

I. when expressed in a public political

[Art & Culture](#), [Dance](#)



I. LITERATURE REVIEW According to Fairclough (1989), “ discourse has effects upon social structures, as well as being determined by them and so contributes to social continuity and social change” (p. 14). This means that a speech or a piece of writing may have a great influence on society, as well as it can reflect the situation that the society is in at the time of the speech being given or express the ideology of the speaker. In the present paper, we are going to focus on one particular part of the discourse – metaphors. The aim is to analyse metaphors that are expressed in public speeches by influential figures, more specifically, in presidents’ George Washington and Donald Trump first inaugural speeches. When expressed in a public political speech, a metaphor is a matter of critical discourse analysis; therefore, the theoretical part of the present paper is going to be dedicated to the further explanation of this field, as well as to literature review of metaphors. 1.

1. CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS Critical discourse analysis (or CDA) is an approach to the study of discourse that regards language as a form of social practice. Critical discourse analysis is used to analyse political speech acts, to highlight the rhetoric behind these speeches, and any forms of speech that may be used to manipulate the impression given to the audience. CDA should not be regarded as a separate direction, specialization or school, as it only seeks to offer a new perspective of theorizing and analysis throughout the whole field of discourse studies. In order to realize the aims of critical discourse analysis effectively, critical research on discourse needs to comply with a number of requirements. As suggested by Van Dijk (1980), the requirements are the following: 1) In order to be recognized, CDA research

has to be better than other research. 2) CDA focuses on political problems and social issues.

3) To be more specific, CDA focuses on the ways discourse structures enact, confirm, legitimate, reproduce or challenge relations of power and dominance in society. 4) Empirically adequate critical analysis usually involves different subjects of study; 5) CDA does not end with describing structures of discourse; it tries to explain these structures in terms of properties of social interaction and especially social structure (Van Dijk, 1980). As summarized by Fairclough and Wodak (1997), the maintainers of critical discourse analysis state that: 1) Critical discourse analysis gives attention to social problems; 2) Power relations are discursive; 3) Discourse forms culture and society; 4) Discourse performs ideological work; 5) Discourse is related to studies of history; 6) The relation between discourse and society is mediated; 7) Discourse analysis provides explanations and interpretations; 8) Discourse is a type of social action (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). 1. 2. SOCIAL POWER A central notion in most critical work on discourse is the social power of groups or institutions.

Van Dijk (1980) explains that groups have more or less power if they are able to control the acts and minds of members of other groups. According to the various resources employed to exercise such power, different types of power may be distinguished. E. g., the coercive power of the military and violent men will rather be based on force; money will give the power to the rich, whereas knowledge, information, or authority is the more or less persuasive power of parents, professors, or journalists.

While most people have active control only over everyday talk with family members, friends, or colleagues, members of social groups and institutions that are more powerful have exclusive control over one or more types of public discourse. E. g., professors have control over scholarly discourse, and lawyers are able to control legal discourse, journalists control media discourse, while policy and other political discourse is in control of politicians. By that definition, the ones who have more control over more discourse also have more power. 1. 3.

POLITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS As the present paper deals with inaugural speeches of two presidents of the United States of America, i. e. political discourse, political discourse analysis (PDA) is to be defined further. Critical discourse analysis practitioners see the analysis of political discourse as an essentially critical enterprise. Fairclough (2012) observes that PDA is therefore understood as the analysis of political discourse from a critical perspective, a perspective that focuses on the reproduction and contestation of political power through political discourse. PDA can have a lot to offer to political science and can contribute to answering genuine political questions, but only if it focuses on features of discourse which are relevant to the purpose or function of the political process or event whose discursive dimension is being analysed. Focusing on the structure of argumentation in a political speech is relevant in precisely this sense, as the purpose of the speech may be to make an audience believe that a certain course of action is right or a certain point of view is true. This is the intended perlocutionary effect, which is intrinsically associated with the speech act of argumentation.

Likewise, being able to analyse the structure of a practical argument is indispensable to be able to evaluate it critically in a systematic, rigorous manner, something that political scientists would also want to do.

Understanding the argumentative nature of political texts is, therefore, the key to being able to evaluate the political strategies they are a part of. The political discourses that will be further analysed in the present paper are the first inaugural speeches from two presidents of the United States of America, who represent two different periods of time – George Washington (presidency period April 30, 1789 – March 4, 1797) and Donald Trump (the current president of the country, inaugurated on January 20, 2017). In the preceding discourse analysis we will analyse the metaphors that each of the presidents used, however, before we commence the analysis, we first have to define and explain the concept of a metaphor. Hence, the following chapters of the literature review will be dedicated to the theory on metaphors. 1.

4. TRADITIONAL CONCEPTION OF METAPHOR

popular view – the most common conception of metaphor, both in scholarly circles and in the popular mind – is introduced by Kövecses (2010), he states that, “ a metaphor is a figure of speech in which one thing is compared with another by saying that one is the other,” (p. 10) as in It’s just a house of cards. Alternatively, the Cambridge Dictionary defines it as “ an expression, often found in literature, that describes a person or object by referring to something that is considered to have similar characteristics to that person or object”. Let us take for example the phrase house of cards. It would be considered a metaphor in the following context: “ Katie’s plan to get into college was a house of cards.

” We could also claim that the phrase is used metaphorically in order to achieve artistic and rhetorical effect, since we speak and write metaphorically to impress others with embellished, rich language and aesthetically pleasing words, or to express deep emotions. Kövecses (2010) indicates that a speaker would also add a certain quality that makes the metaphorical identification possible, i. e. something that both of the entities that are being compared have in common. In case of the previous example, Katie’s plans and a house of cards would both share the same quality of fragility. Kövecses (2010) names five of the most commonly accepted qualities that the traditional concept can be characterized by. 1) A metaphor is a linguistic phenomenon, it is a property of words; 2) metaphor is used for some artistic and rhetorical purpose, such as when Shakespeare writes, “ All the world’s a stage”; 3) metaphor is based on similarities between the two entities that are compared.

Plans must share some features with a house of cards in order for us to be able to use the phrase a house of cards as a metaphor for plans; 4) metaphor is a conscious use of words, and the user of it must have a special talent to be able to do it well. Only great poets like Shakespeare or powerful speakers like Churchill, can master it; 5) it is also commonly held that a metaphor is a figure of speech that we can do without. We only use metaphors as special effects to embellish our language; hence, it is not a necessary part of everyday people communication, let alone day-to-day human thought and reasoning (Kövecses, 2010). 1.

5. COGNITIVE LINGUISTIC VIEW OF METAPHORAs opposed to the most common conception of metaphor, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980) have introduced their seminal study *Metaphors We Live By*. In this study, they have developed a new view of metaphor, which is challenging all of the previously discussed aspects of the powerful traditional theory in a systematic way.

Their theory is now known as the “cognitive linguistic view of metaphor.”

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) challenged the deeply entrenched conception of metaphor by saying that: 1) metaphor is not a property of words, it is a property of concepts. 2) A metaphor is not just an artistic and aesthetic purpose; it serves as a mean to better understand certain concepts.

3) Usually, a metaphor is not based on similarity; 4) metaphor is used in everyday life by ordinary people and they do it effortlessly, special talent is not needed, and 5) metaphor, far from being a superfluous though pleasing linguistic ornament, is an inevitable process of human thought and reasoning (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

1. 6. CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR AND

metaphoric linguistic expressions Definition of a conceptual metaphor suggested by Kövecses (2010) states that a conceptual metaphor consists of two conceptual domains, in which one domain is understood in terms of another, i.

e. conceptual domain A is conceptual domain B. A conceptual domain can be defined as any clear organization of experience. For example, we have coherently organized knowledge about journeys (i. e. conceptual domain A) that we rely on in understanding life (i. e.

conceptual domain B), and the conceptual metaphor would be Life is a journey. The two domains that a conceptual metaphor consists of have special names. The conceptual domain whose qualities we use to draw metaphorical expressions to understand another conceptual domain (previously mentioned as the conceptual domain A) is called source domain, while the conceptual domain that is understood this way (i. e.

conceptual domain B) is the target domain. Therefore, life, arguments, love, theory, ideas, and others are target domains, while journeys, war, buildings, food, plants, and others are source domains. The most basic yet convenient way to describe this view of both target and source domain is introduced by Kövecses (2010) who says this, “ The target domain is the domain that we try to understand through the use of the source domain” (p. 25). We could view a conceptual metaphor as a base. A base, in this case, is the metaphor from which a variety of metaphorical linguistic expressions can derive. We can explain a metaphorical linguistic expression throughout the example that was already used previously in the paper – life is a journey.

The phrase „ life is a journey” is the conceptual metaphor, meanwhile, all the expressions that are associated with life and come from domain journey (e. g., I’m at crossroads in my life; She’ll go places in life; He’s without direction in life; etc.) are called metaphorical linguistic expressions. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) seek to further explain what it could mean for a concept to be metaphorical and for such a concept to structure an everyday activity. In order to do so, they start with the concept argument and the conceptual metaphor argument is war. This metaphor is constantly used by speakers in

their day-to-day language, incorporating a wide variety of expressions: “ He attacked every weak point in my argument; I’ve never won an argument with him; Your claims are indefensible; I demolished his argument; Okay, shoot!; He shot down all of my arguments” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

Based on the examples given, we can observe that description of an argument is not the only purpose why we use war terms. The two sides of an argument actually see each other as opponents; they verbally attack each other, and then try to defend themselves by using strategies that they have planned. Many of the actions that people perform while arguing are formed by the concept of war to a certain extent. The actual physical battle does not take place, however, there is a verbal battle, and it is reflected by the structure of an argument – attack, defence, counterattack, etc. In this sense the argument is war metaphor is one that we carry out in this culture, i. e., it structures the actions we perform in arguing.

Lakoff and Johnson (2003) also add that an argument could be described in terms of something else, e. g. a dance.

As they explain it, “ Imagine a culture where an argument is viewed as a dance, the participants are seen as performers, and the goal is to perform in a balanced and aesthetically pleasing way” (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003, p. 9). In a culture like the one described in the example, the process of arguing would be completely different from what it is now and we would not regard it as an argument, it would be viewed as a different process. That is what it means for a metaphor, in this case, the argument is war, to shape the actions that we perform and how we comprehend what we are doing when we argue.

Lakoff and Johnson also give another example of conceptual metaphor – time is money, as well as the expressions that derive from it, such as “ You are wasting my time; This gadget will save you hours,” etc. From this we can see, that time is very valuable in our culture. Given these examples, it is clear to see that by analysing conceptual metaphors and metaphorical linguistic expressions that are used in a language, it is rather easy to determine particular culture’s point of view regarding one or another topic.

1.

7. KINDS OF CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS observed by Kövecses (2010), there are distinct kinds of conceptual metaphor, and metaphors can be classified in a variety of ways. These include classifications according to the conventionality, function, nature, and level of generality of metaphor.

Metaphors could be classified in several other ways; however, the preceding approaches play the most important role in the cognitive linguistic view. The four ways of classification of metaphors are to be further analysed below.

1) Conventionality of metaphor – the term “ conventional” is used in the sense of well established and well entrenched, i.

e. conventionality of metaphor answers the question of how well worn or how deeply entrenched a metaphor is in everyday use by ordinary people for everyday purposes. Conceptual metaphors, as well as metaphorical linguistic expressions that derive from them, are considered highly conventionalized if speakers use them naturally and effortlessly for their normal, everyday purposes when they talk about such concepts as argument, love, social organizations, life, and so on. For example, conceptual metaphor

social organizations are plants and deriving metaphorical linguistic expression

The company is growing fast; ideas are food: I can't digest all these facts.

Theories are buildings: We have to construct a new theory. The preceding examples are worn or even clichéd to the extent where most speakers would not even notice that they use metaphor when they use the expression construct in connection with theories, grow in connection with a company, or digest in connection with ideas. All metaphors can be more or less conventional.

Highly conventional metaphors are at one end of what we can call the scale of conventionality. At the opposite end of the scale, we find highly unconventional metaphors. E. g.

, (1) He had a head start in life and (2) Two roads diverged in a wood, and I— I took the one less travelled by, and that has made all the difference. Both of these examples are linguistic metaphors that manifest the same conceptual metaphor life is a journey. While the example (1) is widely used in English language, example (2) employs linguistic expressions from the journey domain that have not been conventionalized for speakers of English; “two roads diverged” and “I took the one road less travelled by” are not worn out, clichéd linguistic expressions to talk about life, i. e. they are highly unconventional. 2) The Cognitive Function of Metaphor – the cognitive function of metaphor is the function that a metaphor performs for ordinary people in thinking about and seeing the world. Conceptual metaphors may be classified based on the cognitive functions that they execute, there has

been distinguished three general kinds of conceptual metaphor: structural, ontological, and orientational.

1. Structural – in this kind of metaphor, the source domain provides a relatively rich knowledge structure for the target concept. I.

e., the cognitive function of these metaphors is to allow speakers to understand target (a) by means of the structure of source (b). E. g., The time (a) is motion (b). By comparing time with the motion, speakers observe that time can pass, stop, come, fly by, etc. I.

e., speakers are provided with knowledge about the target (time).

2. Ontological – Ontology is a branch of philosophy that has to do with the nature of existence. The cognitive job of ontological metaphors is to “merely” give a new ontological status to general categories of abstract target concepts and to bring about new abstract entities. What this means is that we imagine our experiences in terms of objects in general, without specifying exactly what kind of object is meant.

For example, we do not really know what the mind is, but we conceive of it as an object, this way we can attempt to understand more about it. Another example is a computer, that is not a human being, however, it is given human-like qualities such as dying, working, etc. Personifying nonhuman objects as humans, helps us understand them a little better.

3. Orientational – cognitive job of orientational metaphors is to make a set of target concepts coherent in our conceptual system, most metaphors that serve this function have to do with basic human spatial orientations,

such as up-down, centre-periphery, and the like. “Coherence” simply means that certain target concepts tend to be conceptualized in a uniform manner.

E. g.

, the following concept is characterized by an “upward” orientation, while their “opposite” receives a “downward” orientation. More is up; less is down: Speak up, please; Keep your voice down, please. 3) The Nature of Metaphor - metaphors may be based on knowledge and image. In knowledge-based metaphors, basic knowledge structures constituted by some basic elements are mapped from a source to a target, as it has already been analysed in the present paper.

In image-schema metaphor, another kind of conceptual metaphor, it is not conceptual elements of knowledge that are mapped from a source to a target, but conceptual elements of image-schemas. Let us take the following examples with the word out: pass out; space out; zone out; tune out; veg out; conk out; rub out; snuff out; out of order; be out of something. These phrases have to do with events and states such as losing consciousness, lack of attention, something breaking down, death, and absence of something. All of them indicate a negative state of affairs. More importantly, they map relatively little from source to target.

As the name implies, metaphors of this kind have source domains that have the most basic image-schemas, such as the one associated with “out”. These basic image-schemas derive from our interactions with the world: we explore physical objects by contact with them; we move around the world; we experience physical forces affecting us; and we try to resist these forces,

such as when we walk against the wind. Interactions such as these occur repeatedly in human experience. These basic physical experiences give rise to what are called image-schemas, and the image-schemas structure many of our abstract concepts metaphorically. 4) Levels of Generality of Metaphor – conceptual metaphors can be categorized in accordance with the level of generality at which they are found. They can be generic-level or specific-level ones.

Examples of specific-level metaphors are life is a journey, an argument is a war, ideas are food, and so on. Life, journey, argument, war, ideas, and food are specific-level concepts. Schematic structures underlying them are filled in a detailed way. Meanwhile, concepts such as events, actions, generic, and specific are all generic-level concepts.

Only minimal number of properties defines them, hence we could say that they are characterized by extremely skeletal structures. For example, in the case of events, an entity experiences some kind of modification influenced by some external force. There is a variety of event kinds: burning, inflation, freezing, the wind blowing, loving, getting sick, dying, and more. All of them are instances of the generic concept of the event.