

THE METAPHORS: THE MAKASSAR LEGISLATORS

LIVE BY

METAFORA: ANGGOTA LEGISLATIF MAKASSAR

LIVE BY

ERNYANTI ZAIN



**POST GRADUATE PROGRAM
HASANUDDIN UNIVERSITY
MAKASSAR
2013**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Praise and thanks to the presence of God, Allah SWT for His blessing and His mercy overflows, so that the writer could complete the thesis entitled "The Metaphors: The Makassar Legislators Live By" as expected. The purpose of this thesis is as one of the requirement in order to achieve a magister degree at Hasanuddin University Post Graduate Program.

This thesis has got support from various quarters, therefore, on this occasion please allow the writer to convey infinite thanks and appreciation, respectively to Prof. Dr. Abdul Hakim Yassi, Dipl. TESL, M.A. as commission's chief of adviser assoc, Dra. Nasmilah Imran, M. Hum., Ph.D. as the member of the advisory commision for giving the time and attention in guiding and directing the writer with patience and wisdom. Thanks also goes to Prof. Dr. Hamzah A. Machmoed, M.A., Drs. Stanislaus Sandarupa, M.A., Ph.D and Dr. H. Mustafa Makka, M.S. as examiners for giving support and participation in providing the time and piece of mind to the writer as a researcher until this study can be well implemented.

The writer does not forget to deliver his profound gratitude to The Regional People Representative Assembly (DPRD) of Makassar in providing the main data for this research.

Sincere thanks is also presented to classmates in 2010-2013, English Graduate Program of Hasanuddin University who have been

motivating one another, especially to Meniwati from Kalimantan who stays in same boarding house and also thanks to all my friends at “Pondok Ar” . In particular, the writer thanks goes to Muh. Zain Baso (father) and Becce (mother) and all sisters (Wahida, Wahyuni, Indrawati, Rahmananengsi, Afdaliana, and Nurfa Zaitun) and brother (Anugrah) who always give pray, support and help to writer for the education. Particularly, my well-deserved thanks is adressed to my beloved friends Dholy Anharika, Ibrahim Umar, Abbas Djohan, Ashar Mustaring and Isdar Binsona who are always cheerful, funny, patient, sincere and loyal to the writer for conducting the study, either in love or sorrow, and always give motivation to study. They are the ones make the writer strong and consistent to quickly accomplish this scientific work.

Finally, the writer would like to thank to both services of all those who have participated in the study and the attention of this writing.

Hopefully, this thesis would be useful to all readers, especially for lovers of English or Linguistic.

The writer realizes that this paper is not yet perfect. Therefore, suggestions and constructive criticism are expected of all readers for the completion of this work.

Makassar, July 2013

Ernyanti Zain

ABSTRACT

ERNYANTI ZAIN. *The Metaphors: The Makassar Legislators Live By* (George Lakoff and Mark Johnson) (supervised by Abdul Hakim Yassi and Nasmilah Imran).

The research aimed at: (1) to identify metaphorical expressions used by Makassar politicians in their speeches, (2) to find out metaphorical concepts formulated from the metaphorical expressions used by the Makassar politicians.

The research was carried out Regional People Representative Assembly of Makassar City, South Sulawesi. This was a descriptive research by using a qualitative approach. Methods used in data collection were recording and transcript. Samples were as many as seven political speeches presented by Makassar politicians.

The research result indicates that Makassar legislators conceptualize regulations as flats, people, and food products; taxes as waves and cargoes; Makassar legislators also orient appreciation as up, and togetherness as front.

ABSTRAK

ERNYANTI ZAIN. *Metafora: Anggota Legislatif Makassar Live By*
(dibimbing oleh Abdul Hakim Yassi dan Nasmilah Imran)

Penelitian ini bertujuan: (1) mengidentifikasi ungkapan-ungkapan metafora yang digunakan oleh politisi Makassar dalam pidato, (2) menemukan konsep-konsep metafora yang diformulasikan dari ungkapan-ungkapan metafora yang digunakan oleh politisi Makassar tersebut.

Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian deskriptif yang menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif. Penelitian dilaksanakan di DPRD kota Makassar. Sulawesi Selatan. Metode pengumpulan data adalah rekaman dan transkrip. Sampel penelitian sebanyak tujuh pidato politik yang disampaikan oleh politisi Makassar.

Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa anggota legislatif Makassar mengonseptualkan aturan sebagai rumah susun, orang dan produk makanan; pajak sebagai gelombang dan muatan kapal; anggota legislatif Makassar juga mengorientasikan penghargaan sebagai posisi atas dan kebersamaan sebagai posisi depan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Background	1
B. Identification of Problem	4
C. Problem Statements	4
D. Objectives of Research	5
E. Significances of Research	5
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	6
A. Previous Studies	6
B. Theoretical Background	7
1. Definition of Conceptual Metaphors Theory	7
2. Kinds of Conceptual Metaphors	12
3. Properties of Conceptual Metaphors	17
4. Metaphorical Concepts within Culture	20
5. Metaphorical Concepts in political Speech	22
C. Conceptual Framework	25

III.	RESEARCH METHOD	26
	A. Type of Research	26
	B. Time and Location of Research	27
	C. Population and Sample	27
	D. Method of Collecting Data	28
	E. Method of Analyzing Data	28
IV.	FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	29
	A. The Conceptualization of Regulation	30
	B. The Conceptualization of Taxes	37
	C. Other Conceptualizations	41
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS	
	A. Conclusions	43
	B. Suggestions	43
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	45
	APPENDIX	47

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background

The language used in politics is a complex issue including many strategies of language uses to influence the listener toward a desired attitude or thought. The use of language strategies will be different depending on the aim and conviction of the speaker. Politicians as speakers, use language to persuade people that their thoughts, aims and ideas are equitable and to make their point clear and vivid to the people. The politicians need to use various language tools in order to make the message persuasive and comprehensible to the people. They try to fulfill the emotions, desires, and needs of the audience.

The use of metaphor is one of the most prominent tools for persuasion and an instrument for propaganda in political speech. Charteris-Black (2005) states that metaphor to a politician is what sex appeals to an individual: a covert way of sending out messages of desirability. This analogy implies that politicians who use metaphor effectively can lure supporters to their side, while those who cannot probably will not survive for long in the competitive arena of modern politics. We can say that metaphor has important role in political speech.

A lot of researches have been made on the subject of metaphoric language and use, and following the publication of Lakoff and Johnson's *Metaphors we live by* (1980). *Metaphors we live by* is said to have been the starting point of the view of metaphors in language today. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), there is a close correlation between language, metaphors and thought. They claim that metaphor is not merely a figure of speech, but is a specific mental and neural mapping that influences a good deal of how people think, reason, and imagine in everyday life. Lakoff and Johnson developed this idea that has become "cognitive linguistic view of metaphor" or known as "Conceptual Metaphors Theory". According to this idea, metaphors are not only a property of words, but of concepts and are not simply used as artistic and aesthetic tools. Metaphors are used in order to make concepts understandable. For Chilton (2006), Metaphor as a cognitive, not a linguistic phenomenon, the human mind has various forms of organized knowledge. These may be innate or partly innate and elaborated by culture – relative experience.

Since conceptual metaphor arises from culture or a set of experiences, the conceptual metaphors available may differ from individual to individual as much as each individual experiences differ from those of his or her fellow human beings. People living together in a (socio-cultural) community will have a certain number of common experiences and will therefore share a basic stock of metaphorical concepts. These experiences are conditioned partially by their environment – by the

geographical structure of the area they inhabit, the degree of industrialization the climate, etc., and partially by traditions and rituals of the community in which they grow up. For example, the conceptual metaphor underlying the expression *to bury racism* arises from an aspect of the ritual of dealing with death and the dead in Western culture. In a culture where the dead are not buried in the ground, but their bodies lie among the branches of old trees, this metaphor would lose its experiential basis and cease to exist. A different conceptual metaphor would be taken to underlie an expression like *to bury racism* if the only things ritually buried in the ground were seeds.

Based on the explanations above, the writer is interested to analyze metaphors used by Makassar Politicians especially legislators in their speeches. Since the writer thinks that Makassar is one of unique cultures in Indonesia whose metaphors are equitable to be analyzed. The writer will analyze the metaphors used by Makassar legislators by using Conceptual Metaphors Theory by Lakoff and Johnson. The results of this research are expected to explain the kinds of metaphorical expressions used by Makassar legislators in their speeches and how the metaphorical concepts of Makassar legislators are formulated from the metaphorical expressions. The result of this study is also expected to give information to the society about metaphorical expressions that Makassar legislators are familiar to utter. The society is therefore able to grasp the meaning that such metaphorical expressions stand for.

B. Identification of Problems

Based on the background of this study, the writer has found out some problems which are equitable to be analyzed related to metaphors used by Makassar legislators in speech, they are such as follows:

1. There are some metaphorical expressions used by Makassar legislators in speech which are identified as part of characteristics of Makassar culture.
2. Based on the metaphorical expressions used by Makassar legislators in speech, some metaphorical concepts will be formulated as the conceptual system of Makassar politicians which are identified as part of characteristics of Makassar culture.

C. Problem Statements

Based on the above identification problems, the writer tries to formulate the following questions in which the writer works:

1. What kind of metaphorical expressions used by Makassar legislators in speech?
2. How are those kinds of metaphorical concept formulated from the metaphorical expressions used by Makassar legislators in speech?

D. Objectives of Research

Referring to the problem statements above, the objectives of the study are:

1. To identify the kind of metaphorical expressions used by Makassar politicians.
2. To find out how such kinds of metaphorical concept are formulated from the metaphorical expressions used by Makassar politicians in their speeches.

E. Significances of Research

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) proposed that in order to understand the nature of metaphorical mapping, it is required to do a conceptual analysis of the conceptual domains. In this study, the writer is expected to be able scientifically explain about:

1. The kinds of metaphorical expressions used by Makassar legislators in speech as a part of characteristics of Makassar culture.
2. How such kinds of metaphorical concepts are formulated from the metaphorical expressions used by Makassar legislators in their speeches.

Another contribution of this study, it can be a comparative study. The result of this study can be compared with metaphorical expressions used by legislators from different culture.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. Previous Studies

Malan (2008) in her research studies about metaphors in politics. She focused her study on analyzing conceptual metaphors in South African political speeches (1994-2001). This study showed metaphors in South African political speeches form a complex systematic and coherent network structuring thought across party-political boundaries. The conceptual metaphors as logical inference patterns of metaphors found in South African political speeches include "Racism is A Disease" and "Reconciliation is Healing". This study showed that the South African politicians view racism as something negative which needs to be resolved and reconciliation as something worth maintaining or striving for. This study supports that conceptual metaphors are formed on the basis of an individual set of experiences.

Another researcher, Lesz (2011) in her research studies about metaphors in politics. She focused her study on analyzing metaphors in the speeches of Barack Obama. The results of this study showed the importance of metaphors in Politics. This study also found some conceptual metaphors used by Obama in his speeches that are considered as Obama's image as an active and strong leader with moral

authority. Some conceptual metaphors found in the speeches of Barack Obama include “America is A Leader in A Journey” and “U.S. Movement Forward” present the actions of the government as proceeding in a journey associates Obama’s leadership with activity and action.

The difference between the two previous studies with this study is more about comparative study. The result of this study is expected to produce some kinds of metaphorical concepts used by Makassar legislators which are considered as a part of Makassar culture, so it could be compared with metaphorical concepts produced by people at another culture.

B. Theoretical Background

1. Definition of Conceptual Metaphors Theory

The term Conceptual Metaphors has been introduced and extensively analyzed by Lakoff and Johnson in *Metaphors we live by* (1980). Before the publication of *Metaphors we live by*, the view of metaphors was constituted as a “figure of speech”. Lakoff and Johnson took the view of metaphors to a different level, arguing that metaphors are not just linguistic phenomena, but a matter of thought. They think that there is a close correlation between language, metaphors, and thought. Therefore, they claim that whether consciously or not, people think in

metaphors (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). Thus, he developed an innovative theory about metaphors that is Conceptual Metaphors Theory.

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Conceptual Metaphors Theory is that the human conceptual system is “fundamentally metaphorical in nature”, and consequently that “human thought processes are largely metaphorical”. The theory suggests that the reason that metaphors are so abundant in language is that they reflect underlying metaphorical thought: “Metaphors as linguistic expressions are possible precisely because there are metaphors in a person’s conceptual system” (Lakoff and Johnson 2003).

Concepts, conceptual systems and metaphors are central notions in Conceptual Metaphor Theory. In cognitive linguistics, a *concept* is the same as a cognitive category. It is something that resides in the mind of the speaker, “the components of thought”. Each concept may have a single word denoting it but a word may denote several concepts. For example, the word “bank” may denote both the financial institution and a river-bank, as in “the bank of the river was very steep”. Accordingly, a *conceptual system* becomes the interrelated, inter-working sum of all our individual concepts. Different people (or groups of people) may conceptualize the world differently, resulting in different worldviews. Human conceptual systems are not something that we are normally aware of, and Lakoff refers to this as the “cognitive unconscious”. In most of the little things people do every day, they simply think and act more or less

automatically along certain lines. One way to find out is by looking at language. Lakoff and Johnson assert that since communication is based on the same conceptual system that human use in thinking and acting, language is an important source of evidence for what that system is like. Primarily on the basis of linguistic evidence, it has been found that most of human ordinary conceptual system is metaphorical in nature. And they have found a way to begin to identify in detail just what the metaphors are that structure how they perceive, how they think, and what they do (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). The last, *metaphor* itself is defined as a cognitive not a linguistic phenomenon as explained above. The human mind has various forms of organized knowledge. These may be innate or partly and elaborated by cultural-relative experience. It is called domain. Metaphor is then defined as a mapping from a source domain to a target domain and metaphorical expressions as manifestation of human conceptual system.

The core principle of Conceptual Metaphors Theory is that metaphorical mappings from source domains to target domains underlie representation. A *mapping* is defined as the systematic set of correspondence that exists between constituent element of the source and the target domain. *Source domain* is the conceptual domain from which the people draw metaphorical expressions (e.g., love is *journey*) while *target domain* is the conceptual domain that the people try to understand (e.g., *love is journey*) (Wikipedia). In summary, according to Lakoff and Johnson (1980) conceptual metaphors are mappings between source

domains and conceptual target domains. These mappings develop through repetitive experiences of the source and target domains. More abstract thought, about domains such as emotion would not be possible without conceptual metaphors.

Some provided idea of what it could mean for a concept to be metaphorical and for such a concept to structure an everyday activity, Johnson and Lakoff (1980) show one example with the concept “Argument” and the metaphorical concept “Argument is War”. This metaphor is reflected in our everyday language by a wide variety of metaphorical expressions:

Argument is War

Your claims are *undefensible*.

He *attacked every weak point* in my argument.

His criticisms were *right on target*.

I *demolished* his argument.

I've never *won* an argument with him.

You disagree? Okay, *shoot!*

If you see that *strategy*, he'll *wipe you out*.

He *shot down* all of my arguments.

It is important to see that the metaphorical expressions above don't just talk about arguments in terms of war. It can actually win or lose arguments. It is seen that the person who is argued as an opponent. The

speakers attack his positions and they defend their own. They gain and lose ground. They plan and use strategies. If they find a position indefensible, they can abandon it and take a new line of attack. Many of the things they do in arguing are not physical battles but there is a verbal battle, and the structure of an argument: attack, defense, counterattack, etc. reflect this. It is in this sense that the “Argument is War” metaphor is one that they live by in this culture; it structures the actions they perform in arguing (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 4).

“Argument is War” is an example of what it means for a metaphorical concept to structure (at least in part) what they do and how they understand what they are doing when they argue. The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another. It is not that arguments are subspecies of war. Arguments and wars are different kinds of actions. But “Argument” is partially structured, understood, performed, and talked about in terms of “War”. The concept is metaphorically structured, and, consequently, the language is metaphorically structured (Lakoff And Johnson, 1980: 5)

Lakoff and Johnson (1980:6) assert that the most important claim is that metaphor is not just a matter of language, that is, of mere words. On the contrary, human thought processes are largely metaphorical. This is what it means when it is said that the human conceptual system is metaphorically structured and defined. Metaphors as linguistic expressions are possible precisely because there are metaphors in a person’s

conceptual system. Therefore, whenever in this study speak of metaphors, such as “Argument is War”, it should be understood that metaphor means metaphorical concept.

Since metaphorical expressions in language are tied to metaphorical concepts in a systematic way, it is able to use metaphorical linguistic expressions to study the nature of metaphorical concepts and to gain an understanding of the metaphorical nature of our activities.

2. Kinds of Metaphorical Concept

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) list three kinds of metaphorical concepts namely orientational metaphor, ontological metaphors, and structural metaphors. A brief description of these kinds is going to be presented following.

a. Orientational Metaphors

Orientational metaphors is a kind of metaphorical concept that doesn't structure one concept in terms of another but instead organizes a whole system of concepts with respect to one another. Most of orientational metaphors have to do with spatial orientation such like up-down, in-out or front-back, on-off, deep-shallow, and central-peripheral. These spatial orientations arise from the fact that people have bodies of the sort they have and that they function as they do in their physical

environment. The provided example is the following English expression: “I’m feeling *up* today”. Lakoff and Johnson claim that this expression comes from the fact that “happy” is oriented “up” in the “Happy is Up” metaphor. They, moreover, argue that such metaphorical orientations are not “randomly assigned”. They are simply grounded on the speakers’ physical and cultural experiences. Though the polar oppositions up-down, in-out, up-down, in-out or front-back, on–off, deep-shallow, and central-peripheral are physical in nature, the orientational metaphors based on them can vary from culture to culture (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 18).

As an illustration, a provided example which has been studied intensively by William Nagy (1974) in Lakoff and Johnson (1980) will be given in this case.

Happy is Up; Sad is Down

I’m feeling *up*. That *boosted* my spirits. My spirits *rose*. You’re in *high* spirits. Thinking about her always gives me a *lift*. I’m feeling *down*. I’m *depressed*. He’s really *low* these days. I *fell* into a depression. My spirits *sank*.

Physical basis: Drooping posture typically goes along with sadness and depression, erect posture with a positive emotional state.

Each metaphorical concept might have arisen from our physical and cultural experience. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) conclude that most of our fundamental concepts are organized in terms of one or more spatialization

metaphors. Spatialization metaphors are rooted in physical and culture experience; they are not randomly assigned.

b. Ontological Metaphors

Understanding experiences in terms of objects (especially our bodies) and substances gives rise to ontological metaphor. These metaphors allow the speaker to treat parts of his/her experience as discrete entities or substances of a uniform kind. The experiences with physical objects (especially people own bodies) provide the basis for an extraordinarily wide variety of ontological metaphors, that is, ways of viewing events, activities, emotions, ideas, etc., as entities and substances (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 25)

Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 27) draw one example of ontological metaphors from the experience of rising prices, which can be metaphorically viewed as an entity via the noun inflation. This gives us a way of referring to the experience:

The Mind is A Machine

We're still trying to *grind out* the solution to this equation.

My mind just isn't operating today.

Boy, the *wheels are turning* now!

I'm *a little trusty* today.

We've been working on this problem all day and now we're *running out of steam*.

The “machine” metaphor gives us a conception of the mind as having an on-off state, a level of efficiency productive capacity, an internal mechanism, a source energy, and an operating condition.

The most obvious ontological metaphors are those where the physical objects is further specified as being a person. This allows people to comprehend a wide variety of experiences with nonhuman entities in terms of human motivations, characteristics, and activities. It is called personification (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 33).

The point here is that personification is a general category that covers a very wide range of metaphors, each picking out different aspects of a person or ways of looking at person. What they all have in common is that they are extensions of ontological metaphors and that they allow us to make sense of phenomena in the world in human terms that could be understood on the basis of our own motivations, goals, actions, and characteristics.

c. Structural Metaphors

Structural metaphors provide the richest source of metaphorical elaboration. Additionally, they allow the speaker to use one highly structured and highly designated concept in order to structure another concept. Additionally, structural metaphors are also grounded in systematic correlations within the speakers’ experience, like orientational

and ontological metaphors. But it such a kind of metaphor is more flexible than the previous ones (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 61).

To know about this in detail, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) examine how the “Rational Argument is War” metaphor might be grounded. This metaphor allows people to conceptualize what a rational argument is in terms of something that they understand more readily, namely, physical conflict. Fighting is found everywhere in the animal kingdom nowhere so much as among human animals. Animals fight to get what they want: food, sex, territory, control, etc., because there are other animals who want the same thing or who want to stop them from getting it. The same is true of human animals, except that we have developed more sophisticated techniques for getting our way. Being “rational animals,” we have institutionalized our fighting in a number of ways, one of them being war. Even though we have over the ages institutionalized our fighting in number of ways, one of them being war.

The point here is that not only people conception of an argument but the way they carry it out is grounded in our knowledge and experience of physical combat. “Rational Argument is War” has a strong structural basis. They emerged naturally in a culture like ours, because what they highlight corresponds so closely to what we experience collectively and what they hide corresponds to so little. But not only are they grounded in our physical and cultural experience; they also influence our experience and our actions.

3. Properties of Metaphorical Concepts

Lakoff and Johnson (2003) consider six points as to how metaphorical concepts are structured and how they function.

a. Metaphorical concepts seem to be culturally dependent. Some provided examples through the study of certain linguistic expressions conceptualize time in terms of money. But it is not necessary for humans to conceptualize time in this way; it is dependent on their culture (Lakoff and Johnson 2003: 9). Thus, linguistic analysis of metaphorical expressions of time in other cultures may reveal different conceptual metaphors.

b. Metaphorical concepts structuring is partial in nature. This means that when people map from one domain in order to bring some enlightenment to another domain they only map some, not all, of the features that define the source domain onto the target domain. For example, sometimes when people talk about theories, they employ the conceptual metaphor “Theories are Buildings”, seen in surface language when they talk about a strong or weak theory, the foundation and framework of theories, theories that need support, and theories that stand or fall. However, it would be very strange to think of theories as having staircases, different rooms, and a roof, though these are properties of buildings too: “Thus the metaphor “Theories are Buildings” has a “used”

part (foundation and outer shell) and an “unused” part (rooms, staircase, etc.) (Lakoff and Johnson 2003: 52).

c. Metaphorical concepts have multiple mappings. A single concept can have several different conceptual metaphors working to describe different parts of how we understand that concept. For example, the human mind is sometimes conceptualized in terms of a machine. In other instances, we may instead employ the “Mind as Brittle Object” metaphor. These two different conceptual metaphors enable us to focus on different aspects of mental experience, as seen in these two examples: He broke down (The Mind is A Machine); He cracked up (The Mind is A Brittle Object) (Lakoff and Johnson 2003: 28).

d. Metaphorical concepts that get mapped into other concepts are not random, but usually human conceptual system is grounded in a very specific way. In most cases the target domains are abstract whereas the source domains are concrete or in the words of Lakoff and Johnson, “we typically conceptualize the nonphysical in term of the physical” (2003: 59). This means that people usually map from a domain which they can see, feel, touch and understand to the domains that they cannot see or so easily comprehend. This is a very important aspect of Conceptual Metaphor theory, because as the theory claims that most concepts are structured in terms of other concepts, a question then arises how people can understand anything at all if there are no concepts to be understood directly without metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson 2003: 56).

e. Metaphorical concepts can have a special property of highlighting and hiding. Following Conceptual Metaphor Theory, a concept may be understood by mapping certain aspects of other concepts onto itself, and it may come down to context as to which concepts are used as source domains. In that way we can choose to highlight certain features of the target domain, for example, by using the “Mind is A Brittle Object”, we can emphasize the psychological strength, or lack of the mind. Or, by using the “Mind is A Machine” metaphor, we can stress that the mind has levels of efficiency, a certain productive capacity and such (Lakoff and Johnson 2003: 28). But a conceptual metaphor can also hide certain aspects of a concept. For example consider the “Conduit” metaphor, where ideas (or meanings are seen as objects, linguistic expressions as container and the act of communication as sending: “It’s hard to *get* that idea across to him”, “It’s difficult to *put* my ideas into words”, “His words *carry* little meaning” (Lakoff and Johnson 2003: 10).

f. In the wake of metaphorical concept research there follows some important philosophical implications. The empirical research, the subsequent findings and theory building carried out by the cognitive sciences challenge much of the basis upon which traditional western philosophy is built. In the traditional view, the mind is divinely separated and elevated above the body, and people’s concepts and knowledge are objective, literal and subject to conscious reasoning. When investigations into figurative language reveal a mind that “is fundamentally shaped by

various poetic and figurative processes” where it is claimed that “most of our thought is unconscious” (Lakoff 2002: 4) and that people’s reasoning draws heavily on their bodily experiences, they see this constitutes nothing short of a definite break with the past.

4. Metaphorical Concepts within Culture

Many scholars have discussed about cultural phenomena in this world. Culture is often viewed as what members of a given society have in common (Chilton 2006). Chilton also refers to culture as a society’s adaptation to its environment. Culture differs from each other because each culture has its unique cultural and social context. Therefore, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) discuss an issue is that the question whether all cultures share the same conception of the world especially in metaphors use. Lakoff and Johnson view a certain class of metaphors seems to be universal. These are a result of people’s bodily interaction with the physical environment. People can therefore say they are products of embodiment.

A provided example of a metaphor that is an outcome of embodiment is the conceptual orientational metaphor “Good is Up”. This conceptual metaphor is a result of our spatial orientation. However, some conceptual metaphors are culture specific. Different cultures may have different value systems that may result different interpretations of

experiences from other cultures. Metaphorical expressions are also directly linked with the conceptual creativity of human beings.

Many scholars also have discussed the important role of culture in conceptual metaphors (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). Metaphor within culture variation is an innovative theory in cognitive linguistics which claims that conceptual metaphors tend to vary within culture variation. Allah (2010) emphasizes that conceptual metaphors can be interpreted only by considering the “cultural context” in which they occur. A similar view had been discussed many years ago by Lakoff and Turner (1989). They argued that basic conceptual metaphors are part of the “common conceptual apparatus” which is shared by the members of a certain culture. Steen (1994) in Chilton (2006) also comments on the “common conceptual apparatus” term. He equalizes this term with social and cultural speech patterns which can be found among particular language users. Another study, Kovecses (2002) claims conceptual metaphors could be tangible processes in our social and cultural practices.

In building all arguments which support the important role of culture in conceptual metaphors, Kovecses gives the following example. He points out that in seating arrangement at a formal meeting usually important people tend to sit more centrally or higher than people who are less important. Kovecses associates this social phenomenon with the metaphorical structure which is provided by the conceptual metaphor SIGNIFICANT/IMPORTANT IS HIGHER/CENTRAL and LESS

SIGNIFICANT/LESS IMPORTANT IS LOWER/PERIPHERAL (Kovecses, 2002:142). Furthermore, Kovecses finds that the main meaning focus in conceptual metaphors is useful because of its “cultural-sensitivity”. He states his rule as follow:

“Each source is associated with a particular meaning focus (or foci) that is (or are) mapped into the target. This meaning focus (or foci) is (are) constituted by the central knowledge that pertains to a particular entity or event within the speech community. The target inherits the meaning focus (or foci) of the source.” (Kovecses, 2002: 82)

He claims that there can be differences in the range of conceptual metaphors that languages and cultures have available for the conceptualization of particular target domains. Kovecses (2002: 184) then concludes that different cultures may elaborate conceptual metaphors differently.

5. Metaphorical Concepts in Political Speech

Everyone knows that politicians use language in ways designed to persuade, and perhaps deceive, and some people would include ‘metaphors’ as examples of political rhetoric or commonly said as political speech. Political speech is a kind of speech that has close relation with

politician and metaphor. A *politician* is considered as a person who is politically active, especially in political parties, a person holding or seeking political office whether elected or appointed, whether professionally or otherwise. Positions range from Homeowner association and block watches to executive legislative and judicial offices of state and national governments, some law enforcement officers, such as sheriffs, are also considered as politicians (Wikipedia), while metaphors are considered as an essential tool in political speech.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) shows that metaphor plays an important part in how a politician talks and thinks about political concepts in speech. Charteris-Black (2005) states metaphors in political speech as tools for making abstract political issues accessible to the listener and they are frequently used to emphasize or soften certain issues. Metaphors can be used to convey the problem as well as implying the solution in the same metaphor. The values of the speaker are often revealed and influence the receiver's interpretation. The truth may easily be altered since metaphors are received, understood and categorized differently by different people and therefore open for interpretation (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: 163). Lakoff (2003) asserts that people are not interested in whether a statement is true but to which extent it is believable or if it is deliberately deceiving and misleading. A lie which is perceived as not causing any greater harm could be justified as serving a good cause and is therefore acceptable.

Functions that metaphors form can be different from just corrupting language. They may be creative of both the world and language. The way of politicians organize their perception of the world is varied depends on the ways of forming knowledge about the world. These may be called traditions or cultures. That knowledge is dependent upon structures governing the production of knowledge (Pikalo 2005). Chilton (2006) supports this point by asserting that the conceptualization of separate groups of individuals, in many cases in separate geographical regions, is probably a crucial component of political thinking and action. On the linguistic evidence, it is apparently recruited by the conceptual system to understand, reason about, and communicate about social groups (Chilton 2006, 624). It is through metaphors that the abstract field of political becomes empirical in the term of abstract reality.

C. Conceptual Framework

