

SAL 34/2019

Conceptual  
Metaphorisation  
through Precedent-  
Related Phenomena  
in Media Discourse

Received 11/2018

Accepted 04/2019

# Conceptual Metaphorisation through Precedent-Related Phenomena in Media Discourse

Konceptualioji precedentu susijusių  
reiškinių metaforizacija žiniasklaidos  
diskurse

LINGUISTICS / KALBOTYRA

**Yuriy Velykoroda**

Precarpathian National Vasyl Stefanyk University, Ukraine

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.34.0.22088>

## Abstract

This article investigates the role of precedent-related phenomena as a type of intertextuality in conceptual metaphorisation in media discourse. This study examines the place of precedent-related phenomena within the general theory of intertextuality, establishing their characteristics and how they can be differentiated from other types of intertextuality, and also provides a general overview of existing theories that aim to describe how precedent-related phenomena function. Drawing on magazine articles, the study analyses two sets of examples: a) single references, and b) recurring references to one source domain through various precedent-related phenomena. In the second set of examples, the differential characteristics and attributes that are common for the references are outlined in order to formulate a hypothetical name for the source domain that would be shared by its constituents. The article concludes by discussing what potential cognitive effect such conceptual metaphors could have on the recipient of a media text, especially when the precedent-related phenomena that refer to them are placed in the dominant positions of the text (such as the heading, the subheading, or the concluding sentence).

**KEYWORDS:** metaphor, cognitive effect, intertextuality, precedent-related phenomenon, media discourse.

## Introduction

Contemporary media discourse constantly develops new forms of linguistic expression in order to attract readers and influence their world-view. Both intertextuality and metaphor are examples of such expressive means, and they have often been studied separately in media linguistics. Recently, though, there have been attempts to also investigate how they can function together in media discourse (Hart, 2017), as well as in literary (Shonoda, 2012; Sell, 2008) and political (Marlow, 1997) discourses. In previous works, the functions of precedent-related phenomena in media discourse have been studied (Velykoroda, 2012; Velykoroda, 2016). The aim of this article is to explore how intertextual references (in the form of precedent-related phenomena) can be used as source domains for metaphorical framing in media texts, and what effects these devices create by implicitly alluding to the attributes of these precedent-related phenomena.



In recent decades, numerous scholars have studied the role of metaphor in creating cognitive images. This imagery is best described through the theory of conceptual metaphor of G. Lakoff and M. Johnson (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Cameron, 2008; Coulson, 2001; Croft & Cruse, 2004; Fauconnier & Turner, 2008; Grady, 2007; Bystrov, 2014). Metaphor in contemporary linguistics is understood as “a linguistic representation that results from the shift in the use of a word or phrase from one context or domain in which it is expected to occur to another context or domain where it is not expected to occur, thereby causing semantic tension” (Charteris-Black, 2004, p. 21). Moreover, “metaphor’s pragmatic characteristic is that it is motivated by the underlying purpose of persuading”, and this purpose is primarily covert and reflects the speaker’s intentions within a certain context of use (Charteris-Black, 2005, p. 15). Although Charteris-Black (2005) mostly studied metaphor in political discourse, it can be assumed that since a lot of political discourse takes place in media, his views can also be applied to the analysis of media texts. This approach is especially significant for us in that it stresses the “covert” purpose of persuading; thus, we can claim that media authors also aim to influence recipients in ways that are not necessarily realised by them, or of which they remain unaware. Recipients can, thus, draw conclusions while remaining unconscious of the linguistic mechanisms of persuasion applied by the author.

Relations between texts have been studied through two major theories in Western linguistics (intertextuality) (Allen, 2000; Eco, 2006; Oliveira, 2004; Orr, 2003) and Eastern-European linguistics (precedent-related phenomena) (Gudkov, 1999; Krasnykh, 2002; Slyshkin, 2000). Even though there are significant differences in the theoretical approach, these two theories are more complementary than contradictory. The history of interconnections between texts could be traced back to Mikhail Bakhtin’s (1979) ideas on dialogism. Bakhtin believed that no text in a language exists in isolation, meaning that there are constant connections with the texts of both the past eras and the future ones (Bakhtin, 1986). According to Bakhtin, “the word by its nature is dialogical”, and in the conditions of dialogical communication, a “diglossical word” will inevitably emerge (Bakhtin, 1979, p. 212–214).

Bakhtin’s theory provided a foundation for Julia Kristeva’s (1980) theory of intertextuality, which is extensively used in literary studies to denote interconnections between different texts. According to Kristeva, “any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another” (Kristeva, 1980, p. 66). Traditionally in literary studies, forms of intertextuality have included allusions, quotations, parody, pastiche, calque, among others. Yet, the complexity of the phenomenon definitely allows for setting out new types of connections between texts.

In Eastern-European linguistics, the term intertextuality had not been used until a few decades ago. Yet, linguists came up with a new term for intertextual references, which they called “precedent-related phenomena”. Originally the term was introduced in the late 1980s by Yuriy Karaulov as “precedent-related texts” in his theory on linguistic persona. This term was useful and applicable in cultural studies, as it denoted texts 1) which are cognitively and emotionally meaningful for speakers, 2) which are of a super-personal nature, that is they are well known in the larger environment of the speaker, including predecessors and contemporaries, and 3) reference to these texts recurs in the discourse of this speaker (Karaulov, 1987, p. 216). Karaulov (1987) spoke predominantly about texts which were prominent and significant cultural phenomena, and references to which could be easily and effortlessly recognised by large numbers of speakers. A decade later, in order to step away from an exclusively textual understanding of similar processes, linguists introduced the term “precedent-related phenomenon”, which could refer both to verbal and non-verbal expressions or images of this nature (Krasnykh, 2002).

---

## Defining Metaphor

---

## Precedent-Related Phenomena as a Type of Intertextuality

There are numerous definitions of precedent-related phenomena, but most generally they are understood as “a cognitive component whose denotation and content are well known to representatives of a certain lingual-cultural community; the understanding of such phenomena is based on the recipient’s background knowledge” (Selivanova, 2006, p. 492). Though there is some ambiguity in these approaches, as it is not immediately clear how to measure how “well-known” a text is, or what percentage of population should know a certain phenomenon for it to be considered precedent-related, this term should prove especially useful in studying media texts, as it allows higher precision when analysing intertextual references in them. It is obvious that intertextuality is a broader term than precedent-related phenomenon. Intertextuality is an umbrella term for all types of references to other texts and discourses. These references can occur in the form of citing a politician, references to legal documents, statistical references, etc. But such components do not necessarily have any cognitive or emotional significance for the recipient. Moreover, intertextual references (more so in literary discourse) may not even be realised by recipients without proper literary background knowledge, while precedent-related phenomena are meant to be immediately recognisable by an average speaker without any significant cognitive efforts. Very often the sources of such references are well-known works of art, literature, pop culture, religious texts, or political mottos. References, such as *Robin Hood*, *the Mona Lisa smile*, *a house divided against itself*, *Mickey Mouse*, *tear down this wall*, *one small step for a man*, *it’s the economy, stupid*, *make America great again*, or *Yes, we can*, will be easily recognised by the majority of native (and some non-native) speakers of English. They will, thus, also bear some cognitive significance, create numerous associations and may also influence the recipient in their interpretation of a text with such references. These features differentiate precedent-related phenomena from other forms of intertextuality that do not necessarily lead to immediate recognition of the text or additional cultural references or cause emotional and cognitive effects.

Some scholars (Gudkov, 1999, p. 142) claim that precedent-related phenomena exist in the status of “myths” or symbols in their cultures, and their function is to determine a certain paradigm of behaviour for the members of the community. Myths may be used as effective arguments, for they “do not need to be proven, it is enough that they be believed and that the believers act upon them” (Qualter, 1985, p. 49).

Precedent-related phenomena theorists often view them as culture-specific concepts. Their nucleus consists of differential characteristics (what makes them recognisable and different from other concepts), while on the periphery there are numerous attributes (additional features that are associated with a certain precedent-related phenomenon, though they are not required for its signification) (Krasnykh, 2002; Gudkov, 1999).

Precedent-related phenomena are normally culture-specific. In one culture or lingual-cultural community, a certain phenomenon can have one meaning, while in another it can have a somewhat different connotation or be devoid of any significance altogether. One of the examples provided above is the phrase *a house divided against itself*. In the U.S. political or media discourse, this phrase will be primarily associated with Abraham Lincoln or his “House Divided speech”, though in fact this saying originates from the Bible, and it remains uncertain whether this saying could necessarily have similar political connotation in another English-speaking community, or, moreover, non-English-speaking community. In the latter, it could have Biblical significance, but unlikely any political sense for a wide range of recipients.

Precedent-related phenomena theorists have developed over the years their numerous typologies, which are in detail described by Gudkov (1999) and Krasnykh (2002). Based on the level of precedence, they are divided into communally-precedent (known to and used by

some social community, e.g., generational, professional, confessional), nationally-precedent (known to and used by national lingual-cultural communities, and this level will be the focus of our research) and universally precedent-related phenomena (known and applied globally). The latter level is often described as hypothetical, for extensive research into their functioning across cultures is needed in order to prove that some reference could have comparably similar effect across languages and cultures (see Velykoroda, 2014, for a more detailed attempt to disprove the possibility to determine the universally-precedent level). Most often precedent-related phenomena are studied on the national level, for it can be claimed that on the level of individual countries there can be some culturally specific references that might be recognised and understood similarly by most members of such communities, and media have traditionally been organised in relation to national or linguistic containers. By the form of verbalisation, precedent-related phenomena are divided into two verbalisable types (precedent-related names and precedent-related expressions), and two non-verbalisable types (precedent-related situations and precedent-related texts). One more criterion of classifying precedent-related phenomena is by the degree of transformation (here we have canonical or non-transformed phenomena, and transformed or altered precedent-related phenomena). Media texts abound with transformed precedent-related phenomena, which despite alterations remain easily recognisable due to their fixed status in the cognitive basis of a lingual-cultural community. Consider the following examples of transformed precedent-related phenomena in the U.S. media discourse: *A Tale of Two Romneys* (Time, January 14, 2008); *It's almost like a tale of two economies, says Porter...* (Time, January 14, 2008); *A Tale of Two Britains* (Newsweek, May 2, 2011); *A Tale of Three Cities* (Time, January 28, 2008); *Apocalypse Not* (Time, August 2, 2010); *Apocalypse New* (Time, January 28, 2008). It should be noted that in case of transformations, such fragments have two levels of expression: the surface level (transformed formulation), and the deeper level which emerges as a result of juxtaposing the surface level of the expression with the original canonical form of the precedent-related phenomenon. In such cases, both of these cognitive levels coexist and complement each other with meanings that are drawn by the recipient.

Contemporary media discourse is abundant with such transformations, and readers are not only expected, but even invited to engage in this word play and to decipher the original formulation and interpret the actual wording. Such transformations are not necessarily possible with other forms of intertextual references, as some of them require accuracy and literality, while others may become unrecognisable as a result of these transformations.

Contemporary media texts have become a favourable environment for precedent-related phenomena, where they are used, reinterpreted, popularised, promoted and created. Media text is often described as “the proverbial tip of the iceberg: most of its implied or presupposed meanings remain ‘hidden’” (van Dijk, 1998, p. 31), and precedent-related phenomena are those units in the text that are capable of implying a lot of the “hidden” meaning by invoking associations with the situations or texts they refer to on the vertical level.

A media text should be conceived “as a tissue of voices and traces of other texts, when we engage with it, we go into dialogue with them. In studying media texts, we need to be aware that they are dialogic, or embedded in a mesh of intertextuality” (Talbot, 2007, p. 63). The wider social impact of media is not just to do with how they selectively represent the world, though that is a vitally important issue; it is also to do with what sorts of social identities, what versions of “self” they project and what cultural values (be it consumerism, individualism or a cult of personality) these entail (Fairclough, 1995, p. 17). These cultural values are expressed through references to the works of literature, religious texts and cultural phenomena that

are both dominant in a culture and are meaningful for language speakers who refer to them themselves and recognise other speakers' references to them.

---

## Method and Material

The aim of this article is to show the interrelation between precedent-related phenomena (as forms of intertextuality) and conceptual metaphors in media texts. It demonstrates how precedent-related phenomena can be used as source domains in conceptual metaphors and what cognitive effects they can consequently create. In order to achieve this, two different but complementary methods of analysis were applied: those of intercultural communication (Bakhtin, 1979; Karaulov, 1987; Gudkov, 1999; Krasnykh, 2002) to identify precedent-related phenomena in the investigated corpus and to determine their attributes and differential features that remain implicit in the texts; and those of cognitive linguistics (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Fauconnier & Turner, 2008; Charteris-Black, 2005) to describe how precedent-related phenomena serve as source domains and map onto the respective target domains, and what additional cognitive effects this mapping creates when the attributes of the precedent-related phenomena used in media texts are implied. Firstly, the corpus was constructed by monitoring contemporary American popular magazines *Time* and *Newsweek* (printed version), then the *Daily Beast* (after *Newsweek* printed edition was discontinued) for occurrences of precedent-related phenomena in their texts. Secondly, from the total pool, those texts where precedent-related phenomena could be analysed as metaphorical expressions forming conceptual metaphors were selected. The texts selected for analysis addressed contemporary political or social events in American society. This means that the study contributes to knowledge of precedent-related phenomena on the national level (in the theory of precedent-related phenomena), yet, while the events and phenomena depicted in the sources examined might pertain to the national level, it is clear that the related conceptual metaphors draw on intertexts that are produced and circulate transnationally based as they are in canons of world literature and Western high and popular culture. This initial stage of analysis of the corpus revealed two central uses of precedent-related phenomena, namely: Group One where one precedent-related phenomenon could be viewed as a source domain in metaphorical framing; and a second much smaller Group Two where several different precedent-related phenomena are used in one article to create a more complex source domain that shares some features with the units that pertain to it.

In this research, only a few most typical examples of the first group that were considered to be most representative are shown. The articles in the second group typically are feature stories providing an in-depth analysis of some current controversial issues. The next stage of the analysis demonstrates how single references (found in Group One articles) can create larger cognitive effect through appeal to precedent-related texts or situations. A second group of texts (Group Two) was investigated, where each occurrence of precedent-related phenomenon was analysed for the differential features and attributes of this phenomenon implied in the context. Then, common attributes among all the phenomena were identified and the emerging common (or nearly common) source domain activated by all the precedent-related phenomena used in the text was determined. It is argued that the new emerging concept is usually not stated explicitly anywhere in the text, yet the appeal to the precedent-related phenomenon inadvertently brings about additional characteristics that come through the attributes of the respective precedent-related situations or texts.

---

## Findings and Discussion

In this research, articles from contemporary U.S. magazines (both printed and e-versions) that contain intertextual references in the form of precedent-related phenomena were selected and examined on the subject of how these references contribute to the formation or

implicit actualisation of conceptual metaphors which may remain covert to the readers of these texts. For each cited example from articles with single references (Group One), the broader context of when the article was written is provided and the tilt such references add to the article is discussed.

The first example comes from an article about Mitt Romney when he first ran for the president of the U.S. in 2008:

“Until he pulled into his home state of Michigan, Willard Mitt Romney was *the Frankenstein monster* of the 2008 Republican sweepstakes. The former Massachusetts governor at times seemed less like a real person than *a strange, inauthentic collection of market research, body parts and DNA* that had been borrowed from past GOP campaigns and *assembled in a lab by the party’s mad scientists*. Romney had the overpowering optimism of Ronald Reagan, the family values of Dan Quayle, the hair and handsome looks of Jack Kemp and manners of George H.W. Bush...”<sup>1</sup> (Time, January 28, 2008)

The article is written before the 2008 U.S. presidential election when there were still several candidates from the Republican Party running for the post. This was basically Mitt Romney’s political debut on the national scale, as before that he had served as Massachusetts governor. The precedent-related phenomenon (well known to the majority of speakers) in this example is named explicitly at the very beginning. It is a reference to the main character in the novel by Mary Shelley (1818). It should be noted here that even though the original precedent-related text is Mary Shelley’s novel, over two centuries it has been adapted, reinterpreted and recreated in various artistic forms (media, cinema, television). These adaptations enrich and supplement the original phenomenon with new features or attributes, which may not necessarily have been present in the original text (consider the popular visual image of the Frankenstein monster by actor Boris Karloff from the 1935 film *Bride of Frankenstein*). This reinterpretability is an inherent feature of precedent-related texts, and it can be explained by their proverbial or canonical status in the lingual-cultural community (Karaulov, 1987).

Further on, in this article this comparison is enhanced by means of more references and imitations of cultural perceptions of how the Frankenstein monster was created (*inauthentic collection of ... body parts, assembled in a lab by ... mad scientists*). These multiple references create imagery for the object of the article and the metaphor *ROMNEY IS FRANKENSTEIN MONSTER* is created. As has been mentioned before, when precedent-related phenomena are used in contexts, they evoke a number of attributes that they are associated with. Not all of these attributes are necessarily implied in a certain context, but they could influence how the text is interpreted. For example, *FRANKENSTEIN MONSTER* as a precedent-related phenomenon has the following attributes which are culturally attached to it: 1) unnatural, ugly, undead, 2) created by a scientist in a lab from different parts, 3) dangerous, 4) can get out of control and rebel against its creators. Not all of these have been explicitly referred to in the article, but they may be inferred by the recipient. Thus, even though in this specific context the *potential rebellion* attribute has not been explicated, recipients could draw this conclusion as a forecast for what might happen in the future. It should be noted that this text comes in the first paragraph of the article, consequently it can be claimed that all further reading will be influenced by this metaphor.

The second example comes from the “Person of the Year” issue, from the article about runner-up Hillary Clinton. The article was written after the 2016 U.S. presidential election, which Clinton lost to Donald Trump. In the wrap-up paragraph, the author summarises Clinton’s efforts to become the president and what it means for society in general:

<sup>1</sup> In this and the following examples cited, emphasis is added to the key passages and marked by italics.



“Like an American *Moses*, she [Hillary Clinton] was *an imperfect prophet*, leading women to *the edge of the Promised Land*. Now it’s up to another woman to enter it” (Time, December 19, 2016)

This example illustrates the statement that precedent-related phenomena are usually closely connected with precedent-related situations that are evoked through them, and some of them are mentioned in the example. By drawing on the metaphor *CLINTON IS MOSES*, the author involved the attributes from the precedent-related situation and mapped them onto the current political and social situation: the old political system as *slavery in Egypt*, the 2016 presidential election as *the trip in the wilderness*, the chosen people as *Clinton’s supporters or women aiming to break the glass ceiling*, Promised Land as *the country with equal rights*, etc. Not only does this metaphor characterise Clinton as an “imperfect” embodiment of people’s hopes and aspirations, it also implicitly forecasts that the future the people were hoping for is bound to come (through the explicit *Promised Land* attribute of the precedent-related phenomenon).

Precedent-related phenomena do not have to be explicitly expressed in the text; they may be implied by means of their attributes. The article “Land of the free, home of the brave” (Time, October 24, 2016) is a response to the opponents of migration from the Middle East. In the opening paragraph, the author compares current migration with those from the past:

“A pair of runaway slaves fleeing the antebellum South, arriving in Boston. A family of Jews fleeing the Third Reich, arriving in New York. A baby boy fleeing the destruction of his home world of *Krypton*, arriving in Kansas. Most Americans know what must be done with such people. They must be taken in. Given a chance. Allowed to become an equal part of the American story.”

In addition to historical comparisons, the author evokes the image of Superman from popular culture. Even though the phenomenon is not yet named explicitly, it is implied through one of its distinguishing attributes. Later in the text, the author explicitly names the source domain:

“How many Americans today would think it right to send ... the *infant Superman* back into space? The very idea seems abominable, absurd – un-American.”

By conceptualising today’s refugees through the popular image of Superman (*REFUGEES ARE INFANT SUPERMAN*), the author appeals to a powerful American myth. Moreover, as with previous examples, we can see that this reference is followed by several attributes of the core precedent-related text, which are mapped on the current situation:

“Why, then, is there such an outcry over accepting refugees from places like Syria? ... What distinguishes these refugees from the slaves, from the Jews, from *Kal-El*?”

As could be seen from the previous examples, it is not uncommon to create more complex conceptual metaphors, when there is one target domain (*REFUGEES*), but several source domains: *CIVIL WAR SLAVES*, *JEWS RUNNING FROM FASCISM*, *INFANT SUPERMAN*.

And next the research will focus on such examples from three different articles (Group Two) with several precedent-related phenomena used in the texts serving as source domains to create metaphorical imagery for the object of the articles. For each article, the content of the article will be briefly discussed, and then the imagery created by means of precedent-related phenomena will be shown, the hypothetical ultimate source domain will be formulated and explanation will be provided of how it is enriched through the attributes of precedent-related phenomena which constitute it.

The article “Friends without Borders” (Time, May 31, 2010) is a cover story that discusses the fast-growing social network and how it connects the people around the world. The article

provides numerous personal examples and also discusses some aspects of its privacy policy. Explicitly the author does not criticise any of Facebook's policies or the management's decisions, yet there are three intertextual references in the text. The first two references are used as subheadings:

"What *Voldemort* is to Harry Potter"

"The Web's Sketchy *Big Brother*"

Because these are subheadings, they are typed in a more prominent font, in bigger letters and will attract the reader's attention. The first reference (*Voldemort*) is the main antagonist in J. K. Rowling's series "Harry Potter" (1997–2007), the archenemy of Harry Potter who is obsessed with conquering the world. The second reference (*Big Brother*) is the unseen ruler of Oceania in George Orwell's dystopia "Nineteen Eighty-Four" (1949), where every citizen is under constant surveillance (one of the slogans is *Big brother is watching you*). It should be noted that despite the title of the subheading, in the text of the article the first precedent-related phenomenon is used in the context of one of Facebook's failed apps, which the company prefers not to discuss: "Ask Zuckerberg and other executives about the program now, and you'll notice that Beacon has become to Facebook *what Voldemort is to Harry Potter's world* – the thing that shall not be named." This formulation is much milder and more specific than the one in the subheading and is used simply in the context of what people do not wish to discuss. Yet, the more prominent position in the subheading is likely to have more impact on the recipient.

The third intertextual reference is contextualising how Facebook is perceived by the general public:

"Otherwise, Facebook will continue to be cast in the role of the Web's sketchy *Big Brother*, sucking up our identities into a massive *Borg brain* to slice, dice and categorize for advertisers."

Here, along with the already discussed precedent-related phenomenon *Big Brother*, there is a reference to an antagonist alien race in "Star Trek", *Borg Collective*, that assimilates and integrates other cultures into one collective group, whose representatives have surgical implants in the brain, as well as ocular implants, which allow them to be part of one collective whole. One of the attributes associated with the Borg in popular culture is the phrase *resistance is futile*.

The use of three precedent-related phenomena to characterise the social network (two of which are used in dominant positions) will shape the recipient's reading of Facebook. All three phenomena are negative characters, main antagonists from three different spheres (classical literature, contemporary literature and popular cinematography), and recipients will, thus, view the object of the article through three conceptual metaphors (*FACEBOOK IS VOLDEMORT / BIG BROTHER / BORG*). On the basis of these three target domains, a broader conceptual metaphor is formed: *FACEBOOK IS ENEMY*, which also includes the key attributes of these precedent-related phenomena (unnatural, threatening, mass surveillance, collective mind, "resistance is futile", etc.). The article is a cover story, and manipulative techniques can already be seen on the cover: *Facebook ... and how it's redefining privacy. With nearly 500 million users, Facebook is connecting us in new (and scary) ways.*

Table 1 shows how precedent-related phenomena are interpreted in order to formulate the source domain for the metaphor that characterises the object of the article. The list of attributes is obviously not exhaustive as there are definitely more and they can be individual for each recipient depending on his or her background knowledge. Moreover, these precedent-related phenomena have powerful visual images that are attached to them in visual media, and these also can be considered as attributes.



**Table 1**

Conceptual  
metaphorisation of  
*Facebook in Friends*  
*without borders*

target domain	source domain	precedent-related phenomenon	attributes of precedent related phenomena
FACEBOOK	ENEMY	VOLDEMORT	archenemy obsessed with power aims to conquer the world
		BIG BROTHER	constant surveillance invisible ruler knows what you think
		BORG	collective brain resistance is futile aims to assimilate

The second article, *The Depressing News about Antidepressants* (Newsweek, February 8, 2010) discusses various views on whether antidepressants are really effective. The article contains multiple citations of different experts who express their opinions and arguments for or against the use of antidepressants. Despite being rather technical in argumentation, the author takes liberty to allude to several intertextual sources:

"Explain that it's all in their hands, that the reason they're benefiting is the same reason why *Disney's Dumbo* could initially fly with only a feather clutched in his teeth – believing makes it so – and the magic dissipates like fairy dust in a windstorm."

"Yet Kirsch is well aware that his book may have the same effect on patients as the crows did on *Dumbo* when they told him the "magic feather" wasn't really giving him the power of flight: the little elephant began crashing to earth." (both to Walt Disney's 1941 eponymous animated film)

"The boy who said *the emperor had no clothes* didn't endear himself to his fellow subjects ..."

"Wider recognition that antidepressants are a pharmaceutical version of *the emperor's new clothes*, he says, might spur patients to try other treatments." (both to Hans Christian Andersen's fairy-tale "The Emperor's New Clothes")

"...more and more scientists believe it is time to abandon the "don't ask, don't tell" policy of not digging too deeply into the reasons for the effectiveness of antidepressants" (to the official U.S. military policy against discrimination of LGBTQ, later repealed)

"Maybe it's time to *pull back the curtain and see the wizard for what he is.*" (implicit, to the "Wonderful Wizard of Oz" by Frank L. Baum, 1900).

These examples refer to four different precedent-related phenomena, each with its specific attributes:

- 1 *Dumbo* – believes he can fly by holding a magic feather, though in fact he is capable of flying because of his big ears;
- 2 *The Emperor's New Clothes* – the emperor orders clothes that would be invisible to everyone who is stupid or incompetent, while in fact he is naked, and only a small boy is brave enough to say the emperor is naked;
- 3 *don't ask, don't tell* – a policy in the US military according to which questions about recruits' sexual orientation were not asked at interviews, while in fact the official ban on LGBTQ people to serve in the army was not lifted;
- 4 *The Wizard of Oz* – tricked everyone into believing that he is almighty and capable of solving everyone's problems, not seen by anyone, held in high esteem by his subjects.

All these references create one complex source domain for the conceptual metaphor with the target domain *ANTIDEPRESSANTS*. Even though antidepressants explicitly do not receive broad criticism other than in the arguments by the experts cited, these precedent-related phenomena create a new imagery in the form of conceptual metaphor *ANTIDEPRESSANTS ARE ILLUSION*, as the one common attribute running through all four precedent-related phenomena is “illusion”. Table 2 is a summary of how this conceptual metaphor is created in the context of this article.

target domain	source domain	precedent-related phenomenon	attributes of precedent related phenomena
<b>ANTIDEPRESSANTS</b>	<b>ILLUSION</b>	<i>DUMBO</i>	<i>“magic feather”</i> <i>unaware of his true potential</i>
		<i>EMPEROR WITH NO CLOTHES</i>	<i>pluralistic ignorance</i> <i>incompetence</i> <i>make-believe</i>
		<i>DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL</i>	<i>pretence</i> <i>avoiding real solutions</i>
		<i>WIZARD OF OZ</i>	<i>trickster</i> <i>believed to be the only one capable of solving everyone's problems</i> <i>liar</i>

**Table 2**  
Conceptual metaphorisation of *Antidepressants* in *The depressing news about antidepressants*

The third article in Group Two *No, Rudy: Trump Isn't Othello. He's Iago* (Daily Beast, July 30, 2018) is a reaction to Rudy Giuliani's attempt to accuse Donald Trump's former lawyer Michael Cohen of betraying his client, “like Iago betrayed Othello and Brutus put the last knife into Caesar”. Further on, the author of the article discusses this and other precedent-related phenomena referencing Shakespeare, comparing Donald Trump to various characters from Shakespeare's plays. First, the author provides his arguments for why Trump should be viewed as Iago, and not as Othello in this situation:

“... Nor does *Iago* ever betray Othello in the sense of “ratting him out,” as Cohen seems to be threatening to do to Trump. What *Iago* does, essentially, is to prank Othello into ruination. By means of an elaborate series of lies and deceptions, Othello is duped into committing a soul-de-destroying act with permanent consequences. So the Othello comparison doesn't really hold up.”

Then the author brings up the comparison between Trump and Iago:

“If anyone in the Trump universe *resembles Iago* it is not the slow-talking, mouth-breathing Cohen, the “fixer” stooge, but Trump himself, the huckster politician. *Like Iago*, Trump is forever brooding over some perceived injury or injustice—on the part of the press, the Democrats, the Mexicans, the liberals, the FBI, the people from “shithole countries” who want to come here. *Like Iago*, he is perpetually at war with a world that perversely fails to appreciate his value and worth. And, *like Iago*, Trump interacts with others almost entirely for the purpose of causing strife, whether among his staff or the electorate.”

Having found common features between the precedent-related name *Iago* and the object of the article Donald Trump (here we can see the first conceptual metaphor invoked: *TRUMP IS IAGO*), the author continues to involve other Shakespearean characters whom he thinks Trump could be compared with:

“And just as Iago—and *Richard III*, for that matter—enact scenes in which they invent scenarios and speak in voices quite unlike their own, Trump stages pageants: on a grand scale at his campaign rallies, and in a sort of mega-miniature on Twitter...”

In this comparison (*TRUMP IS [SHAKESPEARE'S] RICHARD III*), Trump is implicitly given characteristics of a vicious tyrant, who is blinded in his desire to get power.

There are two more Shakespearean allusions, though Trump is not necessarily compared directly to these figures. However, they are also used in his context thus lending him further characteristics:

“... a number of characters in Shakespeare who have baroque tricks played on them and the friends and associates who punk them with playacting. (Think of *Falstaff* and *Malvolio*, who would be pranked into self-knowledge if they were better people.)”

Though these two references might not be considered precedent-related phenomena on a national level, they nevertheless are complementing the overall image for Donald Trump that the author of the article is attempting to create. Falstaff is a vain, boastful and cowardly knight in four of Shakespeare's plays, while Malvolio is a vain, pompous steward, and the main antagonist in *Twelfth Night, or What You Will*.

This article creates a rather complex image of Donald Trump with the source domain influenced by villains from William Shakespeare's plays. At least three of the four figures (with the exception of Falstaff) are clearly the main antagonists in popular views on Shakespeare's works. As precedent-related phenomena, these source domains have their attributes that are commonly associated with them and these attributes contribute to the ultimate image of the object in the article.

The key character Trump is compared to is *Iago*, as is explicitly stated in the title of the article, (moreover, *Iago* is mentioned 15 times in the text), and we can say that this precedent-related phenomenon forms the nucleus of the conceptual metaphor (*TRUMP IS IAGO / RICHARD III / FALSTAFF / MALVOLIO*), yet the other three (each mentioned once) add new qualities to this comparison. The conceptual metaphor implied here could be formulated as *TRUMP IS VILLAIN*, with additional attributes: treacherous, vain, obsessed with power, trickster, and foolish. The author has managed to create a complex image for Donald Trump, which is based on antagonists from Shakespeare's plays, and this image obviously extends far beyond the *TRUMP IS VILLAIN* formula that has been determined, enriching it with more implicit characteristics.

Table 3 summarises the key attributes that are invoked in this conceptual metaphor:

**Table 3**

Conceptual metaphorisation of Trump in *No, Rudy: Trump Isn't Othello. He's Iago*

target domain	source domain	precedent-related phenomenon	attributes of precedent related phenomena
TRUMP	VILLAIN	<i>IAGO</i>	<i>villain, liar, traitor, manipulator, treacherous</i>
		<i>[SHAKESPEARE'S] RICHARD III</i>	<i>ugly, vicious, malevolent, traitor</i>
		<i>FALSTAFF</i>	<i>vain, boastful, cowardly</i>
		<i>MALVOLIO</i>	<i>vain, pompous, puritan</i>

It is clear that the formulation of conceptual metaphors chosen for the last three articles could be different and depend on the background knowledge of the recipient. For instance, in the last example, the source domain could also be formulated as *TYRANT* instead of *VILLAIN*. In such cases, the source domain can hardly be expressed in one concept, as the imagery

created in the article is usually far broader and richer than the formulation offered here. That is why it can be claimed that the precedent-related phenomena that constitute the source domain have some attributes that would go beyond what is directly included in the formulation of the source domain concept, and these attributes also influence the target domain, as in the source domain I have only attempted to find a concept that would be roughly shared by all the components.

This article is an investigation into how conceptual metaphor is formed through precedent-related phenomena in media texts based on examples drawn from six different magazine articles. Precedent-related phenomena unlike most other types of intertextual references are capable of forming more powerful images due to their ability to invoke additional characteristics which are attributed to them culturally. By placing a precedent-related phenomenon as the source domain, authors imply the source of this phenomenon (a text, a situation), as well as numerous subsequent reinterpretations of these phenomena in popular culture. It is very common for such references to occur in the dominant textual positions (heading or sub-heading, first sentence, wrap-up paragraph or concluding sentences), as this will guarantee that such a reference will have more impact on the reader. By placing it in the heading or first paragraph, the author sets up a tone that will be dominant for the recipient during the reading of the text. Placement in the last sentence or paragraph could encourage the reader to reinterpret the text of the article, or its message. Precedent-related phenomena enable authors to create rather complex imagery, which is, moreover, not conventional or standard. If we try to replace the source component with a more general (non-precedent-related) term, the cognitive effect on the recipient would be different and less powerful (for instance, compare: *CLINTON IS PROPHET* vs *CLINTON IS MOSES*). In addition to analysing cases when one precedent-related phenomenon becomes the basis for the source domain (Group One of articles), the study also explored three examples of articles where the object of the article was given characteristics of several precedent-related phenomena (Group Two) and there was an attempt to outline the ultimate conceptual metaphor that could be perceived by the recipient. The formulae suggested for these metaphors (*FACEBOOK IS ENEMY*, *ANTIDEPRESSANTS ARE ILLUSION*, *TRUMP IS VILLAIN*) should not be viewed as definitive and exhaustive, as the attributes of the componential source domains will also be mapped on their respective target domains. They were constructed on the basis of the most dominant and common features of the components in the source domain, but they also contain those additional characteristics that are borne by means of precedent-related phenomena. These more complex conceptual metaphors with the source domain expressed by several precedent-related phenomena are used not only for the purposes of expressiveness, but, as has been stated above, metaphor's "characteristic is that it is motivated by the underlying purpose of persuading", and this purpose is "primarily covert and reflects the speaker's intentions within a certain context of use" (Charteris-Black, 2005, p. 15), such complex devices will be more likely to have a more profound effect on how the recipients will be influenced by the phenomena with a canonical status in their community.

The power of metaphor in the media, as well as media's ability to influence the recipient in their interpretation of the world, has been already proven by numerous studies (Coleman & Ross, 2010; Charteris-Black, 2005; Fairclough, 1995). The purpose of this investigation was to show that intertextuality (in the form of precedent-related phenomena) can also be used efficiently to construct such metaphors. These devices help the authors to make their texts more expressive or dramatic, but the main function is also to make their arguments more persuasive. As has been mentioned above, some theorists (Gudkov, 1999) discuss the "mythical" status of precedent-related phenomena in their cultures, and this quality makes

---

## Conclusion

them a desirable device to be placed as source domains of conceptual metaphors that authors construct in their articles. Such devices allow them to implicitly involve a lot more arguments than are explicitly written in the text, which again proves the opinion that in contemporary communication text is “the tip of the iceberg” (van Dijk, 1998), and media text is a “tissue” of citations (Talbot, 2007) that provides additional vertical context for the recipient to decode.

## References

- 1 Allen, G., 2000. Intertextuality. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203131039>
- 2 Bakhtin M., 1979. Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo [Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics]. Moscow: Sov. Russia. (in Russian).
- 3 Bakhtin, M., 1986. Estetika slovestnogo tvorchestva [Aesthetics in Written Works]. Moscow: Isskustvo. (In Russian).
- 4 Bystrov, Y., 2014. Fractal Metaphor LIFE IS A STORY in Biographical Narrative. *Topics in Linguistics*, pp. 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.2478/topling-2014-0007>
- 5 Cameron, L., 2008. Metaphor and Talk. In: *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, pp. 197–211. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511816802.013>
- 6 Charteris-Black, J., 2004. *Corpus Based Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230000612>
- 7 Charteris-Black, J., 2005. *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230501706>
- 8 Coleman, S., & Ross, K., 2010. *The Media and the Public: “Them” and “Us” in Media Discourse*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444318173>
- 9 Coulson, S., 2001. *Semantic Leaps: Frame-shifting and Conceptual Blending in Meaning Construction*. New York: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511551352>
- 10 Croft, W., & Cruse, D. A., 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803864>
- 11 Eco, U., 2006. Intertextual Irony and Levels of Reading. In: *On Literature*, pp. 212–235. London: Vintage books.
- 12 Fairclough, N., 1995. *Media Discourse*. London: Oxford University Press.
- 13 Fauconnier, J., & Turner, M., 2008. Rethinking Metaphor. In: *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, (ed.) Gibbs, R., pp. 53–66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511816802.005>
- 14 Grady, J., 2007. Metaphor. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, (eds.) Geeraerts, D., & Cuyckens, H., pp.188–213. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 15 Gudkov, D., 1999. *Pretsedentnie fenomeny v yazykovom soznaniyi i mezhkulturnoy komunikatsiyi* [Precedent-related phenomena in lingual cognition and intercultural communication] (Doctoral dissertation). Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russia. (in Russian).
- 16 Hart, C., 2017. Metaphor and Intertextuality in Media Framings of the (1984–1985) British Miners' Strike: A Multimodal Analysis. *Discourse & Communication*, no. 11 (1), pp. 3–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481316683291>
- 17 Karaulov, Y., 1987. *Russkiy yazyk i yazykovaya lichnost* [The Russian language and linguistic persona]. Moscow: Nauka. (in Russian).
- 18 Krasnykh, V., 2002. *Etnopsicholingvistika i kulturologia* [Ethnopsycholinguistics and cultural studies]. Moscow: Gnosis. (in Russian).
- 19 Kristeva, J., 1980. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- 20 Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M., 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 21 Marlow, J., 1997. Metaphor, Intertextuality, and the Post-War Consensus. *Politics*, no. 17 (2), pp. 127–135. doi: 10.1111/1467-9256.00043.
- 22 Oliveira, S., 2004. The Unthinkable Unprecedented: Intertextuality in Newspapers Genres. *Linguagem em (Dis)curso*, no. 5 (1), pp. 9–28.
- 23 Orr, M., 2003. *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- 24 Qualter, T. H., 1985. *Opinion Control in the Democracies*. London: Macmillan.
- 25 Selivanova, O., 2006. *Suchasna lingvistyka: terminologichna entsyklopediya* [Modern linguistics

- tics: terminological encyclopaedia]. Poltava: Dovkillia-K. (in Ukrainian).
- 26 Sell, J., 2008. Intertextuality as Mimesis and Metaphor: The Deviant Phraseology of Caryl Phillips' *Othello*. *Odisea*, no. 9, pp. 201–212. doi: 10.25115/odisea.v0i9.207.
- 27 Shonoda, M. A., 2012. Metaphor and Intertextuality: A Cognitive Approach to Intertextual Meaning-Making in Metafictional Fantasy Novels. *International Research in Children's Literature*, no. 5 (1), pp. 81–96. doi: 10.3366/ircl.2012.0045
- 28 Slyshkin, G., 2000. Ot teksta k simvolu: lingvokulturnye kontsepty pretsedentnykh tekstov v soznaniyi i diskurse [From text to symbol: lingual-cultural concepts of precedent-related texts in cognition and discourse]. Moscow: Academia. (in Russian).
- 29 Talbot, M., 2007. Media Discourse: Representation and Interaction. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- 30 van Dijk, T. A., 1998. Ideology: a Multidisciplinary Approach. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- 31 Velykoroda, Y., 2012. Pretsedentni fenomeny v amerykanskomu mediynomu dyskursi (na materialy chasopysiv "Time" ta "Newsweek") [Precedent-related phenomena in American media discourse (on the basis of "Time" and "Newsweek" magazines)]. (Dissertation). Ivan Franko National University of Lviv. (in Ukrainian).
- 32 Velykoroda, Y., 2014. Spivvidnoshennia mizh universalnym ta natsionalnym rivniamy pretsedentnykh fenomeniv [Correlation between the universal and national levels of precedent-related phenomena]. In: Nova filologia. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats [New Philology. Collection of scientific papers], 62 (in Ukrainian), pp. 27–31.
- 33 Velykoroda, Y., 2016. Ludic Function of Precedent-Related Phenomena in Media Discourse. *Journal of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University*, no. 3 (4), pp. 70–75. doi: 10.15330/jpnu.3.4.70-75.

### Yuriy Velykoroda. Konceptualioji precedentu susijusių reiškinių metaforizacija žiniasklaidos diskurse

Šiame straipsnyje tiriama su precedentu susijusių reiškinių konceptualiosios metaforizacijos vaidmuo žiniasklaidos diskurse, pasireiškiantis kaip intertekstualumo tipas. Šis tyrimas nagrinėja su precedentu susijusius reiškinius ir jų vietą bendroje intertekstualumo teorijoje, taip pat jų ypatybes ir tai, kuo jie skiriasi nuo kitų intertekstualumo tipų. Šiame tyrime taip pat peržvelgiamos dabartinės teorijos, kuriomis siekiama paaiškinti, kaip funkcionuoja su precedentu susiję reiškiniai. Pasitelkiant žurnalų straipsnius šis tyrimas analizuoja dviejų rūšių pavyzdžius: a) vienkartinės nuorodos ir b) pasikartojančios nuorodos, vedančios į vieną duomenų šaltinį per įvairius su precedentu susijusius reiškinius. Šiame straipsnyje diskutuojama, kokią galimą kognityvinį poveikį tokių žurnalistikos tekstų skaitytojams gali sukelti konceptualiosios metaforos, ypač kai precedentą turintys reiškiniai tekste yra pateikiami dominuojančioje pozicijoje (pavyzdžiui, antraštės, paantraštės arba apibendrinantys sakiniai).

### Yuriy Velykoroda

Assoc. prof. Dr. at the Department of English Philology, Precarpathian National Vasyl Stefanyk University

#### Research interests

Media linguistics, intertextuality, cognitive linguistics, translation studies

#### Address

vul. Shevchenka 57, Ivano-Frankivsk 76018, Ukraine

#### E-mail

gvelykoroda@yahoo.com

## Santrauka

## About the Author