

On the Cognitive Function of Conceptual Metaphor: A Discourse Analytic Study of Obama's Speech on ISIL

Zaidoon Abdulrazaq Abboud

زيدون عبد الرزاق عبود

College of Education\ University of Basra

Naghham Ja'far Hussein

نغم جعفر حسين

Shatt Al-Arab University College

Abstract

Politics is a struggle for power. Political discourse is an important field of discourse analysis which includes different political forums such as debates and speeches. Politicians usually exploit certain strategies to convey their messages so as to persuade people with certain perspectives. They use language as a powerful tool that can be manipulated to control people's mind, to gain the consent for their decisions and then to achieve their goals. Actually, language may affect people's thoughts, beliefs, perspectives and attitudes. In this study, American President Barack Obama's speech on fighting ISIL has been analyzed. The aim of this paper is to reveal the role of language and to scrutinize the persuasive strategies and ideological components of Obama through using rhetorical devices especially metaphor to justify his decision of fighting ISIL. The present study is based on using Kövecses' Model of Conceptual Metaphor in the analysis and interpretation of Obama's speech concerning his request to congress for giving authorization of fighting ISIL.

The study of the cognitive function of metaphor is very important in comprehending such a political discourse. Moreover, it is influential in analyzing and

interpreting Obama's speeches concerning ISIL in many perspectives such as reflecting his policy and strategy in tackling, defying and destroying this terrorist group to disguise his hidden agenda and to gain the consent of public and American council opinions.

Keywords: Political Discourse, Rhetoric, Cognitive Function, Conceptual Metaphor, Structural Metaphor, Ontological Metaphor and Orientational Metaphor

1. Introduction

Political discourse is considered as a field which focuses on political affairs. Political discourse includes speeches, debates and hearings as the phenomenon of interest" (Howard and Stavrakis ,2000:3). It is important to mention that "the analysis of discourse is the analysis of language in use. Thus, language is used to perform many communicative functions. The most important function of language is the communication of information" (Brown and Yule,1983: 1). Moreover, Trask (1999:123) claims that language is used in an attempt to persuade people. In politics, the use of language requires certain qualities to be more effective in transmitting what politicians intend.

Politicians also use language in various ways, to present political ideas, to persuade a specific audience and so on. Politicians, who seek acceptance for their ideas, employ different language tools. One of the rhetorical tools they turn to is the use of metaphor.

Metaphors “is not simply a matter of words or linguistic expressions but of concepts, of thinking of one thing in terms of another” (Kövecses, 2010:xi). In addition, metaphor is also defined as “understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain.” This view is based on the cognitive view of linguistics (ibid:4). The metaphorical expressions help the listener to visualize and better understand the presented strategies and the analysis of those metaphorical expressions is a good way of understanding the underlying ideologies, attitudes and beliefs of the speaker. The presidential speeches in USA, for instance, are considered to be the most important medium for presidents to convey their ideas, plans and personal and public achievements. The aim of the study is to analyze the American president Barack Obama’s speeches to reveal the usage of conceptual metaphor as a tool of persuading his audience or the congress with his agendas to degrade and to destroy ISIL. In fact, ISIL is one of the extremist groups, which appeared recently.

The present study concentrates on the use of cognitive function of metaphor in terms of Kövecses’ Model of Conceptual Metaphor in the analysis and interpretation of two of Obama’s speeches on the fight against ISIL which are released in September 10, 2014 and February 11, 2015. This model includes three types of conceptual metaphor: Structural Metaphor, Ontological Metaphor and Orientational

Metaphor. Moreover, the study aims to show how Kövecses’ Model of Conceptual Metaphor helps the researcher to examine persuasive strategies, political ideology and program of President Barack Obama’s speeches. To sum, the main objective of this study is to analyze and assess the conceptual metaphors in the speech of the American president, Barack Hussein Obama, regarding the issues of terrorism and counterterrorism of ISIL. In addition, to find out whether Obama effectively uses conceptual metaphors in convincing the congress about his policy concerning an authorization of force against ISIL and whether his use of language is rhetorical one.

1.1. Political Discourse Analysis

Discourse as a term is used to refer to “what a text producer meant by a text and what a text means to the receiver” (Widdosown, 2007: 7). Discourse is also defined as “a continuous stretch of (especially spoken) LANGUAGE larger than a sentence”. It often constitutes a coherent unit such as a sermon, a conversation, an interview or a joke (Crystal, 2008:148). In addition, Paul (2011:ix) mentions that discourse analysis is “the study of language at use in the world, not just to say things, but to do things.”

Political Discourse Analysis (PDA) is considered as “a field of discourse analysis which focuses on discourse in political forums such as debates, speeches, and hearings as the phenomenon of interest” (Howard and Stravrakakis, 2000 :3). Drew and Heritage (1992:78) define political discourse as “the professional realm of the activities of politicians”. Moreover, in terms of the study of political language, Beard (2000:2) affirms that helps in “understanding how

language is used by those who wish to gain power, those who exercise power and who wish to keep power". In this concern, Charteris – Black (2005:1) states that “within all types of political system leaders have relied on the spoken word to contrast the benefits the benefits that arise from their leadership with the danger that will arise from that of their opponents”.

1.2. What is Rhetoric?

Rhetoric is “art of using words impressively in speech and writing”. It is technique used for impression or persuasion (Hornby et.al., 1963:846). In addition, rhetoric is mainly concerned with written or spoken discourse to motivate an individual hearer or a group of hearers (Corbett ,1971: 3). In this sense, Beard (2000:6) defines rhetoric as “ the art of persuading people”. Moreover, Booth (2004 : xi) states that “rhetoric is employed at every moment when one human being intends to produce, through the use of signs or symbols, some effect on another – by words, or facial expressions, or gestures, or any symbolic skill of any kind”.

Kane and Patapan (2010:371-373) state that persuasion has a an important role in the practice of democratic leadership. Thus, rhetoric is essential in democracy. They affirm that rhetoric is “a form of persuasive speech” and which was historically considered as “the essential part of political art”. Rhetoric is also introduced as “the study of effective speaking and writing (discourse), and the art of persuasion, and many other things” (Gideon, 2016:1). Crystal (2008:416) elucidates that one of the figures of rhetoric is metaphor. He defines rhetoric as:

the study of effective or persuasive speaking and writing, especially as practiced in public oratory. Several

hundred rhetorical figures were recognized by classical rhetoricians, classifying the way words could be arranged in order to achieve STYLISTIC effects. Some of these notions have continued in modern stylistic analysis, such as METAPHOR, simile, personification and paradox.

1.3.What is Metaphor?

Metaphor is a broad term with many definitions. Metaphor is defined as “a figure of speech that, for rhetorical effect, directly refers to one thing by mentioning another (From Metaphor: Wikipedia, 2019:1)”. This central notion of transferring meanings is also embedded in etymology in the sense that “the term metaphor comes from the Greek word ‘meta’ meaning beyond or above and ‘pherein’ meaning carrying or bearing” (Spencer, 2012: 395). Moreover, metaphor is stated as a “device of the poetic imagination and rhetorical flourish – a matter of extraordinary rather than ordinary language” (Lakoff and Johnson, 2003:3). A similar observation is made by Steuter and Wills (2008:4) who observe that “within a broad understanding of metaphor, it is simply a way to enrich or enhance our language, a way to make ideas more memorable, artful or attractive”. Kövecses (2002:vii-viii) points out that metaphor is “a figure of speech in which one thing is compared to another.” He adds that there are many features that may characterize the traditional concept of metaphor as in the following:

- “Metaphor is a property of words; it is a linguistic phenomenon.”
- “Metaphor is used for some artistic and rhetorical purposes.”
- “Metaphor is based on a resemblance between two entities that are compare and identified.”

- “Metaphor is a conscious and deliberated use of words.”

On the other hand, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980) have developed the cognitive linguistic view to metaphor. They state that “the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one thing in terms of another” (Lakoff, 2003:5). Moreover, their conception has become known as the “cognitive linguistic view of metaphor.” In this sense, they present the following (Kövecses 2010:x):

- “Metaphor is a property of concepts, and not of words.”
- “The function of metaphor is to better understand certain concepts, and not just some artistic or esthetic purpose.”
- “Metaphor is often not based on similarity.”
- “Metaphor is used effortlessly in everyday life by ordinary people, not just by special talented people.”
- “Metaphor, far from being a superfluous though pleasing linguistic ornament, is an inevitable process of human thought and reasoning.”

Following the cognitive approach, metaphor can be seen differently from the traditional approach. Steinhart and Kitty (1998) (cited in Rista-Dema, (2008:9), elucidate that metaphor can be used to provide a further stretch of the cognitive and expressive capacity of language.

1.4. Metaphor in Political Discourse

It seems reasonable to assume that metaphor has been used in various areas wherever language has been involved. It can be suggested that in some fields, metaphors may be used more frequently

than in others. Politics would appear as such an area. For Kövecses (2002:62), “politics in general is rife with conceptual metaphors”. Seemingly, such a consideration gives some importance to metaphor as an element present in politics. With reference to that, Stendvoll (2008:37) claims that metaphors are significant in politics. In addition, metaphors inscribe meanings and produce political realities that stretch the limits of our imaginations.

It could be suggested that metaphors are used in political discourse as tools for specific goals. Political issues can sometimes be significantly abstract, thus not clear for the audience to follow. In addition, they can highlight or conceal particular issues. According to Steuter and Wills, (2008:3) “metaphor helps us to understand problems and conflicts in certain ways, offering us certain available responses, and negating or obscuring others.” A similar claim is presented by Charteris-Black (2004:7) who indicates that metaphor can be considered as :

Metaphor is a figure of speech that is typically used in persuasion ; that is because it represents a novel way of viewing the world that offers some fresh insight. Because metaphor is persuasive it is frequently employed discursively in rhetorical and argumentative language such as political speeches.

1.5. Conceptual Metaphor

Lakoff and Johnson regarded metaphor as “not simply a matter of words or linguistic expressions but of concepts, of thinking of one thing in terms of another.” What is new in the cognitive linguistic view of metaphor is that it is comprehensive, generalized and empirically tested theory. “First, its comprehensiveness stems from the fact

that it discussed a large number of issues connected with metaphor.” “Second, the generalized nature of theory derives from the fact that it attempts to connect what we know about conceptual metaphor with what we know about the working of language, the working of human conceptual system, and the working of culture.” Third, since many researchers have tested the theory differently to achieve validity, it is considered as one of the empirically tested theories. They have made many experiments that reveal that the cognitive view of metaphor has psychological reality (Kövecses 2010:xii).

Lakoff and Johnson (2003:270) affirm that “Metaphor Theory is a central subdiscipline of the field of cognitive linguistics, which seeks to provide explanatory foundations for conceptual system and language in the general study of the brain and mind”. In addition, they state that “metaphors are fundamentally conceptual in nature” besides “conceptual metaphors are grounded in everyday experiences” (ibid:272). In this sense, Kövecses (2002:4) mentions that metaphor is “understanding of one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain.” Within the term conceptual metaphor, the conceptual domain aimed to be understood is called “ the target domain” whereas the conceptual domain used for the purpose of understanding is “ the source domain”. (ibid:12).

1.٥. The Cognitive Function of Conceptual Metaphor

Kövecses (2010:4) affirms that “metaphor is understanding of one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain.” This view is based on the cognitive view of linguistics. For example, when people talk and think about

life in terms of journeys, about arguments in terms of war, and so on. The cognitive view is illustrated in the formula: conceptual (domain A) is understood in terms of conceptual (domain B), that is why it is called “Conceptual Metaphor (CM). Thus, each utterance containing metaphor should be an underlying conceptual metaphor.

It is important to differentiate between conceptual metaphor and metaphorical linguistic expressions. Conceptual metaphors are words or other linguistic expressions that are related to more concrete conceptual domain (i.e., domain B). Therefore, the other preceding expressions that are related to life and that come from the domain of journey are linguistic metaphorical expressions. Thus, the corresponding conceptual metaphor that they make manifest is LIFE IS A JOURNEY. “The use of capital letters indicates that the particular wording does not occur in language as such, but it underlies conceptually all the metaphorical expressions listed underneath it” (ibid).

The conceptual domain from which metaphorical expressions is drawn to understand another conceptual domain is called “source domain”, while the conceptual domain that is understood this way is called “target domain”. The linguistic expression by which CM can be realized is called “metaphorical linguistic expression”. For example, (*he has no direction in life*), this sentence contains the conceptual metaphor “life is a journey”. As mentioned above, CM consists of domains, where here the “source domain” is “journey” and the “target domain” is “life”. “The source domain” represents what people have of conceptual understanding concerning any given concept where they have experienced it. In other words, they comprehend its nature and they know what

it is in real terms. While “the target domain” represents the concepts that have no delineated conceptual understanding. For example, the concept of “life” where people do not know what life is or how it looks like and what its conceptual constituent elements are. Thus, this is why they use “the source domain” for understanding of “the target domain” (ibid:5).

Within the term conceptual metaphor CM, Kövecses (2010:7-8) explains that understanding of one domain in terms of another involves a set of fixed correspondences, technically known as “mapping” between “the source” and “the target” domain. For example, let’s take the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY first, when the speaker uses the sentence “*We are not going anywhere*”. In this sentence, the expression “goes somewhere” indicates travelling to a destination and travel or journey in the context of the sentence has no destination. Likewise, the word “we” refers to the travelers. Once one understands the conceptual constituent elements of the source domain “journey”, then he/she can apply them to target domain “love” and comprehend the speaker’s utterance in a specific manners. Therefore, when people hear the sentence in its context, they interpret it as a love relationship and they know that the speaker has in mind lovers instead of travelers; events in a love relationship instead of physical journey, and goals of the love relationship instead of physical destination at the end of the journey. Accordingly, it becomes clear that constituents of the “source domain” are correspondent with those of the “target domain”. The most common “source domains” and “target domains” can be mentioned as follows (ibid:18-26):

1.◦.1.Common Source Domains:

Common source domains are represented by the following:

1. The Human Body: it deals with “various parts of the body” e.g. “The *heart* of the problem.”
2. Health and Illness : it deals with “general properties of health and illness” e.g. “A *healthy* society”
3. Animals: it deals with using expressions like “a *brute*, a *tiger*, a *fox*”, and so on.
4. Plants: it deals with “various parts of plants” e.g. “The *fruit* of her labor.”
5. Buildings and Construction: it involves the static object of a house and its parts e.g. “a *towering* genius.”
6. Machines and Tools: it deals with the use of “machines and tools to work”, play, fight, and for pleasure e.g. “The *machine* of democracy.”
7. Games and Sport: it is concerned with “games and sport” e.g. “*To toy* with the idea.”
8. Money and Economic Transactions (Business): it covers “the commercial event”: “a commodity”, “money”, “handing over the commodity”, and “handing over the money” e.g. “*Spend* your time wisely.”
9. Cooking and Food: it deals with cooking elements: “an agent”, “recipe”, “ingredients”, “actions”, and “a product” e.g. “What’s your *recipe* for success?”\ “He *cooked up* a story that nobody believed.”
10. Heat and Cold : it covers the use of temperature “to talk about our attitude to people and things” e.g. “In *the heat* of passion.”
11. Light and Darkness: it deals with “the properties of light and darkness” e.g. “a *dark* mood.”
12. Forces: it covers forces like: “gravitational”, “magnetic”, “electric”, and “mechanical”. The

forces take “many shapes in the physical world”: “waves”, “wind”, “storm”, “fire”, “agents pushing”, “pulling”, “driving”, “or sending another thing” e.g. “Don’t *push* me.”

13. Movement and Direction: Movement is concerned with “change of location”, or “stability”. Changing location is “associated with direction”: “forward and backward”, “up and down”. e.g. “He *went* crazy.”

1.5.2. Common Target Domains:

Target domains are characterized as being abstract, diffuse, and lacking clear delineation. The most common target domains and their most important sources are represented in the following:

1. Emotion: it is represented by concepts like: “anger, fear, love, happiness, sadness, shame, pride”, and so on. Their source domains involve forces e.g. “He was *bursting* with joy.”
2. Desire: It deals with forces like hunger or thirst. It is understood in terms of “heat” e.g. “She is *hungry* for knowledge.”
3. Morality: it is concerned with concepts like “good and bad, honesty, courage, sincerity, honor, and their opposites”. They are largely understood by means of more concrete source concepts such as “economic transactions, forces, straightness, light and dark, and up-down orientation e.g. “I’ll *pay you back* for this.”
4. Thought: Rational thought is comprehended as workplace stuff. Less-active aspects of thought are understood in terms of perception, such as “seeing”, e.g. “She’s *grinding out* new ideas.”

5. Society / Nation: society and nation are comprehended in a way that involves the source concepts of “person and family”. e.g. “*Neighboring* countries.”

Some other ways to understand them is in terms of machines or the human body, e.g. “The *functioning* of society”

6. Politics: Politics is related to “the exercise of power”. It is comprehended in terms of physical force. It is also concerned with other aspects like “games and sport, business, and war” e.g. “They *forced* the opposition out of the House.”

7. Economy: it includes “building, plants, and journey (movement, direction).” e.g. “Germany *built a strong* economy.”

8. Human Relationships: it includes concepts like “friendship, love, and marriage”. They are understood as “plants, machines, and buildings”, e.g. “Their friendship is *in full flower*.”

9. Communication: communication involves “a speaker and a hearer, and a message.” Metaphorically, they are considered as containers, objects, and sending, respectively, e.g. “You are *putting* too many ideas *into* a single sentence.”

10. Time: time is comprehended in terms of “object that moves”, e.g. “The time will *come*.”

11. Life and Death: Life is understood as “a journey to some destination”. It covers aspects like “day, light, warmth,” and others. Birth and death are considered as arrival and departure respectively, e.g. “The baby will *arrive* soon.”

12. Religion: it is concerned with “our view of and relationship to God”. God is conceptualized as a person: “*Father, Shepherd, King*, and the like.”

13. Events and Actions: they are concerned with certain proceedings like “reading, making a chair, doing a project in the lab, plowing, or whatever are kinds of actions”. These are conceptualized as movement and force. They involve aspects like “notions as change, cause, purpose, means”, and so on, e.g. “The goal *sent* the crowd into a frenzy.”

1.6. Kövecses’ Model of Conceptual Metaphor

Kövecses (2010:37) finds out that conceptual metaphor can be classified in various ways but he stressed that the classifications that play the most important role in the cognitive view of linguistics are according to the conventionality of metaphor, cognitive function of metaphor, nature of metaphor and levels of generality of metaphor. Consequently, conceptual metaphor according to cognitive function can be classified into three kinds. First, *structural metaphor* reflects that one basic domain of experience (usually more abstract) is conceptualized and structured in terms of another basic domain of experience (usually more concrete). Second, *ontological metaphor* shows experiences in terms of subjects and substances and it is necessary for dealing rationally with them. Third, *orientational metaphor* involves spatial orientation and emerging from our physical experience.

1.6.1. Structural Metaphors

This is the richest kind of metaphor where “the source domain” provides a rich knowledge structure for “the target domain”. The cognitive function of this metaphor is used to enable hearers or readers to understand the target domain by means of the structure of “the source domain”. Conceptual mapping between both of the source domain and the target domain is the decisive element for

understanding. For, example, the concept of time is structured according to motion and space. In the case of the metaphor TIME IS MOTION, time is understood in terms of some basic elements:

(1.) “physical objects” (2.) “their locations,” (3) “their motion”.

Moreover, there is a background condition that applies to this way of understanding time: the present time is at the same location as a canonical observer.

It is important to mention that The TIME IS MOTION conceptual metaphor exists in the form of two special cases in English (ibid:37-38).

1-“TIME PASSING IS MOTION OF AN OBJECT.”

Here, one can notice that the observer is fixed and times are objects moving with respect to the observer. For example: “In the weeks *following* next Tuesday . . .”

2- “TIME PASSING IS AN OBSERVER’S MOTION OVER A LANDSCAPE.”

One can notice that times are fixed locations and the observer is moving with respect to time. This can be clarified in the following (ibid: 38):

-“He *passed* the time happily.”

1.6.2 Ontological Metaphors

Ontology is associated with philosophy and it mainly deals with the nature of existence. The main cognitive job of ontology is to “merely give a new ontological status to abstract target concept and bring new abstract entities. Ontological metaphor is used to conceive experiences in terms of objects, substances and containers, in general, without specifying

what it is meant.” As human beings, we look at these things in a rather limited way. Therefore we cannot them in understanding target domains (ibid:38-39):

Source Domains	Target Domains
PHYSICAL OBJECT ⇒ NONPHYSICAL OR ABSTRACT ENTITIES (e.g., the mind)	⇒
EVENTS (e.g., going to the race), actions (e.g., giving someone a call)	⇒
SUBSTANCE ⇒ ACTIVITIES (e.g., a lot of running in the game)	⇒
CONTAINER ⇒ UNDELINEATED PHYSICAL OBJECTS (e.g., a clearing in the forest)	⇒
PHYSICAL AND NONPHYSICAL SURFACES (e.g., land areas, the visual field)	⇒
STATES (e.g., in love)	

The ontological metaphors can be used to give delineated status to undelineated experiences. They can also be used for more specific purposes. They may refer to, quantify or identify certain sides of the experience that have been made delineated. This can occur in cases like considering the concept of “fear” as an object. Speakers may consider fear as something they possess as in “*your fear*”, “*my fear*”, etc. Besides, personification is regarded as a form of ontological metaphor. In this case, human qualities are given to non-human entities. For example, “*the life has cheated me.*” “Life” is undelineated but given a quality which makes it more specific in the mind of hearers (ibid:39).

1.6.3 Orientational Metaphors

This kind of metaphor gives less conceptual structures for target domain

than ontological one. Its cognitive function is used to make a set of conceptual coherent in people’s conceptual systems. For this reason this kind of CM is, sometimes, called “coherence metaphors”. The name “orientational metaphor” is associated with basic human spatial orientations such as up-down, center-periphery, and the like. In addition, the word “coherence” means that the target concept is coherently understood.

Upward orientation indicates positive evaluation; Speak *up*, please, I’m *on top* of the situation, Wake *up*, and the like. On the contrary, downward orientation indicates a negative one; Keep your voice *down*, please, He *fell* ill, He’s really *low* these days, and the like. It is worth noting that “positive-negative evaluation is not limited to the spatial orientation up-down. Thus, whole, center, link, balance, in, goal, and front are mostly regarded as positive, while their opposites, not whole, periphery, no link, imbalance, out, no goal, and back are seen as negative” (ibid).

Table (1) Kövecses’ Model of Conceptual Metaphor

No.	Types of Conceptual Metaphor
1	Structural Metaphors
2	Ontological Metaphors
3	Oriental Metaphors

2. Practical Part: Conceptual Metaphors in Obama’s Speeches on ISIL:

As far as the practical part is concerned, there are (292) conceptual metaphors that are used cognitively by the

American President Obama in his speeches concerning his request for the congress to fight ISIL which are released in September 10, 2014 and February 11, 2015. As quite influential president who combines both talent and eloquence, Obama seems such an expert in choosing and structuring his words and phrases. In his speeches, structural metaphors get the highest number of conceptual metaphor (124) (see table (2)). This reflects that Obama has certain structured strategy in which he organizes his political mission, force and action, time, nation and taking the emotion of his nation within his consideration. Moreover, there are also (91) ontological metaphors and (77) orientational metaphors. For the limitation of the present study, there will be a concentration on the cognitive function of conceptual structural metaphors in the analysis and the interpretation of two of Obama's speeches concerning ISIL so as to get the intended meaning and grasp the implications that the president wants to convey by using these rhetorical items.

Table (2) Types of Conceptual Metaphor Used in Obama's Speeches

No .	Types of Conceptual Metaphor	Obama's Speech (1)	Obama's Speech (2)	Total
1	Structural Metaphors	56	68	124
2	Ontological Metaphors	46	45	91
3	Orientation al Metaphors	35	42	77
	Total	137	155	292

2.1-Structural Metaphor:

There are (124) structural metaphors used by Obama in his speech concerning the fighting of ISIL (see table (3)). Most of the points that he structured rhetorically in his resolution or speeches are (politics, force, action, movement, time, nation and emotion). It seems that he has proved himself among the American people due to his enthusiastic and well-structured speech to persuade the audience in his resolution. He has certain strategies and ideologies that are based on specifying the ways and the time to degrade and destroy ISIL. This will be clarified in the following types of conceptual structural metaphor.

Table (3) Types of Structural Metaphor Used in Obama's Speeches

No .	Types of Structural Metaphor	Obama's speech (1)	Obama's Speech (2)	Total
1	War Metaphor	13	20	33
2	Time Metaphor	15	13	28
3	Movement or Action Metaphor	11	12	23
4	A Nation Metaphor	10	18	28
5	Emotion Metaphor	7	5	12
	Total	56	68	124

2.1.1. War Metaphor: (33)

The target domain is “politics” and the source domain is “forces or war”:

The president Obama is considered as one of the most powerful presidents in the history of the United States due to his enthusiastic and effective speech. In this concern, Obama’s speeches concentrate on the request to congress for authorization of force and the necessity of a war against ISIL. He affirms “*we are going to degrade and ultimately destroy the terrorist group known as ISIL*”. He uses “*we/politician*” to mention “an international coalition of some 60 nations -- including Arab countries -- our men and women in uniform”, “*going to*” indicates that he has a strategy or mission and “*degrade and ultimately destroy the terrorist group known as ISIL*” shows that this war will destroy ISIL and it will be succeeded. Moreover, America will be the powerful and united nation, especially when he affirms that “our coalition is strong, our cause is just, and our mission will succeed. And long after the terrorists we face today are destroyed and forgotten, America will continue to stand free and tall and strong”. Thus, it is clear that the constituents of source domain are correspondent with those of the target domain which is known as “mapping” between “the source” and “the target” domain.

The president Obama declares the war against extremists groups. He asserts the authority he has and the power that Americans have to fight and destroy their enemy ISIL. He intentionally says that he is aware of the threat of terrorism on the United States. He tries to convince Americans that he is taking the responsibility of securing America. Obama declares that he has a complete plan and strategy to combat the threat of ISIL not inside America but abroad. He also declares that American troops and allies

will destroy ISIL following this plan or strategy. He gathers allies and coalition partners to enhance military campaigns and to deploy the plan to counter ISIL. Accordingly, the structural metaphors within this concern can be summarized in the following:

Speech 1:

- “My fellow Americans, tonight I want to speak to you about what the United States will do with our friends and allies to degrade and ultimately destroy the terrorist group known as ISIL.”

- “These strikes have protected American personnel and facilities, killed ISIL fighters, destroyed weapons, and given space for Iraqi and Kurdish forces to reclaim key territory.”

- “So tonight, with a new Iraqi government in place, and following consultations with allies abroad and Congress at home, I can announce that America will lead a broad coalition to roll back this terrorist threat.”

- “Our objective is clear: We will degrade, and ultimately destroy, ISIL through a comprehensive and sustained counterterrorism strategy.”

- “Moreover, I have made it clear that we will hunt down terrorists who threaten our country, wherever they are.”

- “This counterterrorism campaign will be waged through a steady, relentless effort to take out ISIL wherever they exist, using our air power and our support for partner forces on the ground.”

- “And it is consistent with the approach I outlined earlier this year: to use force against anyone who threatens America’s core interests, but to mobilize partners wherever possible to address broader challenges to international order.”

- “Tonight, I call on Congress again to give us additional authorities and resources to train and equip these fighters.”

Speech 2:

- "THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon. Today, as part of an international coalition of some 60 nations -- including Arab countries -- our men and women in uniform continue the fight against ISIL in Iraq and in Syria. "

-" We're destroying their fighting positions, their tanks, their vehicles, their barracks, their training camps, and the oil and gas facilities and infrastructure that fund their operations."

-" And with vile groups like this, there is only one option: With our allies and partners, we are going to degrade and ultimately destroy this terrorist group."

- "It supports the comprehensive strategy that we have been pursuing with our allies and partners: A systemic and sustained campaign of airstrikes against ISIL in Iraq and Syria."

-" Local forces on the ground who know their countries best are best positioned to take the ground fight to ISIL...."

- "Today, our men and women in uniform continue the fight against ISIL,...."

-" And long after the terrorists we face today are destroyed and forgotten, America will continue to stand free and tall and strong."

2.1.2. Time Metaphor: (28)

The target domain is "time" and the source domain is "the observer is moving with respect to time":

The president Obama starts his speech referring to the last years of fighting terrorists threatening America. He attempts to prepare and persuade his nation to accept the coming fight against ISIL. He says that this is not the first time they fight terrorists. He intends to remind his nation of the successful strategies Americans follow in Yemen and Somalia for years. Here is also a reference to end the mission

this year in Afghanistan and Iraq. Obama intends to fight terrorists or anyone who threatens America's core interest. He reminds Americans of their present time saying that it represents the time of dramatic changes after the 13 years of terrorists attack of the United State of America. He tries to make Americans remember the time of economy depression as well. Obama puts a firm plan to address the American nation at this particular time as he seeks their approval to support him in fighting ISIL. He refers also the prosperous future of America after destroying and defeating terrorists.

Obama has a clear strategy and important resolution to get rid of ISIL who threaten his country and the innocent people at other countries, to degrade and ultimately destroy them. He considers what they can do today, what they are going to do in the future for the next days and weeks. So in his speeches, he affirms that "this resolution will give our armed forces and our coalition the continuity we need for the next three years". It seems that he puts certain structured time table that can be followed to defeat ISIL. This can be summarized in the following structural metaphor:

Speech 1:

-"Over the last several years, we have consistently taken the fight to terrorists who threaten our country."

- "We've done so while bringing more than 140,000 American troops home from Iraq, and drawing down our forces in Afghanistan, where our combat mission will end later this year."

-"This strategy of taking out terrorists who threaten us, while supporting partners on the front lines, is one that we have successfully pursued in Yemen and Somalia for years."

- “Tomorrow marks 13 years since our country was attacked.”
- “ Next week marks six years since our economy suffered its worst setback since the Great Depression.”
- “My fellow Americans, we live in a time of great change”
- “It will take time to eradicate a cancer like ISIL.”
- “I see the grit and determination and common goodness of the American people every single day -- and that makes me more confident than ever about our country’s future.”
- “And it is America that is helping Muslim communities around the world not just in the fight against terrorism, but in the fight for opportunity, and tolerance, and a more hopeful future”
- Speech 2:
- “Today, my administration submitted a draft resolution to Congress to authorize the use of force against ISIL.”
- “Today, our men and women in uniform continue the fight against ISIL, and we salute them for their courageous service.”
- “Now, make no mistake -- this is a difficult mission, and it will remain difficult for some time.”
- “ Finally, this resolution repeals the 2002 authorization of force for the invasion of Iraq and limits this new authorization to three years.”
- “So this resolution will give our armed forces and our coalition the continuity we need for the next three years.”
- “In the days and weeks ahead, we’ll continue to work closely with leaders and members of Congress on both sides of the aisle.”
- “And long after the terrorists we face today are destroyed and forgotten, America will continue to stand free and tall and strong.”

2.1.3. Movement or Action Metaphor: (23)

The target domain is “event and action” and the source domain is “movement or force”:

In his speech, Obama refers to the need for preparing the nation and bringing the troops to fight ISIL and take action against the terrorists’ threat. He believes that ISIL threats keeps going as they are growing. He puts his strategies telling his nation that he is going to consider two strategies. He refers to the return of Americans’ troops home after they finish their deadly attack in Iraq fighting extremists. Then, he insists on adopting these strategies in order to face ISIL’s growing. He decides to prevent ISIL from receiving any financial support from other countries that support terrorisms. He says that America will never stop her continuous assistance for the innocent people suffering from extremists’ actions. Obama declares that he is going to mobilize the world against ISIL seeking the help of his nation to start this attack against terrorists.

President Obama associates counterterrorism as an effort to solve the conflict between the terrorists and the US and its allies without the use of armed forces. He expressed the opinion about the need to determine how we can continue to fight terrorism without making any American military intervention because countering violent extremism is not just a matter of military affairs. America has other tools such as the power of diplomacy, economy, and ideals. Moreover, he has made it clear that he will follow those terrorists who threaten his country, wherever they are. That means “he will not hesitate to take action against ISIL in Syria, as well as Iraq”. This can be summarized by examining the following structural metaphors:

Speech 1:

- "That means I will not hesitate to take action against ISIL in Syria, as well as Iraq."
- "Last month, I ordered our military to take targeted action against ISIL to stop its advances."
- "Still, we continue to face a terrorist threat."
- "If left unchecked, these terrorists could pose a growing threat beyond that region, including to the United States."
- "It is America that has the capacity and the will to mobilize the world against terrorists"
- "And that's why I've insisted that additional U.S. action depended upon Iraqis forming an inclusive government, which they have now done in recent days."
- "Tonight, I ask for your support in carrying that leadership forward"

Speech 2:

- "We're taking out their commanders, their fighters, and their leaders."
- "It's going to take time to dislodge these terrorists, especially from urban areas."
- "As Commander in Chief, I will only send our troops into harm's way when it is absolutely necessary for our national security."
- "... I would be prepared to order our Special Forces to take action, because I will not allow these terrorists to have a safe haven."
- "For example, if we had actionable intelligence about a gathering of ISIL leaders, and our partners didn't have the capacity to get them, I would be prepared to order our Special Forces to take action, because I will not allow these terrorists to have a safe haven."
- "As I've said before, I'm convinced that the United States should not get dragged back into another prolonged ground war in the Middle East."

- "In Iraq, local forces have largely held the line and in some places have pushed ISIL back."
- "In Syria, ISIL failed in its major push to take the town of Kobani, losing countless fighters in the process,...."

2.1.4. A Nation Metaphor: (28)

The target domain is "society or nation" and the source domain is "machines"

In his speech, Obama tries to inform American nation that in fighting terrorists, he is securing the United States of America. Since ISIL represents a threat to American citizens, personnel, and facilities, it is the responsibility of American leaderships and people to protect their country. He says that Americans are united in fighting extremists wherever they are as they represent a threat to the American. The president Obama addresses America's allies to help in destroying terrorists' targets. He also says that they are going to send troops to Iraq in order to help Iraqis in fighting and destroying ISIL's targets. He addresses the Iraqi nation and other Arabs as well asking them to participate in freeing their country from the terrorists' threats.

Obama wants to present his nation as hero. The hero has to endure difficulties and sacrifices so as to achieve his goal. However, these sacrifices are not negative, quite contrary; they are positively evaluated and considered worthwhile (Lakoff, 1991: 4). The most important goal of this hero is then to protect and defend its own people. He speaks to the congress using words such as "dislodge", "destroy", and "degrade", to show America's clear aim and target, that is, to eradicate terrorism and to secure America. To gain his audience sympathy, Obama used nation expressions that show his care of his citizens and their security in the future such as in the following:

Speech 1:

- “My fellow Americans, tonight I want to speak to you about what the United States will do with our friends and allies to degrade and ultimately destroy the terrorist group known as ISIL.”
- “It is America that has the capacity and the will to mobilize the world against terrorists.”
- “It is America that helped remove and destroy Syria’s declared chemical weapons so that they can’t pose a threat to the Syrian people or the world again.”
- “American power can make a decisive difference, but we cannot do for Iraqis what they must do for themselves, nor can we take the place of Arab partners in securing their region.”
- “So I welcome congressional support for this effort in order to show the world that Americans are united in confronting this danger.”
- “Despite all the divisions and discord within our democracy, I see the grit and determination and common goodness of the American people every single day — and that makes me more confident than ever about our country’s future.”
- “But as Americans, we welcome our responsibility to lead.”
- “We stand with people who fight for their own freedom, and we rally other nations on behalf of our common security and common humanity.”
- “It is America that helped remove and destroy Syria’s declared chemical weapons so that they can’t pose a threat to the Syrian people or the world again.”
- “And it is America that is helping Muslim communities around the world not just in the fight against terrorism, but in the fight for opportunity, and tolerance, and a more hopeful future.”
- “And in the coming days he will travel across the Middle East and Europe to enlist more partners in this fight, especially Arab

nations who can help mobilize Sunni communities in Iraq and Syria, to drive these terrorists from their lands.”

- “We stand with people who fight for their own freedom, and we rally other nations on behalf of our common security and common humanity.”
- “I have the authority to address the threat from ISIL, but I believe we are strongest as a nation when the President and Congress work together.”
- “Yet despite these shocks, through the pain we have felt and the grueling work required to bounce back, America is better positioned today to seize the future than any other nation on Earth.”
- “And our own safety, our own security, depends upon our willingness to do what it takes to defend this nation and uphold the values that we stand for — timeless ideals that will endure long after those who offer only hate and destruction have been vanquished from the Earth.”
- “And in two weeks, I will chair a meeting of the U.N. Security Council to further mobilize the international community around this effort.”

Speech 2:

- “Today, as part of an international coalition of some 60 nations -- including Arab countries -- our men and women in uniform continue the fight against ISIL in Iraq and in Syria.”
- “And when I announced our strategy against ISIL in September, I said that we are strongest as a nation when the President and Congress work together.”
- “The 2,600 American troops in Iraq today largely serve on bases -- and, yes, they face the risks that come with service in any dangerous environment.”
- “As I’ve said before, I’m convinced that the United States should not get dragged

back into another prolonged ground war in the Middle East.”

- “I do not believe America’s interests are served by endless war, or by remaining on a perpetual war footing”

-“ As a nation, we need to ask the difficult and necessary questions about when, why and how we use military force.”

- “ I’m optimistic that it can win strong bipartisan support, and that we can show our troops and the world that Americans are united in this mission.”

-“ Today, our men and women in uniform continue the fight against ISIL, and we salute them for their courageous service.”

-“But know this: Our coalition is strong, our cause is just, and our mission will succeed.

-And long after the terrorists we face today are destroyed and forgotten, America will continue to stand free and tall and strong.”

2.1.5. Emotion Metaphor: (12)

The target domain includes emotion concepts such as “anger”, “fear”, “love”, “happiness”, “sadness”, “shame”, “pride”, and so on, and the source domains of emotion concepts typically involve forces.

Obama tries to raise the emotion of the American nations. He affirms that there is no excuse for the killing of innocent people using religion as a means to make people sympathize with them. He tries to convince people that strikes can save the lives of thousands people. Innocent civilians are displaced because of ISIL’s threats. Americans, on the other hand are going to provide assistance to those innocent people.

Obama used rhetoric and such conceptual metaphor in his speech to convince his audience about the brutality of (ISIL) or those terrorist group. They kill for no reasons, and try to relate their horrible deeds to Islam. However, Islam

does not accept that. Killing innocent people is not justified in Islam. Some allied nations launched attacks against this terroristic movement.

Speech1:

-“No religion condones the killing of innocents.”

-“These strikes have also helped save the lives of thousands of innocent men, women and children.”

-“Fourth, we will continue to provide humanitarian assistance to innocent civilians who have been displaced by this terrorist organization.”

-“Our children will always remember that there was someone who felt our struggle and made a long journey to protect innocent people.”

-“Next week marks six years since our economy suffered its worst setback since the Great Depression.”

Speech2:

-“Its barbaric murders of so many people, including American hostages, are a desperate and revolting attempt to strike fear in the hearts of people it can never possibly win over by its ideas or its ideology...”

- “because it offers nothing but misery and death and destruction.”

-“ Preventing ISIL attacks, in the region and beyond, including by foreign terrorist fighters who try to threaten our countries.”

- “Humanitarian assistance for the innocent civilians of Iraq and Syria, who are suffering so terribly under ISIL’s reign of horror.”

- “One of the best antidotes to the hateful ideologies that try to recruit and radicalize people to violent extremism.....”

- "I'm optimistic that it can win strong bipartisan support, and that we can show our troops and the world that Americans are united in this mission."

-" We stand with their families who miss them and who are sacrificing here at home."

Conclusions

After analyzing Obama's political speeches from the theoretical basis of cognitive function of conceptual metaphor, especially structural metaphors, this paper finds out the following:

1-Political discourse analysis is one of the influential areas of study in our present days. It requires special attention from the part of the speakers and from the part of the listeners as well. This means it needs careful preparation and investigation from both speakers and listeners respectively. Politicians should prepare their speeches in advance since they have certain messages to convey to their audience. Persuading others is not an easy task. It requires following certain strategies to make others feel satisfied and accept the messages the speakers intend to convey. One of the essential devices is cognitive metaphor.

2- In investigating and analyzing Obama's speech, the study reveals the rhetorical strategies used and how he was successful in managing and manipulating these devices and strategies while delivering his speech. President Obama follows these strategies to convince American nation and make them involve in war against ISIL. He also tries to justify his attack of terrorists' targets using some conceptual cognitive metaphorical devices that helps him in preparing his speech in a way that he can conceal his direct aims and decisions to attack ISIL targets. Ultimately, the study reveals the effectiveness of conceptual cognitive metaphor, especially the

structural metaphor, in preparing and analyzing political discourses.

3- Obama employs language in a way that serves his goals and attitudes. Actually, he seems skillful in his use of rhetoric devices such as conceptual metaphors to persuade his audiences about his views, perspectives, ideologies, and plans to degrade and ultimately destroy the terrorist group .i.e. ISIL.

4- He has the ability to manipulate different images deliberately by highlighting certain aspects make metaphors a powerful rhetoric device used to influence the public opinion and a very useful persuasive strategy used to achieve his goals and ideology. He affirms the importance of force or war to defeat ISIL, taking time in consideration to be limit in his strategies, to achieve a real progress or movement within such a war to dislodge ISIL, to stimulate and provoke the emotion of the people and congress about the innocent people who suffer from misery besides the sacrifices of the soldiers in the battle due to the extreme violent and threat of those terrorists and the importance of making United States as the hero who protect his nation and the other nation.

References

- Beard, A. (2000). *The Language of Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: University Cambridge Press.
- Booth, W. (2004) .*The Rhetoric of Rhetoric: The Quest for Effective Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Charteris- Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Corbett, E. P. (1971). *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (6th ed.). Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1992). *Talk at Work. Interaction in institutional Setting*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Gideon, B. (2016). "The Forest of Rhetoric." *Silva Rhetoricae*. Brigham: Brigham Young University. Available at: <http://rhetoric.byu.edu>.
- Howard, D. and Stavrakis , Y. (eds.) (2000). *Discourse Theory and Political Analysis: Identities, Hegemonies and Social Change*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Kane, J. and Patapan, H. (2010). "The artless art: Leadership and the limits of Democratic Rhetoric." *Australian Journal of Political Science*, vol.45, No.3 pp. 371-389.
- Kövecses , Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses , Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1991). *Metaphor and war: The metaphor system used to justify war in the Gulf*. Available at: <https://georgelakoff.files.wordpress.com/2011/04/metaphor-and-war-the-metaphor-system-used-to-justify-war-in-the-gulf-lakoff-1991.pdf>
- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson. (2003). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Metaphor: Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia .(2019). Available at: <https://en.m.wikipedia.org>
- Paul, J.G. (2011). *How to do Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge
- Rista-Dema, M. (2008). "Language Register and the Impacts of Translation: Evidence from Albanian Political Memories and their English Translation." In Samuel, G.O. and Beverly, A. S. H. (eds.). *Political Discourse Analysis*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Spencer, A. (2012). "The social construction of terrorism: Media, metaphors and policy implications." *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 15(3), 393-419. Available at: http://www.gsi.unimuenchen.de/personen/wiss_mitarbeiter/spencer/publ_spencer/jird_spencer_post_print.pdf
- Stendvoll, D. (2008). "Slippery Slopes in Political Discourse". In Carver, T. and Pikalo, J. (eds.), *Political Language and Metaphor Interpreting and Changing the World*. London: Routledge.
- Steuter, E. and Wills, D. (2008). *At War with Metaphor: Media, Propaganda, and Racism in the War on Terror*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- The White House/Statement by the President on ISIL. (2014) Available at: <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2014/09/10/statement-president-isil-1>
- The White House/ Remarks by the President on Request to Congress for Authorization of Force against ISIL. (2015) Available at: <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2015/02/11/remarks-president-request-congress-authorization-force-against-isil>
- Trask, R.L. (1999). *Key Concepts Language and Linguistics*. London: Routledge.

Widdowson, H. G. (2007). Discourse Analysis. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

الخلاصة

ويعد الخطاب السياسي مجالاً مهماً لتحليل الخطاب والذي يتضمن مننديات سياسية مختلفة مثل المناقشات والخطب. يستغل السياسيون استراتيجيات معينة لإيصال رسائلهم لإقناع الناس بوجهات نظرهم. فيستخدمون اللغة كأداة قوية بحيث يمكن استغلالها للتحكم في عقل الناس و للحصول على الموافقة على قراراتهم ومن ثم تحقيق أهدافهم.

تحلل الدراسة الخطاب السياسي للرئيس الاميركي باراك أوباما حول ISIL . الهدف هو دراسة الاستراتيجيات المتبعة من قبل الرئيس في الاقناع ومكونه الأيديولوجي من خلال استخدام ادوة بلاغية و مجازية لتبرير قراره بمحاربة داعش. اعتمدت الدراسة الحالية انموذج كوفيكسيس (Kövecses) للمفهوم الاستعاري).

تعتبر دراسة الوظيفة المعرفية للاستعارة مهمة للغاية في فهم الخطابات السياسية. كما تعتبر مؤثرة في تحليل وتفسير خطابات أوباما المتعلقة بـ ISIL في كثير من المنظورات مثل عكس سياسته واستراتيجيته لإخفاء أجندته.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الخطاب السياسي، الخطابية، الوظيفة المعرفية، الاستعارة الفكرية، الاستعارة التركيبية، الاستعارة الأنطولوجية، الاستعارة الاتجاهية