The Analysis of Metaphors and Metonymies in Political Speeches – A Case Study of the Former Croatian Prime Minister Ivo Sanader

Dragana Božić Lenard, Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Computer Science and Information Technology, Osijek, Croatia
dragana1.bozic@etfos.hr

Nevena Ćosić, Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Osijek, Croatia
nevenatanasic@gmail.com

Abstract

The paper studies metaphors and metonymies usage in 2007 pre-electoral speech by the former Croatian Prime Minister Ivo Sanader, who has the reputation of being an excellent rhetorician, delivered at the 11th Croatian Democratic Union annual meeting. Successful politicians' language happens to be persuasive and for the purpose of persuasion, among other rhetorical strategies, they use highly conventionalized metaphors and metonymies. This paper aims at classifying metaphors and metonymies and examining their purpose, thus identifying the speaker's covert intentions. The analysis shows that metaphors and metonymies are used for creating positive self-representation of both the speaker and his political colleagues and simultaneously negative representation of the speaker's political opponents. In addition, the speaker attributes himself the roles of a father and a savior the nation so desperately needs.

Keywords: Ivo Sanader, metaphor, metonymy, persuasion, political speech, rhetoric

1   Introduction

Politics is a struggle for power with the aim of putting political ideas into practice. What plays a crucial role in this process is language since every political action is well prepared, influenced and realized by the use of language. In addition to a politician's physical presentation and style, voters create impressions based on a politician's honesty and integrity, which is accomplished through the consistency of one's words and actions and the efficiency of one's political arguments. Therefore, whenever speaking publically, politicians carefully plan and choose their rhetoric.

Rhetoric is inseparably connected with persuasion, though not identical. As Charteris-Black (2011, p.13) says "persuasion, therefore refers to the intention, act and effect of changing an audience's thinking"; being a speech act. In comparison to persuasion, rhetoric refers to the strategies a speaker uses in order to obtain votes. To paraphrase, one needs to make a distinction between a speaker's style, namely rhetoric, and persuasion being done by *ethos* (credibility), *pathos* (emotional impact) and *logos* (use of reasoning) as Aristotle suggested. The Aristotelian concepts of *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos* will not be analyzed with respect to Sanader's persuasive power in the paper. It

means that Sanader's credibility, reasoning and the impact he has on the audience are not that relevant when it comes to the analysis of his persuasive powers because he is giving a speech in front of the like-minded, i.e. he does not have to convince anyone in anything; the audience is there because they think like him.

1.1   Aim

This paper aims at studying the rhetoric, more precisely metaphors and metonymies usage, of the former Croatian Prime Minister Ivo Sanader. We decided to take the Critical Metaphor and Metonymy Analysis approach aiming to detect the types of metaphors and metonymies in Sanader's speech and the purpose of their usage, i.e. reveal covert intentions of the speaker. When it comes to metaphors, only OBJECT, WAR, FINANCE, TIME and BUILDING metaphors were subjected to the analysis. It shows that politicians use metaphors very often – sometimes to conceal the real state of the matter, and sometimes as a means of a positive self-presentation. Sanader is not an exception in that sense as the paper shows; in some examples he comes as a very smart and well-read politician, in some he evokes either positive or negative feelings, in some he conceals the truth, etc. With respect to metonymies, there are few metonymic types that are analyzed in the paper, and those are: COUNTRY FOR THE GOVERNMENT, THE STATE FOR THE EVENT, YEAR FOR THE EVENT, INSTITUTION FOR THE PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE and PARTY FOR POLITICIANS. They are used for more or less the same purpose as metaphors, as is evident in the paper.

1.2   Material and Methodology

The material analyzed in this paper is a speech of the former Croatian Prime Minister Ivo Sanader made on the 11th Croatian Democratic Union annual meeting delivered on 30th June 2007, divided into 7 videos and posted on the website https://www.youtube.com. The authors of the paper downloaded and transcribed the videos. Prior to carrying out a large-scale research, a pilot study was conducted. Both qualitative and quantitative research methods were used in the pilot study. First, metaphors and metonymies were categorized based on discerned themes and domains. Each author classified metaphors and metonymies individually and the final categorization was based on a mutual agreement especially in cases of ambiguity. Secondly, based on the frequency of occurrence, metaphors and metonymies listed in section 1.1 were included in the analysis. Furthermore, the Critical Metaphor and Metonymy Analysis approach proposed by Charteris-Black (2004) is applied in the study. Charteris-Black (2004, p. 35-41) proposes three stages. Firstly, with close and repetitive reading, we identified metaphors and metonymies in our corpus. Secondly, we interpreted and classified metaphors and metonymies identifying the type of social relations construed through them. Finally, we explained their function being the basis of rhetorical motivation.

When it comes to the metaphor identification, Steen proposes five steps of metaphor identification (cited in Semino, 2003). The first step includes *metaphor focus identification*. "Steen introduces the first step of his procedure as the identification of linguistic expressions used metaphorically in the discourse, which he refers to as the 'metaphorical foci'". (Semino, 2003, p. 1274). The second step is *metaphor idea identification*. "Steen introduces the first step of his procedure as the identification of linguistic expressions used metaphorically in the discourse, which he refers to as the 'metaphorical foci'. These, he explains, are expressions that activate concepts ''which cannot be literally applied to the referents in the world evoked by the text'' (Steen, 1999, p. 61)". The following example is provided:

> The royal court is going to hunt
> P1 (REF COURT LIONS)
> P2 (HUNT COURT)
> P3 (MOD COURT ROYAL) (Steen, 1999: 63)

The metaphorical idea is captured by P2, where what is involved is no longer words, but the concepts (in SMALL CAPITALS) activated by the words of the original expression. Here, P1 highlights the metaphorical idea, by spelling out that the concept COURT is being applied nonliterally to LIONS. As Steen explains, the output of step 2 is a proposition in which we have a nonliterally used concept (expressed by the linguistic focus identified in step 1) that is related to one or more literally used concepts identified in step 2 which evoke the relevant literal referent (Steen, 1999, p. 66). The third step includes *nonliteral comparison identification* for which Steen says:

> In step 3, the metaphorical propositions that come out of step 2 are put through a procedure which transforms them into comparative structures (see Miller, 1993). This is necessary, according to Steen, in order to be able to arrive at the sets of correspondences across different domains which constitute metaphorical mappings in the cognitive paradigm. Step 3 itself, however, is ''highly mechanical'' (Steen, 1999, p. 67).

The fourth step provided by Steen is called *nonliteral analogy identification*. Whereas step 3 is mechanical, step 4 is highly interpretative, since it involves filling in the empty slots from the output of step 3 so as to arrive at a complete nonliteral analogy. Step 4 consists of *focus interpretation* whereby a literal expression is filled in to replace the metaphorical focus and the *vehicle identification*, whereby some elements of the source domain evoked by the metaphorical focus are chosen to fill in the second incomplete proposition from step 3. (Semino, 2003, p. 1276).
Regarding step 4, Steen stresses out that *focus interpretation* (i.e. finding a literal equivalent for the metaphorical expression) is constrained by the context in which the metaphor occurs, *vehicle identification* has to rely on ''prototypical or default knowledge about the source domain'' (Semino, 2003, p. 1276).

The last step of the process is *nonliteral mapping identification* for which is said: "Step 5 involves the identification of ''the complete nonliteral mapping [...] by filling out the conceptual structure of the two sides of the nonliteral analogy, the source and target domain'' In other words, with step 5 we move from the output of step 4 to the sets of cross-domain correspondences that are normally proposed in cognitive metaphor theory." (Steen, 1999, p. 71; Semino, 2003, p. 1276).

Given the process of metaphor identification, the paper will try to answer a few questions: 1) What is the purpose of using metaphors and metonymies in political discourse? 2) Can a historical and social background of a certain nation have some influence on the use of metaphors and metonymies?

2   Theoretical Background

Prior to Jakobson and Halle's book (1956), only literary research was applied to the study of metaphors so it marks the beginning of linguistic researches in the field of metaphors. However, the turning point was Lakoff and Johnson's book *Metaphors we live by* (1980) which revolutionized the study of metaphors. They established three major theses: metaphors are omnipresent and should not be limited to literary contexts, metaphors show high level of systematicity and coherency and they are not just a mere figure of speech but the way of thinking. The essence of metaphor is understanding one thing in terms of another, i.e. conceptual (target) domain A is understood in terms of conceptual (source) domain B (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p. 3-5), thus highly abstract entities are conceptualized through concrete ones. Being associated on the basis of similarity, the conceptual correspondence between two domains is referred to as mappings (Kövecses, 2002, p. 6). However, as Lakoff and Johnson (1980) point out, mapping is unidirectional, i.e. it only goes from the source to the target domain.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) differentiate between three main types of metaphors, namely structural, orientational and ontological. Structural metaphors allow us to use a highly abstract concept to structure a concrete one (Lakoff, 1992, p. 61) exemplified with the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY where lovers are perceived as travelers on their joint journey towards the same goal – realization of their love. Orientational metaphors are more extensive than structural ones organizing a whole system of concepts with respect to one another (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, p. 14). These metaphors are based on spatial relations, such as up and down where all positive connotated aspects are perceived as up, whereas negative are perceived as down, e.g. HAPPY IS UP (I'm *on cloud nine*) and SAD IS DOWN (I'm *feeling down*). Finally, ontological metaphors deal with understanding of our experiences in terms of substances and entities. They allow us to treat parts of our experience as entities or substances referring to, quantifying, categorizing and reasoning them (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, p. 26). In addition, understanding our experiences in terms of entities also means perceiving them as containers being grounded in perceiving our bodies as containers. A representative of the ontological metaphors is STATES ARE CONTAINERS exemplified as *Mark is in love with Anna.* Being a universal bodily experience, we are using metaphors subconsciously which makes them universal as well. However, next to universality, metaphors might also be discourse-related.

2. 1   Metaphor in Political Discourse

Charteris-Black (2011, p. 28) claims that metaphors in political context are frequently used for ideological purposes since they activate unconscious emotional associations thereby contributing to myth creation and telling the right story. As he continues (2011, p. 32), the main function of metaphors usage in political rhetoric is to frame our view of political issues by eliminating alternative points of view. Therefore, politicians use metaphors for positive self-representation and negative presentation of their political opponents attacking their ideas.

Many political issues are complex and abstract for voters to understand them; hence metaphors can serve to help voters comprehend abstract entities through more concrete ones (Mio, 1997). In addition, politicians need to show that besides understanding complicated issues, they can resolve them. Therefore, by applying experienced and concrete to abstract concepts, they use metaphors to make persuasive arguments clearly demonstrating their ability of thinking rationally (Brukholder & Henry, 2009). However, given the nature of metaphors and many possible interpretations, voters may attribute their own meanings to them; either positively or negatively connotated. Due to that, politicians' choice of metaphors and metonymies may vary according to the context and the audience, which one needs to take into account when interpreting.

When analyzing metaphors and metonymies, one needs to conceal a speaker's intentions since metaphors and metonymies can be manipulative (Rozina & Karapetjana, 2009) but are more commonly persuasive. Van Dijk (2006) differentiates between manipulation and persuasion and the consequences as follows:

> "(. . .) in persuasion the interlocutors are free to believe or act as they please, depending on whether or not they accept the arguments of the persuader, whereas in manipulation recipients are typically assigned a more passive role: they are *victims* of manipulation. This negative consequence of manipulative discourse typically occurs when the recipients are unable to understand the real intentions or to see the full consequences of the beliefs or actions advocated by the manipulator. This may be the case especially when the recipients lack the specific knowledge that might be used to resist manipulation." (p. 361)

Given the nature of metaphors and metonymies, a speaker exploits associative power of language trying to provoke affective responses, thus showing the persuasive power of metaphors and metonymies.

3   Conceptual Metaphors in Sanader's Speech – Analysis and Discussion

Metaphor has long been identified as a central element in political rhetoric (Chilton 2004, p. 51). One of the principal reasons why politicians use metaphors in their speeches is to make a speech more memorable and arouse an emotional response, which might influence how a politician is

perceived. According to Mio et al.'s study (2005), politicians who used numerous metaphors were perceived as more charismatic and inspirational.

Furthermore, in order to analyze political speeches, the context, which is determined by the audience, event and circumstances, is crucial (Farrel & Young, 2009). According to Hill (2009), a context is twofold - on the one hand, it is a physical context of an event (e.g. when a politician delivers a speech on a battleground) and on the other, it is a political and social context of a situation (e.g. upcoming election). As for this research, the political and social context are upcoming government elections held in 2007. In the previous 2000 elections, the first time since Croatia got its independence Sanader's party lost. Also, this is the period of Croatia's pre-accession to the European Union, i.e. the period of entry arrangements and necessary changes. Bearing that in mind, the following examples will be analyzed accordingly.

3.1   OBJECT METAPHORS

Many abstract concepts are seen as objects, and many OBJECT metaphors used by politicians in their speeches are almost exclusively conventional metaphors, which means that we do not take them as metaphors. The more they are used by the participants of their community, the more those metaphors become conventionalized and no longer seen as metaphors. This feature results in influencing people's political conviction and changing their views on the world (Lesz, 2011, p. 21). That is the case with the OBJECT metaphors.

a) EMOTIONAL STATES ARE OBJECTS

According to Kövecses (2003, p. 93), states in general are metaphorical objects, i.e. an attributed state is perceived as a possessed object. Particular states have high values so possessing them as objects puts a speaker in a dominant position. One of such states that plays a role in determining our actions is dignity exemplified in 1.

> (1) Mi smo vlada koja je *vratila dostojanstvo* hrvatskim braniteljima, koja je *vratila dostojanstvo* hrvatskim majkama.
> We are the government that *gave dignity back* to Croatian warriors and mothers.

Example (1) is a conceptual metaphor in which the more abstract term – *dignity* (Cro. "dostojanstvo") is understood as an object because in Croatian it collocates with the verb usually used with things or something physically tangible. Dignity is a concept that signifies an innate right of an individual human being to be valued and worthy of honor or respect. Therefore, everyone deserves the right to dignity. The speaker here wants to emphasize that his political opponents disagree with that, which is accompanied by their actions of taking mothers' and soldiers' dignity away. To paraphrase, the opposing party took the innate right of dignity from people in the only mandate they won since Croatia's independence. The speaker's party found that deplorable and as

soon as they were in the power of decision making, they made things right by bringing mothers' and soldiers' dignity back, thus creating a positive self-representation. Besides that, the speaker wants to send a powerful message – today, those were mothers and soldiers; tomorrow it might be you, so if not wanting to be deprived of your innate right to dignity, do not vote for our political opponents.

3.2   WAR METAPHORS

The conceptual metaphor POLITICS IS WAR is deeply rooted in people's minds, which might be the reason for its frequent usage in political speeches especially in countries that led war(s) at some point in the past. Croatia is one of those countries that led war in the 1990s and the topic of war is a must-have in political speeches of Croatian politicians, especially those right orientated like Ivo Sanader. If wanting to summarize the concept of politics in a word, the most appropriate word would be power, the same as with the concept of war, hence there is a grounding for the metaphorical mapping.

War metaphors are frequently employed by politicians because they want to stress that in addition to achieving social goals, personal sacrifice and struggle are vital. Hence, war metaphors play an important role in evaluating social goals. In addition, politicians, political elections, political strategies and outcomes of politics are frequently conceptualized as soldiers, battles, war strategies and outcomes of war some of which will be elaborated on in the following examples.

a) A POLITICAL ELECTION IS A BATTLE

The concept of a political election can be conceptualized through the concept of a war, which is grounded in people's experience. When preparing a political campaign, both financial and human resources are used as well as when preparing a war. Additionally, a competition between political parties and politicians in a political election can be conceptualized as a battle between nations and soldiers in a war. The following example is illustrative of that metaphor.

> (2) I dok drugi… nude *borbu za vlast*, mi nudimo borbu za bolju sutrašnju…
> While others…are *fighting for the power*, we are offering better future…

The topic of war inevitably takes place in political speeches of Croatian politicians. That is the case with Sanader who always tries to protrude the concept of war, even metaphorically. In example (2), the word *battle* (Cro. "borba") refers to the fight for votes and consequently the domination. Likewise politicians who, by applying different political strategies and having verbal arguments with the aim of nation's political dominance, soldiers use different war strategies and weapon with the same aim. Politicians who aim only at gaining power are negatively perceived since they do not care about people and the speaker is trying to emphasize that the opponent party's goal is that – get the power and do not care about people and their problems. Moreover, knowing that, due to the war,

war terminology evokes negative feelings with Croatians, the speaker deliberately uses it and tries to illustrate his opponents as power-hungry.

b) STATES ARE WAR STRATEGIES

States may be conceptualized as war strategies because strategies can involve changing depending on a current situation as well as states (Yu, 1998). Changes and trying something new do not necessarily mean the positive thing as shown in example 3).

> (3) *Promjenama se opiru* oni koji žive od stagnacija i od zatečenih odnosa…
> Those who live in the past *resist changes*.

The concepts of fighting and resisting (Cro. "opirati") belong primarily to the domain of war. However, politicians, and Sanader is not an exception in that sense, as illustrated above, use the concept of fighting or struggling in their speeches. Namely, Sanader uses the metaphor to show that, unlike his opponents, he is willing to deal with those social changes, and to generally bring overall well-being to the country. Again, this is an example of Sanader's positive representation which is cunningly being hidden by a neutral statement such as the one in example (3). The political and social context are extremely important in this example. Croatia was in its pre-accession period to be accepted in a desirable and wealthy European Union. So, changes did not only mean usual social changes; rather, those were changes dictated by the European Union. Therefore, those who resisted changes did not mean well for the country. They might have been declared as national enemies because only enemies would not want for the country to be accepted in the European rich family. The implication that the good social changes are fought against by Sanader's opponents, i.e. by social democrats and liberals, is most certainly well received amongst his followers and future voters. Sanader thus, not only managed to praise himself using that metaphor, but also managed to negatively present his opponents.

c) THE OUTCOME OF POLITICS IS THE OUTCOME OF WAR

There are three possible outcomes in a war, namely win, lose or truce likewise in politics. Two conflicted sides try to reach the same goal so they fight in order to win. The source domain of winning the war is mapped onto the target domain of winning the election exemplified in (4).

> (4) … ovo je stranka koja je prošla i uspone i padove i opet nakon tog pada se vratila i trijumfalno 2003. *dobila izbore*…
> …this is the party that had its ups and downs, rose and *won the election* in 2003…

The verb *to win* (Cro. "dobiti") implies success. When speaking about war, that means that one army defeated another one and won the war. The same metaphorical image is found in politics; one party can defeat the other by getting more votes which results in that party becoming the ruling one in a country. In example (4), the speaker not only states that his party won the election in 2003 but stresses that they did it with a triumph. Furthermore, the concept of struggling, realized as ups and downs, is implied in this example. Even though the party probably made some sacrifices, they

showed that were fighters who have the winning spirit who brought the final triumph to their party. The metaphor is one of those that take place the most in political speeches as an illustrator of party's success which is an example of positive representation as one of the main features of political speeches.

In the majority of POLITICS IS WAR studies (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Mio, 1997; Kövecses, 2002; Spencer, 2008), enemies are usually opposing parties. However, an enemy can be something more abstract personified for that purpose as shown in example (5).

> (5) Nakon što je Tuđman otišao, 10. prosinca 1999. umro, bio je to *težak udarac* za stranku jer smo bili nepripremljeni.
> Tuđman's passing away on December 10, 1999 was a *painful blow* for the party because we were unprepared.

The metaphor in example (5) frequently appears in media, especially in the political discourse. It is a type of a metaphor used to describe a difficult situation, and it is commonly used in sports, war, politics and other fields of competition. Example (5) in this context shows the speaker's way of getting closer to his audience by admitting a mistake, i.e. losing the election. He actually acknowledged that it is his (and his party's colleagues') fault not to win the last elections due to lack of readiness to deal with the country's problems conceptualized through an army's fault of not winning a war. The personified enemy in this example is the unexpected death of the first Croatian president who was a right oriented politician and a former member of the speaker's party. By using prepared strategies, every other enemy can be fight against; however, the death is invincible. So, even though they admitted their mistake of not preparing sufficiently enough which resulted in losing the election, the speaker stressed that their enemy was not the opposing party but the death and consequently the sorrow.

d) FEAR IS AN INVADER OR ENEMY

This is a subtype of a conceptual metaphor DISEASE IS WAR. One of the famous symbolic comparison of an enemy, disease and insect was echoed by Chief Porter in 1944 when he said "We wish, at this moment, to poison insects because they threaten the health of our troops…The fundamental biological principles of poisoning Japanese, insects, rats, bacteria and cancer are essentially the same" (Steuter & Wills, 2008, p. 122). Both practical and ideological similarities between the concepts were established. Similarly, the metaphorical mappings between the concepts of fear and an enemy are established in example (6).

> (6) Moramo raditi na *prevladavanju strahova* koje donose globalizacije i integracije.
> We have to *overcome fears* caused by globalization and integration.

Example (6) is again an indicator of how war is a conceptual domain highly exploited in political discourse and Sanader's speech illustrates it. In this case, with the implication of war years that stroke Croatia in the 1990s, Sanader evokes the feeling of fear in his followers by reminding them that many people died or lived in fear back then because the enemy attacked the country. So, he

wants to say that it is not time to be fearful; it is time to overcome all obstacles, not to be afraid of "the new", of what the European Union membership will bring to Croatia; to be brave enough to deal with the challenges such as globalization and integration. He wants to present himself as a savior of Croatian people; as the one who will not allow fear to be a part of Croatians' lives, even if it means the fear of globalization and integration. Fear in this metaphor is seen as an enemy, invader that needs to leave our body so that we can operate on a regular basis as we used to.

3.3   FINANCE METAPHORS

a) MORAL ACTIONS ARE FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

Finance metaphors are usually indicated by words *debt*, *reduction*, *price*, *investment*, etc. conceptualizing actions and relations through monetary transactions. "These metaphors are based on the assumption that money is the most valued entity and therefore should form the basis for ethical evaluation." (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 268). They are grounded in an underlying concept of MORAL ACTIONS ARE FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS as exemplified in (7).

> (7) Prema tome, pozivam sve domoljube u Hrvatskoj da svoj glas na izborima daju Hrvatskoj Demokratskoj Zajednici jer je to *najbolja investicija* u budućnost Hrvatske!
> Therefore, I would like to invite all patriots to give their votes to Croatian Democratic Union because that is the *best investment* in the Croatian future!

This is a typical sentence politicians like to flaunt in a pre-electoral period in order to get the votes. Sanader presented the concept of HDZ, the party he is the leader of, as the best investment in Croatia's future. Obviously, the name of the party is being conceptualized in terms of finances which just shows how important money is today. One of the biggest social changes nowadays is that money became a top priority in people's lives, and that is also evident in language. Moreover, money as the most important value of today's world, serves to set the moral and/or ethical values, and this example illustrates the phenomenon. To summarize, voting on elections is conceptualized as investing. The speaker puts himself in the role of an investment adviser suggesting voters what to choose, i.e. his party, and by doing so, they will not only affect the future of his party but the future of the entire country.

3.3   TIME METAPHORS

As Lakoff and Johnson (1980) put it, in western cultures, both time and money are considered valuable commodities. When employed, we get paid by the time we spend working (hours, months) or when you go on vacation, you pay accommodation by the time spend there. Hence, we understand time as something that can be spent, wasted, saved, lost, etc., which are the concepts

we use to understand something valuable and limited, namely money. The metaphor TIME IS MONEY entails TIME IS A LIMITED RESOURCE which further entails TIME IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY subcategory exemplified below.

a) TIME IS A LIMITED RESOURCE

Resources of any kind may eventually become limited and when this happens, we perceive or should perceive limited resources as something valuable and spend it wisely if we do not want to run out of it. One example of limited resources is money. A working person receives a limited amount of money each month and if one does not use it wisely, one can easily run out of it resulting in numerous problems. The same conceptualization can be applied to time. Given the very fast pace of life, time is perceived as valuable as money and it is indeed limited. A day consists of 24 hours which if not spent efficiently, may cause problems. If, on the other hand, time is used wisely, one can benefit from it as exemplified in (8).

> (8) I tu, to *vrijeme* u oporbi smo *dobro iskoristili* – i pobijedili smo na izborima.
> We *used the period* of political opposition and won the election.

Having the above mentioned in mind, the speaker wants to emphasize his party's right thinking. They are aware of time being limited and extremely valuable and they did not spend it in vain knowing that voters do not forgive when something valuable and limited is spent in vain. The speaker here refers to the previous mandate won by the opposing party which they used in the best possible way and won the election. So, again, the metaphor is used for a positive self-representation of the party.

b) TIME IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY

The three metaphorical concepts – TIME IS MONEY, TIME IS A LIMITED RESOURCE and TIME IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY – form a system grounded in subcategorization relations which characterize the metaphor entailments (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). In addition to explaining a concept from one domain in terms of another, these metaphors reveal the system of values, orientations and preferences of a certain culture (Basson, 2006). To put it differently, the concept of time demonstrates the relationship between metaphor and culture in capitalist societies. Example (9) shows that the Croatian society is indeed a capitalist one.

> (9) *Uzeli smo vrijeme* u oporbi da osmislimo i novu politiku i da se moderniziramo ne zaboravljajući naše korijene…
> We *took the time* while being in the political opposition and modernized our political views not forgetting our roots…

Time metaphors are generally the most frequently used metaphors, and they are nonetheless used in the political speech of Ivo Sanader as well. Example (9) is a type of a metaphor in which time is understood as a valuable commodity, that is, something you can give, take, etc. As Ruiz de Mendoza Ibanez (2003) suggested, a number of correspondences may be set up. In the source domain, there is a group of people (the opposing party) who had the commodity or money which can be used for

certain purposes and in the target domain, there is Sanader's party which did not have the commodity because they were engaged in some activities. Using the verb *took*, Sanader emphasizes that they did not wait to be given the commodity; rather, they were proactive and worked hard to achieve their goals.

In addition, given the fast way of life and the importance of time, it is generally conceptualized as a limited resource and valuable commodity no one wants to spend in vain which is even more important when it comes to political leaders because spending time, and consequently money, in vain is not accepted and forgiven by voters. Having that in mind, the speaker wants to stress their most effective use of time when they were not leading the country, which results in new and modernized ideas yet to be realized for the benefit of the nation.

3.4   BUILDING METAPHORS

a) A NATION IS A BUILDING

When delivering their speeches, politicians often use words which implicate either implementation of construction projects they grant in their programs or construction of a healthy society (society without crime, with a good health care, etc.). That is why the concept of "building" is often heard in politicians' speeches, either literally or metaphorically as in (10).

> (10) Možda najviše talijanski, prema tome, nismo *stvarali Hrvatsku* na ustaštvu, stvarali smo je na Domovinskom ratu i na onim stečevinama na kojima je građena Europa, a to je antifašizam…
> We *did not build Croatia* on the roots of the Ustaša movement; we created it on the Croatian War of Independence and antifascism roots.

The BUILDING metaphors like the one in example (10) are so deeply rooted in the Croatian language. These metaphorical expressions involve the process of mapping between the conceptual domain of building a physical entity onto the conceptual domain of creating something abstract. In example (10), the process of building a concrete entity is mapped onto the process of creating a nation both of which highlights, as Chateris-Black (2004, p. 71) suggests, "progress towards long-term social goals, carry a strong positive connotation, and call for patience and cooperation from the electorate." To paraphrase, the BUILDING metaphors in general carry positive connotations because outcomes require cooperation between people and the government, patience and sacrifice. In this metaphor, the nation is conceptualized as a building, citizens and political leaders as builders who were jointly working to accomplish the nation's development conceptualized through a building construction.

b) THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS

The construction metaphors stand for something that is designed, planned for, turned into or torn down. These metaphors aim to oversimplify complex issues such as the one in example (11).

> (11) Mi zagovaramo tržišno gospodarstvo i vladu koja će *stvarat' uvjete* kroz infrastrukturu, kroz poduzetničke zone, i tako dalje, i tako dalje.
> We advocate a market economy and the government which will *create conditions* using infrastructure, economy, etc., etc.

The construction metaphors are very positive metaphors. They allow a political leader to be seen as an architect who will construct new or improve existing things based on his/her plans. In example (11), the speaker and/or his party HDZ want to be seen as very capable politicians; the ones who really deserve to be elected to guide the country. If elected, they will be the government that will create conditions and foundations for other things, thus metaphorically presenting his party colleagues as builders, which is in line with Taiwo's (2010) study. Furthermore, when built, a building has a purpose; it is either used for people living in it or for business purposes. The speaker uses this metaphorical image saying that they will create foundations and conditions for the development of other things, e.g. infrastructure, business areas, etc. Laying foundations has strong positive connotations since it forms prerequisites for other actions. To put it differently, every solid and durable building has good foundations making them essential. So, if the speaker's party creates solid foundations and conditions, the nation's further development and growth will be the most natural thing.

4   Conceptual Metonymy

Likewise metaphors, metonymies are not merely a figure of speech but the way we think, act and speak, i.e. they are conceptual in their nature. Metonymy is a somewhat different concept than a metaphor. In comparison to a metaphor, a metonymy, as Kövecses and Radden (1998, p. 39) suggest "is a cognitive process in which one conceptual entity, the vehicle, provides mental access to another conceptual entity, the target, within the same domain, or idealized cognitive model (ICM)." To paraphrase, two associated entities are congruous in experience belonging to the same semantic field. Based on the notion of contiguity, the elements in a metonymic relationship belong to a single domain. As Kövecses (2002, p. 148) claims, the main function of a metonymy is to provide "*mental, cognitive access* to a target entity that is less readily or easily available; typically, a more concrete or salient vehicle entity is used to give or gain access to a more abstract or less salient target entity within the same domain." To put it differently, metonymy is referential in its nature, i.e. it refers to expressions pinpointing entities with the aim of discussing them, thus having different function than a metaphor.

Furthermore, Lakoff and Turner (1989) pointed out that in metonymy one entity stands for another coexisting within the same domain. To clarify, "X stands for Y" where X is the vehicle and Y is the target. Hence, there is a single mapping from the vehicle to the target entity. However, based on Langacker's ideas (1993), Kövecses and Radden (1998) define metonymy in terms of the conceptual access it provides. Namely, serving as a point of access to a particular aspect of a domain, metonymy provides access to a target concept.

In addition to ICM, Kövecses (2002, p. 150) claims that a conceptual domain can be either viewed as a whole constituting its parts or parts constituting a conceptual domain as a whole. Therefore, there are three traditional types of metonymies: 1) a part standing for a whole; 2) a whole standing for a part, and 3) a part standing for a part. To illustrate, when referring to the *United Kingdom*, we usually say *England* instead of the UK, thus a part stands for the whole Kingdom. Further, it is sometimes heard that a football player *Messi* is new *Maradona* implying only to his football skills and not other characteristics. Finally, when someone has a headache, it is suggested to take an *aspirin* referring to all kinds of *analgesics*, hence a part stands for another part. Let us take a look at the examples of metonymy in Sanader's speech.

4.1   COUNTRY FOR THE GOVERNMENT

As a subtype of the PLACE FOR INSTITUTION metonymy, the CAPITAL standing for the GOVERNMENT metonymy has been of great interest in cognitive linguistics being extensively studied by Brdar and Brdar-Szabo (2009). In those examples, a capital refers to institutions of executive political power, e.g. *Washington* stands for the *American government.* Similarly, instead of a capital, a whole country might stand for a government of that country exemplified as follows.

> (12) I možemo reći da 2003. kada su nam hrvatski birači dali potporu, kad su nam dali mandat da vodimo *Hrvatsku*.
> In 2003, Croatian voters gave us support to lead *Croatia*.
> (13) Imamo iskustvo u vođenju *Hrvatske* u ratu, imamo iskustvo u vođenju *Hrvatske* u miru i danas rješavamo sve probleme doma.
> We know how to lead *Croatia* in both war and peace. Today, we deal with our problems at home.
> (14) Danas 2007. novi su izazovi pred *Hrvatskom*.
> *Croatia* will face new challenges in 2007.
> (15) I zato želimo, dragi prijatelji, predložiti *Hrvatskoj* nešto o čemu dugo razmišljamo.
> Therefore, dear friends, we would like to suggest *Croatia* something we've been thinking about for a long time.
> (16) Danas se *Hrvatsku* pita, danas *Hrvatska* više nije problem, nego dio rješenja problema.
> Today, *Croatia* is asked about its opinion, *Croatia* is no longer a problem; it is a part of a solution.

In examples (12-16), the whole country, namely *Croatia*, stands for the *Croatian government*. However, even within the same metonymic subtype, there are subtle differences in its usage.

Namely, in examples (12) and (13), the speaker boasts about running the entire country and not just the government. So, when wanting to create a positive self-representation, he stresses out his party's ability of running the entire country. Further, when speaking about problematic issues (deficit or problems yet to be solved), he speaks somewhat neutral like in example (14). To paraphrase, even though they are the leading party responsible for the government and problems solving, the speaker does not say that problems are something they as the leading party should deal with but the country itself. By doing so, he might be thinking ahead. If problems are for them to solve and if they fail in doing that, the nation will blame them. If, on the other hand, the whole country should deal with problems and fails in the process of solving them, the nation cannot blame them since they were not the only responsible. These examples show that the speaker carefully chooses metonymies thinking ahead to possible benefits and consequences. Finally, when wanting to stress that his party can offer brighter future, he uses examples in (15) and (16) where the speaker refers to the government but with no implications of the leading party ahead of it.

4.2 THE STATE FOR THE EVENT

Putting Pearl Harbor and Japan in one sentence carries well-known implications – a place where the Japanese army bombarded the American Navy so *Pearl Harbor* serves as a vehicle entity for the *Japanese attack on the US Navy* target entity. Hence, locations of certain events are grounded in our experience as exemplified in (17). To paraphrase, the relation between time or a place and an event is based on spatial or temporal contiguity, i.e. an event takes place at certain time or a place.

> (17) Imamo puno mladeži ovdje koja se…, imamo puno mladih, imamo puno mladih koji nisu doživjeli *Jugoslaviju* i komunističku diktaturu.
> There are a lot of… a lot of young people who did not live in and with *Yugoslavia* and the communist dictatorship.

In example (17), *Yugoslavia*, stands for the regime and all the events that happened in the former country. However, it will only evoke feelings with people who have lived in the period of the former country. To paraphrase, younger people born after the breakup might not have the same feelings towards the country and the events as people born before the breakup, which the speaker emphasizes. Hence, the example proves for an experiential nature of the metonymic expression. Even though not explicitly, the speaker expresses his attitude towards the former Yugoslavic country stressing only the negative points (communist dictatorship as a ruling regime) with the aim of persuading voters who already have their opinion or influencing voters who are yet to create an opinion about it.

4.3   YEAR FOR THE EVENT

One may have heard variations of the sentence "We should never forget 9/11" and even though one is not an American, he/she would probably know what it is about. The date stands for the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in 2001, which is worldwide famous. Thus, the date is grounded in the experience of an individual. Naturally, *9/11* does not evoke equal feelings with Americans and non-Americans, i.e. a year standing for a certain event is culturally related as illustrated in example (18).

> (18) Hrvatska je umorna od podjela na Ustaše i Partizane, Hrvatska 21. stoljeća ima novu paradigmu hrvatstva – pustimo mi *41.,* imamo *91.,* dragi prijatelji! To je naša snaga! Imamo *95.!*
> Croatia is tired of being categorized as the Ustaše and Partisans. 21ˢᵗ century Croatia has a new paradigm – don't live in the *1941*, my friends! We have *1991*! That's us! We have *1995*!

In example (18), three years are used metonymically, namely, *41*, *91* and *95* referring to three different events. The year *1941* refers to the *Independent State of Croatia* which was a puppet state of Nazi Germany during the World War II. The year *1991* is the vehicle entity for the *beginning of the Croatian War of Independence.* Finally, the year *1995* serves as the vehicle entity for the *ending of the Croatian War of Independence* all of which are important years for Croatian history. However, the speaker distinguishes between those three years belittling *1941* and *1991* and simultaneously emphasizing the importance of *1995* when Croatia finally got its independence and has become recognized by the United Nations knowing that Croatian people find this year the most historically important.

4.4   INSTITUTION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE

Very frequently, a collective name of an institution is used for people working in it due to language economy rules, glorifying or vilifying a whole organization shown in examples (19) and (20).

> (19) Znači i zahvaćanjem dijela sive ekonomije na čemu je posebno radilo *Ministarstvo* ministra Šukera pa mu želim i ovdje zahvaliti „Ivane, sjajan posao radiš".
> The issue of grey economy was dealt with by Šuker's *Ministry,* so I would like to use this opportunity and say "John, you're doing an amazing job!"
> (20) *Europska Unija* traži 3% za monetarnu uniju, za one zemlje članice koje žele uvesti euro granica je 3% deficit.
> *The European Union* wants 3% for monetary union. For those member states that want to introduce euro the deficit is 3%.

Example (19) is the case of glorifying the *Ministry of Finance* which has been dealing with the problematic issue; however, the speaker does not specify how it is done. Moreover, the speaker stresses the most responsible man in the Ministry, namely the Minister of Finance whom the Ministry is attributed as his own possession and especially thanked for the work done as if he is the only person working in the Ministry, thus glorifying the man at the expense of other employees. *People who work in the European Union Parliament* are referred to through the institution of the *European Union* as shown in example (20). The metonymy is used because it is not important to specify each politician; instead, what the politicians as the whole have made as a criterion for eligibility is important.

4.5   PARTY FOR POLITICIANS

The subtype of the INSTITUTION FOR PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE is the PARTY FOR POLITICIANS metonymy which happens to be the most productive type of metonymy in our corpus. Some of the examples are as follows.

> (21) Dame i gospodo, ja se slažem, ja se slažem da bogati trebaju platiti više, ali znate što znači porez na imovinu kako predlaže *SDP*?
> Ladies and gentleman, I agree, I agree that rich people should pay more. But, do you know what does a property tax suggested by the *Social Democratic Party* mean?
> (22) Deficit umjesto *SDP-ovih* 7% koje predlažu u svom gospodarskom programu, bit će 2010. 0% - to je prijedlog *HDZ-a*.
> Instead of 7% of deficit suggested by the *Social Democratic Party*, the *Croatian Democratic Union* suggests 0% by 2010.
> (23) Oni jasno vide da Hrvatska 2007. nije ona iz 2003., ali oni žele izborom i 2007. potvrditi da žele Hrvatsku drugačiju 2011. na kraju idućeg mandata, a to može ostvariti samo *stranka* koja je spremna na najveće izazove…
> They are aware that 2007 Croatia is not the same as 2003 Croatia. However, they want different Croatia by 2011 and that can be only done by the *party* ready for the biggest challenges.
> (24) Na izborima im treba dati komentar – zaokružit' *HDZ*!
> You should tell them your piece of mind on the election - circle *Croatian Democratic Union*!

In examples (21) and (22), the political parties are personified, thus standing for the responsible people being affiliated to and working in those parties. Individual politicians are irrelevant because the majority of them have to agree on a certain issue for it to become public and conductible. Hence, the entire party is vilified and negatively presented due to the political ideas proposed by a small number of decision-making politicians. However, there are some discrepancies with this type of metonymy in political speeches and metonymy usage in general (Kövecses and Radden, 1998). Human experience, as the interaction with things surrounding us, results in the principles like *human over non-human, subjective over objective, concrete over abstract*, etc. However, examples (21) and (22) violate the anthropocentric principle *human over non-human,* thus proving the specific usage of

metonymies in political discourse where the opponent party is always dysphemised and the speaker's party euphemized.

In comparison to examples (21) and (22) where the parties' proper acronyms are used, in example (23), the speaker implicitly refers to the party. However, given the superlatives used to describe the party, there is no ambiguity in determining which party he refers to. Example (24) is somewhat different. Unlike the previous ones, politicians are not so clearly seen. However, by choosing a certain party at the election, one actually chooses people representing that party, so politicians are undoubtedly present.

5   Conclusions

This paper studies conceptual metaphors and metonymies in Ivo Sanader's 2007 pre-electoral speech delivered at the 11th Croatian Democratic Union annual meeting. The aim of this paper was to detect the types of metaphors and metonymies used in the mentioned speech and to study their purpose by applying the Critical Metaphor and Metonymies Analysis approach.

Political speeches have always been associated with the notion of persuasion which, among other linguistic devices, is realized with the use of conceptual metaphors and metonymies. Conceptual metaphors and metonymies from our corpus have an important role in activating either conscious or subconscious associations. The examples have proved to be highly conceptualized and based on audience's experience. The metaphors in our corpus are used for a positive self-representation of both the speaker and the party he affiliates himself with. Simultaneously, the expressions are used for a negative representation of the major opponent party. In other words, using euphemisms and dysphemisms, especially in the metonymy usage, the speaker is glorifying or vilifying the political parties.

Furthermore, since Croatia is the country that has recently been involved in war, it comes as no surprise that, based on the experience, war metaphors are highly conventionalized in the Croatian language. Once again, the opponent party is negatively represented as the party that wants to be involved in some kind of a fight, which evokes highly negative feelings amongst Croatians. In comparison, Sanader's party is perceived as the party wanting to help Croatian people with solving their problems and overcoming fears. Also, war metaphors are used to present the current state in the country – those who refuse to make some sacrifices for the country's progress, might be perceived as national enemies who do not want for the country to be received in a wealthy and developed European Union family. Additionally, war metaphors are indirectly connected with building metaphors since destruction as a consequence of war eventually results in construction in the time of peace. The speaker presents his party as the one, and to his mind probably the only one, able to deal with a long-term and difficult process of constructing what someone else has destroyed or failed to construct. Hence, he attributes himself the role of an architect who will construct new and improve the existing. The process of construction and changes in general call for patience since

they are long lasting. Consequently, time is of major importance being perceived as a limited resource and valuable commodity. The speaker anticipates the possible questions and elaborates on their efficient use of time while not leading the country. Simultaneously, the speaker negatively presents the opposing party for taking the innate right of dignity from people in the only mandate they won, i.e. the opposing party used their time in vain, which should not be forgotten or repeated. In addition, the metonymic examples show that the speaker chooses them wisely. In positive contexts, he boasts about running the entire country, while in the problematic ones, he thinks ahead and creates an alibi should his party not complete the task of leading the country. He mentions the former regime and the events important for the Croatian history evoking feelings which should unite Croatian people.

To summarize, by the use of metaphors and metonymies, the speaker creates a positive representation of all politicians affiliated with his party and negative of all opponent party politicians. The aim of his speech is to show the audience that he thinks right, has the right intentions, tells the right story and has the skills and will to work towards Croatia's progress.

References

Basson, A. (2006). *Divine Metaphors in Selected Hebrew Psalms of Lamentation*. Germany: Mohr Siebeck Tübingen

Brdar, M. and Brdar-Szabó, R. (2009). The (non)metonymic use of place names in English, German, Hungarian, and Croatian. In P. Klaus-Uwe, L. L. Thornburg and A. Barcelona (Eds*.). Metonymy and Metaphor in Grammar.* Amsterdam Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 229-259.

Burkholder, T. R. & Henry, D. (2009). Criticism of Metaphor. In J.A. Kuypers (Ed.). *Rhetorical Criticism: Perspectives in Action.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 97-114.

Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice.* London: Routledge.

Farrell, K. & Young, M.J. (2009). The Rhetorical Situation. In J.A. Kuypers (Ed.). *Rhetorical Criticism: perspectives in action.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 33-37.

Hill, F. I. (2009). The "Traditional" Perspective. In J.A. Kuypers (Ed.). *Rhetorical Criticism: Perspectives in Action.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 39-61.

Kövecses, Z. (2003). *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Z. and Radden, G. (1998). Metonymy: developing a cognitive linguistic view. *Cognitive Linguistics, 9 (1),* 37–77.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Lakoff, G. and Turner, M. (1989). *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. (1992). The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.) *Metaphor and Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 202-251.

Langacker, R. (1993). Reference-point constructions. *Cognitive Linguistics, 4,* 1–38.

Lesz, B. (2011). *To shape the world for the better: an analysis of metaphors in the speeches of Barack Obama*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). University of Tromsø, Norway.

Mio, J. S. (1997). Metaphor and Symbol. *Metaphor and Politics,* 12(2), 113–133.

Mio, J., Riggio, R., Levin, S., & Reese, R. (2005). Presidential leadership and charisma: The effects of metaphor. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 287–294.

Müller, R. (2005). *Creative Metaphors in Political Discourse. Theoretical considerations on the basis of Swiss Speeches*. Metaphorik.de (http://www.metaphorik.de/09/).

Rozina, G., Karapetjana, I. (2009). *The Use of Language in Political Rhetoric: Linguistic Manipulation.* SDU Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi: Sosyal Bilimber Dergesi.

Ruiz de Mendoza Ibanez, F. J. (2003). The role of mappings and domains in understanding metonymy. In A. Barcelona (Ed.). *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 109-133.

Semino, E., Heywood, J., Short, M. (2004). Methodological problems in the analysis of metaphors in a corpus of conversations about cancer. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 36, 1271–1294.

Spencer, A. (2008). The Metaphor of Terror: Terrorism Studies and the Constructivist Turn. *Security Dialogue,* 39(6), 571–592.

Steuter, E. & Wills, D. (2008). *At War with Metaphor. Media, Propaganda, and Racism in the War of Terror.* New York: Lexington Books.

Taiwo, R. (2010). *Metaphors in Nigerian Political Discourse*. Obafemi Awololowo University, Nigeria.

van Dijk, T.A. (2006). Discourse and Manipulation. *Discourse and Society*, 17(3), 359–83.

Yu, N. (1998). *The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor: A Perspective from Chinese*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.