU, as the following metaphorical expressions suggest: *live in the same house, sleep together and with no one else, pay into a joint bank account* and *do your share of the domestic chores*. In this case, it becomes even more obvious that the future partnership resembles more to a

marriage than a divorce, which is why Brexit seems as a pointless endeavour, bringing no change to the political and economic position of Britain. Moreover, the DIVORCE metaphor has also been used to present Boris Johnson's view on Brexit, but in this case with a different rhetorical goal. The use of the concept of a divorce in its full sense, disregarding any form of emotional crisis, has been rhetorically aimed at presenting Brexit as a difficult but the best possible way of attaining the desired independence from the EU. These two diverse views on Brexit indicate how the same metaphor can be used to achieve different rhetorical goals, depending on the communicative intention of the speaker.

The last in the series of examples, which mostly emphasise psychological and emotional aspects of a divorce, is taken from the *Guardian* article written by Marina Hyde as a reaction to the speech delivered by Theresa May in Florence at the meeting with the EU officials. Her speech was criticised for concealing the real state of affairs regarding Brexit, presenting it as the best solution for the problems between Britain and the EU and a start of their renewed partnership. However, the author of the article notes that her strategy did not succeed and uses the DIVORCE metaphor to explain the true meaning of Brexit in her speech.

- (32) To call the speech optimistic didn't really cover it. Many of the lines had the flavour of something you'd say *if you were leaving your wife of 40 years for a Babestation presenter who'd once read out one of your texts*. This period could be remembered "not for a relationship that ended, but a new partnership that began". Well, I mean ... it COULD be. If you're drinking Bacardi.
... *This was a breakup speech that again reminded Europe it was not us; it was them.*
(Marina Hyde, *the Guardian*, 22 September 2017)

Just like in all the previous examples, the metaphor BREXIT IS A DIVORCE has been used in this case and the DIVORCE scenario has been created due to the mappings established between the source and target domains. However, what distinguishes this example from the previous ones is the use of a unique conceptual element as a means of creatively extending the source domain. Hence, in this DIVORCE scenario, separation of the spouses has been presented in a psychologically and emotionally hurtful manner. The husband has been portrayed as *leaving [his] wife of 40 years for a Babestation presenter who'd once read out one of [his] texts*, which is assumed to be one of the worst possible ways of ending a marriage. In order to depict how disturbing and humiliating this separation is, the author of the article uses the conceptual element which involves Babestation presenters, i.e. girls who communicate with the viewers

in a British TV sex line called Babestation. Metaphorically, the husband who left his wife after 40 years of marriage represents Britain and its decision of terminating the 43-year-old membership in the EU, whereas the EU has been conceptualised as a wife that was left. The concept of a Babestation presenter can be understood as a reference to all kinds of promises made by pro-Brexit politicians during the campaign, which now seem unrealistic. To complicate the bad situation even further, the husband, i.e. Britain, blames everything on the wife, i.e. the EU, in the following metaphorical expression: *This was a breakup speech that again reminded Europe it was not us; it was them*. The part of the metaphorical expression *it was not us; it was them* is a reversed form of the usual breakup phrase *It's not you, it's me*, said by the spouse who wants to divorce, as a way of taking all the blame and easing the pain that the other spouse might feel. Thereby, the scenario uses the image of a foolish husband, who leaves his wife after four-decade-long marriage for an unknown Babestation presenter whom he saw only once, in order to present Brexit as an unreasonable decision made under the influence of fancy promises of a group of pro-Brexit politicians. The husband's reckless behaviour, reflected in his putting all the blame on the wife, without feeling his own guilt, has been used to suggest that Britain does not feel any blame for Brexit, but transfers all the blame onto the EU.

The choice of the DIVORCE metaphor in this example has also been greatly influenced by the previous discourse on the topic of Brexit, which abounds in the examples that use this very metaphor. Just like in example (29), the effects of the situational context are evident here as well. However, it can be argued that, in this case, a rather controversial product of culture has impacted the creative elaboration of the DIVORCE metaphor, i.e. a British television sex line called Babestation. The author used the conceptual element of leaving a wife for a Babestation presenter to portray Brexit as an act of an ugly betrayal of the EU.

In this example, the author extends the DIVORCE metaphor by means of introducing the concept of one of the worst marital betrayals, i.e. *leaving your wife of 40 years for a Babestation presenter who'd once read out one of your texts*, followed by the denial of any guilt. Hence, the creative metaphor has been used to reinforce the negative representation of Brexit by persuasively presenting Brexit as a betrayal and Britain as a traitor, who unexpectedly decided to withdraw from the EU, feeling absolved of any guilt and blaming everything on the EU.

While in the previously analysed examples only the emotional and psychological aspects of divorce have been utilised for the creative elaboration of the DIVORCE metaphor, there are examples in which these aspects are combined with the aspects of the legal procedure that a divorce involves. One such example comes from the *Guardian* article written by Nick Herbert, in which he discusses the EU's attitude towards Brexit.

- (33) The story after the referendum could have been different. Despite the narrowness of the result, there was never an attempt by Europe to persuade us to stay. *It is unusual, when an unhappy partner suddenly and unexpectedly asks for a divorce, for the injured half simply to agree and instruct the lawyers.*
... *At first reacting in disbelief, Europe then behaved as a partner scorned. Well, then – go, it said. But you can't expect to keep the house and the car, and there'll be a price for this selfish separation.* (Nick Herbert, *the Guardian*, 28 March 2017)

It is evident that metaphorical expressions related to the issue of Brexit are instances of the BREXIT IS A DIVORCE metaphor and that the mappings between the source and the target domain activate the DIVORCE scenario. The cognitive mechanism termed target-induced creativity enables the creative extension of the source domain. Various unused conceptual elements of the DIVORCE source domain have been used in this example to creatively extend the source domain. As already indicated, these conceptual elements include the combination of psychological and emotional aspects of divorce and its legal procedures, as in the following metaphorical expression: *It is unusual, when an unhappy partner suddenly and unexpectedly asks for a divorce, for the injured half simply to agree and instruct the lawyers.* First of all, the idea of *an unhappy partner* and *the injured half* implies that a divorce can cause a lot of emotional suffering to both sides. In this case, Britain is conceptualised as *an unhappy partner* who wants a divorce, while the EU is *the injured half*. However, no matter how unexpected it is, the EU, as *the injured half*, accepts the *unhappy partner's*, i.e. Britain's, wish and does nothing to prevent the divorce. The next step involves legal divorce procedures. Thus, *the injured half* not only accepts the divorce but immediately *instruct[s] the lawyers*. What this means is that the EU accepts Britain's decision to withdraw from the EU, makes no effort to persuade Britain to remain a member state and instantly starts the legal procedure that the process of withdrawal requires. In the next part of the example, this situation has been additionally elaborated. Based on the knowledge about the emotional aspect of divorce, more information has been provided about the initial reaction of the EU as *the injured half*. As

usual, the first reaction was *disbelief*, reflecting the lack of trust in Britain's determination to actually vote for Brexit, followed by the behaviour of the EU *as a partner scorned*, which is another conceptual element in terms of which the source domain has been extended. The conceptual element involving a betrayed spouse includes emotional reactions that range from the initial shock and acceptance to the strong emotional reaction, which can involve legal issues as well. Here, the reaction that came after the acceptance of Brexit includes a form of legal punishment for the leaving side, which is evident in the metaphorical expression *you can't expect to keep the house and the car, and there'll be a price for this selfish separation*. Though legal divorce proceedings involve an equal division of the assets, there are usually disputes between the spouses, mostly aimed at punishing each other. Based on the knowledge about this conceptual element of the source domain, the EU has been presented as a betrayed spouse determined to punish the other side, by excluding any possibility that the leaving spouse asks for the assets such as *the house and the car*. This means that the EU is ready to accept Brexit but deprives Britain of any rights in the EU after the finalisation of the process of Brexit, which is a form of punishment *for this selfish separation*. Overall, all the conceptual elements which involve the usual reaction of the *injured half* on the unexpected divorce have been used in this scenario for the purpose of presenting the actions taken by the EU after Brexit. After the initial acceptance and lack of any effort in trying to persuade the British side to reconsider the decision, the EU takes all the required legal measures that will ensure its position in the negotiating process, including a list of conditions Britain has to fulfil in order to finalise the process of Brexit.

In a similar way, the combination of the emotional and legal aspects of divorce has been identified in the *Guardian* article written by Helen Mountfield, in which she discusses the possibility of stopping the process of Brexit.

- (34) *All we have done is tell the EU we are unhappy and plan to go. Our relationship has not yet reached the point of no return. True, we have thrown the wedding ring at them and said we're off. We have instructed the lawyers. We have lodged the petition. But we have not yet annulled the marriage. If the UK changes its mind before the end of the two-year notice period, then, (most lawyers think, not to mention Lord Kerr, who drafted article 50), we can simply say we have changed our minds, and we want to stay...* (Helen Mountfield, *the Guardian*, 19 October 2017)

The passage opens with the (DYSFUNCTIONAL) MARRIAGE metaphor used for the conceptualisation the source domain RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BRITAIN AND THE EU, which is evident in the metaphorical expressions *all we have done is tell the EU we are unhappy and plan to go* and *our relationship has not yet reached the point of no return*. Due to the conceptual mappings between the source and target domains, the (DYSFUNCTIONAL) MARRIAGE scenario has emerged. Within this scenario, the source domain has been extended by introducing some of the additional conceptual elements of the source domain, such as the feeling of unhappiness in a marriage, which resulted in the decision to leave. Such extension of the source domain has enabled the conceptualisation of the problems that Britain has always had in its political relationship with the EU, which eventually led Britain to vote for Brexit, though, as it has been highlighted, the decision has not been finalised yet. After presenting this problematic relationship that is likely to end in a divorce, i.e. Brexit, the author of the article provides further information about the nature of such decision by using the DIVORCE metaphor and activating the DIVORCE scenario. The first conceptual element involves the emotional dimension of divorce manifested in this case as the act of *throw[ing] the wedding ring* at the partner, which implies that the marriage is over. The next conceptual element used in the DIVORCE scenario is the legal aspect of divorce, which involves the actions necessary for a marriage to be legally terminated, such as *instruct[ing] the lawyers* and *lodg[ing] a petition*. In the case of Brexit, these metaphorical expressions represent a means of conceptualising the actions taken by the British side. Thus, while the act of *throw [ing] the wedding ring* metaphorically presents the decision to withdraw from the EU, *instruct[ing] the lawyers* and *lodg[ing] a petition* represent the use of all legal mechanisms necessary for withdrawal, such as forming a team of experts who will negotiate the terms of Brexit with the EU and invoking Article 50 of the Lisbon treaty, which gives the sides two years to negotiate the terms of withdrawal. The metaphorical expressions used thus far imply that the process of Brexit is to be conceptualised as a divorce between Britain and the EU. However, the metaphorical expression *we have not yet annulled the marriage* introduces a new conceptual element, the annulment of marriage as another form of legally ending a marriage. The choice of this particular legal procedure changes the perception of Brexit since the annulment of marriage invalidates the marriage from the very beginning as if it never existed. If Brexit is perceived as an annulment of the political partnership between Britain and the EU, then it means that the existence of such partnership would be declared void, which leaves Britain free from any responsibilities towards the EU. Though such form of withdrawal is what Britain strives for, the possibility of changing the decision is not entirely excluded

either, as suggested in the metaphorical expression: *If the UK changes its mind before the end of the two-year notice period, then, (...), we can simply say we have changed our minds, and we want to stay.* What this means is that the process of Brexit can still be stopped, in spite of all legal procedures that were started, if Britain decides that staying in the EU is better for the country. The scenario thus portrays the actions taken by an unhappy spouse, such as *throw[ing] the wedding ring* at the partner, *instruct[ing] the lawyers* and *lodg[ing] a petition*, in order to present the actions Britain takes to withdraw from the EU, including the appointment of the negotiating team and invoking Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty. Even though the intention behind Brexit was to withdraw from the EU without any responsibilities and consequences, it is deemed that Britain still has enough time to change the decision and remain the EU member state.

Besides a clear impact coming from the previous discourse on the same topic, which is evident in both examples, in example (34), the choice of metaphor and its creative elaboration can also be associated with the conceptual-cognitive context, i.e. concerns and interests. The author of this article is Helen Mountfield, a barrister. This suggests that the professional interest motivated the author to choose the DIVORCE metaphor and elaborate it creatively in terms of the conceptual elements which refer to legal divorce procedures.

Metaphorical creativity evident in example (33) has been rhetorically aimed at conveying a negative representation of both Brexit and the EU's reaction on Brexit. Thus, Britain has been criticised for opting for Brexit in the first place, acting as *an unhappy partner* who *suddenly and unexpectedly asks for a divorce*, and the EU for its reaction towards Britain's decision, first showing indifference by *instruct[ing] the lawyers* and then acting as *a partner scorned* who wants to punish Britain for choosing Brexit. The combination of the legal aspects of a divorce such as lawyers and the division of the assets and the emotional reaction of divorcees has enabled the author to vividly explain the state of affairs and make a persuasive and emotional appeal to the audience. Similarly, the rhetorical goal of the creative metaphor used in example (34) has also been to present Brexit in a negative light. The author has exploited the emotional aspects of a relationship, such as the state of unhappiness, which culminated in the act of throwing the wedding ring at the partner, to portray Brexit as an immature and rushed decision, mainly governed by emotions. The level of immaturity demonstrated on the British side has further been emphasised by the belief that the entire process of Brexit can simply be averted if Britain decides to change its mind, despite the fact

that the legal procedures have already been started. At the same time, from the criticism and the negative portrayal of Brexit, it can be deduced that the author's intention has been to present the idea of staying in the EU positively, as the only sound decision that could be made by Britain.

The next example to be discussed is a continuation of the example from the previous section which dealt with the (DYSFUNCTIONAL) MARRIAGE metaphor. As the first part of the article offers an explanation of which marriage problems might lead to a divorce, the second part is more focused on the divorce itself, including its legal, emotional and psychological aspects. Once again, it should be noted that the article was written two days before the Referendum and thus represents the author's attempt to predict a possible outcome.

(35) ... *So you are voting for a divorce, my pro-Brexit friends. And, like most divorces, it's going to take much longer than you think and cost much more. That nice yacht you were daydreaming about? Sorry, your money is going on alimony and lawyers' bills, just as the money Boris Johnson and Michael Gove have promised to spend on the NHS and cuts in VAT will be swallowed up by the post-Brexit recession and negotiation nightmare.*

Yet this is not just about time and money. For divorce has other unintended consequences. Yes, you're fixated on all that is wrong with your spouse. But other people are inevitably involved in any divorce: children mainly, but also parents, siblings and friends. It's the same with this referendum. If England votes Leave but Scotland votes Remain, you surely know happens next – to say nothing of Northern Ireland and Wales.

... The lesson I have learned in the nearly eight years since I and my first wife separated is that divorce is one of the toughest things you can do in peacetime. And the one thing you can never divorce are the problems that turn out to be all your own – the inner demons that you wrongly blamed on your ex.

Today there are a great many Brexiteers who would love to pin all the UK's problems on the EU. Trust me: most of those problems will still be there after Brexit, along with a heap of nasty new ones. And you'll have no one left to blame but yourself. (Niall Ferguson, the Spectator, 21 June 2016)

The metaphor underlying the entire passage is the BREXIT IS A DIVORCE metaphor, which inevitably leads to the activation of the DIVORCE scenario, due to the conceptual mappings between the source and the target domain. Since a divorce can simultaneously be a legal, emotional and psychological issue, the creative extension of the source domain uses the knowledge about these three aspects of a divorce and creatively elaborates the DIVORCE metaphor in three ways. Each of these cases is an instance of target-induced creativity, which enables the target domain to reconnect to the source domain and choose its most suitable aspects.

The opening part of this passage highlights the legal aspects of a divorce, utilising the conceptual elements of the source domain such as the amount of time necessary for the completion of a divorce, as well as the divorce costs, which involve paying the costs of alimony and lawyers. Hence, based on the general knowledge that divorce procedures are usually expensive and time consuming, the following metaphorical expression emerged, *like most divorces, it's going to take much longer than you think and cost much more*. Special attention has been given to the divorce costs, which are presented as being so high that one can no longer think of realising of any dream or plan for future such as *that nice yacht you were daydreaming about*. Instead, as the next metaphorical expression indicates, *your money is going on alimony and lawyers' bills*. All these creative extensions of the source domain enable the comprehension of the process of Brexit in terms of a divorce procedure. Hence, Britain and the EU have been conceptualised as divorcees who go through a long process of divorce, i.e. the process of Brexit, which is likely to be very expensive, for Britain in particular. The reason why Britain will suffer the consequences is because the British side started the process of withdrawal and will thus have to pay a huge sum of money. The two kinds of costs specified in the metaphorical expression are *alimony* and *lawyers' bills*. The concept of *alimony*, which involves the maintenance of the spouse after the divorce, can be understood as the amount of money Britain is obliged to continue paying into the EU budget, until the process of withdrawal is legally completed. *Lawyer's bills* refer to the amount of money Britain has to pay to the negotiating team whose job is to negotiate the best possible terms of Brexit.

The next part of the passage deals with the emotional aspect of a divorce. As indicated in the metaphorical expression, a divorce does not only include financial consequences. There are also other family members such as *children mainly, but also parents, siblings and friends*

who suffer because of it, which might eventually result in bad relationships among close family members or friends. Close family members can be understood as a direct reference to the relationship between the members of the United Kingdom, which might become problematic if member states vote differently in the Brexit Referendum. Such contrasting views on Brexit have the potential of even threatening the already shattered union of the United Kingdom, since it was not long ago when Scotland held the referendum on leaving the United Kingdom. Additionally, it can be understood that the conceptual element of friends, who are disturbed by the divorce, has been used as a reference to other countries with which the United Kingdom has good relations, which could be affected by Brexit.

Finally, in the last part of this passage, one specific psychological aspect of a divorce has been presented. As it frequently happens in dysfunctional marriages, spouses tend to blame everything bad on each other, unaware of their own blame. In the same way, Brexiters have been conceptualised as a spouse who would like to *pin all the UK's problems on the EU*, which implies that the EU is believed to be fully responsible for the British decision to withdraw. Moreover, divorcees retain this state of mind for some time after the divorce, before they realise that the problems they blamed on the other partner still exist. This psychological state has been used in this example to metaphorically present the situation Britain is likely to face after Brexit, as suggested in the metaphorical expression: *Trust me: most of those problems will still be there after Brexit, along with a heap of nasty new ones. And you'll have no one left to blame but yourself.* What has been suggested here is that all the problems that appeared to be a good reason for Brexit will remain, while additional ones will most likely appear. In such a situation, Britain will realise that Brexit is not only far from being a solution for all their problems, but it also has a great potential of causing even more serious ones, and that the fault for the post-Brexit situation is entirely theirs.

Taking all these conceptual elements together, it can be claimed that the scenario presents three kinds of consequences of a divorce: legal, emotional and psychological. Each one of them presents a different stage of the process of Brexit, from legal issues which involve time and money, internal problems between the members of the United Kingdom, to the bitter realisation that problems which were blamed on the EU still exist, with even greater ones emerging, and that all the blame can now be put on Britain.

More than a year after the Brexit referendum, the same author wrote another article about Brexit, confirming his own idea from the previously discussed article that the best way

to conceptualise Brexit is the DIVORCE metaphor. Since this article gives a different post-Brexit view of the situation, the metaphor has been used in a slightly different manner, which means that it has been creatively elaborated by means of extending the source domain in terms of its, so far, unused conceptual elements.

(36) Ah, yes. *In divorce, it is standard practice to accuse the exiting party of poisoning the atmosphere if there is the slightest resistance to the furious party's initial and obviously overstated financial claims.* The EU side has dreamt up the hefty sum of €100 billion (S\$161 billion) as Britain's gross "Brexit bill" and stated flatly that there will be no discussion of future trade until this has been accepted. *This is the equivalent of the spurned spouse demanding the family home, minus the mortgage, and refusing to discuss custody of the children until the deeds have been handed over.*

Inevitably, British international trade secretary Liam Fox is starting to sound exactly like a frustrated would-be divorcee. He would not be "blackmailed", he declared, expressing his "frustration that... we're stuck on this separation issue". (Niall Ferguson, *the Sunday Times*, 3 September 2017)

In the DIVORCE scenario activated by the conceptual mappings between the source domain and the target domain, several conceptual elements, which creatively extend the source domain, have been used. Their selection has been enabled by the cognitive mechanism termed target-induced creativity. These conceptual elements involve the divorcees being infuriated with each other and financial and legal disputes between them, such as the claims to the assets and the issue of custody of the children, which appear to be suitable for the conceptualisation of problems regarding Brexit. In the opening of the passage, the metaphorical expression *in divorce, it is standard practice to accuse the exiting party of poisoning the atmosphere if there is the slightest resistance to the furious party's initial and obviously overstated financial claims*, presents two parties in a divorce procedure who cannot agree on the terms of divorce. These two parties metaphorically present the British and the EU sides in the process of negotiating the terms of Brexit, in which Britain, as *the exiting party*, is accused of *poisoning the atmosphere*, which can be understood as putting the blame on Britain for any kind of failure in negotiations. It especially applies to *the slightest resistance to the furious party's initial and obviously overstated financial claims*, i.e. Britain's disagreement with the amount of money that the EU requires from Britain for the process of Brexit to be finalised. To provide more details about this issue, the author of the article uses two additional conceptual

elements. The first one involves financial requirements, as indicated in the metaphorical expression *the spurned spouse demanding the family home, minus the mortgage*, in which *the spurned spouse* represents the EU feeling betrayed by Britain's decision to withdraw from the Union. The financial claims the EU posed on Britain as a condition for Brexit, known as Brexit bill, have been metaphorically presented as *demanding the family home, minus the mortgage*. Moreover, *the spurned spouse* refuses to discuss custody of the children until the deeds have been handed over, which refers to the EU's refusal to negotiate any other term of Brexit before Britain agrees to pay the required sum of money. In the next metaphorical expression, British international trade secretary Liam Fox has been presented as *a frustrated would-be divorcee who would not be "blackmailed"*, which can be comprehended as Britain's unwillingness to meet the EU's demands. Furthermore, he highlighted that Britain and the EU are *stuck on this separation issue*, which implies that the EU is responsible for the situation. The dispute between divorcees during a legal divorce procedure, which the scenario presents in such details, has been used here with the aim of understanding the nature of the relations between Britain and the EU in the Brexit negotiations, in which the EU demands Britain to pay a huge sum of money before setting the terms of Brexit. Britain's refusal to comply with such demands, often referred to as blackmail, is interpreted by the EU as the only reason why the process of negotiating the terms of Brexit is on a standstill.

It has already been noted in the analysis of example (25), that the author of the article emphasised that his personal experience with a divorce served as a motivation for his choice and creative elaboration of the (DYSFUNCTIONAL) MARRIAGE metaphor. Since example (35) comes from the same article, it is clear that concerns and interests, an element of the conceptual-cognitive context, have also prompted the use of the DIVORCE metaphor, as well as its creative elaboration. Example (36) was also written by the same author. Since it was written a year later, it can be argued that besides personal experience, the previous discourse on the same topic, i.e. his own article, has had a major impact on the choice of metaphor and the emergence of metaphorical creativity evident in this example.

While the negative portrayal of Brexit in the previous two examples can be understood as criticism of Brexit, example (35), which was published two days before the Brexit referendum, has been mainly aimed at issuing a warning of a potential threat of Brexit and the long-term problems Brexit might cause to Britain. The author uses his personal divorce experience to highlight all the psychological, emotional and legal problems caused by Brexit,

such as a large amount of time and money that the process of Brexit will take, undesirable consequences for the family members, especially children, as well as the fact that Brexit will not solve any of Britain's problems but will produce new, even greater ones. Since the author sees no good in Brexit, he implicitly conveys a positive representation of the EU and Britain's continued membership in the EU. In example (36), the same author discusses the situation and the consequences Britain has been dealing with after Brexit, which seem to be in accordance with his warning from the previous example. The process of Brexit aggravated an already bad relationship between Britain and the EU, resulting in a dispute over the terms under which Britain can withdraw from the EU. Thus, the author conveys a negative representation of the EU's excessive financial demands from Britain, by metaphorically presenting the EU as *the spurned spouse demanding the family home, minus the mortgage, and refusing to discuss custody of the children until the deeds have been handed over*. Such attitude of the EU has been understood as a way of punishing Britain for choosing Brexit. Though Britain appears to be victimised in this situation, the author also expresses his criticism of Britain's failure to take a proper action in response to the EU's demands.

The next example provides a very detailed elaboration of the DIVORCE metaphor by continuing to use the legal and emotional aspects of a divorce with the aim of portraying all the complexities of Brexit. It was taken from the article written by Fleet Street Fox, i.e. Susie Boniface, published in the *Daily Mirror*. The article presents two possible kinds of withdrawal from the EU, known as soft Brexit and hard Brexit.

(37) *The UK can insist on breaking-up, fed up to the back teeth of the EU's relaxed attitude to letting her friends Migrants and Refugee come and sit on the sofa at all hours of the day and night.*

However the UK doesn't want to leave its much-loved and very successful children, Single Market and Customs Union.

Therefore the UK goes to live in the shed at the bottom of the garden, from where it will have to pay extortionate amounts of alimony for the privilege of watching the EU have parties with her friends, and to receive visits from Market and Customs who always seem to need more pocket money.

This is what lawyers call "an amicable break-up" and what people who think the two of will somehow remain friends call a "Soft Brexit"...

... It saves a lot of problems - only one lot of council tax, sharing the leccy bill, doing the school run - but it creates a lot more pain in the shape of having to constantly negotiate the bathroom and watching your ex get into bed with a new trading partner.

You have to obey all your ex's rules, pay into their household budget, 27 former mutual friends have to sign off on every little thing you suggest, and they take anything up to 7 years to agree with each other.

... It makes the whole reason for leaving in the first place redundant. Refugee and Migrant are still on your sofa, eating crisps. The ex hates you more with every passing day. Market and Customs are very confused, your finances are in freefall and the thought of someone else getting screwed is not as nice as you thought it would be.

... The second way of leaving is to open the door, walk through the door, and close the door behind you. A clean break, a cliff edge, the "Hard Brexit" only your crazy-eyed Tory chums recommend.

The pain is sharper, and no briefer. Instead of constant reminders of your old life you have no contact with it at all - no mischief with Market, no cuddles with Customs, no inconsequential chatter with a partner who's been in your life for 40-odd years.

You do get a one-bed flat where you can invite the friends who never liked the EU anyway round for a drink.

... And your solicitor is a bit of a problem. Because he's called David Davis and appears in every way to be a complete prawn.

... You hear him promise this won't cost a penny and you can ignore whatever their court says and think that probably isn't true but you hope it is, so just nod along.

Whichever option you choose your random deadline comes and goes. The money disappears from your pocket.

*... You don't ask your ex if they'll take you back. That would be too galling. You just start hanging around, looking hopeful, bringing presents, offering to help in the current dispute with North Korea over the road. Eventually the EU takes pity and tells you gently that they've moved on, that it's better this way, and you've been replaced by Turkey. (Fleet Street Fox, *the Daily Mirror*, 1 September 2017)*

In order to present two versions of Brexit, the author used the knowledge about two different kinds of divorce, an amicable divorce and a clean break. The use of the source-internal knowledge for the extension of the source domain, which results in the production of metaphorical creativity, can be explained by means of a cognitive mechanism termed source-related creativity. The extension of the DIVORCE source domain by means of the source-internal conceptual elements has provided conceptual material for the emergence of two scenarios, the AMICABLE DIVORCE scenario and the CLEAN BREAK scenario.

The passage opens with the AMICABLE DIVORCE scenario which emerges from the metaphor SOFT BREXIT IS AN AMICABLE DIVORCE, used for the conceptualisation of an option which advocates the maintenance of a good relationship with the EU, often referred to as soft Brexit. A whole range of conceptual elements has been used for the creative extension of the source domain. First, the attention has been given to the annoying behaviour of one of the spouses, which was also one of the main causes of the divorce. This annoying behaviour involves frequent visits of friends at any time, which the other spouse finds inappropriate, as suggested by the metaphorical expression *the EU's relaxed attitude to letting her friends Migrants and Refugee come and sit on the sofa at all hours of the day and night*. From the metaphorical expression itself, it becomes clear that the annoying spouse presents the EU, whereas migrants and refugees, who constantly arrive into the EU countries in significant numbers, are conceptualised as friends who *come and sit on the sofa at all hours of the day and night*. While this irritating behaviour of the EU urges Britain to leave as soon as possible, there are some benefits granted by the EU membership, which Britain does not want to lose. These benefits include the EU's single market and customs union, which have been metaphorically presented as Britain's *much-loved and very successful children*, whom Britain cannot leave. It is for the sake of the children that Britain needs to consider an amicable divorce as a possible solution. However, this kind of divorce involves a number of disadvantages for Britain, which have been metaphorically presented by means of different conceptual elements of the source domain, which seem most appropriate for the conceptualisation of the target domain. One of those conceptual elements includes the idea of leaving the family home but living close enough to be able to see your family regularly. Therefore, Britain's amicable withdrawal from the EU has been metaphorically presented as *liv[ing] in the shed at the bottom of the garden*, which implies that in order to maintain good relations with the EU Britain has to accept a new, undermined position in the future partnership. However, the acceptance of such a position includes further problems for Britain, which means that additional conceptual elements have been included, such as alimony, the ex-

spouse's life after divorce, children and pocket money. The first problem has been presented in the metaphorical expression *pay[ing] extortionate amounts of alimony for the privilege of watching the EU have parties with her friends*, in which *extortionate amounts of alimony* refer to the amount of money Britain has to keep paying into the EU budget after withdrawal, while *watching the EU have parties with her friends* can be understood as a reference to the careless way in which the EU spends the money paid by Britain. The second problem is again of financial nature and, as the metaphorical expression indicates, it includes *receiv[ing] visits from Market and Customs who always seem to need more pocket money*. What this suggests is that the benefits of remaining in the EU's single market and customs union, metaphorically presented as Britain's and the EU's children, require constant financial investments, metaphorically presented as *pocket money*. However, despite many disadvantages, the amicable divorce also includes certain benefits, which again involves the use of new unused conceptual elements, which creatively extend the source domain, such as the payment of taxes and other regular bills and taking children to school. Therefore, the first benefit is paying *one lot of council tax*, which implies that once out of the EU, Britain will only pay its own tax, while being freed from paying the same tax to the EU as well. The next benefit is *sharing the leccy bill*, which refers to the benefits granted to Britain by the agreement called soft Brexit. The third benefit is *doing the school run*, which can be understood as Britain's continued membership in the EU's single market and customs union, in which a shared financial investment is still perceived as much better than having to regulate these two crucial issues on one's own. Nevertheless, all these benefits do not exclude practical and emotional problems that this new relationship brings. To present these problems, the author used new conceptual elements such as the problem of shared rooms and the problem of future love relationships of the ex-spouse. The problem of *having to constantly negotiate the bathroom* is a practical one and refers to the lack of full independence which soft Brexit involves, which opposes Britain's Brexit ambitions. The second problem of *watching your ex get into bed with a new trading partner* is of emotional nature and presents the EU's future trade deals with new partners, which Britain is excluded from. There are also legal issues that complicate the situation even further: *You have to obey all your ex's rules, pay into their household budget, 27 former mutual friends have to sign off on every little thing you suggest, and they take anything up to 7 years to agree with each other*. New conceptual elements, which include the rules set by the ex-spouse, household payments, mutual friends who have to approve of every decision, have been utilised for the conceptualisation of the complexity of the situation Britain might be in, due to soft Brexit. Though Britain's unfavourable position in the new

post-Brexit relationship with the EU has already been mentioned, this part of the text provides further explanation. Hence, the metaphorical expressions *you have to obey your ex's rules* and *pay into their household budget* suggest that Britain will have no real independence and will have to follow the rules set by the EU, even though it pays regularly into the *household budget*, i.e. the EU budget. Another problem with the EU are 27 member states, metaphorically presented here as *27 former mutual friends*, who have to agree on every single issue but often seem to be in disagreement needing *up to 7 years to agree with each other*. The passage dealing with the amicable divorce concludes with questioning the meaningfulness of Brexit if the position of Britain will not change in any way. For instance, the issue that prompted Britain to opt for Brexit such as the EU immigration policy, metaphorically presented as the EU's annoying friends *Refugee and Migrant who are still on your sofa, eating crisps*, will remain unchanged. Even if Britain accepts all these conditions, its position in the EU will not improve in any way. On the contrary, *the ex hates you more with every passing day*, which implies that the relationship with the EU is likely to deteriorate even further. The fact that even the beloved children *Market and Customs are very confused* suggests that Britain might be disappointed that the gains from the EU's free market and customs union do not meet the expectations. Moreover, from the metaphorical expression *your finances are in freefall*, it can be deduced that Britain is going to face serious financial difficulties due to Brexit. From the concluding remark in the passage about the amicable divorce, *the thought of someone else getting screwed is not as nice as you thought it would be*, it can be inferred that Britain's initial Brexit plan to enjoy all the benefits at the cost of the EU is not really feasible and is gradually turning against Britain.

After this creative elaboration of the AMICABLE DIVORCE scenario, the author has also provided an elaborate overview of the CLEAN BREAK scenario, which emerges from the metaphor HARD BREXIT IS A CLEAN BREAK. Before providing all the details about a clean break, the author begins this section with a new metaphor in which the CLEAN BREAK target domain has been comprehended in terms of the LEAVING A BUILDING source domain. Hence, in the metaphorical expression *[t]he second way of leaving is to open the door, walk through the door, and close the door behind you*, the underlying metaphor is A CLEAN BREAK IS LEAVING A BUILDING, which presents a divorce, i.e. *a clean break*, as walking out of the building with the door closed behind oneself, which implies the end of any kind of relationship between the divorcees. Taking into consideration that the DIVORCE metaphor has been used for the comprehension of the PROCESS OF BREXIT target domain, the same applies

for the LEAVING A BUILDING source domain, which leads to the emergence of the metaphor HARD BREXIT IS LEAVING A BUILDING. In the BUILDING scenario created by this metaphor, the EU has been conceptualised as a building, whereas hard Brexit has been comprehended as leaving that building. Additionally, the conceptual element of a door has been employed to further extend the source domain to its unused conceptual element. Thus, hard Brexit involves three steps: opening the door, which represents the legal beginning of the process of withdrawal, walking through the door, i.e. meeting all the requirements needed for the finalisation of Brexit, and closing the door behind, which metaphorically presents the exclusion of any kind of future relation with the EU.

In the remaining part of the passage on hard Brexit, the author again uses the CLEAN BREAK metaphor, elaborating it creatively by means of various unused conceptual elements of the source domain, which has been enabled by the cognitive mechanism termed target-induced creativity. The first conceptual element includes no contact with the ex-spouse and the children despite the emotional pain, as evident in the following metaphorical expression: *The pain is sharper, and no briefer. Instead of constant reminders of your old life you have no contact with it at all - no mischief with Market, no cuddles with Customs, no inconsequential chatter with a partner who's been in your life for 40-odd years.* Thus, *constant reminders of your old life* refer to political or economic connections with the EU that are in any way similar to the ones before Brexit. This means that there should be no *mischief* and *cuddles* with children and *no inconsequential chatter* with the ex-spouse. Therefore, *no mischief with Market* and *no cuddles with Customs* imply that Britain will not be a member of the EU's single market and customs union, whereas *no inconsequential chatter with a partner who's been in your life for 40-odd years* suggests that, in the future, Britain ought to refrain itself from any kind of political and economic partnership with the EU, after being a member of the EU for 43 years. In order to avoid any contact with the ex-spouse and the children, one has to find a place to live, which is the next conceptual element used for the creative extension of the source domain. The new place is in fact *a one-bed flat where you can invite the friends who never liked the EU anyway round for a drink.* What can be inferred from this metaphorical expression is that Britain will be independent after Brexit but also left on its own to make new partnerships with the countries that do not have good political relations with the EU. The next conceptual elements include a divorce lawyer and the costs of a divorce. In this scenario, the divorce lawyer seems to be *a bit of a problem* because of his unusual promise that *this won't cost a penny* and his strange advice that *you can ignore whatever their court says and think*

that probably isn't true but you hope it is, so just nod along. As it has been noted in the text, the divorce lawyer is the Brexit lawyer David Davis whose job is to negotiate the best possible terms of Brexit. Despite the awareness that Britain cannot withdraw from the EU without financial losses, he assures the government that Brexit will cost nothing and that the information coming from the EU's negotiating team about the amount of money Britain has to pay to the EU before finalising the process of Brexit ought to be ignored.

After presenting detailed scenarios of what soft Brexit and hard Brexit involve, the author concludes the article by giving a prediction of the final outcome of either of these two options, which in both cases appears to be pessimistic. Neither an amicable divorce nor a clean break bring any good and the only consequence is that *the money disappears from your pocket*, which implies that Britain will be at loss whether it chooses soft Brexit or hard Brexit. One of the solutions for such a problematic divorce is to stop the process of divorce, show repentance and try to reconcile with the spouse. These are the conceptual elements that creatively extend the source domain in order to present the target domain and lead to the emergence of metaphorical creativity as an instance of target-induced creativity. An important thing to note is that the process of reconciliation cannot be too direct: *You don't ask your ex if they'll take you back. That would be too galling.* What these metaphorical expressions suggest is that Britain, metaphorically presented as the partner who repents and wants to reconcile, cannot openly express its regrets of starting the process of withdrawal from the EU, metaphorically presented as the ex-partner. Since the process of reconciliation is very delicate, it has to be handled carefully and gradually, involving three steps. The first step is *hanging around, looking hopeful*, which can be understood as Britain's attempts to still be included in the issues regarding the EU. The next step is *bringing presents*, referring to Britain's concessions and contributions to the EU. The final step is the engagement into some practical issues of the ex-partner, which, in the case of Britain and the EU, is *offering to help in the current dispute with North Korea over the road*. All these steps towards reconciliation finally provoke the feeling of sympathy in the ex-spouse, whose reaction is evident in the following metaphorical expression: *Eventually the EU takes pity and tells you gently that they've moved on, that it's better this way, and you've been replaced by Turkey*. Here, the EU reacts in a usual manner and informs Britain that their renewed partnership is no longer possible due to the existence of a new partner Turkey that has taken Britain's place in the EU as a new member state.

In spite of the high degree of metaphorical creativity evident in this example, it can be argued that it was motivated by a single contextual factor. The existence of a number of texts that dealt with the issue of Brexit using the MARRIAGE/DIVORCE metaphor, some of them being analysed here, suggests that the discourse context, i.e. the previous discourse on the same topic, played a crucial role in the choice and creative elaboration of the DIVORCE metaphor.

Even though the metaphorical creativity in example (37) also has the rhetorical goal of expressing a strong criticism of Brexit, at same time, it has the aim of victimising the Britain's position, by presenting all the sacrifice Britain would be ready to make, in order to finalise Brexit. Thus, the author questions the assumed benefits of both soft Brexit and hard Brexit. By using emotional associations, which involve various problems in the relationship with the children and the ex-spouse, as well as the problems with the financial and legal issues, the author makes an emotional and persuasive appeal to the readers in order to evoke the feelings of sympathy towards Britain. Whether Britain opts for soft Brexit or hard Brexit, the amount of sacrifice it will have to endure will be that great that it will, eventually, force Britain to regret its decision and implore for the renewal of the EU membership. The fact that this regret might come too late and that the position of Britain could be given to Turkey further enhances the victimisation of Britain as well as the feelings of sympathies for its downfall.

Among various aspects of divorce discussed in the previous two examples, the idea of children being involuntarily involved in the process of divorce has only been briefly introduced. In the following example, this issue has been given more attention, as it proves to be a very useful conceptual element of the DIVORCE source domain when utilised for the conceptualisation of the Brexit negotiations. The example comes from the *Irish Times* article in which two divorce lawyers give their view of Brexit using the DIVORCE metaphor, especially highlighting the position of British citizens by presenting them as children in a divorce procedure.

- (38) “In divorce proceedings you have a CAFCA, child and family court advisory service. They observe the child and the parent and report back on the child's wishes and feelings,” said Rai. “The amount of weight put on those wishes depends on the maturity of the child.

“With Brexit, the children are the electorate and in this instance they need to be involved and need to be able feel their wishes are being heard.”

“For the sake of the children, I tell my clients you may not like the other party for whatever reason but you’re going to have to put up with them for the rest of your life,” said Rai. *“If we come out of the EU, we want to do it in a way which leaves you in a good relationship.”*

“You may not be the best of friends or have a special relationship, but they must still be able to communicate effectively for the sake of those living in the countries.”

“Similar to what I tell my clients, *we will depart as two separate individuals as Britain and the EU,*” said Rai. *“Unfortunately, both of us will be poorer and there are going to be consequences living on your own.”*

“You have to make do with what you get left over. *Britain is going to go it alone and let’s see, we might be better off or we might not – the same goes for the EU.*”

“In divorce, we talk about a cycle of loss where the emotional journey is akin to a bereavement and the parties go through feelings of denial, guilt, resentment and anger but eventually they reach a point of acceptance,” said Hawkhead. *“After Brexit, the sooner we can reach the point of acceptance about our future the better.”* (*The Irish Times*, 21 June 2017)

All the metaphorical expressions used in the passage are instances of a more general THE PROCESS OF BREXIT IS A DIVORCE metaphor. The metaphor then activates the specific DIVORCE scenario in which various unused conceptual elements of the DIVORCE source domain are utilised with the aim of presenting particular characteristics of Brexit, which is a case of target-induced creativity. The first conceptual element used in this example includes the position of children in a divorce procedure, which is usually unfavourable, since they seem to be involuntarily involved in a dispute between their parents. Based on the knowledge about real divorce proceedings, in which a special advisory service observes and reports a child’s wishes and feelings, British citizens, i.e. the voters, have been conceptualised as the children in the divorce proceedings whose wishes and feelings need to be taken into consideration: *With Brexit, the children are the electorate and in this instance they need to be involved and need to be able feel their wishes are being heard.* What this means is that the citizens who voted in the Brexit referendum should be included in the decision making regarding Brexit

and they need to be assured that their decision will be respected, no matter whether they voted for or against Brexit. The next conceptual element refers to the tolerance that is necessary between the divorcees in order not to hurt the children. Regardless of how bad the relationship between the ex-spouses is, they have to tolerate each other because of the children. The same principle can be applied to Brexit: *If we come out of the EU, we want to do it in a way which leaves you in a good relationship.* In this metaphorical expression, British citizens have been metaphorically represented as the children for the sake of whom Britain and the EU, perceived as parents who are in the divorce process, have to maintain a good relationship after Brexit. The nature of this good relationship and its significance are two additional conceptual elements used in the following metaphorical expression: *You may not be the best of friends or have a special relationship, but they must still be able to communicate effectively for the sake of those living in the countries.* What has been suggested here is that it is not realistic to expect Britain and the EU, conceptualised as ex-spouses, to have a relationship based on real friendship and affection. Rather, their relationship should be based on tolerance and the ability *to communicate effectively.* As already indicated, such relationship is necessary for the sake of children, i.e. *those living in the countries*, which refers to the British citizens who live in the EU and thus need a form of partnership between Britain and the EU that would protect their rights. The remaining part of this passage moves to the issue of post- divorce consequences by employing new conceptual elements. The first conceptual element refers to the consequences of a new life as individuals, as suggested in the metaphorical expressions *we will depart as two separate individuals as Britain and the EU* and *both of us will be poorer and there are going to be consequences living on your own.* Therefore, Britain and the EU are metaphorically presented as divorcees who start their lives as *two separate individuals*, which implies that Britain and the EU will no longer depend on each other and that their future functioning in a political, economic and any other sense will be completely independent. However, independence brings consequences for both Britain and the EU, one of them being a financial loss which will affect both sides. In face of various kinds of consequences, *Britain is going to go it alone and let's see, we might be better off or we might not – the same goes for the EU*, which implies that the end result of Brexit is still uncertain. There is a chance that Britain will manage better without the EU and vice versa, but the possibility of everything going wrong for both of them cannot be excluded either. In the conclusion of the passage, another conceptual element has been utilised, i.e. the emotional and psychological acceptance of the new situation caused by the divorce. It is normal for divorcees to go through different emotional and psychological stages during the divorce. The most important of these stages is

the final one, the acceptance, which is what Britain and the EU need to aspire to, as indicated in the metaphorical expression: *After Brexit, the sooner we can reach the point of acceptance about our future the better*. In case of Brexit, *the point of acceptance* can be understood as Britain's and the EU's acceptance of all benefits and losses earned as a result of Brexit. Overall, by focusing on the rights of children and highlighting the care required from parents who are in the process of divorce in maintaining a good relationship with each other for the sake of their children, regardless of all the disputes, the scenario presents the idea that the rights of British citizens, especially those living in the EU, have to be considered in the process of negotiating the terms of Brexit. For the sake of protecting their rights, it is essential for Britain and the EU to maintain a good political and economic relationship, which is barely possible unless both Britain and the EU deal with the consequences of Brexit and accept all of its advantages and disadvantages.

Concerns and interests, as an element of the conceptual-cognitive context, have played a significant role in the emergence of metaphorical creativity in this example. The article from which the example was taken is in fact a form of an interview with two well-known British divorce lawyers regarding Brexit. The lawyers thus use various conceptual elements of the DIVORCE source domain in order to present the complex elements of the process of Brexit, which indicates how conceptualisers are prompted by their professional interests to use creative elaborations of the DIVORCE metaphor in a real communicative situation.

In this example, the emphasis has been placed on the rights of British citizens living in Britain and the EU. Thereby, the metaphorical representation of the citizens as the children of Britain and the EU has been rhetorically aimed at drawing attention to the often undermined problems of the citizens, especially those living in the EU, and to propose a solution in the form of an amicable divorce, which includes the acceptance of the new situation and guarantees a good relationship between Britain and the EU for the sake of the citizens.

4.4.3. Concluding remarks on the MARRIAGE/DIVORCE metaphors in British political discourse on Brexit

In this case study, fifteen examples of creative use of the MARRIAGE/DIVORCE metaphors, taken from British electronic news media, have been analysed. For the purpose of the

analysis, the metaphors from the corpus have been divided into two groups: the MARRIAGE metaphor and the DIVORCE metaphor.

In the analysis of the metaphorical expressions at the level of conceptual domains, special attention was dedicated to two cognitive mechanisms responsible for the emergence of metaphorical creativity in these examples, source-related creativity and target-induced creativity. Source-related creativity has been identified in both MARRIAGE and DIVORCE metaphors, though the number of source-internal conceptual elements in terms of which source domains were creatively extended was lesser than in the previous case study. Thus, in the MARRIAGE metaphor, the additional source-internal conceptual element in terms of which the source domain was creatively extended is A DYSFUNCTIONAL MARRIAGE. Additionally, in example (24), the MARRIAGE metaphor was combined with the MOVEMENT metaphor, in which the source domain was creatively extended in terms of two unused source-internal conceptual elements, DANCE and STAGGER. The DIVORCE source domain was creatively extended in terms of two unused source-internal conceptual elements, AN AMICABLE DIVORCE and A CLEAN BREAK. Target-induced creativity, on the other hand, was responsible for much of the metaphorical creativity in both metaphors. Based on the rich knowledge about the source domains, this cognitive mechanism enabled the target domains to use numerous conceptual elements of the source domains which seemed most appropriate for the target domains in question. Some of the conceptual elements in the MARRIAGE metaphor are honeymoon, the lack of compromise, a disappointed husband, a misbehaving wife, unfavourable qualities of a spouse, marriage counselling, a mediator, emotional problems, etc. Among the conceptual elements in the DIVORCE metaphor, there are post-divorce disputes, post-divorce psychological and emotional state of spouses, a new bad relationship, reconciliation, living in the same house, intimate relationship with the ex-spouse, a joint bank account, annulment of marriage, elements of the legal procedures (lawyers, alimony, custody of children, financial issues), etc.

The analysis of metaphors at the level of conceptual domains was complemented by the analysis of metaphors at the metaphor scenario level. In accordance with the metaphors used in the examples, corresponding metaphor scenarios emerged, providing the additional information about participants, events, processes, emotions, biases, thus enabling the creative elaboration of metaphors. The metaphor scenarios that emerged in the MARRIAGE metaphor are the ROMANCE, MARRIAGE and DYSFUNCTIONAL MARRIAGE scenarios, while in case of the

MOVEMENT metaphor, being combined with the MARRIAGE metaphor, the emerging scenarios are the DANCE and STAGGER scenarios. In the case of the DIVORCE metaphor, the emerging scenarios include the DIVORCE, AN AMICABLE DIVORCE and CLEAN BREAK scenario. All these metaphor scenarios created the elaborate source-based storylines, which were then mapped onto the corresponding target-domain concepts, providing access to attitudinal biases and political preferences, which is especially important for understanding the rhetorical goals of the metaphors in question.

When it comes to the impact of context on the production of metaphorical creativity, the same three types of context have been identified in this case study as in the previous one, the discourse context, the conceptual-cognitive context and the situational context. However, the number of the individual elements pertaining to these types of context is lesser. Thus, the element of the discourse context that had the major impact on the choice and creative elaboration of both MARRIAGE and DIVORCE metaphors is the previous discourse on the same topic, since these two metaphors are very frequently employed in the political discourse on Brexit. As far as the conceptual-cognitive context is concerned, the only conceptual element used is concerns and interests, i.e. a personal experience of the author or his/her professional interest. Finally, in the case of the situational context, it is the cultural context, or more precisely a cultural product, that played a significant role in choosing and creatively elaborating the metaphor.

Like in the previous case study, the two-fold analysis has proven to be very beneficial in clarifying the rhetorical goals of the MARRIAGE and DIVORCE metaphors as well. As it has already been mentioned in the analysis, MARRIAGE metaphor is usually associated with expressing positive aspects of a relationship (love, harmony, solidarity). However, only two such examples have been found in the present analysis and their rhetorical goal was to give a positive representation of the initial stage in the political relationship between Britain and the EU and present Brexit as a bad choice. In all other examples, the conceptual elements of the DYSFUNCTIONAL MARRIAGE source domain were used with the aim of expressing a negative attitude towards Britain's membership in the EU, putting all the blame on the EU by assigning the EU gender roles of either an unfair husband or a misbehaving wife, victimising Britain's position in the EU and justifying Brexit. The rhetorical goals that pervade the DIVORCE metaphor are the following: highlighting the negative aspects of Brexit, warning about bad consequences of Brexit, questioning the purposefulness of soft Brexit, criticising Britain for

the decision to withdraw from the EU, drawing attention to the rights of British citizens living in the EU, but also victimising the post-Brexit position of Britain and presenting Brexit as the best solution for the long-term problems between Britain and the EU.

5. CONCLUSION

Political discourse is generally characterised by an extensive use of metaphors, which, besides their conventional use, also exhibit a great deal of metaphorical creativity. The present dissertation was aimed at examining metaphorical creativity in British political discourse on Brexit, applying the cognitive linguistic theory of conceptual metaphor and Musolff's (2016) theory of metaphor scenarios. The special attention was given to the rhetorical power with which creative metaphors shape political creativity, as well as the contextual factors that motivate the emergence of metaphorical creativity in discourse. The dissertation presented two case studies, one dealing with the JOURNEY metaphors and the other with the MARRIAGE/DIVORCE metaphors. The case studies unravel the ways in which the cognitive mechanisms, source-related creativity and target-induced creativity, lead to the emergence of metaphorical creativity in British political discourse on Brexit, the ways in which metaphor scenarios emerge and provide the story lines along which the creative extension of mappings between the source and target domains occurs, the ways in which metaphorical creativity is used for achieving various rhetorical goals, as well as the ways in which the cognitive mechanism termed context-induced creativity leads to the emergence of creative metaphors.

The case studies demonstrate that, at the level of conceptual domains, the interaction of source-related creativity and target-induced creativity accounts for much of the metaphorical creativity in British political discourse on Brexit. First, it was discovered that, in case of source-related creativity, the source domains are creatively extended in terms of unconventional conceptual elements, taken from the unused source-internal conceptual material, based on the rich encyclopaedic knowledge about the source domains. What this means is that the target domains are then comprehended by using the unconventional source domains, which results in the emergence of creative metaphors. Additionally, the further analysis revealed that these unconventional source domains provide more conceptual material that can be used in case of target-induced creativity. Thus the target domains, already associated with particular source domain, reconnect to the same source domains and take further conceptual elements from them, which seem most appropriate for the target domains in question. The use of novel unused conceptual elements of the source domain, which are not part of the conventional mappings between the domains, results in the production of creative metaphors.

The analysis of metaphors at the level of conceptual domains, which offers valuable insights about the emergence of metaphorical creativity under the impact of the cognitive mechanisms, was further complemented by the analysis of metaphors at the level of metaphor scenarios. The mappings between the source and target domains lead to the creation of metaphor scenarios, which contain more conceptual material than the conceptual domains. Based on this additional conceptual material, the mappings between the source and target domains are even more creatively extended. Such creative extension of mappings contributes to the creation of elaborate source-based storylines, which provide information about participants, roles, relations, actions, processes, events, emotions, attitudes, intentions, evaluations, biases, interests, etc. and are mapped onto corresponding target domain concepts, thus expressing the attitudinal biases and political preferences.

In addition to two cognitive mechanisms, source-related creativity and target-induced creativity, which impact the production of metaphorical creativity at the level of conceptual domains, there is also the third cognitive mechanism called context-induced creativity, which is especially significant for the study of creative metaphors in political discourse. The case studies indicate that the context in which particular metaphors emerge proves to be a major motivating factor in producing creative metaphors. The context operates in three forms, the conceptual-cognitive context, the discourse context and the situational context, each of them containing specific elements that directly affect the choice and creative elaboration of metaphors. Though it occurs that a single contextual factor induces metaphorical creativity, more frequently metaphorical creativity is impacted by the combination of contextual factors, belonging to the same or different context(s). Moreover, the context in which creative metaphors are produced can be directly associated with their rhetorical goals. Therefore, the change of the context in which a particular creative metaphor is used can cause the change of rhetorical goals. Consequently, this requires a change or adaptation of the existing metaphor so that it can achieve the rhetorical aims intended by the author(s).

Metaphorical creativity emerging from the cognitive mechanisms and metaphor scenarios was used with the purpose of achieving specific rhetorical goals. In that sense, the conceptual material that metaphor scenarios contain is rich enough to be exploited for argumentative and rhetorical purposes. The rhetorical goals, which range from providing a better understanding of a political issue, expressing a positive or negative representation of a political issue, promoting a particular point of view, criticising, expressing concern or warning, making an emotional and persuasive appeal, to enhancing vividness, clarity and

argumentative potential of the text, are intended to shape the audience's views and produce their reaction. All this points to the conclusion that metaphorical creativity in political discourse should in no way be undermined or considered accidental because it reveals the potentially concealed intentions and viewpoints of its author(s).

Overall, this dissertation shows how the combination of the cognitive theory of conceptual metaphor and the discourse-based theory of metaphor scenarios can offer valuable insights into the cognitive processes involved in the emergence of metaphorical creativity in political discourse, which is primarily aimed at achieving rhetorical goals. Furthermore, it also demonstrates that in order to get a full account of metaphorical creativity in political discourse and its rhetorical force, it is necessary to look at the examples from different perspectives, which involve conceptual domains, metaphor scenarios and the context of use.

6. REFERENCES

- Adler-Nissen, Rebecca (2016). The vocal euro-outsider: The UK in a two-speed Europe. *The Political Quarterly* 87.2: 238-246.
- Alexandre-Collier, Agnès (2016). Euroscepticism under Margaret Thatcher and David Cameron: From theory to practice. *Observatoire de la société britannique* 17: 1-11.
- Badri, Afef (2017). Emergentist metaphorical creativity: Towards a model of analysing metaphorical creativity in interactive talk. *International Journal of Cognitive and Language Sciences* 11.1: 223-230.
- Barcelona, Antonio (2003). Clarifying and applying the notions of metaphor and metonymy within cognitive linguistics: An update. Dirven, René, Ralf Pörings, eds. *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 207-277.
- Berberović, Sanja (2010). *Figurative Creativity in Political Discourse* (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Josip Juraj Strossmayer University, Osijek, Croatia.
- Berberović, Sanja (2013). Magic tricks with race cards: Conceptual integration theory and political discourse. *Jezikoslovlje* 14.2-3: 307-321.
- Berberović, Sanja, Mersina Mujagić (2017). A marriage of convenience or an amicable divorce: Metaphorical blends in the debates on Brexit. *ExELL (Explorations in English Language and Linguistics)* 5.1: 1-24.
- Black, Max (1993). More about metaphor. Ortony, Andrew, ed. *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 19-41.
- Borčić, Nikolina, Igor Kanižaj, Svea Kršul (2016). Conceptual metaphor in political communication. 3. *Zbornik Sveučilišta u Dubrovniku*: 73-94.
- Brdar, Mario (2017). *Metonymy and Word-Formation: Their Interactions and Complementation*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Caruso, Assunta (2014). A roadmap to peace: Journey metaphors in political speeches on the Middle East peace process. *Lingue Linguaggi* 11: 77-92.
- Carver, Terrell, Jernej Pikalo (2008). *Politics, Language and Metaphor: Interpreting and Changing the World*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan (2004). *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan (2009). Metaphor and political communication. Musolff, Andreas, Jörg Zinken eds. *Metaphor and Discourse*. Basingstoke/ New York: Plagrave Macmillan, 97-115.

- Charteris-Black, Jonathan (2011). *Politicians and Rhetoric*. Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chilton, Paul (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse*. London /New York: Routledge
- Chilton, Paul and Christina Schäffner (2002). *Politics as Talk and Text: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Chilton, Paul, Christina Schäffner (2002). Introduction. Chilton, Paul and Christina Schäffner, eds. *Politics as Talk and Text: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1-41.
- Cienki, Alan (2008). The application of conceptual metaphor theory to political discourse: Methodological questions and some possible solutions. Carver, Terrell, Jernej Pikalo, eds. *Politics Language and Metaphor: Interpreting and Changing the World*. London/NewYork: Routlegde, 241-265.
- Crisp, Peter (2003). Conceptual metaphor and its expressions. Gavins, Joanna, Gerard Steen, eds. *Cognitive Poetics in Practice*. London/New York: Routledge, 99-113.
- Croft, William (2003). The role of domains in the interpretation of metaphors and metonymies. Dirven, René, Ralf Pörings, eds. *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 161-206.
- D’Ancona, Matthew (2016). Brexit: How a fringe idea took hold of the Tory party. *The Guardian*, 15 June 2016.
- Dancygier, Barbara, Eve Sweetser (2014). *Figurative Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dávid, Gyula, Bálint Péter Furkó (2015). The journey metaphor in mediatised political discourse: Cognitive and critical perspectives. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica* 7.2: 7-20.
- Díaz-Peralta, Marina (2018). Metaphor and ideology: Conceptual structure and conceptual content in Spanish political discourse. *Discourse & Communication* 12: 1-21.
- Dirven, René, Ralf Pörings (2003). *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Drulák, Petr (2004). *Metaphors Europe Lives By: Language and Institutional Change of the European Union*. EUI Working Papers, SPS No. 2004/15, Florence: European University Institute.
- Dueck, Cheryl (2001). Gendered Germanies: The fetters of a metaphorical marriage. *German Life and Letters* 54.4: 366-376.

- Dunmire, Patricia L. (2012). Political discourse analysis: Exploring the language of politics and the politics of language. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 6.11: 735-751.
- Đurović, Tatjana (2009). "Unity in diversity". The conceptualisation of language in the European Union. *Linguistics and Literature* 12.1: 47-61.
- Đurović, Tatjana, Nadežda Silaški (2010). Metaphors we vote by – The case of 'marriage' in contemporary Serbian political discourse. *Journal of Language and Politics* 9.2: 237-259.
- Đurović, Tatjana, Nadežda Silaški (2018). The end of a long and fraught marriage: Metaphorical images structuring the Brexit discourse. *Metaphor and the Social World* 8(1): 25-39.
- Fairclough, Isabela, Norman Fairclough (2012). *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. Abingdon/ New York: Routledge.
- Ferrari, Federica (2007). Metaphor at work in the analysis of political discourse: Investigating a 'preventive war' persuasion strategy. *Discourse & Society* 18.5: 603-625.
- Frank, Roslyn M. (2015). A complex adaptive systems approach to language, cultural schemas and serial metonymy: Charting the cognitive innovations of 'fingers' and 'claws' in Basque. Díaz-Vera, Javier E., ed. *Metaphor and Metonymy across Time and Cultures*. Berlin/Munich/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter, 65-94.
- Fusaroli, Riccardo, Simone Morgagni (2013). Introduction: Thirty years after. *Journal of Cognitive Semiotics* 5.1-2: 1-13.
- Geeraerts, Dirk (2003). The interaction of metaphor and metonymy in composite expressions. Dirven, René, Ralf Pörings, eds. *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 435-465.
- Gentner Dedre, Brian F. Bowdle (2001). Convention, form, and figurative language processing. *Metaphor and Symbol* 16 (3/4): 223-248.
- Gibbs, Raymond Jr. W. (1994). *The Poetics of Mind. Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbs, Raymond Jr. W. (2015). Does deliberate metaphor theory have a future?. *Journal of Pragmatics*. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.03.016>
- Gibbs, Raymond Jr. W., Gerard Steen (1999). *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Gibbs, Raymond W., Julia E. Lonergan (2009). Studying metaphor in discourse: Some lessons, challenges and new data. Musolff, Andreas and Jörg Zinken, eds., *Metaphor and Discourse*, Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 251-261.

- Goatly, Andrew (1997). *The Language of Metaphors*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Goatly, Andrew (2007). *Washing the Brain: Metaphor and Hidden Ideology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Goossens, Louis (2003). Metaphtonomy: The interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. Dirven, René, Ralf Pörings, eds. *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 349-379.
- Grady, Joseph (1999). A Typology of motivation for conceptual metaphor: Correlation vs. resemblance. Gibbs, Raymond Jr. W., Steen, Gerard, eds. *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 79-100.
- Grady, Joseph (2007). Metaphor. Geeraerts, Dirk, Hubert Cuyckens, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 188-213.
- Grady, Joseph, Todd Oakley, Seana Coulson (1999). Blending and Metaphor. Gibbs, Raymond Jr. W., Steen, Gerard, eds. *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 101-124.
- Hampe, Beate (2017). Embodiment and discourse: dimensions and dynamics of contemporary metaphor theory. Hampe, Beate, ed. *Metaphor: Embodied Cognition and Discourse*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 3-23.
- Hart, Christopher (2011). Force-interactive patterns in immigration discourse: A cognitive linguistic approach to CDA. *Discourse & Society* 22.3: 269-286.
- Hidalgo Downing, Laura (2016). Metaphor and metonymy. Jones, Rodney H., ed. *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Creativity*. London/New York: Routledge, 107-128.
- Hidalgo Downing, Laura, Blanca Kraljevic Mujic (2013). Introduction: Special issue on metaphorical creativity across modes. *Metaphor and Social World* 3.2: 133-139.
- Hidalgo Downing, Laura, Blanca Kraljevic Mujic, Begoña Núñez-Perucha (2013). Metaphorical creativity and recontextualization in multimodal advertisements on e-business across time. *Metaphor and Social World* 3.2: 199-219.
- Hülse, Rainer (2006). Imagine the EU: the metaphorical construction of a supra-nationalist identity. *Journal of International Relations and Development* 2006.9: 396-421.
- Ilie, Cornelia, Ariadna Ștefănescu (2015). Interdiscursive strategies of metaphor-driven rhetoric in Romanian discourses on a political crisis. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 61.1: 139-160.
- Jakobson, Roman, Morris Halle (1956). *Fundamentals of Language*. The Hague: Mouton&Co.'s-Gravenhage.

- Jäkel, Olaf (1999). Kant, Blumenberg, Weinreich- Some forgotten contributions to the cognitive theory of metaphor. Gibbs, Raymond Jr. W., Gerard Steen, eds. *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 9-27.
- Jones, Rodney H. (2016). *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Creativity*. London /New York: Routledge.
- Jones, Rodney H. (2016). Creativity and discourse analysis. Jones, Rodney H., ed. *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Creativity*. London /New York: Routledge, 61-77.
- Koller, Veronika (2004). *Metaphor and Gender in Business Media Discourse: A Critical Cognitive Study*. Basingstoke/ New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Koller, Veronika (2009). Missions and empires: Religious and political metaphors in corporate discourse. Musolff, Andreas, Jörg Zinken, eds. *Metaphor and Discourse*. Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 116-134.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2002). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2005). *Metaphor in Culture. Universality and Variation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2006). *Language, Mind, and Culture. An Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2009a). Metaphor, culture, and discourse: The pressure of coherence. Musolff, Andreas, Jörg Zinken, eds. *Metaphor and Discourse*. Basingstoke/ New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 11-24.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2009b). The effect of context on the use of metaphor in discourse. *Ibérica* 17: 11-24.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2009c). Aspects of metaphor in discourse. *Belgrade English Language and Literature Studies (Belgrade BELLS)* 1: 81-95.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2010a). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Second edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2010b). A new look at metaphorical creativity in cognitive linguistics. *Cognitive Linguistics* 21.4: 663-697.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2010c). Metaphorical creativity in discourse. *Insights* 3: 2-14.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2011a). Contextual images as visual metaphors. *Periodica Polytechnica*: 63-66.

- Kövecses, Zoltán (2011b). Recent developments in metaphor theory: Are the new views rival ones?. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 9.1: 11-25.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2014a). Context-induced variation in metaphor. *Argumentum* 10: 392-402.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2014b). Creating metaphor in context. *International Journal of Language and Culture* 1.1: 21-41.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2014c). Metaphor and metonymy in the conceptual system. Polzenhagen, Frank, Zoltán Kövecses, Stefanie Vogelbacher, Sonja Kleinke, eds. *Cognitive Explorations into Metaphor and Metonymy*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 15-34.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2015). *Where Metaphors Come From. Reconsidering Context in Metaphor*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2017a). The interplay between metaphor and culture. Wachowski, Wojciech, Zoltán Kövecses, Michal Borodo, eds. *Zooming In. Micro-Scale Perspectives on Cognition, Translation and Cross-Cultural Communication* 18. Oxford: Peter Lang AG, 7-18.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2017b). Context in cultural linguistics: The case of metaphor. Sharifian, Farzad, ed. *Advances in Cultural Linguistics*. Singapore: Springer Nature, 307-323.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2017c). Levels of metaphor. *Cognitive Linguistics* 28.2: 321-347.
- Lakoff, George (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George (1990). The Invariance Hypothesis: Is abstract reason based on image schemas? *Cognitive Linguistics* 1.1: 39-74.
- Lakoff, George (1992). Metaphor and war: The metaphor system used to justify war in the Gulf. Pütz, Martin, ed. *Thirty Years of Linguistic Evolution: Studies in honour of René Dirven on the occasion of his 60th birthday*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 463-482.
- Lakoff, George (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. Ortony, Andrew, ed. *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 202-251.
- Lakoff, George (1995). Metaphor, morality, and politics, or, why conservatives have left liberals in the dust. *Social Research* 62: 177-213.
- Lakoff, George (1996) *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George (2002) *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think (Second edition)*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

- Lakoff, George. 2006. The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. Geeraerts, Dirk, ed. *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 185-238.
- Lakoff, George (2009). *The Political Mind: A Cognitive Scientist's Guide to Your Brain and Its Politics*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Lakoff, George, Mark Johnson (1980). *Metaphors We Live by*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George, Mark Johnson (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lakoff, George, Mark Turner (1989). *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. 1. Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Linkevičiūtė, Vilma (2013). Conceptual metaphors in Gordon Brown's political discourse (2007-2008). *Studies About Language* 23: 89-94.
- Littlemore, Jeannette (2015). *Metonymy. Hidden Shortcuts in Language, Thought and Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lukeš, Dominik (2005). Towards a classification of metaphor use. *Proceedings of the Third Interdisciplinary Workshop on Corpus-Based Approaches to Figurative Language*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham, 27-34.
- Lynch, David, Richard Whitaker (2008). A loveless marriage: The Conservatives and the European People's Party. *Parliamentary Affairs* 61.1: 31-51.
- Merkel-Davies, Doris M., Veronika Koller (2012). 'Metaphoring' people out of this world: A critical discourse analysis of chairman's statement of a UK defence firm. *Accounting Forum* 36: 178-193.
- Moseley, Tom (2016). The rise of the word Brexit. *The BBC*, 25 December 2016.
- Musolff, Andreas (2000a). Political imagery of Europe: A house without exit doors? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 21.3: 216– 229.
- Musolff, Andreas (2000b). Maritime journey metaphors in British and German public discourse: transport vessels of international communication. *GFL* 3: 66-80.
- Musolff, Andreas (2001). Cross-language metaphors: parents and children, love, marriage and divorce in the European family. Cotterill, Janet, Anne Ife, eds. *Language across Boundaries*. London/New York: Continuum, 119-134.
- Musolff, Andreas (2004). *Metaphor and Political Discourse: Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Musolff, Andreas (2006). Metaphor scenarios in public discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol* 21.1: 23–38.
- Musolff, Andreas (2010). The Eternal outsider? Scenarios of Turkey's ambitions to join the EU in the German press. Šaric, Ljiljana, Andreas Musolff, Stefan Manz, Ingrid Hudabiunigg, eds. *Contesting Europe's Eastern Rim: Cultural Identities in Public Discourse*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 157-171.
- Musolff, Andreas (2011). Metaphor in political dialogue. *Language and Dialogue* 1.2: 191-206.
- Musolff, Andreas (2012). The study of metaphor as part of critical discourse analysis. *Critical Discourse Studies* 9.3: 301-310.
- Musolff, Andreas (2015a). Dehumanizing metaphors in UK immigrant debates in press and online media. *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict* 3.1: 41-56.
- Musolff, Andreas (2015b). Metaphor interpretation and cultural linguistics. *Language and Semiotic Studies* 1.3: 35-51.
- Musolff, Andreas (2016). *Political Metaphor Analysis. Discourse and Scenarios*. London/New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Musolff, Andreas (2017a). Truths, lies and figurative scenarios: Metaphors at the heart of Brexit. *Journal of Language and Politics* 16.5: 641-657.
- Musolff, Andreas (2017b). How metaphors can shape political reality: The figurative scenarios at the heart of Brexit. *Papers in Language and Communication Studies* 1: 12-16.
- Musolff, Andreas (2017c). Metaphor, irony and sarcasm in public discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 109: 95-104.
- Musolff, Andreas, Jörg Zinken (2009). *Metaphor and Discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Müller, Ralph (2005). Creative metaphors in political discourse. Theoretical considerations on the basis of Swiss Speeches. *metaphorik.de* 9: 53-73.
- Müller, Ralph (2010). Critical analysis of creative metaphors in political speeches. Low, Graham, Alice Deignan, Lynne Cameron, Zazie Todd, eds. *Researching and Applying Metaphor in the Real World*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 321-332.
- Neagu, Maria-Ionela (2013). *Decoding Political Discourse: Conceptual Metaphors and Argumentation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ortony, Andrew (1993). *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Ortony, Andrew (1993). Metaphor, language, and thought. Ortony, Andrew ed. *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-16.
- Panther, Klaus-Uwe, Linda Thornburg (2003). The roles of metaphor and metonymy in English *-er* nominals. Dirven, René, Ralf Pörings, eds. *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 279-319.
- Panther, Klaus-Uwe, Linda Thornburg (2004). The role of conceptual metonymy in meaning construction. *metaphorik.de* 6: 91-116.
- Radden, Günter (2003). How metonymic are metaphors? Dirven, René, Ralf Pörings, eds. *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 407-433.
- Radden, Günter, Zoltán Kövecses (1999). Towards a theory of metonymy. Panther, KlausUwe, Günter Radden, eds. *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. (Human Cognitive Processing 4). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 17-59.
- Reddy, Michael J. (1993). The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. Ortony, Andrew, ed. *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 164-201.
- Ritchie, David L. (2017). *Metaphorical Stories in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, Francisco J., Olga I. Díez Velasco (2003). Patterns of conceptual interaction. Dirven, René, Ralf Pörings, eds. *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 489-533.
- Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez; Francisco José; Usón, Ricardo Mairal. 2007. High-level metaphor and metonymy in meaning construction. Radden, Günter, Klaus-Michael Köpcke, Thomas Berg, Peter Siemund, eds. *Aspects of Meaning Construction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 33-49.
- Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, Francisco J., Lorena Pérez Hernández (2011). The contemporary theory of metaphor: Myths, developments and challenges. *Metaphor and Symbol* 26.1-25: 1-23.
- Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, Francisco J., Alicia Galera-Masegosa (2011). Going beyond metaphonymy: Metaphoric and metonymic complexes in phrasal verb interpretation. *Language Value* 3(1): 1-29.
- Semino, Elena (1997). *Language and World Creation in Poems and Other Texts*. New York: Longman.

- Semino, Elena (2002). A sturdy baby or a derailing train? Metaphorical representations of the Euro in British and Italian newspapers. *Text* 22(1): 107-139.
- Semino, Elena (2008). *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Semino, Elena, Alice Deignan, Jeannette Littlemore (2013). Metaphor, genre, and recontextualization. *Metaphor and Symbol* 28: 41-59.
- Semino, Elena, Zsófia Demjén, Jane Demmen (2016). An integrated approach to metaphor and framing in cognition, discourse, and practice, with an application to metaphors for cancer. *Applied Linguistics* 2016: 1-22.
- Silaški, Nadežda, Tatjana Đurović (2014). 'And now – a velvet divorce!' Or, how metaphors communicate values. Lopičić, Vesna, Biljana Mišić-Ilić, eds. *Values Across Cultures and Times*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 37-50.
- Steen, Gerard. 2008. The paradox of metaphor: Why we need a three-dimensional model of metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol* 23: 213-241.
- Steen, Gerard. 2009. Deliberate metaphor affords conscious metaphorical cognition. *Cognitive Semiotics* 5(1-2): 179-197.
- Steen, Gerard (2011). The contemporary theory of metaphor – now new and improved. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 9.1: 26-64.
- Steen, Gerard (2015). Developing, testing and interpreting Deliberate Metaphor Theory. *Journal of Pragmatics*. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.03.013>
- Steen, Gerard, Aletta G. Dorst, J. Berenike Herrmann, Anna A. Kaal, Tina Krennmayr, Trijntje Pasma (2010). *A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification*. Amsterdam: JohnBenjamin Publishing Company.
- Stenvoll, Dag (2008). Slippery slopes in political discourse. Carver, Terrell, Jernej Pikalo, eds. *Politics, Language and Metaphor: Interpreting and Changing the World*. London/New York: Routledge, 28-40.
- Stern, Josef (2008). Metaphor, semantics, and context. Gibbs, Raymond Jr. W., ed. *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 262-279.
- Surette, Leon (1987). Metaphor and metonymy: Jakobson reconsidered. *University of Toronto Quarterly* 56: 557-574.
- Šarić, Ljiljana (2005). Metaphorical models in EU discourse in the Croatian media. *Jezikoslovlje* 6(2): 145-170.
- Tarnavskiy, Omelian (2017). Proponents of Euroscepticism in the UK from 1950 to 2017. *ЅSP* 4.17: 39-57.

- Taylor, John R. (2003). Category extension by metonymy and metaphor. Dirven, René, Ralf Pörings, eds. *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 323-349.
- Urquidi, Alicia (2015). Meaning construction in creative metaphors: Conventional meaning integration through *generic interfacing* in a blend, and conditions of propagation and lexicalization. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 14 (2015): 219-237.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (2002). Political discourse and political cognition. Chilton, Paul and Christina Schäffner eds., *Politics as Talk and Text: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 203-237.
- Walter, Jochen, Jan Helmig (2008). Discursive metaphor analysis: (De)construction(s) of Europe. Carver, Terrell, Jernej Pikalo, eds. *Politics, Language and Metaphor: Interpreting and Changing the World*. London/New York: Routledge, 119-131.
- Wee, Lionel (2001). Divorce before marriage in Singapore-Malaysia relationship: The invariance principle at work. *Discourse and Society* 12.4: 535-549.
- Wilson, John (2001). Political discourse. Schiffrin Deborah, Deborah Tannen, Hiedi E. Hamilton, eds. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 398-415.
- Werkmann, Ana, Gabrijela Buljan (2013). Knocking on EU's door: on the changing and conflicting metaphorical images of Croatia in selected EU press. *Jezikoslovlje* 14(2-3): 337-362.
- Wilson, Sam (2014). Britain and the EU: A long and rocky relationship. *The BBC*, 1 April 2014.
- Whitman, Richard G. (2016). Brexit or Bremain: What future for the UK's European diplomatic strategy?. *International Affairs* 92.3: 509-529.
- Wodak, Ruth (2016). "We have the character of an island nation". A discourse-historical analysis of David Cameron's "Bloomberg Speech" on the European Union. *EUI Working Papers*, RSCAS 2016/36. San Domenico di Fiesole: European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies.
- Zinken, Jörg, Andreas Musolff (2009). A discourse-centred perspective on metaphorical meaning and understanding. Musolff, Andreas and Jörg Zinken, eds. *Metaphor and Discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, 1-8.

DICITIONARIES

Cambridge English Dictionary <http://www.dictionary.cambridge.org>

Collins English Dictionary <http://www.collinsdictionary.com>

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English <http://www.ldoceonline.com>

Oxford English Dictionary <http://www.oed.com>

7. SUMMARY

The aim of this dissertation is to examine the use of creative metaphors in British political discourse on Brexit, using the cognitive theory of conceptual metaphor and Musolff's (2016) theory of metaphor scenarios. Analysing metaphors from different perspectives, conceptual domain, metaphor scenarios and the context of use, the dissertation investigates how creative metaphors emerge in British political discourse on Brexit and what rhetorical power these metaphors exhibit. Apart from studying the effects of two cognitive mechanisms based on conceptual domains, i.e. source-related and target-induced creativity, the special attention is given to contextual factors that motivate the emergence of metaphorical creativity. The first part of the dissertation presents the theoretical background, which includes the historical overview of figurative language studies, the basic tenets of CTMM, as well as the overview of studies dealing with metaphorical creativity and political discourse. In the second part of the dissertation, two case studies investigating metaphorical creativity in British political discourse are presented, one dealing with the JOURNEY metaphors and the other with the MARRIAGE/DIVORCE metaphors. The focus of these case studies is to reveal the impact of cognitive mechanisms on the emergence of metaphorical creativity, especially the motivation coming from the contextual factors, the role of metaphor scenarios in producing creative metaphors, and the rhetorical force of creative metaphors. The dissertation shows that metaphorical creativity in political discourse emerges from three cognitive mechanisms, i.e. source-related creativity, target-induced creativity and context-induced creativity, that metaphor scenarios play a crucial role in providing additional and rich conceptual material, used for the creative extension of mappings between the source and target domains, and that the use of creative metaphors in political discourse is necessarily associated with achieving particular rhetorical goals.

Key words: metaphorical creativity, political discourse, conceptual metaphors, metaphors scenarios, contextual factors, rhetorical goals

8. SAŽETAK

Cilj ove disertacije je istražiti uporabu kreativnih metafora u britanskom političkom diskursu o Brexitu, primjenjujući kognitivno-lingvističku teoriju konceptualne metafore i Musolffovu (2016) teoriju metaforičkih scenarija. Primjenjujući različite perspektive pri analizi (konceptualne domene, metaforičke scenarije i kontekst), disertacija istražuje nastanak kreativnih metafora u političkom diskursu o Brexitu kao i njihovu retoričku moć. Osim proučavanja utjecaja kognitivnih mehanizama, kreativnosti zasnovane na izvorišnoj domeni i kreativnosti potaknute ciljnom domenom, posebna pozornost se daje kontekstualnim faktorima koji motiviraju nastanak metaforičke kreativnosti. Prvi dio disertacije daje teorijski okvir, koji podrazumijeva povijesni pregled proučavanja figurativnog jezika, osnovne postavke kognitivne teorije metafore i metonimije, kao i pregled studija koje se bave metaforičkom kreativnošću i političkim diskursom. U drugom dijelu disertacije su predstavljene dvije studije slučaja koje se bave istraživanjem metaforičke kreativnosti u britanskom političkom diskursu o Brexitu, od kojih jedna proučava metafore PUTOVANJA, a druga metafore BRAKA/RAZVODA. Glavni cilj ovih studija je otkriti utjecaj kognitivnih mehanizama na nastanak metaforičke kreativnosti, sa posebnim osvrtom na motivaciju od strane kontekstualnih faktora, na ulogu koju metaforički scenariji imaju u nastanku kreativnih metafora, kao i na retoričku moć kreativnih metafora. Disertacija pokazuje da na nastanak metaforičke kreativnosti u političkom diskursu utječu tri kognitivna mehanizma, kreativnost zasnovana na izvorišnoj domeni, kreativnost potaknuta ciljnom domenom i kreativnost potaknuta kontekstom, da metaforički scenariji osiguravaju dodatni i bogat konceptualni sadržaj koji omogućava kreativno proširivanje preslikavanja između izvorišnih i ciljnih domena, te da se uporaba kreativnih metafora u političkom diskursu uvijek povezuje sa ostvarivanjem određenih retoričkih ciljeva.

Ključne riječi: metaforička kreativnost, politički diskurs, konceptualne metafore, metaforički scenariji, kontekstualni faktori, retorički ciljevi

9. BIOGRAPHY/ŽIVOTOPIS

Lejla Aljukić was born in 1984 in Tuzla. She graduated from the University of Tuzla, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of English Language and Literature in 2007. In 2008, she started her PhD studies in Linguistics at the University of Josip Juraj Strossmayer of Osijek, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. Since 2007, she has been working as an English teacher in primary and secondary schools. Currently, she is employed as an English teacher in the Primary School “Dobošnica”. In 2014, she started working as an external associate at the Department of English Language and Literature, at the University of Tuzla and was appointed teaching assistant. She attended a number of teacher training workshops and seminars. She authored the paper *A Steep and Rocky Path to Brexit: Creative Metaphors in British Political Discourse on Brexit*, published in *DHS* vol 4, no 2 (8) in 2019.

Lejla Aljukić je rođena 20. lipnja 1984. u Tuzli. Diplomirala je na Filozofskom fakultetu Univerziteta u Tuzli 2007. godine i stekla zvanje profesora engleskog jezika i književnosti. 2008. godine je upisala Poslijediplomski sveučilišni studij Jezikoslovlje na Filozofskom fakultetu Sveučilišta Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku. Od 2007. godine radi kao nastavnica engleskog jezika u osnovnim i srednjim školama. Trenutno je zaposlena kao nastavnica engleskog jezika u Osnovnoj školi „Dobošnica“. 2014. godine je počela raditi kao vanjski suradnik na Odsjeku za engleski jezik i književnost Univerziteta u Tuzli gdje je izabrana u zvanje asistenta. Sudjelovala je na mnogobrojnim radionicama i seminarima za stručno usavršavanje nastavnika engleskog jezika. Autor je rada *A Steep and Rocky Path to Brexit: Creative Metaphors in British Political Discourse on Brexit*, objavljenog u časopisu *DHS* vol 4, no 2 (8) 2019.