

I. PROBLEMOS IR SPRENDIMAI / PROBLEMY I ICH ROZWIĄZANIA

Jurga Cibulskienė

Vilnius Pedagogical University

Studentų g. 39, Vilnius LT-08106, Lietuva

E-mail: jurga.c@takas.lt

Research interests: cognitive linguistics, conceptual metaphor, political discourse

ARE IDEOLOGIES REFLECTED IN METAPHORS?

Conceptual metaphor analysis in political discourse has been the focus of many cognitive linguists (Lassan 1995; Lakoff 1996; Musolff 2004; Charteris-Black 2005; Goatly 2007; Semino 2008, etc.). Moreover, the recent years of political discourse analysis have undergone cross-fertilization between cognitive researches into metaphor and critical discourse analysis. Thus, this paper aims at analyzing the right-wing and left-wing ideologies of Lithuanian political parties through cognitive metaphor perspective since metaphor is regarded to be a cognitive mechanism of ideology. It is generally assumed that political parties verbally and non-verbally behave in accordance with the ideology they adopt. Therefore, the research employing conceptual metaphor analysis blended with rhetorical persuasion approach attempts to look into the subtleties of the relationship between the conventional conservative or social democratic ideology of a party and its linguistic performance. The question whether Lithuanian political parties really adopt the ideology their party name implies is brought up. Empirically, the research is based on election discourse of Lithuanian Conservative and Social Democratic parties. First, metaphorically used words and phrases in the target discourse were identified applying the Pragglejaz Metaphor Identification Procedure ("MIP") (2007). Next, it is taken into consideration that the identified metaphorically used words tend to construct a certain scenario which underlies a certain conceptual metaphor. Once this relation is established, ideological implications of the metaphorical expressions and their underlying conceptual metaphors are highlighted and analysed. Also, the research takes into account rhetorical effect produced by ideological implications of the analyzed parties.

KEY WORDS: ideology, conceptual metaphor; linguistic metaphorical expressions, political discourse.

Introduction

When during the presidential campaign Barack Obama was accused of his rhetorical flair as "just words", the famous speechwriter Ted Sorensen said "Words are incredibly important for a candidate because they are incredibly important for a president. They can mobilize, inspire and galvanize support. Words are how JFK¹

mobilized support at the time of the worst crisis of the world has ever seen and solved the Cuban Missile Crisis without a shot being fired. Words are how he transformed the country's attitude to its black citizens". Who is right? Are words "just words" and actions speak louder than words? Or do the words have potential significance?

Political communication is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon including ideological as well as behavioural components. It is generally assumed that poli-

¹ John Fitzgerald Kenedy.

ticians verbally and non-verbally behave in accordance with the ideology they adopt. Thus, the interrelation of ideology, language and political behaviour comes into focus while analyzing political discourse. The question arises whether or to what degree ideology corresponds to what politicians say and how they behave. Although a considerable number of attempts to answer the question have been made, this problem still remains unresolved neither by political scientists, journalists, ordinary people nor politicians themselves. This article is one more attempt to investigate the problem of ideology and language performance through cognitive linguistic perspective. The third dimension – political non-verbal behaviour – being a peripheral sphere to linguistic investigation is left out for the studies of political scientists. Thus, coming back to the idea expressed at the beginning whether words matter, the paper argues that language is important in shaping and reshaping political discourse and ideology.

Methodological Framework

Moreover, defining and narrowing the scope of the analysis, it is questioned what the relationship between the conventional conservative or social democratic ideology of a party and its linguistic performance is. The question whether Lithuanian political parties really adopt the ideology their party name implies is brought up. Empirically, the research is based on the previous research on election discourse of Lithuanian Conservative and Social Democratic Parties which focused on conceptual metaphors underlying the General Election discourse of Lithuania and which covered the span of 2000–2004. The Lithuanian printed press and official websites of the Conservative Party (www.

ts.lt) and the Social Democratic Party (www.lsdp.lt) were set as the targets of investigation. Accordingly, two periodical corpora of the Conservative Party and the Social Democratic Party containing approximately 42.230 and 39.150 words respectively were constructed.

Taking into account three major findings of cognitive science proposed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson that the mind is inherently embodied, thought is mostly unconscious and abstract concepts are largely metaphorical, the working hypothesis that since ideology is an abstract concept, it is likely to find its manifestation in conceptual metaphors is put forward.

The authorship of the concept *ideology* can be ascribed to Destutt de Tracy who lived in the 18th century and defined it as a ‘science of ideas’. However, understanding and defining the broad and fairly vague term of ideology was not the easiest task for scholars. Roughly, the concept of ideology is often referred to from different perspectives taking into consideration whether it conveys *negative* or *neutral* sense. Different scholars subscribe to these opposing views to different degrees. The *negative* or ‘*loaded*’ sense, as the latter term was used by Dirven, Frank and Pütz (2003, p. 1–2), has relation to classical Marxist understanding of ideology and seeing it as ‘false consciousness’, “a misleading representation, the superstructure overlaying and distorting material reality” (Goatly 2007, p. 1). Goatly partly adopts this view by accepting its transformation into the theory of hegemony: “instead of an overt imposition of an ideology by the ruling class, hegemony manages the mind in covert ways to construct a consensus about the social order which benefits those in power. Hegemony depends upon the

naturalization of ideology as common-sense, and thereby makes ideology latent or hidden” (Goatly, *ibid*).

However, it should not be confused with its vulgar Marxist version² which has compromised itself because of two main reasons: first, the notion was made theoretically vulgar by insisting that ideology is a highly negative process when individuals are made to use conceptual systems which do not correspond to their interests (Mills 1997, p. 30), and second, due to the aggressive Soviet Marxist-Leninist ideological practice, the notion of ideology has acquired a fairly negative meaning. Therefore, as Seriot (1999, p. 20) puts it, the notion of ideology has been gradually changed by the French school of discourse analysis which defined it as any language or semiotic fact which is interpreted by social interests and which legitimizes social significance of the fact determined by historical interests. It emphasizes that political or social discourses have never been neutral and even such statement as *Marquees left at five o'clock* is not less ideological than *France just for French*. There is not any statement, symbol or behaviour which would not be culturally determined and which would not be interrelated with interests of a certain society or social group.

Charteris-Black defines the concept of ideology from the *neutral* point of view as “a belief system through which a particular social group creates the meanings that justify its existence to itself, it is therefore an exercise in self-legitimization” (2005, p. 21). Thus, adopting this point of view,

² The example of the vulgar Marxist model is presented here since it is related to the present investigation as it historically had considerable influence on Lithuanian political discourse.

we can see Lithuanian Conservatives or Social Democrats as a social group striving to establish their legitimization through conservative or social democratic beliefs and values which underlie their ideologies. The very idea of conservatism as an ideology has triggered considerable controversy among political scientists and philosophers. As White maintained, “To put conservatism in a bottle with a label is like trying to liquefy the atmosphere [...]. The difficulty arises from the nature of the thing. For conservatism is less than a political doctrine than a habit of mind, a mode of feeling, a way of living”. In order to avoid discussions what conservatism or social democracy are or are not, the theory of radial categories proposed by Lakoff (1996, p. 31) has been employed. He claims that political ideology can be approached as a radial category. Conservatism or liberalism (or any other ideology such as socialism in this case could also be included into this list) are radial categories composed of central models and variations on those models. This view implies that a party which ideology is considered to be right or left has its own further inner subdivisions; for example, Conservatives within their party are more left or right-winged while displaying different attitudes to addressing political problems or we can come across such notions as British or American conservatism. Although taking into account the risk of oversimplification, the paper dwells just on central models of conservative or social democratic ideologies, thus aiming to narrow and define the scope of the research – what should be compared to what.

The recent years of political discourse analysis have undergone cross-fertilization between cognitive researches into metaphor

and critical discourse analysis (CDA), as Goatly put it (2007, p. 2). Consequently, Charteris-Black (2005) named this newly established approach to the analysis of political discourse as Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA), according to which, conceptual metaphor is regarded as a cognitive mechanism of ideology. The essence of this approach lies in a three-step procedure – metaphors are first identified; next, they are interpreted; and finally, they are explained (*Identified* → *Interpreted* → *Explained*) (2005, p. 26). Thus, this paper aims at analyzing the right-wing and left-wing ideologies of Lithuanian political parties through CMA perspective.

The first step of the procedure, i.e. *metaphor identification*, was realized by applying a method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse (MIP) suggested by Pragglejaz group (Pragglejaz 2007; Semino 2008, p. 11). At this point, metaphorical linguistic expressions (metaphors in language) come into focus of the research and it is necessary to differentiate them from underlying conceptual metaphor (metaphor in thought). According to this method, first close reading of the text-discourse was performed; next, after lexical units being identified in the text, their meaning in context was established. Afterwards, it was determined if a lexical unit “has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context” (Semino 2008, p. 11); then, if the basic meaning contrasted with the contextual meaning, the lexical unit was marked as metaphorical. Thus, the most recurrent thematic elements, which are motivated by the essential metaphorical concept being in hyperonymical relations with it, were identified. According to Kövecses,

“metaphorical linguistic expressions make conceptual metaphors manifest, and, on the other, we can use these metaphorical expressions to arrive at metaphors in thought” (2005, p. 8). Therefore, continuing Kövecses idea, it seems quite possible to think that the amount and frequency of metaphorical expressions used by us correlate with the stability and entrenchment of a particular conceptual metaphor in our minds. Secondly, it was obvious that the identified metaphorical linguistic expressions (metaphors in language) underlying the conceptual metaphors tend to construct scenarios of a JOURNEY, WAR, HOUSE/STRUCTURE, FAMILY, speaking more technically – the conceptual correspondences (mappings) between the target (POLITICS) domain, which is more abstract, and the source (JOURNEY, WAR, HOUSE/STRUCTURE, FAMILY) domains, which are more concrete.

The next step of *metaphor interpretation* is closely related to the three Lakoff and Johnson’s major findings – “the mind is inherently embodied, thought is mostly unconscious, abstract concepts are largely metaphorical” (1999, p. 3). We interpret metaphors in a certain way just because we have bodily experiences of space, movement, containment and we do it mostly unconsciously systematically relating the abstract concepts to a more concrete. In order to show how metaphor interpretation works, Charteris-Black (2005, p. 27) provides an example from Tony Blair’s speech:

Forward or back

I can only go one way.

I’ve have no reverse gear.

The presented example illustrates that the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY is grounded on our bodily

experience of movement and space and such metaphorical expressions as *forward or back, go one way* are linguistic realizations of it. Furthermore, we obviously understand one abstract concept (LIFE) in terms of a more concrete concept (JOURNEY).

The final step of *metaphor explanation* has to do with ideological use of language. Here metaphor is understood as a persuasive and rhetorical tool of argumentation. According to Charteris-Black (2005, p. 28), “Critical Metaphor Analysis therefore enables us to identify *which* metaphors are chosen and to explain *why* these metaphors are chosen by illustrating *how* they create political myths”. This idea roughly corresponds to Lassan’s (1995) proposed conception about creating an ideologized discourse where she also sees metaphor as a cognitive mechanism of ideology. Her research on the discourse of government and dissidence maintains that an ideologized text tends to be created using oppositions where one constituent has positive and the other has negative implications. It is related to the idea of antithesis of reasoning which can be traced back to the philosophical antithetical worldview. According to cognitive science, the antithesis of thinking is encoded in the very nature of the humankind, and it can be supported by orientational metaphors UP and DOWN, FRONT and BACK, etc. Lassan distinguishes five oppositions (*communism – anticommunism, patriotism – antipatriotism, collectivism – individualism, legitimacy – illegitimacy, humanism – antihumanism*) characterizing the political discourse of the 1960s in the former Soviet Union. This is the primary level of text generation and these oppositions are termed as primary text-primitives. At the more advanced level,

these primary text-primitives, which are highly abstract, are presented through conceptual metaphors, which tend to be more understandable for addressees. For example, the conceptual metaphor of the primary text-primitive *individualism – altruism* is INDIVIDUALISM IS AN ILLNESS OF HUMANKIND. Such cognitive elements as oppositions constitute *scenarios*, i.e. schemes according to which our experience is organized and acquire a metaphorical form. The content development of metaphor-scenario is determined by the scenario itself and the further textual embodiment is nothing more than the periphrasis of this metaphor. The metaphor-scenario encodes all the main characters and the turns into the plot of the future text. Under these circumstances, this conceptual metaphor implies that individualism as an illness might be infectious or dangerous to one’s health and even life. Therefore, while generating a text, an attempt to reveal all these aspects will be made possibly alongside with preventive measures and/or prescribing medicine to treat the disease of individualism.

Results and Discussion

At the level of conceptual metaphor usage, a close analysis of the discourses of Lithuanian Conservatives and Social Democrats did not show any significant differences. Apparently, both political parties structure their thinking around the same conceptual metaphors POLITICS IS WAR, POLITICS IS A JOURNEY, POLITICS IS A HOUSE/STRUCTURE, POLITICS IS A FAMILY³, etc. Conceptual

³ The conceptual metaphors POLITICS IS A HOUSE/STRUCTURE and POLITICS IS A FAMILY

metaphors, as Kövecses put it, operate at an extremely general level and, therefore, they do not “specify many things that *could* be specified” (2005, p. 68). He maintains that “the metaphor constitutes a generic schema that is filled out by each culture that has the metaphor”. Thus, we can assume that although the underlying conceptual metaphors are similar, their conceptual correspondences (mappings) may be expressed differently and carry different ideological and rhetorical purposes. Hence, it is hypothesized that the same conceptual metaphors are filled out with different content by the Conservative Party and the Social Democratic Party. This idea is supported by Musolff’s (2000, 2004, 2006) findings in the analysis of the distribution of such metaphor scenarios as FAMILY, HUMAN BODY, JOURNEY and HOUSE with their entailments and their differences in attitudes towards the European Union and argumentative tendencies of the United Kingdom and Germany. Although Musolff (2004, p. 5) shows that the range of conceptual metaphors is alike in both target discourses (British and German), he argues that the usage of the same source domain may have different argumentative and ideological purposes. Thus, Musolff proposes “to regard political metaphors as integral aspects of argumentative reasoning, i.e. reasoning which typically aims to prove a *contested* issue and thus also legitimize a certain course of action” (Musolff 2004, p.32). All in all, the present research on Lithuanian political discourse is a similar attempt to contribute to the study of the metaphorical conceptualization of party politics putting emphasis on ideological aspects.

are not analysed in the present paper. They are left for further analysis.

Since the difference at the level of conceptual metaphors between the Conservatives and Social Democrats was not observed, it was expected to see considerable variation across conceptual correspondences (mappings) within the target discourses. The first conceptual metaphor which came under quantitative and qualitative examination was that of WAR domain. Numerous metaphorical linguistic expressions illustrate that politics is typically conceived as an unpredictable exercise of power. The present findings confirm the previous studies conducted by Howe (1988), Montgomery, Tolson and Garton (1989), Chudinov (2003), Charteris-Black (2005), etc. who emphasized the importance of power and fight. The conceptual metaphor POLITICS IS WAR is a complex structural metaphor arising from the following hierarchy of conceptual metaphors: FORCE IS UP, FIGHT IS FORCE, POLITICS IS POWER, POLITICS IS WAR.

Having control or force is evaluated as a positive phenomenon by Western society (HAVING CONTROL OR FORCE IS UP), while not having control or force (BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE IS DOWN) acquires negative aspects. As it was mentioned earlier, according to Lakoff and Johnson (1999, p. 54), it is related to our sensorimotor experience, i.e. our experience is embodied – a vertical and straight body expresses an active position, which is considered to be positive, while a body in horizontal position presupposes passivity, weakness or illness, which are the signs of negative evaluation. In political discourse, the fight between political parties is therefore conceptualized as a wish to acquire more power to influence others and make political decisions. Thus,

while performing political actions, both parties see themselves and each other as warriors with their outstanding leaders fighting in battlefields and using different types of weapons; consequently, the fight ends either with victory or defeat. Although the parties conceptualize the battlefield, weapons, victory/defeat and damage, no ideologically important differences were observed. Special and different emphasis is however put on the concept of fight with its constituents – preparation for the fight, attacking, defence and retreat.

The Conservative Party elaborates on the concept of FORCE/POWER at length ascribing it to the Soviet past and present attempts to negatively influence current Lithuanian political and economic situation. The following metaphorical expressions – *lenkti žmogų, parklupdyti jį, kad jis pasiduotų didžiojo kaimyno globai* (to bend people so that they would surrender themselves to the custody of the great neighbour⁴); *lyg karšta geležim išdeginusios mūsų sąmonę* (like hot iron it branded our consciousness); *įkirstas į sąmonę* (hacked into our consciousness); *tas laužimas mūsų atžvilgiu* (this crushing on us); *primesti agresyvų supratimą apie praeities įvykius su spaudimu, kad tai turi būti priimta* (to impose aggressive understanding about the past events and push us to accept that); *brovėsi į valdžią* (thrust themselves forward to the government); *Lietuvos pramonė buvo parklupdyta ant kelių* (Lithuanian industry was made to kneel down); *KGB tinklo jėgos metamos prezidento rinkimams* (KGB network force is being thrown to

the presidential elections) – distinguish themselves in aggressive vocabulary with certain elements of pathos. Obviously, such Lithuanian lexemes as *lenkti, parklupdyti, išdeinti, įkirsti, laužti, primesti, spausti, brautis* have negative connotations expressing force, violence and aggression.

Although we come across people involved in military actions in the discourse of the Conservative Party, it is evident that the concept of a TRAITOR is particularly emphasised. It is expressed by such lexemes as *dviveidis asmuo* (two-faced person), *perbėgimas* (deserting), *pabėgti* (run away), *išduoti* (betray), *suskaldyti* (disunite), *sužlugdyti* (bring to ruin), *vengti* (avoid), *parduoti Lietuvą* (sell Lithuania). Once more we encounter the vocabulary which has strong negative connotative component.

The major focus of attention is, however, on the concept of FIGHT. First, the Conservatives feel themselves being attacked in various ways and by different forces. Moreover, the feeling of being attacked is heavily reinforced with the syndrome of VICTIM which runs as a leitmotif through the whole discourse of the Conservative Party. The concept of attack is strengthened by such contextual means as *intensyvinti* (make more intense), *ar iai* (savagely), *smogti per smegenis* (hit on the brain). The concept of accusation expressed by the lexeme *apkaltino* is a bit weaker contextual synonymic version of attacking. Moreover, the concepts of encroachment and destruction are likely to be contextual synonyms of the attacking. The image which is conveyed by the usage of the encroachment concept is even more powerful than attacking since the former implies a secret action which is even more dangerous than the open attack because

⁴ Translations from Lithuanian here and further are author's (J. C.). Although some translations may sound awkward in English, they are supposed to show original Lithuanian wording.

it involves the factor of unexpectedness – people being attacked stealthily are not ready to defend themselves properly. Thus, the Conservatives feel that they or their values are being encroached or destroyed. No doubt that the concept of *attack* is used in attempt to describe their opponents' actions but not their own ones. Interestingly, we can arrange all the above mentioned actions hierarchically according to the growth of the feature related to threat: *accuse* → *attack* → *encroach* → *destroy*.

The concept of *attack* is, however, closely related to the concepts of *threat* and *intimidation*. We can treat them as a certain subspecies of attack. The Conservatives envisage menace in the actions and verbal behaviour of other parties. Such lexical units as *pavojus Lietuvai* (*danger/threat to Lithuania*); *kursto gyventojus* (*incite the people*); *stiprėja naujos imperinės tendencijos* (*new imperial tendencies are growing stronger*); *tirštėja grėsmingas netikrumo laukas* (*a threatening field of uncertainty is getting thicker*); *jos [partijos] neprognozuojamos, o juk nieko pavojingesnio valstybei kaip neprognozuojama valdžia nėra* (*they [political parties] cannot be predicted, so there is nothing more dangerous to a country than unpredictable government.*). Among other metaphorical expressions used to develop the concept of DEFENCE, a strongly connoted lexeme *pasipriešinti* (*make a stand against sth/resist*) is apparently taking an important place in the Conservatives' discourse.

The conceptual metaphor of WAR is also intrinsic to the **Social Democrats**. They also structure their thinking around this conceptual metaphor and explicate similar conceptual correspondences (mappings). Despite the surface similarities, their

discourse differs substantially from the discourse of the Conservatives, and one of the most crucial distinctions is that it can be characterized as more rational. The Conservatives' discourse distinguishes itself by emotionally-coloured linguistic metaphorical expressions appealing to moral evaluation, whereas the Social Democrats use linguistic metaphorical expressions which can be described as being more or less neutral and not having such a strong evaluative component.

However, there are certain features which are characteristic just of the Social Democrats. They tend to place considerable emphasis on making preparations for war aiming to underline that they are a responsible, reliable and mature political party which will be able to run the country. The usage of past tense verbs – *sudarėme* (*formed*), *pasidalijome* (*shared*), *pasitelkėme* (*recruited*), *parengėme* (*prepared*), *apsvarstėme* (*thought over*), *pradėjome* (*started*), *užbaigė* (*completed*) – indicates readiness to stand for election, win it and govern the country. This statement is supported by recurrent use of the lexeme *telkti* (*recruit*) and its various forms (*pasitelkti*, *susitelkti*, *sutelkti*, *sutelkimas*). Furthermore, the concepts of *strategy* and *tactics* are inseparable part of preparation. These concepts are used in the following collocations *political strategy*, *reliable strategy*, *right tactic*, *strategic goals*, *strategic priorities*. The linguistic metaphorical expressions presented here do not have any latent evaluative connotations; they just stand out for readiness.

In contrast to the Conservatives, the Social Democrats do not highlight the concept of FIGHT. Although it exists in their discourse, it is quite insignificant in comparison with elaboration of other

parts of conceptual correspondences. Quantitatively, the concept of VICTORY is one of the most recurrent elements of the Social Democrats and it is verbally expressed by different forms of the lexemes *pergalė* (victory) and *laimėti* (win). The evaluative linguistic context of the concept VICTORY is neutral.

Another conceptual metaphor underlying the discourses of the Conservatives and Social Democrats is POLITICS IS A JOURNEY which is a complex hierarchical metaphor derived first of all from the *Event Structure Metaphor*. The second level includes the complex conceptual metaphor A PURPOSEFUL LIFE IS A JOURNEY, whereas the third level presupposes the target metaphor POLITICS IS A JOURNEY. According to the conceptual correspondences presupposing the conceptual metaphor of the JOURNEY, we comprehend politicians as travellers trying to reach the destination of their journey (for which read, to achieve their political goals). Taking decisions which way to go is understood as considering what major priorities to choose, and at the same time it is an attempt to convince the electorate that they know which way to go and how to achieve the social and economic wealth of the country. The actions while travelling are considered as political actions which respond to the needs of the electors. The chosen direction is nothing more than the right or wrong means taken to solve a problem. The obstacles encountered by politicians-travellers on their way should be regarded as difficulties encountered in political life and at the same time as an attempt to solve them. The vehicle carrying politicians should be comprehended as political strategy on the whole. Thus, we can claim that the metaphorical linguistic

journey expressions manifesting in the discourse of the Conservatives and Social Democrats show the existence of the presented metaphor-scenario in the consciousness and subconscious of Lithuanian politicians and electors.

Referring to the above presented Lassan's ideas that an ideologized text is generated by using oppositions where one constituent is highly positive whereas the other is entirely negative, the **Conservative** discourse lends support to distinguishing the opposition 'good' political roads – 'bad' political roads, which acquires considerable significance in the discourse of the Conservatives. The carried out analysis indicates that the first part of this opposition coincides with positively connoted ways of independence and democracy and the way leading to NATO and the European Union. It is evident that all these ways have strong positive evaluation which is quantitatively expressed through recurrent emphasis on it. The way of democracy and independence from the former Soviet Union is characterized by strong emphasis on travelling difficulties and obstacles. The word *duobė* (a pit) with its Lithuanian derivatives and the words *skaudus* (painful), *sunkus* (hard), *atsakingas* (responsible), *suklupti* (trip over) collocating with the word *kelias* (road) reveal the difficulties experienced while building democracy and attempting to live independently without interference from abroad. Another important point about travelling along the way of independence and democracy is the Conservatives' absolute confidence in being right about the chosen way.

[...] *tai žengti sąžiningos bekompromisės akistatos su komunizmu keliu. (Lietuvos aidas, 17 February 2002) [It's a road of an honest and uncompromising confrontation with communism.]*

Atgimimas atvėrė vartus į laisvą pasaulį – tai kelias, kuriuo ir toliau turime eiti. (Atgimimas, 23 October 2003) [The revival has opened gates to the free world – this is the way we have to take.]

Though at first sight some of the examples may seem a bit detached from the idea of being confident about choosing the right way of democracy and independence, in fact, the context and extra-linguistic knowledge help to conclude that the Conservatives feel completely convinced they are on the right road. Moreover, the retreat from the Soviet Union is comprehended as choosing the way of independence and democracy. The presented examples support the claim that in the subconscious mind of Lithuanian politicians and ordinary people, the independence is seen as a journey and the fact that the movement direction is identified with the destination of the journey indicates that the full independence has not been achieved yet because it is not a one-off action but it is a lengthy and continuous process. Yet, we can find some clues in the Conservatives' discourse which suggest that independence is not a self-contained goal anymore, it has become an essential prerequisite to travelling further and if you do not observe it, the journey will not be successful.

The quantitative and qualitative emphasis was put on the way leading to the European Union and NATO. Abundant metaphorical expressions occurring in the discourse of the Conservatives imply that it is one of the fundamental aims that have to be accomplished. The following examples are just a minor part of them to illustrate the diversity: *vakarietiškos Lietuvos kūrimo kelias (the way of building Western Lithuania); vakarietiškos gyvenamosios kūrimo kelias (the way of creating Western*

*lifestyle); vakarietiškos žemės ūkio veiklos kūrimo kelias (the way of creating Western agriculture); kelias, kuriuo eina visas pasaulis (the way which all the world goes); kelias į svarbiausią tikslą (the way leading to the ultimate destination); kelias į saugią gerovę (the way to the secure welfare); Europos Sąjungos kelias (the European Union way); Europos kelias (European way); Europos kryptis (European direction); užsibrėžtas kelias (the set road); strateginė šalies raidos kryptis (strategic direction of the country's development); vienintelis kelias (the only way); kelias, kuriuo nuėjusios kaimyninės šalys (the way which neighbouring countries have gone), etc. It has to be emphasized that the words *Western* and *European* have obviously positive implications.*

Moreover, the verbs and their combinations implying movement show the mode the Conservatives imagine that Lithuania and its people travel to the destination. The words *greičiau (quicker)*, *sparčiau (quickly)* and *greitesnis proveržis (thrust forward)* indicate the speed which shows the importance of immediacy of joining the European Union and NATO. There are certain modes of travelling – either on foot or by train (*European Express*). The concept of the *European Express* is recurrent in the discourse of the Conservatives and it itself contains the element of speed. Active integration into the European Union and NATO is considered as a *ticket* to the *European Express*.

It may seem that travelling on foot does not indicate speed; however, the overall context of it also suggests determined movements. The mode of travelling is expressed through the emphasis on speed as well as on relentless pursuit of the goal: *nepamesti kelio į svarbiausią tikslą (not to*

lose our way to the most important destination); *neatsilikti (not to lag behind)*; *išlaikyti kryptį (to follow closely the direction)*; *judėti į saugią gerovę (move forward to safe welfare)*; *eiti užsibrėžtu keliu į Europą (go along the envisaged road to Europe)*; *eiti pasirinktu keliu – nelėtinami žingsnio ir nesidairydami atgal (go this way without slowing down and not looking back)*; *įsigyti bilietą į saugią gerovę (purchase a ticket to safe welfare)*. It should be noted that the European Union and NATO are not self-contained goals; they are comprehended as the way to promote the welfare of Lithuania and its citizens.

The second part of the opposition 'good' political roads – 'bad' political roads assumes cardinal importance in the subconscious of the Conservatives. It is related to the notion of *going back, returning to the Soviet Union*. This is the most powerful opposition underlying the target discourse and, hence, it acquires the following display **West – East**, whereas the first member is supposed to gain positive evaluation and the second one gets negative. Negatively connoted ways are firstly associated with Russia. Returning to Russia implies a step back to the past. This direction is perceived to be geopolitical and temporal at the same time. Therefore, the Conservatives comprehend Lithuania as standing at the crossroads.

The ample usage of metaphorical expressions and their diversity reveal the Conservatives' distrust of the Soviet past: *unkelis (a byway)*; *kelias, vedantis į posovietinį narvą (a road leading to the post-Soviet cage)*; *Golgotos kelias į niekur (Golgotha's road to nowhere)*; *kelias, vedantis į seną pelkę (the way leading to the old swamp)*; *kelias, vedantis į tamsą, pinkles (going to the darkness, falling*

into the trap), etc. The main conclusion to be drawn is that the discourse of the Conservative Party in Lithuania before joining the European Union and NATO clearly distinguishes from the discourses of other political parties since it puts strong emphasis on differentiating between right and wrong ways and comprehending Lithuania as standing at the crossroads where there are just two choices – the European Union or Russia. While drawing a clear demarcation line between the West and the East, the Conservative Party stands out in the political context of that time in Lithuania, and at the same time, it strives to prove to be the party which does not hesitate about taking and defending its position on the future of Lithuania in comparison with other political parties and movements.

Referring back to the discourse of the Social Democrats, it seems that they conceptualize the destination in a similar way to the Conservatives – it is the welfare of Lithuania and its citizens. Yet, their election discourse cannot be characterized as overemphasizing ways of independence/democracy and the ways leading to the European Union and NATO, whereas it obviously points to divergent priorities that different parties have chosen. Rather, its importance is obviously downplayed which is in sharp contrast to the Conservative Party.

In the Social Democratic discourse, the major focus of attention is shifted to ideological aspect. The way leading to the welfare of Lithuania and its citizens is referred to as a social democratic road, and the most recurrent collocations are the following: *socialdemokratinis kelias (social democratic road)*; *naujo socialdemokratinio etapo vėliava (a flag*

of a new social democratic stage); *einame kaip nacionalinė socialdemokratinė jėga* (we go as a national social democratic force); *stovime ant to paties idėjinio ir programinio [t. y. socialdemokratinio] pagrindo* (we stand on the same ideological [social democratic] ground); *pažangiausias socialdemokratinis kelias* (the most progressive social democratic way); *tai socialdemokratinės Europos ir [...] Lietuvos kelias* (this is the road of social democratic Europe and [...] Lithuania); *nukreipti Lietuvą į socialdemokratijos kelią [...] tai vienintelis tikras tiesos ir gėrio kelias* (to direct Lithuania onto the social democratic road [...], it is the only true road of truth and good); *socialdemokratinės veiklos kelias* (the road of social democratic activities); *socialdemokratinės gerovės kūrimo kelias* (the road of creating social democratic welfare). The preceding examples illustrate that the description of the way proposed by the Social Democrats explicitly coincide with their political ideology – the road chosen by the Social Democrats is a social democratic one. The very concept of social democracy is not explicated; therefore, the addressee is left with a vague idea about what is meant. The advantages of the social democratic way are attempted to be disclosed by an odd tautology – *the social democratic way is good because it is a social democratic way*.

Unlike the Conservatives, the Social Democrats highlight the description of their chosen way by the usage of the concept of CONSOLIDATION. Such recurrent expressions containing various forms of the lexeme *vienytis* (unite) as *vienykimės* (let's unite); *socialdemokratinė jėga, jungianti keletą panašių programinių nuostatų partijų* (social democratic force uniting

several parties of similar ideological attitudes), etc., are perhaps manifestations of social democratic ideology. On the other hand, the concepts of *consolidation*, *collectivism* and *community* are highly associated with communism ideology promoted in the Soviet times and which was represented by the famous slogan “Proletarians of all countries, unite!” Thus, the concept of *consolidation* is somehow ambiguous and it seems fairly difficult to determine whether it is the outcome of social democratic thinking or just a legacy of Soviet ideology.

Conclusions

The research question which was formulated at the beginning of the paper whether metaphors directly correlate with conservative and social democratic ideologies, is however, left open since the findings do not show fairly evident and direct relation of that, although we can trace back to indirect and not so highlighted marks. The answer is yes and no at the same time. It is felt necessary to go into plausible reasons why the obtained findings are tentative.

The results suggest that the prime conceptual metaphors underlying the discourses of Lithuanian Conservatives and Social Democrats coincide – they are POLITICS IS WAR and POLITICS IS A JOURNEY. Hence, at first sight, at the conceptual level, we cannot observe the relation between conceptual metaphors and ideologies of political parties. However, when we look into the realization of conceptual correspondences, we see considerable differences across the parties' discourses. The Conservatives' metaphorical linguistic expressions underlying both analysed conceptual metaphors (the

former particularly) distinguish themselves in the usage of aggressive, emotionally-coloured and high-flown lexis appealing to morality. Whereas the Social Democratic metaphorical expressions show that the reverse is true. They can be described as lacking pathos and being considerably more rational. Charteris-Black (2005, p. 13), while discussing the interrelationship between ideology, myth and metaphor, suggests that they are fundamentally similar since they perform the same rhetorical function of persuasion. He contends that *logos* (reasoned argument) is directed to consciously developed beliefs and values whereas myth is associated with emotions called *pathos*, and this is related to unconsciously developed beliefs and values. Metaphor is in between the conscious and unconscious, and it is related to *ethos* which is considered to be a moral perspective.

Charteris-Black's idea apparently correlates with the findings of the present research. We can assume that the Conservatives' metaphorical system is more based on *pathos* or myth, as pointed out by Charteris-Black, whereas the Social Democrats ground their metaphorical system on *logos* or reasoned argument. *Pathos* or *logos* used by the Conservatives and Social Democrats, respectively, are the ways to legitimise their political behaviour

and establish and justify their moral system or *ethos*.

It is noteworthy that the present findings claiming that Lithuanian Conservative Party's discourse is more aggressive and related to *pathos* while the Social Democratic Party's legitimacy is based on reason or *logos* are supported by another research into metaphorical thinking of British Conservative and Labour Parties (see Cibulskienė, 2002 p. 102–116). It all points to similar conclusions that despite the country with its different geopolitical and historical background, the Conservatives in both countries build their arguments in a more aggressive way, whereas the Social Democrats in Lithuania and the Labour Party adopting social democratic ideology in the UK tend to be more rational. Alongside with the reasons residing in the conservative philosophy, it is possible to find a plausible explanation of this in Lakoff's (1995, p. 74) idea that in the cognitive structures of conservatives, there is the conceptual metaphor of MORAL STRENGTH. The point of it is that the evil has to be fought against and it has to be defeated by any means; if you want to be morally strong, ruthless behaviour against evil is justified. Emphatic and aggressive lexis used by the Conservatives indicates that election campaign is a fight between some adversaries and it has to be won at any cost.

References

CHARTERIS-BLACK, J., 2005. *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

CHUDINOV, A. P., 2003. – ЧУДИНОВ, А. П., *Россия в метафорическом зеркале: когнитивное исследование политической метафоры (1991-2000)*. Екатеринбург.

CIBULSKIENĖ, J., 2002. Metaphorization of Elections as War in the 2001 General Election Discourse of Great Britain. *Respectus Philologicus*, 2 (7), 102–116.

DIRVEN, R., FRANK, R. M., PÜTZ, M., 2003. *Cognitive Models in Language and Thought*. Hawthorne, N.Y.: Mouton de Gruyter.

GOATLY, A., 2007. *Washing the Brain. Metaphor and Hidden Ideology*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

HOWE, N., 1988. Metaphor in Contemporary American Political Discourse. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, vol. 3 (2), 87–104.

LAKOFF, G., 1995. *Moral Politics. What Conservatives Know that Liberals don't*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

LAKOFF, G., JOHNSON, M., 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*. Basic Books.

LASSAN, E., 1995. – ЯИССАИ, Э., *Дискурс власти и инакомыслия в СССР: когнитивно-риторический анализ*. Vilnius: Vilnius University.

MONTGOMERY, M., TOLSON, A., GARTON, G., 1989. Media Discourse in the 1987 General Election: Ideology, Scripts and Metaphors. *English Language Research*, 3, 173–204.

MUSOLFF, A., 2000. *Maritime Journey Metaphors in British and German Public Discourse: Transport Vessels of International Communica-*

tion? Available from <http://www.gfl-journal.de/3-2000/musolff.html> [February 4 2008].

MUSOLFF, A., 2004. *Metaphor and Political Discourse. Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

MUSOLFF, A., 2006a. Metaphor Scenarios in Public Discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 21(1), 23-38.

PRAGGLEJAZ, 2007. A Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22 (1), 1-39.

SEMINO, E., 2008. *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SERIOT, P., 1999. *Quadrature of Meaning: The French School of Discourse Analysis*, ed. P. Seriot. Moscow: Progress, 225–290.

SORENSEN, T., 2008. Available from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newsttopics/uselection2008/2058887/US-Elections-Barack-Obama-is-JFKs-inspirational-heir-says-former-Kennedy-aide-Ted-Sorensen.html> [June 04 2009].

Jurga Cibulskienė

Vilniaus pedagoginis universitetas, Lietuva

Moksliniai interesai: kognityvinė lingvistika, konceptualioji metafora, politinis diskursas

AR METAFOROS RODO, KAD LIETUVOS KONSERVATORIAI YRA IŠ TIKRŲJŲ KONSERVATORIAI, O SOCIALDEMOKRATAI – SOCIALDEMOKRATAI?

Santrauka

Konceptualiosios metaforos raiška politiniame diskurse vis dažniau susilaukia dėmesio iš kognityvinės lingvistikos specialistų (Lassan 1995; Lakoff 1996; Musolff 2004; Charteris-Black 2005; Goatly 2007; Semino 2008, kt.). Pastaruoju metu vis populiarešni tampa politinio diskurso tyrimai, sujungiantys dvi tyrimų kryptis – kognityvinį metaforos tyrimą ir kritinio diskurso analizę. Šiame darbe kognityvinė metafora suvokiama kaip kognityvinis ideologijos mechanizmas. Ji pasitelkta analizuojant dešiniuosius ir kairiosius Lietuvos politinių partijų ideologijas. Manoma, kad politinių partijų verbalinė ir neverbalinė

Jurga Cibulskienė

Wileński Uniwersytet Pedagogiczny, Litwa

Zainteresowania naukowe: lingwistyka kognitywna, metafora konceptualna, dyskurs polityczny

CZY METAFORY DOWODZĄ, ŻE LITEWSCY KONSERWATYŚCI RZECZYWIŚCIE SĄ KONSERWATYSTAMI, A SOCJALDEMOKRACI – SOCJALDEMOKRATAMI?

Streszczenie

Realizacje metafory konceptualnej w dyskursie politycznym coraz częściej stają się przedmiotem uwagi ze strony specjalistów z zakresu lingwistyki kognitywnej (Lassan, 1995; Lakoff, 1996; Musolff, 2004; Charteris-Black, 2005; Goatly, 2007; Semino, 2008, etc.). W ostatnich latach coraz popularniejsze stają się badania nad dyskursem politycznym, łączące dwa kierunki dociekań badawczych – badania nad metaforą kognitywną i analizę dyskursu krytycznego. W niniejszym opracowaniu metafora kognitywna jest pojmowana jako mechanizm ideologii kognitywnej: za jej pomocą

elgsena priklauso nuo jų pasirinktos ideologijos. Konceptualiosios metaforos ir retorinio poveikio analize siekiama parodyti skirtumų subtilumus tarp tradicinės konservatyviosios ir socialdemokratinės ideologijos, jų lingvistinės raiškos. Keliamas klausimas, ar Lietuvos politinės partijos iš tikrųjų remiasi ideologija, kurią implikuoja jų partijų pavadinimai. Empiriškai tyrimas grindžiamas Lietuvos konservatorių ir socialdemokratų partijų rinkiminiais diskursais. Pritaikius Pragglejaz grupės pasiūlytą metodiką, buvo išskirtos kalbinės metaforos. Daroma prielaida, kad išskirti metaforiškai vartojami žodžiai konstruoja tam tikrą scenarijų, kuris sudaro konceptualiosios metaforos pagrindą. Nustačius šį ryšį, nagrinėjamos kalbinių ir konceptualiųjų metaforų ideologinės retorinės prasmės.

REIKŠMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: ideologija, konceptualioji metafora, kalbinė metafora, politinis diskursas.

są analizowane ideologie pravicowych i lewicowych partii politycznych na Litwie. Przyjmuje się, że werbalne i niewerbalne zachowania partii politycznych zależą od wybranej przez nich ideologii. Zatem za pomocą zaprezentowanej analizy metafory konceptualnej i oddziaływania retorycznego podjęto próbę ukazania subtelnych różnic między tradycyjną ideologią konserwatywną a ideologią socjaldemokratyczną oraz ich postaci językowej. Postawiono pytanie: czy litewskie partie polityczne rzeczywiście opierają się na ideologii, którą implikują nazwy ich partii. Empiryczne badanie jest oparte na dyskursach przedwyborczych partii litewskich konserwatystów i socjaldemokratów. Po zastosowaniu metody zaproponowanej przez Pragglejaz Group wyróżniono metafory językowe. Przedstawiono przesłankę, że wyróżnione wyrazy używane w znaczeniu metaforycznym konstruują określony scenariusz, który stanowi podstawę metafory konceptualnej. Po ustaleniu tego związku, omówiono znaczenia ideologiczne i retoryczne metafor językowych i konceptualnych.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: ideologia, metafora konceptualna, metafora językowa, dyskurs polityczny.

Gauta 2009 11 20

Priimta publikuoti 2010 01 04

Copyright of *Respectus Philologicus* is the property of Vilnius University and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.