
The Function of Metaphorical Language in Shaping Political Texts Based on Kövecses' Framework: A CDA Perspective

Somayyeh Jafarnezhad¹, Bahloul Salmani^{2*}, Hossein Sadegh Oghli³

¹Ph.D. Candidate, English Language Department, Sarab Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sarab, Iran

^{2*}Assistant Professor, Department of English, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

³Associate Professor, English Language Department, Sarab Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sarab, Iran

Received January 03, 2019

Accepted: October 10, 2022

Abstract

This study aimed to examine the role of figurative language in shaping political texts based on the modern framework suggested by Kövecses. The research corpus comprised thirty thousand words selected as a text sample to see the source of the conceptual domain used. It was prepared through a systematic random sampling of various editorial articles in Western political journals on the relationship between Iran and the West in the period 2010-2019. Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA) was used to specify patterns in political articles, usually providing support for previous research by authority figures in critical and political metaphor analysis that metaphors are used to shape political thought, aid political persuasion, and in directing circumstances and cognitive models to form the interpretation of the nation as a person or body metaphor. Finally, the study provides substantial support for the textual findings of conceptual metaphors used. The findings of the study provide EFL classrooms with a number of implications for future research.

Keywords: Conceptual metaphor; Critical discourse analysis (CDA); Critical metaphor analysis (CMA); Political articles; Source domains

INTRODUCTION

So far, some research work has set out to analyze conceptual metaphors in political texts (Beer, & Landtsheer, 2004; Bednarek, 2005; Cammaerts, 2012; Charteris-Black, 2006; Hart, 2010, among others). The idea is that a combination and comparative deployment of metaphor within a research paradigm will be able to shed some new light on the role of metaphor in how the reader is led to make sense of the text in two widely read but contrasting genres, Prose Fiction and Political Magazines and articles, at least in terms of a social and cultural categorization of readers.

In this spirit, this project will concern itself with the role of metaphorical language in po-

litical texts using a sample of articles from western established political magazines like Time Magazine and Newsweek, drawing on available literature on the theory and research on conceptual metaphor (Kovecses, 2015; Bednarek, 2005, 2006a, 2006b; Beer and de Landtsheer, 2004; Cap, 2006; Charteris-Black, 2006; Charteris-Black, 2006b; Chiappe, 2000; Chilton, 2005; Hart, 2010).

Also, needless to say, conceptual metaphors are legion in the language of literature, playing constitutive, dominant and inescapable roles in literary discourse, one major manifestation of which is modern prose fiction. The purpose of this Ph.D. study will be to examine the metaphorical language in two separate genres; the discourse of political texts as reflected in established political magazines, and

*Corresponding Author's Email:
Bsalmani@iaut.ac.ir

a sample of some established novels in modern English fiction.

There are many references in the literature on discourse and critical discourse analysis not only to the ubiquitous role and existence of metaphor in political language but also to its necessary inclusion in any discursive model of critically analyzing the instances and texts of the such genre (Musolff, 2004; Musolff and Zinken, 2009).

It is believed that “politics cannot be conducted without language” (Chilton and Schäffner, 1997, 206). As a matter of fact, language is a powerful instrument that can be used not only for communication but can also be exploited to exert power on others and persuade them. Charteris-Black (2011) believes that ‘Metaphor is an effective means for politicians to develop persuasive arguments’ (p.35).

Several scholars have referred to the important role of metaphors in political discourse. According to Thompson (1996), ‘politics without metaphors is like fish without water’ (p. 185). In fact, metaphors are persuasive, ideological, and manipulative tools deployed by politicians to inject a certain understanding into the reader’s cognitive ideology, making him share it through the use of metaphors and other critical-linguistic devices.

Traditionally, the metaphor was treated as a linguistic phenomenon, studied within rhetorics, philosophy, linguistics, and literature studies. In current approaches to metaphor, however, metaphors have been studied in other fields, such as in cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, and social sciences (Hellsten, 2002: 13).

In their seminal and influential book, *Metaphors We Live By*, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980) talk enlighteningly about the actual function and nature of metaphors:

Metaphor is typically viewed as characteristic of language alone, a matter of words rather than thought or action. For this reason, most people think they can get along perfectly well without metaphor. We have found, on the contrary, that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in

terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature. (p. 3)

Today, in linguistic circles, the proponents of cognitive linguistics have focused on political discourse in terms of critical metaphor analysis (CMA). In fact, the methodological potential of CMA ‘to restore the hidden ideology of metaphors in political discourse is one of the reasons why CMA has received a lot of attention (Arcimavičienė, 2014, 76).

Based on the above synopsis of the study of metaphor in language and linguistics, the current research attempted to explore the role of conceptual metaphor in shaping political texts based on the framework proposed by Kövecses (2015), and thus the following research question was addressed:

R. Q. *How do conceptual metaphors shape political texts based on Kövecses’ and CDA frameworks?*

LITERATURE REVIEW

Lakoff and Johnson (2003) maintain that metaphor is for most people a device at the service of poetic imagination and a rhetorical flourish a matter of extraordinary rather than ordinary language. Metaphor is typically viewed as characteristic of language alone, a matter of words rather than thought or action. It is for this reason, Lakoff and Johnson argue, that most people think they can get along perfectly well without metaphor. However, they argue against this, by maintaining that, on the contrary, metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature (p.3).

Metaphors can also be explored from a different angle of being offline or online. According to Kövecses (2009), there are two types of metaphor understanding: online and offline. The online process of metaphor understanding occurs without activation of the source domain (very short automatic processing) while offline understanding always takes place with the source domain activated (hence a longer processing time).

People do make use of conceptual metaphors when they comprehend metaphorical

expressions online; the source domains are clearly activated in the real-time comprehension of target-related metaphorical meanings even in the case of highly conventional metaphorical expressions. Thus, “understanding” does involve conceptual metaphors in both the online and offline senses.

Metaphor identification is the process of relating linguistic metaphor in the text to the conceptual metaphor of cognitive metaphor theory. In Gibbs and Steen’s (1999) procedure for metaphor identification, the process of distinguishing between literal and metaphorical expressions is the first and basic step in metaphor identification.

Heywood, Semino, and Short (2002) in their insightful article “linguistic metaphor identification in two extracts from novels” examine a series of issues involved in identifying metaphors in texts. They argue that metaphor identification is, in turn, a fundamental part of the more complex issue of how to relate linguistic metaphors in texts to the conceptual metaphors of cognitive metaphor theory. They analyze the differences between the uses of metaphors in two extracts from novels.

They indicate that a single expression in a text can be regarded as being both literal and metaphorical. It is the writer’s style that determines the possibility, extent, and type of metaphoricality. Crisp et al. (2002) explore the patterns of metaphor usage in a systematic fashion and develop a taxonomy of the propositional structure of metaphors. Then they discuss how such a taxonomy may be used in the quantitative characterization of the metaphorical style of an author. Gibbs et al. (2002) also offer an explicit procedure for metaphor identification and describe how these linguistic expressions are grounded in cognitive mapping.

The most fundamental notion of conceptual metaphor theory (CMT) is ‘Mapping’. This refers to systematic metaphorical correspondences between closely related ideas. For example, in the common conceptualization of a nation as a ship, the course of the ship is said to map or be mapped onto the historical progression of a nation. So here,

“ship” is the source domain, and “politics and state” are the target domains (Grady, 1999, p. 206).

One of the language-related strategies employed by many political writers towards the delivery of those functions is metaphors. Referring to the considerable political effects of metaphors, some scholars have argued that metaphors are important in the language of foreign policy (Shimko, 2004, on US Desert Storm discourse, as cited in Musolff and Zinken, 2009, p. 61). Metaphors are powerful persuasive instruments which, as Thomas Hobbes described in his treatise *Leviathan*, can lead ‘the human mind into intellectual and political confusion’ (Hobbes 1996: 36, as cited in Musolff, 2004, p. 1):

(1) [. . .] The Light of humane minds is Perspicuous Words, but by exact definitions first snuffed, and purged from ambiguity; [. . .] And on the contrary, Metaphors, and senseless and ambiguous words, are like *ignes fatui*; and reasoning upon them, is wandering amongst innumerable absurdities; and their end, contention, and sedition, or contempt. (Hobbes 1996: 36, as cited in Musolff, 2004, p. 1)

There are countless linguistic strategies deployed in political language to distort basic and essential facts. Metaphorical language is one way through which political writers convince readers that they are merely presenting absolute facts, whereas their aim is, in reality, to emphasize only those issues which are in accordance with the profit and gain of either their country or the stakeholder organizations they are affiliated with. The established western news outlets also, like news centers elsewhere, make use of metaphors to appeal to the emotions of the readers. In other words, as Musolff and Zinken (2009) have mentioned, ‘metaphors are powerful political style elements (p. 64) that ‘can arouse a broad spectrum of emotions, ranging from negative to positive and from superficial to explicitly moving’ (p. 64).

In connection with discourse, in the current literature and Applied Linguistics circles, it is taken for granted that metaphor is important in the language (Zinken and Musolff, 2009). Metaphor is no longer discussed as a ‘violation’ of

normal verbal meaning (e.g., Levin, 1977), but rather as one form of normal verbal meaning.

However, if metaphor were all that 'normal', it would not stimulate the interest that it does. This interest is not only academic: it is not only philosophers, linguists, and psychologists who have a considerable interest in metaphor: 'real' people going about their everyday business of discussing events, possibilities, and problems, who seem to find metaphors striking as well. As Musolff and Zinken (2009) show through their insightful collection of articles and thoughts written by authoritative figures in the field of conceptual metaphor, entire discourses circle around the negotiation of a metaphorical understanding. Metaphors in discourse summarize a possible stance, and such a summary attracts further debate.

Zinken and Musolff (2009) maintain that discourse studies make an empirical contribution to the study of metaphor: depending on the setting that is under investigation, such studies contribute to our understanding of the social realities constructed in the areas of politics, economics, science, law, doctor-patient conversation, and other areas of life. Such research can be conceptualized as an 'applied' endeavor that supplements (tests, provides a basis for) the aims of 'basic' (linguistic, philosophical) research to understand 'metaphor understanding'.

However, they argue that a discourse perspective also calls into question assumptions made on the basis of theoretical commitments. What they aim to do is to bring both of these possible contributions – empirical analysis and distinctive theoretical perspective – together.

Many philosophical accounts of how metaphor is understood stress the importance of context (e.g., Guttenplan, 2006; Leezenberg, 2001; Stern, 2000). Still, theorizing about metaphor does not often make use of empirical research in which metaphor is studied in context. One of the aims pursued by Zinken and Musolff (2009) is to show that it should: approaching metaphors as actions that are embedded in larger discursive activities has important implications for our understanding of 'metaphor understanding'.

Zinken and Musolff (2009) start with an example to demonstrate this mutual and important relationship between discourse and metaphor. One of the persistent debates in the study of metaphorical communication concerns the question of how general the information is that is predicated of the topic. Relevance-theoretic approaches (Carston, 2002) answer that it is rather general (note that we indirectly could conclude this on the basis of the above account we gave of relevance-theoretic approaches to metaphor, where it could be read between the lines and metaphor is almost as ubiquitous as all everyday means of linguistic expression and language, even prosodic seemingly non-verbal ones).

The sentence *my job is a jail* was ever used outside the activity of writing a scientific text about metaphor. Let's further assume that the speaker is not actually the manager of a jail, but works in a fish and chip shop, the addressee knows this, and the speaker knows that the addressee knows this. What will the addressee make of the fact that the speaker said that his job was a jail?

According to Carston, the addressee 'works out the speaker's communicative intentions by constructing a new category 'labeled' jail, which includes not so many actual jails, but rather what is common to all unpleasant, confining situations, and (b) including the speaker's job in this new, ad-hoc category. The ad-hoc category keeps what is common to jails and the speaker's job, but loses (ignores) anything that is true of jails, but not true of the speaker's job. In other words, the word jail becomes merely a placeholder for a quite abstract conceptual category – unpleasant, confining situations – which the hearer supposedly works out when understanding the metaphor. Presumably, the speaker might just as well have said that his job was a stuck lift/ elevator – another unpleasant, confining situation to be in.

Another approach to metaphor that claims that the ideas involved in metaphor understanding are very general is 'conceptual metaphor theory' (Lakoff, 1993). Although the conclusions regarding the generality of ideas involved in metaphor understanding are reached on dif-

ferent grounds in the ‘conceptual metaphor’ and the ‘relevance theory’ approach, this shared conclusion has encouraged researchers to explore possible complementarities between the two approaches (Gibbs and Tendahl, 2006).

In this view, the fact that polysemies can be sorted into thematic clusters indicates that these very polysemies are ‘licensed’ by associations holding between general ‘conceptual domains’ – i.e., by ‘conceptual metaphors’.

According to this approach, thinking about a relationship as a car that is spinning its wheels, as a derailed train, or as a wrecked ship is the same thing – only the ‘general’ ideas of vehicles, motion, and an impediment to motion, somehow detached from the ‘particulars’ of a specific vehicle, matter (Zinken and Musolff, 2009).

However, the results of discourse analyses of metaphor do not support the assumption that the (surface, linguistic) forms used in discourse are themselves irrelevant. For example, in one study of public discourse on political transformation, kettle metaphors were used in the context of political pressures, whereas pot metaphors were used in the context of subdivisions of political territory; ship metaphors were used in the context of complex systems, whereas boat- metaphors were used in the context of collaboration, etc (Zinken, 2007). Such results cast doubt on the validity of accounts that assume that metaphorical understanding involves only generic- level, abstract knowledge, representations abstracted from the particulars of situations, and mental representations that do not need contextual/discursive specifications for their online use and comprehension.

If ships are metaphorically meaningful in a different way than boats, then the particular ‘things’ that are employed in metaphorical communication (ships, jails, etc.) should surely play a role in accounts of how people make sense of metaphor.

There are two ways to act upon such doubts thrown up by research on naturally occurring communication (discourse). One can embrace a distinction between ‘mere surface’ phenomena, such as the particular words people use in communication, and the ‘real business’ of ‘un-

derlying’ structures, the ‘hidden’ realm of people’s representations and abilities that ‘allow’ them to do or refrain from doing certain things.

This Platonic ‘solution’ is popular with theorists in the ‘conceptual metaphor’ approach, as it means that they do not need to take discourse data too seriously. It is, unsurprisingly, unpopular with discourse analysts, for the same reason.

The second way of acting upon this doubt is to take discourse data seriously. Let us spell out some of the consequences that follow for our thinking about metaphorical understanding.

The psycholinguistic literature on metaphor understanding has been focused on how quickly participants can indicate an understanding of the metaphorical utterance (Zinken and Musolff, 2009). Metaphor understanding has occurred when the participant gives relevant feedback, and that is the end of it (e.g., McGlone and Manfredi, 2001).

From a discourse analysis perspective, metaphor understanding is not the end, but rather the beginning; entire fiercely fought debates center on what follows from metaphor understanding: What would or should it mean for Britain to be at the heart of Europe’ (Musolff, 2004)? Is language an ‘instinct’ (Pinker, 1994; Tomasello, 1995)?

And when a particular interpretation has been negotiated in a discourse, it generates further activities (Schoen, 1979): ethical debates about the implications of ‘deciphering the book of life’ act upon, rather than a question, the assumption that establishing a person’s DNA-sequence tells you as much about that person as reading a book tells you about the contents of that book.

Metaphors seem to play a vital role in keeping discussions (Discourses and Conversations, as argued by (Gee et al., 2018) going, at least in the discourse genres of the English-speaking world, such as science, education, and public discourse.

The bottom line is: metaphor understanding in the real world might not be a matter of milliseconds passing until an individual study participant responds.

It might rather be a matter of dialogue, of engagement in debate, unlike what dyed-in-the-wool psycholinguistics researchers think.

In the current study, the focus is only on the metaphors used by western writers in established political texts. Attempts have been made to analyze the discourse of such texts and explore how discourse is manipulated and structured by the writers. For this purpose, the lines of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) have been adopted.

METHOD

Design

In the current descriptive study, critical discourse analysis was exploited to analyze the language of political texts in terms of the used conceptual metaphors.

Corpus

The corpus of this current study consisted of various articles in political periodicals established in the west; namely, Time, The New York Times, Newsweek, Orient net, Washington Post, Daily Mail, Huffington Post, and BBC. For the purpose of the research, the articles published during the period 2010-2019 were analyzed regarding the use of figurative language. The reason for choosing these periodicals was because they are considered important in terms of circulation, especially concerning such discursive events as nuclear negotiations - which are a hot topic in the Iranian and international media.

Procedures

In order to measure the function of conceptual metaphor in shaping political media discourse, the framework proposed by Kövecses (2015) was used. This framework is based on the understanding of linguistic, pragmatic, and cognitive approaches. In general, this framework focuses on the speaker/writer's intentions in creating and promoting metaphorical representations. Based on the model, the analysis of conceptual metaphors contributes to the understanding of the culture (Kövecses 2015), so the essence of the analysis of metaphors is cultural and pragmatic. Kövecses' (2015) framework is a multi-dimensional model for metaphor anal-

ysis that aims to reveal the hidden ideological intentions of language users by studying various aspects such as context and pragmatics.

The starting point for finding examples of metaphors in the political corpus of the research was through the theory of 'conceptual mapping' of metaphors (also known as Cognitive Theory of Metaphors or Domain Mapping) where words are examples of metaphors when they exist as 'source domain' from which the 'target domain' borrows, to speak more powerfully and effectively than normal non-metaphorical words. In other words, in a conceptual metaphor, certain elements and relationships in a domain are mapped to other domains.

The domain, from which it is mapped is called the "source domain" and the domain to which it is mapped is called the "target domain". Thus, the analysis in the present study proceeded to determine the source domain and the target domain of each conceptual metaphor and classify the results in several tables containing the five analysis categories proposed in the theory; namely, 'Linguistic Metaphor Expression', 'Meaning in Context', 'Target Domain', 'Source Domain', and 'Conceptual Metaphors'.

It should be further said that the conceptual metaphors of the corpus were identified and highlighted by three different people, that is, the researcher, the supervisors, and a very capable team of the University of Tabriz, well trained in conceptual metaphors. Cohen's Kappa inter-rater reliability index was calculated as $\kappa = .91$.

RESULTS

The sample results obtained from the analysis of conceptual metaphors (CMs) in 8 political articles comprising a 30,000-word corpus appear in the following tables.

DISCUSSION

In the 30,000-word political corpus analyzed, more than half of the CMs were ontological metaphors or metaphorical use of HUMAN BEINGS as their conceptual SD in their cognitive model. In many of such CMs, we have a version of STATES (COUNTRIES) ARE HUMAN BEINGS metaphor. Also, there are

other interesting recourses made to this SD, like in DEALS/AGREEMENTS ARE HUMAN BEINGS metaphor, with the issue of political and nuclear ‘deals’ a major theme running through the texts, lending support to Kovecses’s (2015) Pressure of Coherence (to approach talking about ‘deals’ from many angles as demanded by contextual forces). Following the theory, we see ‘deals’ talked about metaphorically using the SD of SHIPS, BUILDING, and other SDs too, with some instances of POLITICAL DEALS ARE SHIPS metaphor, of POLITICAL DEALS ARE BUILDINGS, and of POLITICAL DEALS ARE OBJECTS IN A SCRAP YARD metaphor (Table 2), all lending support to the theory of Pressure of Coherence by Kovecses, casting political deals in many different guises, to trigger different cognitive interpretations in the reader.

Even when there are fewer CMs used in some articles, as in the case of Table 4, there are some creative and interesting ones, such as the CONTROVERSIES ARE HUMAN BEINGS and SOCIAL PROBLEMS (i.e., POVERTY / CORRUPTION) ARE ENEMIES metaphors and some instances using sports/running contests as SD, as in the POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS ARE RUNNING CONTESTS, ELECTORAL CANDIDATES ARE RUNNERS. Even so, the familiar COUNTRIES ARE HUMAN BEINGS metaphor crops up among these few, and some interesting ones use a CONTROVERSIES ARE HUMAN BEINGS metaphor. Considering ENEMIES ultimately as a version of human beings SD, we come out with the picture given above.

This shows that even when writers use a variety of other SDs and TDs, political writing still seems to necessitate such an ideological patterning of nation-states as discussed above, since they need to extend such an undifferentiated and collective agentive role to countries /states when they talk about them, with SOCIAL PROBLEMS portrayed as ENEMIES and CONTROVERSIES metaphorically re-mapped as HUMAN BEINGS who are ill or unconscious and need ‘reviving’.

In relation to the SD of human beings, the CM analyzed in number 10 of Table 5 is very interesting. It is a version of COUNTRIES ARE HUMAN BEINGS metaphor again, but the linguistic metaphorical expression evidencing it, The US was selling arms to Iran, via Israel of all people, uses the CM in a complex mega-metaphorical way, relying on the linguistic metaphor part of the CM in a conscious way by emphasizing the last part Israel of all people. Thus, we have three instances of one CM in one clause, using the three countries the US, Iran, and Israel, all as if they are human agents in a marked way as if forcefully demanding such cognitive integration for the reader.

Such an extensive recourse to OMs by different political article writers seems to establish that writers-in-hire of political articles constantly fall back on human beings as SD not just to talk about COUNTRIES/STATES but also about entities as diverse as DEALS, CONTROVERSIES, SOCIAL PROBLEMS, RELIGION, and RELIGIOUS DIFFERENCES, etc. One could argue that this wide range of TDs shows that human beings offer the best SD to the writers, in lieu of some reasons and forces in discourse.

One minor comment the data lead us to make is that skilled writers of political articles, seem to make use of a more diverse range of SDs, and resulting CMs, in their writings. What is interesting in this case is the limited use such writers sometimes make of HUMAN BEINGS as SD and the more frequent use they make of inanimate entities instead.

In table 7 above, there are many important aspects of the text and CMs analyzed in the table that, according to the CMA perspective, are consciously used by the author for specific political and critical ends. One interesting fact is that the first CM of the author in the text and the last one that closes his writing is one and the same POLITICAL ALLIANCES is a metaphor for ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS. Between these two, many other CMs are sandwiched, especially different versions of given and familiar CMs such as the HUMAN STATE metaphor.

In table 8, the majority of CMs analyzed in the article, use OM and metonymic or metaphorical use of MAN in the cognitive model. This is a very important finding in a political text dealing with international relations between controversial world powers. In general, there is considerable work on developing CM research in the area of Applied Linguistics (Cameron, 2003; Farahani & Adeli Jam, 2019; Low, 1988).

One of the main efforts in this regard is Cameron's *Metaphor in Educational Discourse* (Cameron, 2003) where he offers an applied linguistic approach to metaphor in discourse.

In addition, as an important and important issue in this regard, he talks about the research methods of metaphors in classroom discourse and the linguistic form of metaphors in classroom discourse. They also talk about intentional and conventional metaphors in classroom discourse and incorporate their own metaphors into classroom activities.

What we agree on is his belief that 'before approaching metaphors in classroom discourse and integrating them into classroom activities, one (educator/ESL teacher) must be trained and aware of research on the interpretation of metaphors and metaphors in texts.

Table 1

A Sample of the CMs used in the Washington Post's Article 'the U.S. and Iran are heading toward crisis

The Linguistic Metaphorical Expression	Meaning in Context	Target Domain	Source Domain	Conceptual Metaphor
The US and Iran are heading toward a crisis	Crisis will soon happen to the US and Iran	An imminent negative eventuality	Journey	INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS ARE A JOURNEY
1. Collision course	Crisis will soon happen to two bodies in interaction	An imminent negative eventuality resembling a collision	Rapid and reckless Movement or speed	IMMINENT CONFLICT IS COLLISION
2. Iran's compliance with the deal	Iran as a human being agreeing with the deal	Consenting of a country with something	OM: The human being	COUNTRIES ARE HUMAN BEINGS
Trump assented to the move	Trump agreed to this action	An action or decision	Physical movement	ACTIONS ARE PHYSICAL STEPS OR MOVEMENT
3. Malign activities	Bad, wicked and harmful activities	Bad and chronically harmful behaviour	Diseases and bad medical conditions	PERSISTENTLY HARMFUL AND BAD BEHAVIOR IS A SERIOUS DISEASE
Trump reportedly fumed at	Trump expressed great anger at	Extreme anger	Fire	ANGER IS FIRE

Table 2*Sample of the CMs used in 'How Trump can confront Iran without blowing up the nuclear deal'*

The Linguistic Metaphorical Expression	Meaning in Context	Target Domain	Source Domain	Conceptual Metaphor
1. How Trump can confront Iran	Deal with Iran as if the country Iran is a person	Dealing with and confronting a country in a serious and deterring way	OM: (Iran as) Human being	STATES ARE HUMAN BEINGS
2. without blowing up the nuclear deal	Completely destroying the nuclear deal	Events and actions: Destroying	Forces: Blowing something up(is completely destroying it)	COMPLETE DESTRUCTION IS EXPLOSION
3. Iran is complying with the nuclear deal	The Iranian Politicians are behaving true to the nuclear agreement	Politics And: Events and actions	Games and Sport And: Business	COUNTRIES ARE HUMAN BEINGS
4. when that question comes before him	When he has to answer the question and cannot evade	Events and actions: Having but to answer a	Forces: And: (OM): Human	QUESTIONS ARE HUMAN BEINGS

Table 3*A Sample of the CMs used in 'There Is No Peace in the Middle East without Iran'*

The Linguistic Metaphorical Expression	Meaning in Context	Target Domain	Source Domain	Conceptual Metaphor
1. open up Iran further to the rest of the world	Make the country have free and unproblematic relationships with all the world	Events and actions Making free and unproblematic relationships between countries possible	Doors / gates And: OM: human being (walking through an open door)	OPEN DOORS ARE FREEDOM And: COUNTRIES ARE HUMAN BEINGS
2. Accusing Iran of factually incorrect actions	Accusing the Iranian decision makers and politicians of.....	Morality	OM: the human being	COUNTRIES ARE HUMAN BEINGS
3. Blaming Iran for the Saudi attack on Yemen	Blaming the Iranian decision makers and politicians for.....	Morality	OM: the human being	COUNTRIES ARE HUMAN BEINGS
4. Iran is essential to the peace process and cannot be ignored.	The importance of Iranian decision makers and politicians cannot...	(mental) Events and actions: Ignoring	OM: the human being	COUNTRIES ARE HUMAN BEINGS (that can be ignored)
5. Iran stands on its two feet	The country Iran is independent	Events and actions Human relationships	The human body (Human feet) OM: the human being	(STANDING ON) TWO FEET IS INDEPENDENCE
6. Iran would not have collapsed within six months	The country Iran would not have been	Events and actions: Destruction	Buildings	COUNTRIES ARE BUILDINGS
7. Strangling Iran economically for a decennia	Putting extreme pressure on the economy of Iran	Economy	Forces (strangling) Health and illness	COUNTRIES ARE HUMAN BEINGS (who)

Table 4*A Sample of the CMs Used in 'A look at Iran's presidential candidates'*

The Linguistic Metaphorical Expression	Meaning in Context	Target Domain	Source Domain	Conceptual Metaphor
1. The contest	The elections	Politics (elections) Political events	Sports contests (Games and Sport)	ELECTIONS AND OTHER POLITICAL RIVALRIES ARE SPORTS CONTESTS
2. pave the way for the country's nuclear deal with world powers.	Made possible the nuclear deal	Politics Actions (Facilitating something)	Roads (Buildings and construction)	POLITICAL PROBLEMS ARE UNPAVED ROADS
3. President Hassan Rouhani is widely seen as the front-runner	Seen as a candidate with the best chance	Politics Political candidate with the highest chance	Running contest (games and sport)	POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS ARE RUNNING CONTESTS Or: ELECTORAL CANDIDATES ARE UNNERS

Table 5*A Sample of the CMs Used in 'How Iran fell out with the West'*

The Linguistic Metaphorical Expression	Meaning in Context	Target Domain	Source Domain	Conceptual Metaphor
1. Saddam Hussein in neighboring Iraq	In the country Iraq that shares a border with Iran	Society / Nation	Person / Family (neighbor)	COUNTRIES SHARING A BORDER ARE NEIGHBOURS
2. Saddam Hussein was quietly and methodically preparing to invade Iran.	Without allowing the media and intelligence services to know	Politics (information for media and intelligence services) Actions	Properties of objects and forces in movement: sound	AWARENESS / KNOWLEDGE IS LOUD
3. the Americans had given up any hope of reversing the revolution	Of making the revolution null and go back to the Previous regime	Politics (a revolution)	Vehicle (gears)	A POLITICAL UPHEAVAL IS (A GEAR ON) A VEHICLE
4. the main US preoccupation at the time	The main preoccupation of American decision makers and politicians	Emotion	OM: human beings	COUNTRIES ARE HUMAN BEINGS
5. plunge the two countries into an obsessive crisis in relations	cause the two countries to experience a crisis they cannot save themselves from	Events and actions (Being suddenly faced with a crisis)	Forces (Plunging; of swimming human beings)	COUNTRIES ARE (SWIMMING) HUMAN BEINGS
6. crisis in relations from which they have yet to emerge	They have yet to save themselves from	Events and actions (Saving oneself from crisis)	Forces (Emerging from beneath the water)	COUNTRIES ARE (SWIMMING) HUMAN BEINGS
7. a coup engineered by the CIA and the British	A coup that was designed and planned by....	Politics (Planning a coup)	Machines and tools (engineering)	POLITICS IS A MACHINE/TO OL

Table 6***A Sample of the CMs Used in 'Five of Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's Weirdest Conspiracy Theories'***

The Linguistic Metaphorical Expression	Contextual Meaning	Target Domain	Source Domain	Conceptual Metaphor
1. Ahmadinejad had previously said he would not stand	He would not participate in the elections	Politics (The elections)	The human body	POLITICS IS THE HUMAN BODY (RUNNING FOR THE ELECTIONS IS STANDING)
2. He had discouraged Ahmadinejad from running.	taking part in the elections	Politics Political candidates participating in elections	Running contests (games and sports)	POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS ARE RUNNING CONTESTS Or: ELECTORAL CANDIDATES ARE RUNNERS

Table 7***A Sample of the CMs Used in 'Turmoil in the Middle East Is Setting Up Some Strange Bedfellows'***

The Linguistic Metaphorical Expression	Contextual Meaning	Target Domain	Source Domain	Conceptual Metaphor
1. Turmoil in the Middle East Is Setting Up Some Strange Bedfellows	Is making unlikely alliances be established between states otherwise hostile to each other	Politics Relationships	Human relationships (love)	POLITICAL ALLIANCES ARE ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS
2. the romance between Iran and	The very friendly relations between	Politics Relationships	Human relationships (love)	POLITICAL ALLIANCES ARE
Hamas is at full bloom again	Iran and Hamas		OM: Human beings	ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS (allied) COUNTRIES ARE HUMAN BEINGS (in a Romantic relationship)
3. the romance between Iran and Hamas is at full bloom again	the politicians and decision-makers in Iran and those in Hamas ...	Politics	OM: the human being	(allied) COUNTRIES / POLITICAL PARTIES ARE HUMAN BEINGS (in a relationship)
4. put the Hamas alliance with Iran to the test	the politicians and decision-makers in Iran and those in Hamas ...	Politics	OM: the human being	COUNTRIES / POLITICAL PARTIES ARE HUMAN BEINGS
5. President Bashar Assad was slaughtering the	Was killing the rebels in large numbers and	Life and death Actions (Killing in large	Animals (slaughtering)	HUMAN BEINGS ARE ANIMALS

Table 8***A Sample of the CMs Used in 'Why the Iran-Russia Relationship Is So Uneasy'***

The Linguistic Metaphorical Expression	Contextual Meaning	Target Domain	Source Domain	Conceptual Metaphor
1. Why the Iran- Russia Relationship Is So Uneasy	the alliance and relationship between politicians and decision-makers in Iran and Russia	Politics Relationships	OM: the human being	COUNTRIES ARE HUMAN BEINGS
2. Russia froze the S-	The politicians	Politics	OM: the	COUNTRIES ARE

CONCLUSIONS

As discussed above, the writer portrays and manipulates certain political images through discourse using the cognitive model that exists in the reader towards the media and specific political goals in line with the maintenance of power relations and the long potential of the political/economic status quo and journalistic security. Our comments are also reflected in the literature in different guises and voices, for example by Koller (2004), Kovecses (2009), Lakoff (1996), Musolff (2004, 2006, 2010, 2016), Cammaerts (2012), Eubanks (2000), and very powerful by Goatly (2007), among others. To close our CMA comments, political articles have a direct social, ideological, political, and economic function to launch when facing the reader. Therefore, language and discourse must be cultivated and used par excellence, without mistakes, so that certain ideological, political, and economic powers remain.

As for the pedagogical implications, providing EFL students with insights from Cognitive Linguistics is very important for researchers and language teachers in EFL classrooms. In fact, through the analysis of conceptual metaphors, as we have done with the current corpus, we can argue, like many previous researchers, that conceptual metaphors play a sensible role in the practice and process of making critical/discursive meaning and, therefore, will gain consideration in the context of EFL. To be more specific, the current study has several implications for the practice of critical metaphor analysis in EFL classrooms. One of the implications is to develop a practical and facilitated analysis of the table above in order to provide foreign language education and educators to quickly understand the theory and practice of CM, and then perhaps use a version of the table in their own teaching, especially to teach intermediate and advanced reading and writing. Another implication for teacher educators - it can help student teachers gain a more complete understanding of discourse, especially political discourse, by attending to specific metaphors and genres such as political texts. An understanding of the various features in metaphors can

lead to a better understanding of social issues, ideology, and power in political texts. In general, studying metaphors critically in various genres can lead to the advancement of language awareness and provide language learners with more control over their own language production as well as a better understanding of how metaphors are manifested in the language use of others.

As with other qualitative discourse analytic studies, this study may suffer from some limitations. First, it can be said that metaphors identified and analyzed in certain sub-genres, such as those limited in this study, may be used in other semantic and contextual chains in other genres and discourses (Musolff & Zinken, 2009). This limitation, it is expected, is a consequence of time, personal, and scope limitations that rob the researchers beyond the sub-genre focused on establishing a relationship between the metaphors brought out and those in the compared genre. Another obvious limitation is the limited size of the corpus and the number of articles analyzed. Needless to add, these limitations encourage the conduct of further research with better designs and complementary perspectives to provide more insight into the field.

References

- Arcimavičienė L. (2014). Presidential New Year greetings: What is implied by metaphors? *Studies about languages*, 24, 76-86.
- Bednarek, M. (2005). Construing the world: Conceptual metaphors and event-construal in news stories. *Metaphorik*, 9, 6-32.
- Bednarek, M. (2006a). Epistemological positioning and evidentiality in English news discourse: A text-driven approach. *Text & Talk*, 26(6), 635-60.
- Bednarek, M. (2006b). *Evaluation in media discourse: Analysis of a newspaper corpus*. A&C Black.
- Beer, F. A., & Landtsheer, C. D. (2004). Metaphors, politics, and world politics. In F. A. Beer, & C. De Landtsheer (Eds.).

- Metaphorical World Politics (pp. 5-55). Michigan State University Press.
- Cameron, L. (2003). *Metaphor in educational discourse*. London: Continuum.
- Cammaerts, B. (2012). The strategic use of metaphors by political and media elites: the 2007- 11 Belgian constitutional crisis. *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics*, 8 (2/3), 229-249.
- Cap, P. (2006). *Metaphor and Political Discourse: Analogical Reasoning in Debates About Europe*: by Andreas Musolff, Palgrave Macmillan, Houndmills, Basingstoke, 2004, viii+ 211 pp., hb.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2006a). Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2007). *The Communication of leadership: The design of leadership style*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2006b). Britain as a container: Immigration metaphors in the 2005 election campaign. *Discourse & Society*, 17(5), 563-581.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2011). Metaphor in political discourse. In *Politicians and rhetoric* (pp. 28- 51). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Chiappe, D. L. (2000). Metaphor, modularity, and the evolution of conceptual integration. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 15(3), 137-158.
- Chilton, P., & Lakoff, G. (2005). Foreign policy by metaphor. In *Language & Peace* (pp. 61- 84). Routledge.
- Chilton, P., & Schäffner, C. (1997). Discourse and politics. *Discourse as social interaction*, 2, 206-230.
- Carston, R. (2002). Metaphor, ad hoc concepts and word meaning—more questions than answers. University College London, 83-105.
- Crisp, P., Heywood, J., & Steen, G. (2002). Metaphor identification and analysis, classification and quantification. *Language and literature*, 11(1), 55-69.
- Eubanks, P. (2000). *A war of words in the discourse of trade: The rhetorical constitution of metaphor*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Farahani, A., & Adeli Jam, Z. (2019). The role of metaphorical language in the critical discourse analysis of Western political texts. *Journal of Language and Translation*, 9(1), 17-31.
- Gibbs Jr, R. W., & Tendahl, M. (2006). Cognitive effort and effects in metaphor comprehension: Relevance theory and psycholinguistics. *Mind & Language*, 21(3), 379-403.
- Goatly, A. (2007). *Washing the brain: Metaphor and hidden ideology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Grady, J. (1999). A typology of motivation for conceptual metaphor. *Metaphor in cognitive linguistics*, 79-100.
- Guttenplan, S. (2006). The transparency of metaphor. *Mind & language*, 21(3), 333-359.
- Hart, C. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis and cognitive science: New perspectives on immigration discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hellsten, I. (2002). *The politics of metaphor: biotechnology and biodiversity in the media*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Heywood, J., Semino, E., & Short, M. (2002). Linguistic metaphor identification in two extracts from novels. *Language and Literature*, 11(1), 35-54.
- Hobbes, T. (1996). *Leviathan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Koller, V. (2004). *Metaphor and gender in business media discourse: A critical cognitive study*. Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2009). Metaphor, culture, and discourse: The pressures of coherence. In A. Musolff, & J. Zinken (Eds.), *Metaphor and discourse* (pp. 11–24). Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.

- Kövecses, Z. (2015). *Where metaphors come from: reconsidering context in metaphor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1993). How metaphor structures dreams: The theory of conceptual metaphor applied to dream analysis. *Dreaming*, 3(2), 77.
- Lakoff, G. (1996). *Moral politics: What conservatives know that liberals don't*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). The metaphorical structure of the human conceptual system. *Cognitive science*, 4(2), 195-208.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2008). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago press.
- Leezenberg, M. (2001). Aristotle on Metaphor, Comparison and Similarity. *Contexts of Metaphor*. Amsterdam, New York: Elsevier, 31-42.
- Levin, S. (1977). *The Semantics of Metaphor*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins. Levin *The Semantics of Metaphor* 1977.
- Low, G. (1988). On teaching metaphor. *Applied Linguistics*, 9 (2), 125-47.
- McGlone, M. S., & Manfredi, D. A. (2001). Topic—vehicle interaction in metaphor comprehension. *Memory & Cognition*, 29(8), 1209-1219.
- Musolff, A. (2004). Metaphor and political discourse: Analogical reasoning in debates about Europe. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Musolff, A. (2006). Metaphor scenarios in public discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 21(1), 23– 38.
- Musolff, A. (2010). *Metaphor, nation and the holocaust: The concept of the body politic* (Vol. 3). Routledge.
- Musolff, A. (2016). *Political Metaphor Analysis. Discourse and Scenarios*. John Benjamins. Musolff, A., & Zinken, J. (eds.) (2009). *Metaphor and discourse*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Osgerby, J., Marriott, P., & Gee, M. (2018). Accounting students perceptions of using visual metaphor as part of personal development planning: an exploratory case study. *Accounting Education*, 27(6), 570-589.
- Pinker, S. (1994). How could a child use verb syntax to learn verb semantics? *Lingua*, 92, 377- 410.
- Schön, D. A. (1979). Generative metaphor: A perspective on problem-setting in social policy. *Metaphor and thought*, 2, 137-163.
- Shimko, K.L. (2004). The power of metaphors and the metaphors of power: The United States in the cold war and after. In F. A. Beer, & C. De Landtsheer (Eds.). *Metaphorical world politics* (pp. 199–215). East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Steen, G. J., & Gibbs Jr, R. W. (1999). Metaphor in cognitive linguistics. *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*, 1-233.
- Stern, J. (2000). *Metaphor in context*. MIT Press.
- Thompson, S. (1996). Politics without metaphors is like a fish without water. In J. Scott Mio, & A. N., Katz (Eds.). *Metaphor: Implications and applications* (pp. 185-201). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Zinken, J. (2007). Discourse metaphors: The link between figurative language and habitual analogies.
- Zinken, J., & Musolff, A. (2009). A discourse-centered perspective on metaphorical meaning and understanding. In *Metaphor and discourse* (pp. 1-8). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Biodata

Ms. Somayeh Jafarnezhad is a Ph.D. Candidate in TEFL from Sarab Azad University, Iran. She is a university lecturer in Islamic Azad and Pyame Nour Universities in Tabriz. Her main area of research interests encompasses Critical discourse analysis, Sociology and mainly General and advanced English language teaching materials; so, she has prepared several applied abridged notes related to IELTS and TOEFL training courses which are being redacted to be published.

Email: *Somayehjafarnezhad@yahoo.com*

Dr. Bahloul Salmani received his Ph.D. in Translation Studies from Hyderabad Central University, India in 2008. He is an academic member of the Department of Translation Studies at Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University. His main area of research interest includes topics as translation quality assessment, sociology of translation, cultural-semiotics and translation studies, and hermeneutics and translation. He has published three books and several papers in accredited journals on translation-related topics. He is presently dean of the Humanities, Persian Literature, and Foreign Languages Faculty at Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch.

Email: *Bsalmani@iaut.ac.ir*

Dr. Hossein Sadegh Oghli

Associate Professor, English Language Department, Sarab Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sarab, Iran