

Armenian Folia Anglistika – the official peer-reviewed academic journal of the Armenian Association for the Study of English (since 2005) and Yerevan State University (since 2015) aims at fostering research of the English Language, Literature and Culture in Armenia and elsewhere and facilitate intellectual cooperation between high school teachers and scholars.

In 2007 the Editorial Board of *Armenian Folia Anglistika* announced the opening of a new section in the Journal – Armenological Studies, which invites valuable and innovative contributions from such fields as Armenian Linguistics, Literary Criticism, Ethnic Studies, Cultural History, Gender Studies and a wide range of adjacent disciplines.

Armenian Folia Anglistika is intended to be published twice a year. Articles of interest to university-level teachers and scholars in English Studies are warmly welcomed by the multi-national Editorial Board of the Journal. Articles should be directed to the Editor-in-Chief.

Հիմնադիր և գլխավոր խմբագիր՝
ՄԵՂԱ ԳԱՍՊԱՆՐՅԱՆ
Համարի թողարկման
պատասխանատու՝
ԼԻԼԻ ԿԱՐԱՊԵՏՅԱՆ
Լրատվական գործունեություն
իրականացնող
«ԱՆԳԼԵՐԵՆԻ
ՈՒՍՈՒՄՆԱՍԻՐՈՒԹՅԱՆ
ՀԱՅԿԱԿԱՆ ԱՍՈՑԻԱՑԻԱ» ՀԿ
<http://www.aase.y-su.am>
Վկայական՝ 03Ա 065183
Տրված՝ 28.06.2004 թ.

Yerevan State University
Press

Editor-in-Chief

Seda Gasparyan – Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Corresponding Member of RA NAS, Honoured Scientist of RA, Head of Yerevan State University English Philology Department, President of Armenian Association for the Study of English.

Phone: +374 99 25 50 60;

E-mail: sedagasparyan@yandex.ru; sedagasparyan@ysu.am

Editors

Shushanik Paronyan, Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Head of the Department of English for Cross-Cultural Communication, Yerevan State University (Armenia).

Gaiane Muradian, Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Associate Professor of English Philology Department, Yerevan State University (Armenia).

Astghik Chubaryan, PhD in Philology, Professor of English Philology Department, Yerevan State University (Armenia).

Editorial Advisory Board

1. Svetlana Ter-Minasova – Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor Emeritus at Lomonosov Moscow State University, President of the Faculty of Foreign Languages and Area Studies, Doctor Honoris Causa at the Universities of Birmingham, UK (2002), The State University of New York, USA (2007), the Russian-Armenian Slavonic University, Armenia, Visiting professor at the National Research Tomsk State University, Russia (2013), Yunshan Professor at Guangdong University of Foreign Languages and International Relations, China (2016), holder of Lomonosov Award (1995), Fulbright's 50th Anniversary Award (1995), Boris Polevoi Prize (2015), Member of the Council of Experts of the International Academic Forum, Japan (2013).

2. Angela Locatelli – Professor of English Literature, Bergamo University, Italy, Adjunct Professor in the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Faculty Member of the International PhD Network established in 2008 by the University of Giessen, Germany, holder of a Fellowship at the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington (1999, 2008), one of the three General Editors of EJES (European Journal of English Studies) (2004-2010).

3. Olga Aleksandrova – Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Head of the Department of English Linguistics at Lomonosov Moscow State University, holder of Lomonosov Award (2001), Award of the International Federation of Modern Language Teachers' Associations at FIPLV (2005).

4. **John Stotesbury** - Adjunct Professor of the Department of English University of Oulu, Finland, Adjunct Professor of Philosophical Faculty, School of Humanities, Finland.
5. **Elżbieta Chrzanowska-Kluczevska** – Professor, Dr. hab. Uniwersytet Jagiellonski, Institute Filologii Angielskiej, Katedra Jezykoznawstwa Angielskiego. Cracow, Poland.
6. **Elżbieta Manczak-Wohlfeld** – Professor, Dr. hab. Uniwersytet Jagiellonski, Institute Filologii Angielskiej, Katedra Jezykoznawstwa Angielskiego. Cracow, Poland.
7. **Alessandra Giorgi** – PhD in Philology, Full Professor, Department of Linguistics and Comparative Cultural Studies, Ca’Foscari University of Venice, Italy.
8. **Buniatova Isabella** – Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of the Department of Germanic and Romance Philology, Boris Grinchenko Kyiv University, Ukraine.
9. **Ірина Шевченко** - Doctor of Philology, Full Professor, V. N. Karazin Kharkov National University, Head of the Department of Business Foreign Language and Translation, Academician of Academy of Sciences of the High School of Ukraine, Editor-in-Chief of The International Journal “Cognition, Communication, Discourse”.
10. **Ewa Salkiewicz-Munnerlyn** – Professor, Doctor of Cracow Academy after Andrej Frycz Modrzewski, Cracow, Poland.
11. **Marta Dabrowska** – Associate Professor, Doctor hab. , Institute of English Studies, Jagiellonian University, Cracow, Poland.
12. **Peter Sutton** – Freelance Editor and Translator, UK.
13. **Sona Haroutyunian** – Doctor of Linguistics, Professor at the Department of Asian and African Studies, Visiting Professor at University of California Los Angeles (2009), Nida School of Translation Studies, New York - Misano Adriatico (2012), California State University Fresno (2013), Yerevan State University (2015), City University of New York (2017).

Managing Editor

Lili Karapetyan – Associate Professor of English Philology Department, Yerevan State University (Armenia)

Assistant Editor

Gohar Madoyan – PhD in Philology, Associate Professor of English Philology Department, Yerevan State University (Armenia)

Երևանի պետական համալսարան

**Անգլերենի ուսումնասիրության հայկական
ասոցիացիա (Անգլերենի ուսումնասիրության
եվրոպական ֆեդերացիայի անդամ)**

**ԱՆԳԼԻԱԳԻՏԱԿԱՆ
ՀԵՏԱԶՈՏՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԻ
ՀԱՅԿԱԿԱՆ ՀԱՆԴԵՍ**

**Միջազգային գրախոսվող ամսագիր
համագործակցությամբ՝**

Երևանի Վալերի Բրյուսովի անվան պետական
լեզվահասարակագիտական համալսարանի
(Հայաստան)

Մոսկվայի Մ. Լոմոնոսովի անվ. պետական համալսարանի
(Ռուսաստան)

Կրակովի Յագիելոնյան համալսարանի
(Լեհաստան)

Մոնտենեգրոյի համալսարանի

ԵՐԵՎԱՆ – 2019



100



Yerevan State University

**Armenian Association for the Study
of English (Member Association of the
European Society for the Study of English)**

**ARMENIAN FOLIA
ANGLISTIKA**

**Reviewed International Journal
in cooperation with:**

Yerevan Brusov State University of Languages
and Social Sciences
(Armenia)

Lomonosov Moscow State University
(Russia)

Jagiellonian University, Cracow
(Poland)

University of Montenegro
(Montenegro)

YEREVAN – 2019

CONTENTS

Linguistics

Seda Gasparyan

A Methodological Mechanism for Applying the Hermeneutical Approach9

Mariam Askarian, Hovhannes Vanesyan

Sports Metaphors in American Political Discourse30

Kristine Harutyunyan, Anna Sargsyan

The Sociolinguistic Perspective of Hedging in English44

Hovhannes Vanesyan

Politeness and Its Perception by Armenian Learners of English:

From Theory to Action53

Methodology

Tatyana V. Sidorenko, Margaret Apresyan

CLIL as a New Innovative Pedagogy: the case of Russia and Armenia63

Veronik Khachatryan, Armenuhi Ghalachyan

Meeting the Goals and Challenges of Adult EFL Learners88

Syuzanna Tadevosyan

Inclusive Education in Armenia103

Culture

Evgeniia Zimina, Mariana Sargsyan

Politics, Poetry, People: an Overview of Contemporary Poetry Trends

in the British Literary Landscape113

Narine Harutyunyan

On Some Forms of “Out-Group” Intolerance and “Unlimited”
Tolerance in Linguoculture 130

Marine Yaghubyan

The Use of Positive and Negative Politeness Strategies to Express
Request in English and Armenian Cultures..... 141

Mara Baghdasaryan

Fate across Cultures: a Linguocognitive Approach..... 151

Literature

Angela Locatelli

Spatial Mobility as Social Mobility in the Early Seventeenth Century:
Henry Peacham Jr.’s Picaresque Novel
A Merry Discourse of Meum and Tuum 166

Vicky Tchapanian

Morality vs Immorality in the Miserable Life of
Daniel Defoe's Moll Flanders..... 182

Armenological Studies

Seda Gasparyan, Luiza Gasparyan

On Translational “Lacunae” in the English Translation of
The History of Armenia by Movses Khorenatsi 191

**To the Centenary
of Yerevan State University**

Sports Metaphors in American Political Discourse

Mariam Askarian, Hovhannes Vanesyan

Yerevan State University

Abstract

In cognitive linguistics, conceptual metaphor refers to the understanding of an idea in terms of another familiar object. As conceptual metaphors are great persuasive means due to their ability to make unfamiliar things familiar, we have analyzed transcripts of recent political speeches with a special reference to presidential campaign speeches (2016-2019). It should be noted that the usage of conceptual metaphors is strictly linked to cultural patterns, i.e. Asian people tend to use conceptual metaphors of eating or family, while Western politicians tend to rely on sport, driving or war metaphors. The thing is that they consciously, subconsciously or even unconsciously view their lives as a race, a game or a battle. Our analysis is based on Western presidential campaign speeches. As an outcome of our analysis we wanted to reveal and elucidate that particular link between culture and cognitive linguistics.

Key words: *cognitive linguistics, conceptual metaphors, culture, Western politicians, presidential campaign.*

Introduction

Since sports metaphors are so popular in American English, we can see that in the American conceptual system, sports, business and politics are always combined. American people have an obsession with sports. People fuse politics and sports, showing people's perception of life as sports, without being aware of it. We can use Lakoff and Johnson's (1980:102) words to demonstrate the reason: "Our conceptual system is not something we are normally aware of. In most of the little things we do every day, we simply think and act more or less automatically along certain lines. Just what these lines are is by no means

obvious. One way to find out is by looking at language. Since communication is based on the same conceptual system as we use in thinking and acting, language is an important source of evidence for what that system is like”.

We may ask how the connection between politics and sports contributes to Americans’ conceptual combination of the two domains. Since the United States is a nation with advanced democracy, everyone is encouraged to participate in governing, so politics is widely tackled by ordinary Americans. Only sports can compete with politics in terms of popularity and the extent and level of participation. Most people agree that American sports, especially professional sports, are the products of industrialization and sports have in turn strengthened the political “industry”. Politics and sports are constantly promoted and benefit from each other. Besides, sports are a good way to promote national pride and patriotism. There’s no wonder that lots of politicians turn to sports for various political purposes. Politics and sports are conceptually combined and the image of politicians and that of sports stars are prone to merge. People hope their sports stars become politicians and politicians are good at sports. Hence, in the government, there are quite a few politicians who were professional players. American children are taught to possess the spirit of competition, self-reliance, and entrepreneurship. This conception gradually forms the foundation of American way of life. People seek free competition and enterprise. That is why, in the public discourse, sports and politics always interact and many politicians often unconsciously treat politics like sports. We can say that American politics, in a sense, resembles a sports game. Due to the high frequency of usage of sports metaphors, American politics and politics in general, can be clearly depicted as a contest between two opponents.

Sports Metaphors in American Politics

The foundations of the cognitive theory of metaphor were laid down by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980) in their influential work *Metaphors We Live By*. In this book, they developed a new theory that has become known as the *cognitive view of metaphor*. Some years later, Lakoff (1993) renamed it

and referred to it as the *contemporary theory of metaphor*. Their key argument of the cognitive theory of metaphor is that metaphor forms an inherent part of our conceptual system – in their words, “our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature” (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:26). Although the cognitive theory of metaphor tends to be described as radically new, the cognitive dimension of metaphor had been recognized by previous scholars. One of which, the interaction theory, viewed metaphor as a mental process, and even before that a number of philosophers, including John Locke, Giambattista Vico, and Immanuel Kant, had discussed the cognitive implications of metaphor (Semino 2008:13). According to this new perspective, the metaphor is defined as a cognitive mechanism whereby one conceptual domain is partially mapped onto a different conceptual domain, the second domain being partially understood in terms of the first one: “the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another.” (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 82). The domain that is mapped is called the *source* and the domain onto which it is mapped is called the *target*. Sometimes, we find people unconsciously using metaphors in their public discourse. But, we feel puzzled by some of these metaphors, because we don’t have the cultural knowledge behind them. Such a fascination and amazement have led researchers to a close examination of people’s use of metaphor. Metaphors are widely used in human communication: ancient or contemporary, formal or informal. It is not just a matter of choice of the expressions nor is it merely a rhetorical device or a linguistic convenience in human communication. Metaphor participates fully in the process of knowledge and brings us to a new world. Culture is the symbol of civilization and the development of human language is closely related to diversities of culture. Different cultures may cause people to use different metaphors. For example, Western people tend to use obviously more sports, business, war and driving metaphors, because they consciously or unconsciously view their life as a sport and war; while the Chinese appear to use far more frequently family, eating and performing metaphors. So we can say language and culture are closely related. On most occasions, Western people are fond of using sports and war metaphors,

which reflect the features of people's experience, thinking and vision. Most probably, speakers of one language sometimes find it difficult to appreciate the metaphors of another language. This is because "communication is based on the same conceptual system that we use in thinking and acting" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:118).

Thus, sports metaphors make part of the American conceptual system, their mode of thinking and can help to shed light on the processes going on in their electoral system, where one side seeks to defeat the other. Moreover, sports metaphors can function to create an image of game in politics like *they first have to run for and win the office in election, to play and score points in political or legislature games and fight the opposition while in office*. In short, these metaphors are deeply rooted in American culture and appeal widely to the American electorate.

Sport metaphors overlap, to some extent, with WAR schemas, for war terminology is commonly resorted to talk about sports in English. Let's consider some examples from US president Donald Trump's speech in order to put this in perspective:

I think beating Obama would have been a much easier one than the one that's coming up, which is sad to say but true.

(<<https://bit.ly/2YMW1JU>>)

When politicians compete, they *beat* each other, as it is seen in the above mentioned example. *Beating* the adversary is common in games and sports matches, where one team beats the other and eventually gains the victory, therefore Trump takes up the verb *beat* to show his brutal and unexpected victory over ex-president Obama, although he never actually competed with him, thus putting Obama down by claiming that it would be easier to beat him than the candidates whom he will face in the future. Yet, in another example, Trump uses the word *run* speaking about a candidate who tried to get a government office, that of the president presumably, but failed. What's more,

Trump or probably his speechmakers, intentionally or unintentionally, repeat the final word *failed*, thus intensifying the intended effect.

It' can't be Mitt because Mitt ran and failed. He failed.

(<<https://nym.ag/2YPxRyz>>)

Presidential elections have always been compared with a race, i.e. presidents run and they either succeed or fail. That is why, president Trump in one of his presidential campaign speeches made the adduced remark about Mitt Romney, who had failed over again and who promised not to run against Trump in 2020 elections.

To further elaborate on the American way of thinking and the conceptual basis of their metaphoric expressions, let's look at a few more examples taken from president Trump's speeches, where he addresses a number of topics ranging from domestic issues to American overseas policies.

(1) Iran is taking over Iraq, and they're taking it over big league.

(<<https://bit.ly/2HIde83>>)

(2) We need a leader that can bring back our jobs, can bring back our manufacturing, canbring back our military, can take care of our vets.

(<<https://wapo.st/2KafSif>>)

In the first example president Trump uses the phrasal verb *take over*, which is often used in sports games, such as soccer, when one player takes over the ball from another player. Besides, it should be noted in the first excerpt, although it is about a serious international conflict, the president employs the overly colloquial or rather slangish term *big league*, which other than having some explicit references to the sports leagues, has also the meaning of *ignoring* or *doing something beyond good* according to online Urban Dictionary, this brings the context closer to the everyday life and a layperson's repertoire of

words, who, we earlier mentioned, is interested in politics as well as sports. Examining the second example we may encounter some difficulties. At first, one may not see a sport metaphor here, but going deeper into the sports studies we have found that the term *bring back* is widely used in basketball and means the action of bringing back the ball which was stolen by the opponent, which is the case in our example. President Trump uses this metaphor to show his ability, keenness, and alacrity to bring back everything which belongs to the proud American nation and which has been stolen from them. Hence, we can say that intranational conflicts are assimilated to (basket) ball games.

Nobody, nobody will be pushing us around.

(<<https://wapo.st/2HHxqk5>>)

This example is also taken from one of Donald Trump's 2016 presidential campaign speeches. Once more these examples state that sports metaphors are widely used in politics and are great means of conveying thought. Namely, the word *loser* or *losing* is used to define those teams that have lost the game, *pushing around* can refer to those players who are incompetently hurled around by other players in contact games, and *game changer* is applicable to those players who change the course of the game in favor of their team after entering the game. Thus again, politics is a GAME.

You know, when President Obama was elected, I said, "Well, the one thing, I think he'll do well. I think he'll be a great cheerleader for the country." (...) I really thought that he would be a great cheerleader. He's not a leader. (...) But he wasn't a cheerleader. He's actually a negative force.'

(<<https://bit.ly/30M8K1i>>)

Not only does this excerpt from one of Trump's speeches make it obvious that Trump's biggest rival, his biggest problem is Obama, but it also proves Trump's incontinence towards the previous President. Trump diminishes

Obama's political competence by downgrading him from a *leader* to a *cheerleader*, which is a term typically used in relation to a female college student who leads a team of similar female students, who perform gymnastic dances and songs, before and after athletic games, in order to cheer and support their team of athletes. In the next example, Trump repeatedly uses the phrasal verb *kick in* yet another term that would usually appear in sports contexts.

You look at Obamacare. A total catastrophe and by the way it really kicks in in '16 and it is going to be a disaster. But Obamacare kicks in in 2016. Really big league.

(<https://bit.ly/2IkPm5m>)

He uses *kick in* to qualify the process of a legislation taking effect. This sounds rather brusque and conveys some negative connotations about this legislation and shows the speaker's disapproval of it.

Below, let's discuss some other examples taken from 2019 presidential campaign speeches:

In our National Security Strategy that the President Trump released last December, he described a new era of "great power competition."

(<https://bit.ly/2OCjmwv>)

Politics has always been described as a game, and as usual a game is a kind of a competition. The above mentioned example by Vice President Pence clearly views the world of politics under the light of competition. *Great powers* here is associated with strong countries which in President Trump's words compete with each other.

(1) Brothers and sisters: We're going to win this election not because we have a super PAC funded by billionaires.

(2) Let's be honest: while we have won some victories, our struggles have not always been successful.

(<https://bit.ly/2wz97P7>)

Bernie Sanders in his campaign speech again compares politics with a game, a game that needs to be won. In this example presidential election is considered to be a game that needs to be won.

(..) It was a bruising race. But we kept coming back to that basic point that I made in every speech.

(<https://politi.co/2wnAM5r>)

Rick Santorum speaks about the past elections he participated in. All the elections that America experienced were hard but he describes the last election he participated in as a *race*, a very hard to win *race*. Here again, we have an example of sports metaphor, showing competition and strong desire to win.

Concluding the instances of the usage of metaphorical sports terms in the speeches of a male representative of American political platform, let's move on and consider some examples taken from his counterpart female representative's speeches delivered around the same period of time for the same purpose.

For some reason or another it was quite difficult for us to find sports metaphors in Hillary Clinton's speeches. However we succeeded to find some. In her 2016 concession speech Clinton notes that politics is a game and there is a loser and a winner. She represents herself as a loser in a particular game, i.e. when she lost elections, but she claims herself to be a winner by nature for those who believed in her abilities and strength. And again, this way of thinking and formulating her ideas comes to prove that political activities are regarded as games and thus embedded in the consciousness of not only male but also female politicians. Further excerpts taken from Clinton's political speeches come to prove our hypothesis.

"We're going to start calling some good plays. We're going to go on offense as well as playing defense."

(<https://politi.co/2wnHRmp>)

The example is taken from Hillary Clinton's speech of 2008 Presidential Campaign. Here again, we clearly can differentiate sport metaphors such as *good play, go on offence, play defense*. In her presidential campaign launch speech she elucidated the real state of America, meaning that in the past America had some achievements, but now not. Lack of actions makes America stand in the same position for a long time, without moving forward.

(1) (...) *Our history has moved in that direction, thanks to generations of Americans who refuse to give up or back down.*

(<https://bit.ly/1XEH75G>)

(2) *I hear you. I see you. And as your president, I will always have your back.*

(<https://bit.ly/2JKHA5y>)

Here also, it is quite easy to spot metaphors that are used in sports, mainly in basketball game such as *move in a certain direction, give up, back down*". As stated earlier many politicians compare presidential elections to a basketball game. As we see here, Clinton also considers her presidential elections a basketball game. The similarity of Clinton's conceptual thinking to that of her male counterparts, to that of Donald Trump in particular, could be explained by the fact that society tends to entrust important matters of governance to male representatives of the same society, who are thought to be guided more with logic and less with sentiments, tactics typical of sports as well as war. Therefore, Clinton's image makers might have tried to assimilate her political figure to that of a strong male politician, in order to gain more electorate confidence and bring about her political triumph. This, by no means, comes to refute the idea that women too can possess a competitive mind and see politics as sports or war, however, this hypothesis aims to put forward the idea that such a way of thinking is more typical of men politicians as displayed in the speeches of Donald Trump.

Having analyzed 2019 presidential campaign speeches by different female candidates too, we found a lot more examples of sports metaphors widely used by women in politics. This example is taken from the Rachel Maddow Show, to be more precise, from the interview with Senator Kirsten Gillibrand. The interviewer Rachel Maddow begins her interview with sports metaphor *running in this field*, of course we should not take the literal meaning of this expression, however, both *running* and *field* are baseball related terms, which would most usually be used in situations where this game is involved.

Why is she running? Why is she running in this field?

How does she distinguish herself in this field?

(<https://on.msnbc.com/2K6RX3f>)

Although the above-mentioned example is not from a politician's speech, it reflects the reality of how politics is conceived in the minds of those people who have to do with it; both as politicians as well as journalists who cover the formers' activities.

No wonder, politicians tend to use various conceptual metaphors in their presidential campaign speeches, it helps them make their speeches more persuasive, more intimate and closer to the hearts of the general masses.

*By leveling the playing field, our democracy will thrive
and we will protect against the dysfunction that's
poisoning Washington now.*

(<https://bit.ly/30G06u>)

In the above-presented excerpt, Sen. Kristin Gillibrand singles out her to-do tasks using a very interesting sports related phrase – *level the playing ground* – which is a synonymous expression to the commonly used idiom *level the playing field* meaning *to make a situation fair for everyone* according to Merriam Webster online dictionary. This expression helps her get her message across in a vivid yet understandable manner to her supporters.

The verbs *to lose* or *to win* highly refer to sports metaphors and are also widely used in political discourse. With the help of these verbs politics is represented as a game, and politicians are players who have just two alternatives: to lose or to win. This tactic is especially used in electoral speeches.

To be sure we've won and we've lost, but we've never stopped playing.

(<https://bit.ly/2MLbqpx>)

Interestingly enough Elizabeth Warren starts her speech with a story. Not a typical beginning for a campaign speech, indeed. Anyway, she embroiders a sports metaphor to the main part of her speech so skillfully, that it makes the reader imagine the vitality of electing her as a future President of the USA.

(..) A product of a rigged system that props up the rich and the powerful and kicks dirt on everyone else.

(<https://bit.ly/2wr3yC0>)

In her speech she used the word *rigged* which we would often come across in such expressions as *rigged games* or *competitions*. Although, we are to perceive this as natural and typical, we have to look deeper into the consciousness of the perception of certain concepts and ways of thinking, peculiar to Americans to better justify the usage of such expressions related not only to sports but to other spheres of American life.

Conclusion

As a result of our analysis we came to the conclusion that politics is perceived as a game and politicians are seen as players. Moreover, political parties are seen as sports teams and political tactics are understood as sports tactics. All of this is embedded in political speeches of more or less esteemed politicians. Thus, politics, put metaphorically, is a game to win. Politicians *fight* and *compete* with their opponents in order to win an election. In other words, people frequently talk about politics in terms of sports: baseball, basketball,

football, etc. It is so common that the word *race* is more often used than the term *election campaign* and the phrase *running mate* sounds far more familiar than that of someone's *campaign partner*.

References:

1. Beard, A. (2000) *The Language of Politics*, London: Routledge.
2. Glucksberg, S. (2001) *Understanding Figurative Language: From Metaphors to Idioms*, Oxford and New York: OUP.
3. Hiraga, M. K. (2005) *Metaphor and Iconity: A Cognitive Approach to Analyzing Texts*, New York, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
4. Lakoff, G. (1993) *The Contemporary Theory Of Metaphor*, In Andrew Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*. London: Cambridge University Press
5. Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
6. Semino, E. (2008) *Metaphor in Discourse*, Cambridge and New York: CUP.

Sources of Data:

1. *Interview with Senator Kristen Gillibrand*. Available at: <<http://www.msnbc.com/transcripts/rachel-maddow-show/2019-01-16?fbclid=IwAR15Nm9Uff9T504UYldufceoFCIIvbKCzKYzVnLkRSnzszyEXGSwFmarRkbw>> [Accessed May 2019].
2. *Remarks by Vice President Pence at the 2019 Munich Security Conference*. Available at: <<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-vice-president-pence-2019-munich-security-conference-munich-germany/>> [Accessed May 2019].
3. *Senator Bernie Sander's Presidential Campaign Speech*. Available at: <<https://vtdigger.org/2019/03/02/full-text-sen-bernie-sanders-2020-presidential-campaign-kickoff-speech/>> [Accessed March 2019].
4. *Rick Santorum Values Voter Summit speech*. Available at: <<https://www.politico.com/story/2012/09/rick-santorum-values-voter-summit-speech-transcript-full-text-081256>> [Accessed March 2019].

5. *Kamala Harris kicks off presidential campaign in Oakland*. Available at: <<http://www.ktvu.com/news/transcript-kamala-harris-kicks-off-presidential-campaign-in-oakland>> [Accessed March 2019].
6. *Elizabeth Warren's 2020 announcement speech*. Available at: <<https://www.masslive.com/politics/2019/02/read-elizabeth-warrens-2020-announcement-speech.html>> [Accessed March 2019].
7. *President Trump's Campaign Launch Speech*. Available at: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2017/06/16/theyre-rapists-presidents-trump-campaign-launch-speech-two-years-later-annotated/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.8e5da9ac2ce8> [Accessed March 2019].
8. *Hillary Clinton to Women and Girls: "Nothing Has Made Me Prouder Than to Be Your Champion"*. Available at: <<https://www.vogue.com/article/hillary-clinton-concession-speech>> [Accessed March 2019].
9. *Hillary Clinton Campaign Rally Speech*. Available at: <<https://www.politico.com/story/2015/06/hillary-clinton-campaign-rally-speech-transcript-118973>> [Accessed March 2019].
10. *Donald Trump Iowa Freedom Summit Speech*. Available at: <<http://www.p2016.org/photos15/summit/trump012415spt.html>> [Accessed March 2019].
11. *Clinton's Historic Victory Speech as Presumptive Democratic Nominee*. Available at: <<http://time.com/4361099/hillary-clinton-nominee-speech-transcript/>> [Accessed March 2019].
12. *Hillary Clinton's June 7 Victory Speech*. Available at: <<https://bluenationreview.com/full-transcript-of-hillary-clintons-june-7-victory-speech/>> [Accessed March 2019].
13. *Urban Dictionary*. Available at: <www.urbandictionary.com> [Accessed March 2019].
14. *Merriam Webster's Advanced Learners' Dictionary*. Available at: <<https://www.merriam-webster.com>> [Accessed March 2019].

Սպորտային փոխաբերությունները ամերիկյան քաղաքական դիսկուրսում

Ճանաչողության տեսության համաձայն՝ փոխաբերությունը մեր առօրյայի անբաժան մասն է՝ դրսևորվելով ոչ միայն լեզվում, այլև մեր մտածողության մեջ: Մարդու գիտակցության մեջ հասկացույթների խմբերի միջև գոյություն ունեն խորքային կառուցվածքային հարաբերություններ, որոնք թույլ են տալիս այս կամ այն հասկացույթն ընկալել մեկ ուրիշ, արդեն ծանոթ կամ հայտնի հասկացույթի միջոցով: Սույն հոդվածում փաստական նյութ հանդիսացող ԱՄՆ նախագահական քարոզարշավի ելույթների քննությունը բացահայտում է մշակույթ-մտածողություն-լեզու եռամիասնության կարևորությունը, հատկապես, երբ խոսքը հասկացական փոխաբերության՝ որպես քաղաքական դիսկուրսում կիրառվող պերսուազիվ միջոցի մասին է: Նյութի վերլուծությունը ցույց է տալիս, որ արևմտյան քաղաքական դիսկուրսում, ի տարբերություն արևելյանի, հասկացական փոխաբերությունները հիմնականում առնչվում են սպորտի, պատերազմի, մեքենա վարելու հետ, քանի որ արևմտյան մշակույթում կյանքը դիտարկվում և ընկալվում է որպես խաղ, որպես ճակատամարտ, որպես մրցավազ:

Received by the Editorial Board 01.02.2019

Recommended for publication by the reviewers 02.04.2019

Accepted for print 22.04.2019

Our Authors

Angela Locatelli – Professor (Full and Tenured) of English Literature, and Director of the PhD Program in “Euro-American Literatures”, University of Bergamo, Italy.

E-mail: angela.locatelli@unibg.it

Anna Sargsyan – MA in Linguistics, English Philology Department, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: kristineharutyunyan@ysu.am

Armenuhi Ghalachyan – PhD in Philology, Senior Professor, Chair of Theory of Language and Cross-Cultural Communication, Russian-Armenian University.

E-mail: armiine@mail.ru

Evgeniia Zimina – PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, Department of Romance and Germanic Languages, Kostroma State University.

E-mail: ezimina@rambler.ru

Hovhannes Vanesyan – PhD student at English Philology Department, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: hovhanesyan@yandex.ru

Kristine Harutyunyan – PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, English Philology Department, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: kristineharutyunyan@ysu.am

Luiza Gasparyan - PhD in Philology, Institute of Literature, NAS RA.

E-mail: luizagasparyan@rambler.ru

Mara Baghdasaryan – PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at the Chair of English Language 2, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: marabaghdasaryan@ysu.am

Margaret Apresyan – PhD in Linguistics, Professor, Head of the Chair for ESP, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: english@ysu.am

Mariam Askarian – MA in Linguistics, English Philology Department, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: mariamaskaryan@gmail.com

Mariana Sargsyan – PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, English Philology Department, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: marianasargsyan@ysu.am

Marine Yaghubyan – PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of English for Cross-Cultural Communication, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: marina.yaghubyan@ysu.am

Narine Harutyunyan – Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor at the Department of English for Cross-Cultural Communication, Yerevan State University.

Email: narineharutyunyan@ysu.am

Seda Gasparyan – Corresponding Member of RA National Academy of Sciences, Honoured Scientist of RA. Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Head of English Philology Department, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: sedagasparyan@yandex.ru, sedagasparyan@ysu.am

Syuzanna Tadevosyan – PhD in Philology, Senior Professor, Chair of Theory of Language and Cross-Cultural Communication, Russian-Armenian University.

E-mail: syuzantadevosyan@mail.ru

Tatyana Sidorenko – PhD in Pedagogy, Assistant Professor, School of Core Engineering Education, Tomsk Polytechnic University.

E-mail: SidorenkoT@tpu.ru

Veronik Khachaturyan – PhD in Philology, Assistant Professor at the Chair of English Language 2, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: veronikkhachaturyan@ysu.am

Vicky Tchapanian – PhD in Philology, Lecturer at the Department of Business and Economics, Lebanese University.

E-mail: vicky.tchapanian@hotmail.com

Author Guidelines

Manuscript Submission

Manuscripts should be submitted by one of the authors of the manuscript through the online manuscript management system. Only electronic Word (.doc, .docx) files can be submitted. Only online submissions are advised strongly to facilitate rapid publication and to minimize administrative costs. Submissions by anyone other than one of the authors will not be accepted. The submitting author takes responsibility for the paper during submission and peer review. If for some technical reason submission through the online Manuscript Management System is not possible, the author can send manuscript as email attachment. Email submission: afajournal@ysu.am

Editorial Policy

Armenian Folia Anglistika is concerned with such fields as Linguistics, Literary Criticism, Translation Studies, Methodology, Ethnic Studies, Cultural History, Gender Studies, Armenian Studies and a wide range of adjacent disciplines. The articles address a wide range of interesting questions and are of consistently high quality. The reviewing is timely, knowledgeable and objective. The book reviews are very balanced and informative. The language of submission and publication is English.

Editorial Process

This journal follows strict double blind fold review policy to ensure neutral evaluation. All manuscripts are subject to peer review and are expected to meet standards of academic excellence. High quality manuscripts are peer-reviewed by minimum two peers of the same field. The reviewers submit their reports on the manuscripts along with their recommendation of one of the following actions to the Editor-in-Chief:

Recommendation regarding the paper:

1. I recommend the paper for publication
2. I recommend the paper for publication after major/minor corrections
3. I do not recommend the paper for publication

The Editor-in-Chief makes a **decision** accordingly:

1. to publish the paper
2. to consider the paper for publication after major/minor corrections

In these cases the authors are notified to prepare and submit a final copy of their manuscript with the required major/minor changes in a timely manner. The Editor-in-

Chief reviews the revised manuscript after the changes have been made by the authors. Once the Editor-in-Chief is satisfied with the final manuscript, the manuscript can be accepted. The Editor-in-Chief can also reject the manuscript if the paper still doesn't meet the requirements.

3. to reject the paper

The editorial workflow gives the Editor-in-Chief the authority to reject any manuscript because of inappropriateness of its subject, lack of quality, incorrectness, or irrelevance. The Editor-in-Chief cannot assign himself/herself as an external reviewer of the manuscript. This is to ensure a high-quality, fair, and unbiased peer-review process of every manuscript submitted to the journal, since any manuscript must be recommended by one or more (usually two) external reviewers along with the Editor in charge of the manuscript in order to accept it for publication in the journal.

Ethical Issues:

Authors cannot submit the manuscript for publication to other journals simultaneously. The authors should submit original, new and unpublished research work to the journal. The ethical issues such as plagiarism, fraudulent and duplicate publication, violation of copyrights, authorship and conflict of interests are serious issues concerning ethical integrity when submitting a manuscript to a journal for publication.

Withdrawal of Manuscripts:

The author can request withdrawal of manuscript after submission within the time span when the manuscript is still in the peer-reviewing process. After the manuscript is accepted for publication, the withdrawal is not permitted.