

Khazar University

Faculty: Graduate School of Science, Art and Technology

Department: English Language and Literature

Major: 060251-Linguistics

Master Thesis:

A Comparative Investigation of Conceptual Metaphors in Azerbaijani
vs English Political Discourse: American and Azerbaijani
Presidential Speeches

Master student: Talia Bayramova

Supervisor: Ph.D. Yaser Hadidi

Baki-2023

Acknowledgments

Dear Dr. Yaser Hadidi and Dr. Davud Kuhi,

As I reach the end of my research journey, I cannot express enough gratitude for your invaluable support and guidance throughout this process. Your unwavering support, advice, empathy, and patience have been crucial in helping me achieve this significant milestone.

Dr. Yaser Hadidi, your personal interest and engagement in this area of research have been evident from the outset, and I consider myself fortunate to have had you as my supervisor. Your profound understanding of this field, coupled with your mentorship, has been a constant source of inspiration for me. I am grateful for all the time and effort you put into guiding me throughout this journey.

Dr. Davud Kuhi, your contributions to this research project have been invaluable, and I cannot thank you enough for your guidance and support. Your expertise and knowledge in this area have been an asset to this research project, and I am grateful to have had you as my co-supervisor.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to all my professors in B.A and M.A who taught me everything I know, with a special place engraved in my heart for my family and friends. Your support and encouragement have been instrumental in helping me achieve this milestone, and I am forever grateful for all that you have done for me.

Once again, thank you for your invaluable support and mentorship. Your guidance has been instrumental in helping me achieve this significant milestone, and I am forever grateful for all that you have done for me.

Sincerely yours,

Talia Bayramova

Table of contents

Acknowledgments	2
Abstract:	6
Introduction	7
Background	7
Statement of the Problem and Purpose	8
Research Questions	9
Significance and Justification	9
Organization of the Study	10
Chapter 1: Review of literature	11
1.1. A Succinct Recap on Conceptual Metaphor Theory.....	11
1.2. The Issue of Metaphorical Universality	12
1.3 Universality and Variation in Metaphor.....	14
1.3.1 Components of the Cognitive Linguistic View of Metaphor	17
1.3.2. Metaphorical Language	20
1.3.3. What is the Nature of a Conceptual Metaphor?.....	22
1.3.4. Metaphorical Universality and Variation Revisited.....	24
1.5. CMA (Critical Metaphor Analysis).....	27
1.6. Review of Literature: Some Empirical Background.....	34
Chapter 2: Methodology	39
2.1. Restatement of the Research Questions	39
2.2. Participants	40
2.3 Corpus and Sampling.....	40
2.4. Instruments and Material	41
2.5. Design	42
2.6. Procedures vis-à-vis the Theoretical Framework	43
2.7. Controlling Discursive Theme: The Discourse of Conflict/War.....	44
2.8 Abbreviations and the Analytic Categories in the Tables	45
2.9 The Nature of the Analytic Categories	46
2.10 A Note on the Data Analysis and the Tables	46
2.11 The Key Terms Re-articulated in Depth	47
2.12 Chapter Summary	54
Chapter 3 : Data Analysis and Results	56

3.1. Exploring the Conceptual Metaphors in the Azerbaijani President’s Discourse.....	56
3.2. Exploring the Conceptual Metaphors in the American President’s Discourse.....	62
Chapter 4: Discussion and Conclusion.....	67
4.1. Restatement of the Research Questions	68
4.2. Frequencies of Metaphor Use in the Two Sets of Data	68
4.3. Research Question 1	69
4.4. Research Question 2	71
4.5. Research Question 3	71
4.6. Research Question 4	73
4.7. Limitations and Delimitation	75
4.8. Suggestions for Further Research	75
References	76
References used for the Azerbaijani President’s Speeches data:	82
References used for the American President’s Speeches data:	82
Appendix 1:.....	83
Conceptual Metaphors in the Azerbaijani data with a frequency of only 1:	83
Appendix 2:.....	83
Conceptual Metaphors in the AMERICAN data with a frequency of only 1:....	83

List of figures

Figure 1 .1.1: Aspects of Metaphor Variation in order of Effect and importance	27
---	----

List of tables

1.Table 1.1 Summary of conceptual metaphors in the US Inaugural Corpus....	28
2.Table 1.2 A Discourse Model for Metaphor (adapted from Charteris-Black, 2004)	31
3. Table 3.1 The Five-step Conceptual Metaphor Analysis in the Azerbaijani President's Discourse	57
4 .Table 3.2 The Five-step Conceptual Metaphor Analysis in the American President's Discourse	62
5 .Table 4.1 Frequency of Conceptual Metaphors in the 1000-word Azerbaijani Data: ordered according to Target Domain	69
6 .Table 4.2 Frequency of Conceptual Metaphors in the 1000-word American Data: ordered according to Target Domain	70

Abstract:

There is a recognition in the literature that in political discourse, politicians make ample use of conceptual metaphors to organize their talk, achieve more persuasion, and leave stronger imprints of ideology and action on the minds of their audience. The framework of Critical Metaphor Analysis brings together the theory of Conceptual Metaphors and insights from Critical Discourse Analysis to study the important role of conceptual metaphors in constructing political discourse. Using such insights championed by Jonathan Charteris-Black and Zoltan Kovecses, this study analyzed a similarly sized corpus of speeches spanning the same years by the President of Azerbaijan Ilham Aliyev and of the USA Joe Biden to locate how conceptual metaphors contribute to the construction of particular discourses through different conceptual structures that also emerge upon analysis. The findings point to variation on a lot of levels, shedding light on different patterns and groups of conceptual metaphors used, as well as a lot of variation in the frequency and spread of metaphors. Ultimately, this study probes interesting and insightful differences between the speeches by two presidents , which harks back to differences in the ideologies prevalent in their respective communities and being aimed at, long-term collective histories shaped accordingly, and the group identities forged differentially in the two cultures.

Keywords: *Critical Metaphor Analysis, Conceptual Metaphors, President of Azerbaijan, President of the USA*

Introduction

Background

Unlike what is strongly argued in traditional theories, metaphors are actually more integral to real-time discourse and everyday language than they are to literary language. They are a significant tool for enriching language in use, comprised of systematic mappings between an abstract conceptual (source) domain and a more concrete (target) domain. In essence, metaphors facilitate the expression of what is difficult or impossible to convey through literal linguistic means (Kovecses, 2010). Among the most fundamental types of abstract concepts and thoughts are emotions, which are extensively represented in the taxonomy of metaphors. The literature on the linguistic expression of emotions demonstrates a high prevalence of metaphorical language use.

Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) conceptual metaphors, as described in their work "Metaphors We Live By," are believed to be largely universal. However, this view has been criticized for neglecting the evident diversities of metaphors both within and across cultures. According to Kövecses (2005), metaphors vary along two dimensions: the cross-cultural and the within-culture dimension. The relationship between culture and metaphor raises the question of whether there are universalities and variations in the use of metaphor. The majority of recent theoretical work and research highlights a dearth of empirical evidence regarding this matter. Upon reviewing cross-cultural studies of metaphors, it becomes apparent that there is a need for more cross-linguistic research on alterations in what are thought to be universal, body-based, conceptual metaphors (Kovecses, 2015, 2010, 2005, and 2000; Safarnejad et al., 2014a). This is especially true for under-researched languages around the world and new modes of discourse use such as online communication. Additionally, other genres and their textual manifestations lack sufficient research in this area.

The use of Cognitive Linguistics approaches has provided new and innovative perspectives, departing from traditional ideas about metaphor, which can be traced back to Aristotle, Poetics, and Rhetorics falling under the category of the "rhetorical perspective." Prior to the release of Lakoff and Johnson's *Metaphors We Live By* (1980), the prevailing opinion was that metaphor was simply an embellishment, limited to literary works and the realm of literary studies.

The groundbreaking work of Lakoff and Johnson brought to light the crucial role that metaphors play in everyday language and thought, dispelling the notion that they are mere adornments of literary texts. In fact, metaphors are pervasive in our everyday lives, shaping the way we think and act. As Lakoff and Johnson argued, our entire conceptual system is rooted in

metaphor, which allows us to understand complex and abstract concepts by mapping them onto more concrete and familiar ones. Metaphors, therefore, not only aid in our cognition but also facilitate communication by providing us with new and creative ways of expressing ourselves (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Ortony & Fainsilber, 1987).

One of the fundamental principles of Cognitive Linguistics is that the way we think about abstract concepts is expressed through linguistic metaphors. This means that we use more concrete domains to understand less tangible concepts, creating metaphorical representations of reality that are shaped by our thoughts and cognition, and are also influenced by our culture. For instance, emotions are often understood through metaphors because they are abstract and difficult to articulate using literal language. Therefore, metaphors play a crucial role in shaping emotional, narrative, cognitive, and pragmatic realities in our minds, as well as in everyday genres and specialized ones like politics and literary texts.

Statement of the Problem and Purpose

A review of the research actually conducted in this area shows that there hasn't been, to begin with and to the best of the researcher's knowledge, much research on how members of speech communities, politicians mainly, use metaphors in political speeches and as a result of the context. In this spirit, the purpose of this qualitative exploratory discourse analysis research is the analysis of metaphorical meaning as manifested by the discourse of two important discourse producers in two languages, i.e. English and Azerbaijani, in the knowledge that the top political figures in a culture and discourse community, when producing discourse, would offer traces and evidence of a range of current discourses and conceptual structures and templates in the community in question. In the same vein, there has been little research to systematically use Conceptual Metaphor Theory in order to see to what extent Azerbaijani and American top political leaders use conceptual metaphors in their speeches, within a comparative cross-linguistic paradigm, and to understand the patterns of Conceptual Metaphors used in their political discourse. Such research, as the current one also hopes to approximate, will also shed light on what areas of cross-linguistic similarity and difference (i.e. potential universality and variation) emerge in Conceptual Metaphor use of such discourse. The data is gathered through purposive sampling, since the discourse and the theme determined and drove forward our identification of the discursive context, the top political leaders as discourse producers, and their relevant discourse data produced by them. For purposes of discursive comparison and more illuminating findings, since this research becomes a critical metaphor and critical discourse analysis in part too, speech data comparison by the two presidents focuses on the

discourse of war, or war-related, conflict-related discursive themes, as one major political discourse (Charteris-Black, 2004 and 2011).

Research Questions

This qualitative content and discourse analysis study is undertaken to find answers to the following qualitative research questions:

Research Question 1: Do Azerbaijani and American presidents use conceptual metaphors in their speeches?

Research Question 2: What patterns of Conceptual Metaphor are used by Azerbaijani and American presidents in their speeches?

Research Question 3: What areas of cross-linguistic similarity and difference (potential universality and variation) emerge between Conceptual Metaphor use of Azerbaijani and American presidents in their speeches?

Research question 4: How are ideologies present or influential in the metaphorical discourse of the two presidents' political discourse?

Significance and Justification

Alongside previous important work on metaphor in political discourse like Charteris-Black (e.g. 2004, 2011) and Musolff (e.g. 2004, 2016), for its hands-on coding of the data and content/thematic analysis, the current study used a variation on the procedures by the Pragglejaz Group (Metaphor Identification Project, Pragglejaz Group, 2007). Coding and tagging the data are done for every linguistic metaphorical expression by reference to a close consultation of Pragglejaz Group's MIP (Metaphor Identification Project, Pragglejaz Group, 2007) and Master Metaphor List (Lakoff et al., 1991).

In terms of the theoretical mainstay and thinking adopted here, we fall in line with Kovecses's research on cross-cultural and cross-linguistic work on cultural/cognitive variation and universality in English and languages other than the English (LOTE). What of course hasn't been specifically been looked at much and will need far more research than the current one is such comparative exploration of metaphorical conceptualization in the discourse of English and other unrelated languages in many other genres. This study is a baby-step in that direction, looking at the deployment of war- and conflict-related conceptual metaphors in political discourses by top political leaders of the American President and the Azerbaijani president. Bringing out conceptual sameness and difference in these groups of discourse producers in different languages will be helpful to certain insights in these issues of culture, cognition, ideology and language.

After the turn of century, there has emerged a style of research considering various languages by evaluating metaphors. This thesis undertakes a cross-linguistic analysis to see if similar (universal) or different political conceptual metaphors are utilized by the presidents of the US and Azerbaijan.

Organization of the Study

This thesis has been organized into 4 chapters. First of all Introduction, introduces the topic, lays out the significance of the study, and puts forward broad explanations for the terms use throughout the study. This part comprises a background of the study, implication and purpose of the study, statement of the problem, and organization of the study.

Chapter one , Review of Literature, looks at the theoretical framework, mainly Kovecses's ideas on the structure and place of Conceptual Metaphor in universal conceptualization.

Chapter two , Methodology, starts with the restatement of the research questions, the corpus, data collection, procedure. Next ,the design of the study and the categories of analysis are introduced.

Chapter three , Data Analysis and Results, explains how the analysis is conducted and provides a summary of the analyses in tables. It also explains the findings to lead into chapter four , Discussion and Conclusion, which discusses the findings and brings the study to a conclusion. The Limitations and Delimitation are also brought up in chapter four .

Chapter four focuses on providing a comparative analysis of the conceptual metaphors used in Azerbaijani and English political discourse. Building on the findings of the previous chapters, the author utilizes critical metaphor analysis (CMA) to analyze the discourses that emerge from the data and answer the research questions. The chapter begins by comparing the frequencies of metaphor use in the two sets of data, which are the speeches of American and Azerbaijani presidents. The most commonly used metaphors are highlighted in each data set and analyzes how they are used to frame political issues.

The chapter then delves into a comparative analysis of the metaphors used in the two languages, highlighting similarities and differences in the ways in which political leaders use metaphorical language to communicate their ideas and ideologies.

Finally, some suggestions for further research are provided for researchers who wish to fill more gaps in the field and contribute to the many things we still don't know about how metaphor plays a key role in semantic conceptualization within different understudied languages.

Chapter 1: Review of literature

In this chapter, a review of the literature in connection with Conceptual Metaphor Theory is presented. Meanwhile, Kovecses's ideas on Conceptual Metaphor Theory, as well as his notions of Metaphorical Universality and Variation in a version of Cultural Studies that he advances will be mapped out, since they have bearings on our themes of cognitive structures and models emerging upon our analyses. A section below will put forward the gist of cross-linguistic research using up CMT between English and Azerbaijani language that will notify the reader of the styles, subjects, nature and structure of such work, as well as the goals and objectives of such mode of research.

1.1. A Succinct Recap on Conceptual Metaphor Theory

Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980) was a groundbreaking school of thought with regard to the light in which metaphors were looked at. Using and inspired by disciplines like Cognitive Psychology and studies on the brain Mark Johnson was well versed with, Lakoff and Johnson proposed that metaphors are, first and foremost, matters and patterns of thought. Inspired by Structural Linguistics too, Conceptual Metaphors were then regarded as being, in essence, cognitive tokens (just like signs are a marriage of form and function), coins with two flip-sides; in this case, every Conceptual Metaphor was postulated as carrying two simultaneous planes of reality, two 'conceptual domains' constituting it, both domains happening at the pre-linguistic level of thought/cognition.

To put the theory on its most basic theoretical footing, one conceptual domain is the 'Source Domain', which is the conceptual and semantic domain of reality, meaning, and the world from which we 'borrow', so to speak, IN ORDER TO be able to talk about (conceptualize) the 'Target Domain', the target concept/meaning. The Source Domain is, usually, a concrete reality, something to do with bodily experiences or immediate sensory-motor reality, something we have tangible knowledge and awareness of in our consciousness and culture. The target domain is the abstract target meaning, difficult to conceptualize in lexicalized non-metaphorical ways, that we aim to capture THROUGH recourse to and help FROM the concrete domain of experience, i.e. the Source Domain.

For example, in the linguistic metaphor (metaphorical linguistic expression), *His arguments are indefensible*, we are borrowing from the Source Domain of WAR, about the parameters of which we have a lot of folk knowledge in the culture, to be able to talk about the target domain of ARGUMENT. The conceptual metaphor will then accrue as ARGUMENT IS WAR. All conceptual metaphors will be characterized as A is B (A being the Target Domain,

and B the Source Domain). Or, for example, *I met a lot of obstacles on this path*; using the same line of reasoning, we are left with the metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY.

The universality of conceptual metaphors is still a controversial topic in Cognitive Linguistics. Far more cross-linguistic and language-specific studies are needed and justified using Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT). Many researchers have conducted studies to compare different emotion conceptual metaphors in various languages; such insights will be associated with the differential or near-universal play of culture and its impact on such cognitive variations. In other words, culture will both be impacted by and impact the manifestation of cognitive reality in language use, one major dimension of which will be metaphor (Kovecses, 2005). Consequently, metaphor and culture go hand in hand and are inseparable, making any variation in metaphorical use across two languages associated automatically with cultural variation and implications as well.

Concerning the provenance of source domains, Kovecses (2005) pointed out that since the human body and the brain are predominantly universal, the metaphorical structures that are related to them will also be universal. It can explain why many conceptual metaphors can be found manifested along similar linguistic lines in a large number of unrelated languages, which can be probed in research such as the current one and is the impetus here. If we go beyond looking at metaphorically used linguistic expressions in different languages and, instead of linguistic metaphors, we look at conceptual metaphors, we begin to notice that many conceptual metaphors appear in a wide range of languages (Kovecses, 2010).

1.2. The Issue of Metaphorical Universality

The underlying thought feeding into this thesis is fueled by Zoltan Kovecses's pace-setting and championing work on the place of conceptual metaphors in shaping culture, i.e. Kovecses (2005). The question he poses in this seminal thinking of his to set this in motion is what exactly constitutes the link between metaphor and culture. A quick and initial answer may be that metaphor and culture are related in many ways. One example light in which metaphor and culture could be seen to be connected in our mind could be in relation to something that we all learn about metaphor in school: men and women of literary penmanship commonly famously use metaphors, and since literature is a prominent element of culture, metaphor and culture can be then easily seen to be in intimate close relationships. As went the traditional thinking, metaphor can be viewed, after all, as 'the ornamental use of language' (Koveces, 2010, 2005). Seen in this light, metaphor and culture may be seen to be linked with each other because they

meet one another in literature in a necessary and subliminal conflation – ‘an exemplary manifestation of culture’ (Kovecses, 2005).

Without writing it off just yet, this is one possible way of conceptualizing the metaphor-culture synergy, but it is important to realize that the cognitive linguistics school of thought known as Conceptual Metaphor Theory has had as one of its chief missions the squashing of the view of metaphor as a literary ornamental device only; one of the main arguments made in CMT is that metaphor is a fundamental matter of thought and not of language, and as such, it happens in everyday discourse to even greater extent than in literature. Metaphor in this view is a constitutive linguistic and cognitive force of shaping reality and the semantics.

Looked at differently then, this link to literature is not the kind of relationship between culture and metaphor that should be the concern of the theory. What Kovecses has in mind is a much more fundamental connection between them; drawing on lines of argument in other disciplines like anthropology, we can think of culture as a set of shared understandings that characterize smaller or larger groups of people’ (e.g., D’Andrade, 1995; Shore, 1996; Strauss and Quinn, 1997). This is certainly not a comprehensive definition of culture, seeing as it does not incorporate real objects, artifacts, institutions, practices, actions, and so on, that people use and participate in in any culture. But it will be enough for the purposes of the moment, for we can assume culture to capture the shared understandings that people have in connection with all of these conceivable things.

At any rate, with culture conceived of in this way, the metaphor-culture link grows into what is believed to be paramount within the cognitive linguistic thinking championed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson’s (1980) work *Metaphors We Live By*. What we have already indicated and stressed in Lakoff and Johnson’s revolutionary thinking about metaphors is that metaphor does not occur primarily in language but in thought (Kovecses, 2015, 2010, 2005). Another way of looking at this underlying theoretical assumption in Cognitive Linguistics is that ‘we actually understand the world with metaphors and do not just speak with them’ (Kovecses, 2005). According to Kovecses, and as pertaining closely to the work going into the current MA project, it is in this way depicted above that the shared understandings that anthropologists postulate as an important part of the definition of culture are, in fact, often metaphorical understandings. These are most probably metaphorical when understanding and meaning making in communication and cognition understanding are focused on some intangible entity, such as time, our inner life, mental processes, emotions, abstract qualities, moral values, and social and political institutions. When these are the cases of communication and thought, the metaphors that social agents use to understand these intangibles may gain

tremendous importance in the process of how these intangibles are conceptualized in a culture. In other words, in this school of thought, ‘metaphors may be an inherent part of culture’ (Kovecses, 2005, 2000). Kovecses also shows at length that, interestingly, there are anthropologists who do accept the view of culture as in part consisting in shared understandings, but these anthropologists do not simultaneously embrace the view that metaphor, in the sense used here, is an inherent part of it.

Having established this way of thinking about the connection between metaphor and culture, Kovecses believes the question to then ask is:

- *To what extent do people share their metaphors?*

On the surface, this is ‘a trivial question’ he says, but it becomes ‘much more interesting and significant’ (for the current thesis too) ‘if we ask the larger and more significant question of which it forms a part’:

- *To what extent do people around the world share their understandings of aspects of the world in which they live?*

This is one of the main projects that Kovecses pursues (especially in his 2005 project) in his quest for the place of metaphor in shaping ideology, political thinking affecting public thinking, and culture. And it is this question that is of particular and central significance to us in this thesis as well.

1.3 Universality and Variation in Metaphor

Conceptual Metaphor Theory is taken by some to be a quasi-revolutionary thinking on the nature of metaphor that used and brought together many strands of thinking in Cognitive Linguistics, semantics and brain studies. This was done by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. In this framework, metaphors are, first of all, based on embodied human experiences (e.g., Lakoff and Johnson, 1999; Grady, 1997a, 1997b). For example, we metaphorically view AFFECTION as WARMTH (Kovecses, 1986: 101) because our childhood experiences contain concrete (embodied and physical/sensorimotor) correlations between the loving embrace of our parents and the comforting bodily warmth that accompanies it. This gives us the conceptual metaphor AFFECTION IS WARMTH. In other words, one could say that thinking (by means of AFFECTION IS WARMTH) and talking (e.g., We have a *warm* relationship) of AFFECTION in terms of WARMTH are the natural products of our embodied experience. What is equally interesting is that through research, we can conclude that probably no one would be surprised to hear that AFFECTION is universally conceptualized as WARMTH, rather than COLDNESS. The encoding of such primary metaphors is not a choice for us: it

happens unconsciously and automatically. Kovecses (2005: 3) argues that ‘because this is a universal bodily experience, the metaphor corresponding to it may well be universal. In other words, universal primary experiences produce universal primary metaphors.’

And yet, when metaphors in the world’s languages are studied, some linguists reason on the basis of what they regard as compelling evidence towards the fact that there is a considerable number of non-universal metaphors as well, and that these non-universal metaphors may be just as possible and frequent as the universal metaphors. In other words, metaphorical variation and language/culture-specificity seems to be just as significant and likely as universality. How can one explain these metaphors if human embodied experience is a shared and common ground? In his work on culture, Kovecses shows that metaphorical variation assumes many possible shapes; one common manifestation of it is when a particular abstract domain is conceptualized in a range of ways that are cross-culturally diverse. One can come upon many examples of this kind of variation: LOVE is conceptualized as A JOURNEY, UNITY, HUNTING, and so forth, in many cultures, including English, Hungarian, and Chinese, but in certain dialects of Chinese LOVE is FLYING A KITE (Yang, 2002); ANGER is conceptualized as A FLUID or GAS in many cultures, but in Zulu ANGER is understood as OBJECTS IN THE HEART (Taylor and Mbense, 1998); LIFE is commonly viewed as A JOURNEY or A STRUGGLE, but in Hmong, it is viewed as A STRING (Riddle, 2000).

The issue that arises is: if metaphorical variation is as common as this, one needs to be able to offer the right explanations for it. It is in this way, Kovecses (2005) argues, that the main challenge emerges: *How can we come up with a comprehensive theory that can account for both the universality and the variation in our use of metaphor?* To go about this, the standard cognitive linguistic theory of metaphor would need to go out in the following way:

There are a great number of primary metaphors; in addition to AFFECTION IS WARMTH, we have:

- CAUSES ARE FORCES (e.g., You’re *driving* me crazy)
- EVENTS ARE MOTIONS (e.g., What’s *going on* here?)
- PROGRESS IS MOTION FORWARD (e.g., We haven’t made any *headway*)
- PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS (e.g., She’s *reached her goal*)
- DIFFICULTIES ARE IMPEDIMENTS (e.g., Let’s try to *get around* this problem)

When one is affiliated with this school of thought, one then tends to regard primary metaphors as being capable of being potentially combined in different languages and cultures to give rise to ‘complex’ metaphors, like LIFE IS A JOURNEY and LOVE IS A JOURNEY; what we need to recognize as the underlying thought in this theory is that these conceptual

metaphors are the product of ‘conceptual correspondences’, or ‘mappings’, between the ‘source’ domain of JOURNEY and the ‘target’ domains of LIFE and LOVE.

The way in which primary metaphors are combined to form these complex metaphors may be language-specific. And it should constitute one of the projects and strands of focus for cross-linguistic variation research into conceptual metaphors to find out how different languages make use of slightly different combinations of these primary patterns of thought and cognition to form slightly varied conceptual metaphors.

But, at the end of the day, Kovecses (2005) argues, the main point to appreciate, the main hypothesis to begin with on this path of cross-linguistic research agenda, is that the primary metaphors are more likely to be universal, whereas the complex metaphors that are formed from them are much less likely to be so. In the cultural theory of Kovecses where he believes metaphors to play a constitutive formational role, it is the influence of cultures that exercise foundational and conceptually ontogenetic effects on what complex conceptual metaphors ultimately come into being from the primary metaphors.

In Kovecses’s view, this all is certainly part of the explanatory tool and picture, but for the cognitive linguistic view of metaphor to be a more comprehensive and sophisticated theory of both the universality and the variation of metaphor, there is a lot more that must be added, in the form of important possibilities and caveats that research from the 1980s onwards has alerted us to. So far in this mode research, the findings point to the following directions and reminders that I map out inspired by Kovecses’s work (2005, 2010, etc.). There are others, but the following are the most crucial ones and will serve for the purposes of the moment:

- Universal experiences, said to be naturally common among most peoples of the world of all cultures, do not necessarily lead to universal metaphors;
- Bodily experience (which may be common among most people irrespective of culture, distance, geography and race) may be selectively used by different cultures and peoples in the creation of metaphors;
- Bodily experience may be overridden by both culture and cognitive processes;
- Primary metaphors are not necessarily universal (due to the above possibility, i.e. that bodily experience, which is thought to be universal, may be overridden by both culture and cognitive processes, which may not be universal, and may be situation-specific, event-specific, experience-specific (experience that is non-biological and hence, not shared), and culture-specific);
- (in the same way) Complex metaphors (created out of primary ones) may be potentially or partially universal;

- Finally, and building on the above, metaphors are not necessarily based on bodily experience; many of them are based on cultural considerations and cognitive processes of various kinds.

1.3.1 Components of the Cognitive Linguistic View of Metaphor

In laying out the cognitive linguistic view of metaphor, one can see that this theory of metaphor has arrived at a complex stage of its journey. Within this plane of the theory, metaphor is seen as being built up of a number of parts, aspects, or components that interact with each other (Kovecses, 2015, 2010, 2005). According to Kovecses (2005), and as of course there is wide consensus on the literature, these components are as follows:

1. Source domain
2. Target domain
3. Experiential basis
4. Neural structures corresponding to (1) and (2) in the brain
5. Relationships between the source and the target
6. Metaphorical linguistic expressions
7. Mappings
8. Entailments
9. Blends
10. Nonlinguistic realizations
11. Cultural models

For those who are not acquainted enough with the cognitive linguistic view of metaphor derived from Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) work, a book-length introduction to the past 28 years of the theory can be found in Kovecses (2010). Nonetheless, each of these components will be treated here briefly, inspired by Kovecses's (2005) own treatment of them.

1 and 2 (Source Domain and Target Domain): Metaphor consists of a source and a target domain such that the source is a more physical and the target a more abstract kind of domain. Conceptual Metaphors are a mainstay of cognitive conceptualization because speakers need to structure the world around them, express meaning and intention, and talk about reality, by 'borrowing' from this concrete, bodily experience and experiential (source) domain to capture, mean, and talk about that abstract target domain.

Examples:

Source Domains: WARMTH, JOURNEY

Target domains: AFFECTION, LIFE, LOVE

Hence the CMs (Conceptual Metaphors):

- AFFECTION IS WARMTH
- LIFE IS A JOURNEY
- LOVE IS A JOURNEY

3. Further and continued research using the theory soon shed light on the important fact, one that researchers had long engaged with, that the choice of a particular source to go with a particular target is motivated by an experiential basis, that is, some embodied experience.

Examples:

Affection correlates with bodily warmth; forces often act as causes; motion is a type of event.

4. Embodied experience results in certain neural connections between areas of the brain (these areas correspond to source and target).

Potential example:

When the area of the brain corresponding to affection is activated, the area corresponding to warmth is also activated.

5. The relationship of the source and the target is such that a source domain may apply to several targets and a target may attach to several sources. This is what Kovecses (2010) comes to call *The Scope of Metaphor*.

Example:

The JOURNEY domain applies to both LIFE and LOVE, given the linguistic evidence in English.

6. The particular pairings of source and target domains make for metaphorical linguistic expressions; as such, linguistic expressions are derived from the connecting of two conceptual domains. One of the many strengths of the theory is that it can predict how thought underlies speech, how thought underlies, prefigures and predetermines what can emerge in surface linguistic expression. This is one of the most important underlying elements of the theory. This also has Applied Linguistics and pedagogical implications for Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Education.

Examples:

- *warm* relationship (from AFFECTION IS WARMTH metaphor),
- *get around* a problem (from DIFFICULTIES ARE OBSTACLES metaphor).

7. In its classical version of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), and as another important mainstay, the argument is that there are basic, and essential, (and therefore predictable) conceptual correspondences, or **mappings**, between the source and target domains. *Example:*

Conceptual metaphor:

LOVE IS A JOURNEY

Mappings:

Travelers → lovers

Vehicle → love relationship

Destination → purpose of the relationship

Distance covered → progress made in the relationship

Obstacles along the way → difficulties encountered in the relationship

8. As later insights gathered to enrich the theory, it was found that source domains often map ideas onto the target beyond the basic correspondences the unmarked source-target mappings identify. These additional mappings are called *entailments*, or *inferences*. Entailments are a later development in Cognitive Linguistics, and are not just a concept used in CMT.

Example:

If love is conceptualized as a journey and the vehicle corresponds to the relationship, then our knowledge about the vehicle can be used to understand love relationships. If the vehicle breaks down, we have three choices:

- (1) we get out and try to reach our destination by some other means;
- (2) we try to fix the vehicle; or
- (3) we stay in the vehicle and do nothing.

Correspondingly, if a love relationship does not work, we can:

- (1) leave the relationship;
- (2) try to make it work; or
- (3) stay in it (and suffer).

9. The joining of a source domain with a target domain often gives rise to blends, that is, conceptual materials that are new with respect to *both* the source and the target.

Example:

Take the sentence “*He was so mad smoke was coming out of his ears.*”

In this example we have an angry person as the target domain and SMOKE (fume) IN A CONTAINER as the source domain. The target (the angry person) has no smoke emerging from it and the source (the container with hot fluid) has no ears. But the example conceptually integrates the two: We have a container that has ears that have smoke blowing out of them. This is called a **blend** (Fauconnier and Turner, 2002).

10. Conceptual metaphors often can be manifested in nonlinguistic guises as well, that is, not just in language and thought but in social-physical practice and reality as well.

Example:

Taking the IMPORTANT IS CENTRAL conceptual metaphor and its linguistic manifestations (such as “the *central* issue”) as an example, one can observe that, in meetings and other social events, important people (e.g., people in higher positions) tend to take up more “central” physical locations in the surrounding environment than less important ones would.

11. As mentioned above, Kovecses believes cultures to have underlying metaphorical driving forces and constitutive essences. He believes that conceptual metaphors converge on, and often produce, cultural models that operate in thought. These are structures that are simultaneously cultural and cognitive (hence, the term *cultural model*, or *cognitive model*), in that they are culturally specific mental representations of aspects of the world.

Example:

An inherent part of our understanding of TIME is that it is an entity that moves. This is because our cultural model of time is fueled by the conceptual metaphor TIME IS A MOVING ENTITY.

1.3.2. Metaphorical Language

The foregoing has illuminated the fact that, within the theory of CMT, i.e., in the cognitive linguistic view, the linguistic manifestation and representation of metaphor is only derivative; metaphor has manifestation in language only because it has it in thought (Kovecses, 2015, 2010, 2005; Strauss and Quinn, 1997; Lakoff and Johnson, 1999). Linguistic metaphors (i.e., metaphors in language) are linguistic manifestations of metaphorical concepts that are encoded in the brain’s conceptual system. Thus, on the one hand, metaphorical linguistic expressions are surface realizations of conceptual metaphors, and, on the other, we can make use of these metaphorical linguistic expressions to analyze our way toward metaphors in thought through a theoretical assumption of hypothetical links between two domains, which can then be subjected to psychological experiments (Gibbs, 2003a, 2003b; Glenberg, 1997; Boroditsky and Ramscar, 2002).

The hypotheses that we postulate about what the conceptual metaphors are derive their shape from linguistic evidence and linguistic observations; as such, knowing what can be considered a metaphorical linguistic expression is of importance. One could wonder what the criteria are based on which we can conclude what counts as a linguistic metaphor. Different answers to this question could be put forward, and an extensive research agenda has been endeavouring to gain some insights in this regard (e.g. Praggeljaz Group, 2007; Steen et al., 2010; Cameron, 2003).

Kovecses (2015) argues that the origin of metaphors lies in human experience and the context in which they are used. According to him, metaphor is not just a linguistic device, but a cognitive mechanism that allows us to understand and reason about abstract concepts by mapping them onto concrete, sensory experiences. This view is consistent with the cognitive linguistic theory of metaphor, which posits that metaphorical thinking is a fundamental aspect of human cognition. In the context of political discourse, metaphors play a crucial role in shaping public opinion by framing complex issues in a way that resonates with people's everyday experiences and emotions. By analyzing the use of metaphors in American and Azerbaijani presidential speeches, we can gain insights into how different cultural and linguistic backgrounds influence the use of metaphor in political communication.

Charteris-Black (2011) further emphasizes the persuasive power of metaphors in political discourse. According to her, metaphors not only enable us to understand complex political issues, but also evoke powerful emotions and shape our attitudes towards them. Political metaphors can be used to portray politicians and political parties as heroic or villainous, and to frame issues in a way that highlights their importance and urgency. In the context of presidential speeches, metaphors are often used to convey a sense of national identity and purpose, and to appeal to the emotions and values of the audience. By analyzing the use of metaphors in American and Azerbaijani presidential speeches, we can gain a better understanding of how political leaders use metaphors to persuade and influence their audiences in different cultural and linguistic contexts.

Semino (2008) provides a comprehensive overview of metaphor in discourse, highlighting the different functions and forms of metaphorical expressions across a variety of contexts. According to her, metaphors are not just limited to individual words or phrases, but can also be expressed through broader patterns of language use, such as narrative structures, rhetorical strategies, and cultural conventions. In the context of political discourse, metaphors play a critical role in constructing and reinforcing political ideologies, values, and beliefs. They can be used to create a sense of shared identity and belonging among members of a political community, as well as to justify and legitimize political actions and policies. By analyzing the use of metaphor in American and Azerbaijani presidential speeches, we can gain insights into the different ways in which political leaders construct and convey their political messages through metaphor, and how these messages are received and interpreted by their audiences in different cultural and linguistic contexts.

1.3.3. What is the Nature of a Conceptual Metaphor?

By now it should also have unfurled that within the cognitive linguistic view, metaphor is not a solely linguistic phenomenon. Rather, metaphor seems to reside on simultaneous planes of language, thought, social-cultural practice, brain, and body - with metaphor in thought acting as the crucial mainstay. Put another way, metaphor is taken to be a:

- linguistic
- conceptual
- social-cultural
- neural
- bodily

phenomenon, occupying all of these planes and dimensions simultaneously.

Cognitive Linguistics circles have not always unanimously taken warmly to the idea that metaphor lies on all of these simultaneous planes. Many epistemological revolutions have been called for so as to agree that metaphor is a multi-faceted phenomenon to do with not only language, but also the conceptual system, as well as social-cultural structure and neural and bodily activity. Kovecses (2005) believes that an important intellectual revolution in this direction happened in 1980 in line with the pace-setting and revolutionary book *Metaphors We Live By* by Lakoff and Johnson that changed the scene of the cognitive linguistic outlook on metaphor studies and, in essence, gave rise to the realm of Conceptual Metaphor Theory.

The main accomplishment that Lakoff and Johnson reached in that book was their position that metaphors are conceptual in nature, that is, that they belong to the conceptual system, and not just to language (i.e., in linguistic meaning). One should of course note that the seeds and grounds for this cognitive linguistic standpoint on the nature of metaphor had already begun to emerge, and Lakoff and Johnson were not the first to be making this proposition (For example, anthropologists have always looked upon metaphor as a powerful conceptual device, rather than just a decorative linguistic one). But Lakoff and Johnson were the first to make this claim in a systematic, generalizable, and verifiable way. As it turns out, time and research have lent ample support to their ideas.

According to Kovecses's beliefs, the historical turn in research and theory that made us view metaphor as not just linguistic and conceptual but also embodied in its essence was of equal importance. This represents the underlying and theoretically crucial idea that metaphorical thought is embodied. Yet it was Lakoff and Johnson to have proposed this in a more systematic and compelling way than any movement predating them (Johnson, 1987; Lakoff, 1987; Lakoff and Johnson, 1999). Their beliefs of course saw follow-up and refinement

by Joe Grady and his postulate of primary metaphor (e.g., Grady, 1997a, 1997b). The chief line of thinking presented in all this work was that abstract thought, shaped and classified by metaphor to a large extent, is the product of the way in which the human body constrains the way we think about such abstract conceptual domains as time, emotion, morality, and politics.

To clarify this and take it further, Kovecses believes (Kovecses, 2005) that continued present-day research is opening up crucially important insights, with researchers looking into how the brain is equipped to govern metaphorical thought. A number of models, or proposed hypotheses, of this neural activity in the brain have been put forward and have been the focus of attention in a variety of disciplines (Gibbs, 1994, 1998, 1999; Gibbs and O'Brian, 1990; Gibbs et al., 2004; Gibbs et al., 1997; Deignan, 1995).

In addition to all this, Kovecses also believes that the first major revolution in metaphor studies took place more than 2,000 years ago when such Greek philosophers as Plato and Aristotle recognized the existence of metaphor in language (and to some extent also in thought). They were the first to argue in all seriousness that there is something called metaphor. But this is not to say that metaphor as a phenomenon did not exist before; it definitely had, and it was a device pervasively used both by other orators and speakers two millennia ago and by even many people predating them.

These beliefs on metaphor find their way into a more inclusive model that incorporates philosophical claims made by Lakoff and Johnson (1999). They postulate the following chief principles underlying the theory (adapted from Kovecses, 2005):

1. *Thought is largely unconscious*: This means that we cannot help thinking in the ways we do. We are not consciously aware of the way we think and reason, and we cannot think just anything.
2. *Abstract concepts are largely metaphorical*: This is a very important principle in modern Cognitive Linguistics and, by extension, Conceptual Metaphor Theory. In short, and crucially, it means that most of our nonphysical (social, psychological, etc.) reality is conceptualized via physical reality, that is, in terms of physical domains of experience.
3. *The mind is embodied*: Concepts derive their meaning through sensorimotor experience – either directly or indirectly (i.e., via metaphor).

These were treated at some length above, but here, in these three principles, one can see the chief running themes of CMT in a simple and clear-cut manner. It is the second proposition above that clearly is of most immediate relevance to us, but there is consensus in the field that

the other two tenets are just as important for a more comprehensive grasp of the essence and prominence of metaphor in culture.

One important aspect of Conceptual Metaphor Theory that deserves further attention is the idea that metaphors are not only pervasive in our everyday language and thought, but they also play a fundamental role in shaping our perception of reality. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argue that our understanding of abstract concepts, such as time, emotions, or politics, is grounded in concrete experiences, and that metaphors are the means by which we make sense of these abstract domains. For instance, we understand time in terms of motion and space, as in "we're running out of time" or "we're moving towards the future", because we have a bodily experience of motion and space. Similarly, we understand emotions as objects that can be contained, as in "he bottled up his feelings", because we have a bodily experience of containment.

This view of metaphor as a means of grounding abstract concepts in concrete experience has important implications for our understanding of how language and thought work together. According to this view, language is not simply a tool for expressing pre-existing thoughts, but rather, language actively shapes and structures our thinking. The metaphors we use in language are not arbitrary, but rather, they reflect the underlying conceptual structures that guide our thinking. In other words, our language reflects and reinforces the way we conceptualize reality

1.3.4. Metaphorical Universality and Variation Revisited

Ultimately, and at this stage, the question that should be posed is: what should a theory of metaphor be like if it is one that tries to account for both universality and variation in the use of metaphor? A theory of that kind must at least be able to answer questions such as the following (adapted from Kovecses (2005) as he encapsulates them):

1. Which metaphors are universal, and why?
2. Where is metaphor variation most likely to occur?
3. What are the aspects of metaphor that are most commonly affected by variation?
4. What are the causes of metaphor variation?
5. Do conceptual metaphors form a seamless fit with embodiment, cultural experience, and cognitive processes? Do these systems function together in a completely coherent fashion? If not, how can we account for the conflicts among these various systems that interact with metaphor?

It is mostly the first question that has claim the focus of cognitive linguists working on metaphor. The theory of primary metaphor accounts for the universality of certain metaphors in the sharpest and most incisive way. Although Kovecses agrees overall with this standpoint towards universality, his research and thinking and the data he considers leads him to suggest many adjustments to this account of metaphor universality.

One of these is that although he does take primary metaphors important for developmental and cognitive reasons, he believes that complex metaphors are more important when it comes to the study of culture than primary metaphors are. It is complex metaphors - not primary metaphors - that people actually use at the level of thought in real cultural contexts to conceptualize abstract target concepts. Kovecses (2005) adds that primary metaphors, in some sense, often look less alive in comparison to culturally embedded complex ones. *PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS* feels and sounds like a decontextualized made-up and theoretical construct in comparison to *LIFE IS A JOURNEY*, the former being a part of the latter. This being said, the importance of primary metaphor should of course not be diminished; what this means, rather, is that while the important cognitive role of primary metaphors should be attested, the essential cultural role of complex metaphors should also receive recognition. Ultimately, as a theory of culture, Kovecses (2005) postulates that metaphors are just as much cultural as they are cognitive entities and processes.

Another aspect in which Kovecses sees room for modification in the standard cognitive linguistic theory of metaphor is that he believes conceptual metaphors (both the complex and primary kinds) have one or several 'meaning foci' (see Kovecses, 1995a, 2002). This means that each source domain lends and contributes certain pre-specified conceptual material to the range of target domains to which it applies. This conceptual material is something that a community of speakers agrees on; it represents very essential, rudimentary and core knowledge about the source. Kovecses believes, in other words, that most source domains that lend themselves to a range of targets have something like a 'major theme or themes.' The source domain of *JOURNEY* has the idea of progress as its major theme (whether we apply it to *LIFE* or *LOVE*); the source domain of *HEAT* (though not *WARMTH*) is often used to conceptualize *INTENSITY*; and *BUILDING* is very often used to capture some *ABSTRACT STRUCTURE*, *LASTINGNESS*, and *CREATION*.

Looked at another way, the notion of 'main meaning focus' is Kovecses's way of talking about some of the same things that the notion of primary metaphor can explain. He maintains that he finds the notion of main meaning focus, or major theme, useful because of its 'culture-sensitivity.'; it allows us to talk about ideas associated with a source domain agreed upon by a

community of speakers. And it also allows us to capture interesting cross-cultural variations in source domains and what they combine with in the target. For instance, ANGER IS HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER primary metaphor as studied in English (Lakoff, 1987).

In the theory of primary metaphor, the mapping that characterizes this metaphor should be universal; HEAT should map onto the intensity of ANGER. But in some other languages, studied by Emanatian (1995), HEAT does not map onto the intensity of ANGER; instead, it maps onto other aspects of the person. In other words, within the thinking of Kovecses, and as a crucial aspect of his thinking, the notion of ‘main meaning focus’ seems to be more culture-sensitive than that of primary metaphor. He again does not see the two notions as being in competition with each other; rather, he adds that he sees them as tools that capture two sides (the cognitive and the cultural) of the same (metaphorical) coin (Kovecses, 2005: 12).

It is interesting that a notion similar to that of main meaning focus has made up one dimension of research by psycholinguists in their experiments. Kovecses finds this in Ray Gibbs’s experiments on the “nonlinguistic profile” of some typical source domains which strikes a fairly similar resemblance to the notion of main meaning focus. Kovecses also sees an echo of it in Hoyt Alverson’s work who concludes forcefully that all experience is intentional, that is, is conceived of “in a certain manner” (Alverson, 1991: 97). Experience conceived in a particular manner is conceptualized by (often different) cultural models.

Since cognitive linguists have generally not concerned themselves with the issue of metaphor variation, they have not sought systematic answers to the other questions; among these, question (2) relates to what Kovecses terms the *dimension* of metaphor variation. This refers to the fact that we need to identify, or, in fact, outline the dimensions along which metaphors can vary. Kovecses proposes several such dimensions, primarily including the cross-cultural and within-culture dimensions. Put another way, Kovecses argues that we need to find those boundaries that point to discontinuities in otherwise universal human experience.

Question (3) relates to the components of the cognitive linguistic view of metaphor, to which *components*, or *aspects*, of metaphor constitute areas and aspects of metaphor variation (or to what degree), which ones do not, and how they do so. Expectedly, when we are talking about variation, Kovecses suggests that experiential basis (which constitutes a universal area of metaphorical conceptualization, especially towards primary metaphors; experiential basis explains what is common to the physical experience of all races and peoples, no matter how disparate geographically, as indicated above) is at work less than, say, metaphorical mappings, and that mappings are in turn less at work than, say, metaphorical linguistic expressions, in variation. In other words, in analyzing variation, one observes that when cross-cultural and

within-culture metaphorical variation occurs, it is less to do with the experiential basis of the metaphor in question, but more with the way certain cultures come up with different metaphorical mappings of the same metaphor, and more than that with the way the conceptual metaphor is manifested in actual linguistic evidence. These are recapitulated in order of the importance attached to them by Kovecses, as outlined in the following figure:

Figure 1.1.1: Aspects of Metaphor Variation in order of Effect and importance

Variation =metaphorical linguistic expressions > metaphorical mappings > experiential basis

To Kovecses, question (4) possibly holds the most promise. It asks us to explore the main *causes* of metaphor variation. Kovecses argues that he has found two large groups of such causes: differential experience and the differential application of (otherwise universal) cognitive processes. Both can create both interculturally and intraculturally different metaphors.

Kovecses believes that question (5):

- Do conceptual metaphors form a seamless fit with embodiment, cultural experience, and cognitive processes? Do these systems function together in a completely coherent fashion? If not, how can we account for the conflicts among these various systems that interact with metaphor?

has to do with the issue of the degree of cultural *coherence* in the interplay among the conceptual metaphors, embodiment, and causes of metaphor variation. In his 2005 work, he shows that the coherence among these systems is partial most of the time (at least in the case of complex metaphors), but that we also find cases of complete coherence and, at the other extreme, very little coherence, or no coherence at all, among the systems.

1.5. CMA (Critical Metaphor Analysis)

Jonathan Charteris-Black is one of an influential group of thinkers who use a strict bedrock of Conceptual Metaphor Theory, Cognitive Linguistics, Cognitive Semantics, and ideas from Critical Discourse Analysis to rearticulate the crucial role of conceptual metaphors in political discourse and propose a model for their analysis. When researching metaphors in a large corpus of American Presidential Speeches in their inaugural speech (Charteris-Black, 2004), he points to CONFLICT metaphors, JOURNEY metaphors, BUILDING metaphors, LIGHT and FIRE metaphors, PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT metaphors, RELIGIOUS metaphors, and BODY PART metaphors.

He argues and reminds that that a great many of the metaphors that are used in American presidential inaugural speeches can be accounted for with reference to only a few source domains for metaphor. These are drawn from familiar everyday experience and in linguistic terms are examples of reification. Charteris-Black believes that one should consider the rhetorical and pragmatic purpose of the discourse event in which a linguistic delivery pans out and makes use of conceptual metaphors. For him and his model of critical metaphor analysis, the persuasive power of metaphor is a crucial dimension (Charteris-Black, 2011). In an inaugural political speech, for example, they are rhetorically appropriate because the pragmatic aims of an inaugural political speech are both to make intelligible and to persuade the listener of the value of abstract social ideals such as peace, prosperity and justice. In constructing his model, he finds that there is overlap between metaphors from apparently unrelated source domains such as journeys and building and journeys and light, and that the evidence of conceptual metaphors taken from other text types may differ in the case of political speeches. For example, more evidence was found for PURIFICATION IS FIRE than for ANGER IS HEAT; he considers this intriguing as it implies a largely *positive* evaluation of heat metaphors in the big corpus that he analyzes. This he regards and explains as exploiting the expressive resources of language for the rhetorical end of conveying an evaluation in political speeches.

Below in table 1.1 is a summary of conceptual metaphors in the US Inaugural Corpus (taken from Charteris-Black, 2004):

1.Table 1.1 Summary of conceptual metaphors in the US Inaugural Corpus

Source Domain	Conceptual Metaphor
Conflict	POLITICS IS CONFLICT
Journeys	PURPOSEFUL SOCIAL ACTIVITY IS TRAVELLING ALONG A PATH TOWARDS A DESTINATION
Buildings	WORTHWHILE ACTIVITY IS BUILDING SOCIETY IS A BUILDING
Light and fire	HOPE IS LIGHT PURIFICATION IS FIRE
Physical environment	A SOCIAL CONDITION IS A WEATHER CONDITION A SOCIAL CONDITION IS A FEATURE IN A LANDSCAPE

	MENTAL STATES ARE LOCATIONS
Religion	POLITICS IS RELIGION
Body parts	ACTION IS A BODY PART

Charteris-Black explains how interrelations between the various levels of metaphor analysis support a cognitive model of metaphor. However, he also adds how the approach of Critical Metaphor Analysis supplements the cognitive semantic view by accounting for particular metaphor choices in different types of discourse leading to a discourse model of metaphor. He argues that while cognitive semantics is a satisfactory model of how metaphors are *interpreted* by individuals, the social influence of ideology, culture and history may provide a more convincing account of *why particular metaphors are chosen in specific discourse contexts*.

To further his CMA, he then argues that the interpretation of metaphors is often unconscious and one reason why metaphors are so persuasive is because we are not always aware of how they influence our emotional response to language. Just like the remit and aims of Critical Discourse Analysis, he notes how increased awareness of metaphor through critical metaphor analysis is necessary for individual empowerment and offers alternative ways of understanding the world we live in.

In his exhaustive corpus, at the level of conceptual metaphor, in politics and in much press reporting, struggle is conceptualized in terms of war and physical conflict. This is why we can talk about *election battles*, *battles against relegation* or *fighting for economic survival*. In the case of religion, struggle is conceptualized in terms of a relationship with a divine being that has the capacity to inflict punishment on the non-believer. Struggle implies that *effort*, or expenditure of energy, is necessary to *overcome* obstacles; this is a central notion that is relevant to all these disciplines because it identifies what is necessary in the attainment of their objectives. Struggle is therefore a very central idea in the development of the ideology of different types of discourse. Critical Metaphor Analysis is, therefore, an important approach for those interested in inter-disciplinary studies because it enables us to see connections across otherwise unrelated areas of human enquiry.

This descriptive model – based on evidence provided by Critical Metaphor Analysis for an underlying conceptual framework – implies a cognitive motivation for metaphor. Indeed, this is the strong point of view taken by cognitive linguists such as Lakoff, Gibbs and Johnson, who argue that notions of containment, orientation, movement etc. inhere in our bodily experience. Charteris-Black’s analysis of his corpus demonstrates that metaphors occurring in

the discourses of politics and sports reporting do in fact draw on a relatively small set of source domains. Religious discourse appears to draw on a wider range of lexical fields – but these are not unlimited and still appear to be systematic. Moreover, domains such as conflict, nature, buildings, journeys, fire and light, the human body, the physical environment and the weather are *common to all three types of discourse*. There is an experiential basis in so far as it is our experience of journeys, conflict, nature etc. that permits us to interpret the metaphors.

What Charteris-Black importantly reminds us of, however, is that it is not bodily experience *alone* that accounts for metaphor choice; for example, our experience of conflict inheres as much in social as in personal physical experience. Complementing Kovecses's view, he argues that conceptual knowledge is therefore grounded in experience of the social as well as the physical world, the former being more prone, obviously, to cultural and contextual variation, and hence, a source of metaphorical variation rather than universality. Using his corpus and for the sake of his CMA, Charteris-Black suggests that the notion of struggle offers a highly explanatory concept that unifies our experience of struggle – as in childbirth or physical movement – with the *social* dimension of struggle – as in competition in the workplace, participation in a recognizable social group or in personal social relations.

As indicated above, CMA recognizes that an important factor in metaphor choice is the rhetorical aim of persuasion. Cognitive semantics, Charteris-Black argues, conceals a dimension of metaphor that is revealed by Critical Metaphor Analysis; this is the way that metaphor selection in particular types of discourse is governed by the rhetorical aim of *persuasion*. In many cases, therefore, metaphor choice is motivated by ideology. The same notions could have been communicated using a different metaphor had the ideology been different and the same metaphors can also be employed in different ways according to ideological perspective. In politics, for example, we do not have to use conflict metaphors in the first place, and, if we do, they could be used either to attack an opponent's point of view or to represent the opponent as an aggressor. In his data analysis, Charteris-Black finds different aspects of the source domain to correspond with different ideological outlooks. For example, Labour discourse conceived of journeys as forward motions in *space* – with a location for the points of embarkation and destination – whereas Conservative and New Labour discourse conceived of journeys as forward motions occurring in *time* – with a temporal beginning and end. Choice of a space or a time metaphor is therefore motivated by ideological outlook – although bodily experience may be necessary for its interpretation.

To complement the traditional Cognitive Linguistics Outlook on Conceptual Metaphor Theory, Charteris-Black adds that, because of its universalist tendencies, cognitive semantic

theory does not explain *why* the discourse of one political party employs spatial metaphor and the other employs temporal metaphor. It therefore needs to be modified when applied to the goal of understanding specific ideologies. Cognitive semantics, therefore, provides a better explanation of how metaphors are *understood* rather than why they are *chosen* in a particular type of discourse for the rhetorical purpose of persuasion. Metaphors are – like many aspects of language – chosen by speakers to achieve particular communication goals within particular contexts rather than being *predetermined* by bodily experience. Charteris-Black claims, therefore, that a complete theory of metaphor must also incorporate a pragmatic perspective that interprets metaphor choice with reference to the *purposes of use* within *specific discourse contexts*. This point of view is also shared by Forceville (1996: 35): ‘The production and interpretation of metaphor include reference to many contextual elements that are at best only partly linguistic in character. Since situational context plays such a dominant role in metaphor, a semantic view of metaphor must always be complemented by a pragmatic one.’ This perspective does not exclude either cognitive or semantic views of metaphor but it does claim that metaphor choices may be governed by cognitive and semantic and pragmatic considerations and by ideological, cultural and historical ones. This view is summarized in table 1.2 below.

2. Table 1.2 A Discourse Model for Metaphor (adapted from Charteris-Black, 2004)

Individual Resources feeding into metaphor choice in discourse	Social Resources feeding into metaphor choice in discourse
Cognitive and Affective (experiential meaning)	Ideology (e.g. political belief)
Pragmatic (contextual meaning)	Culture (e.g. group identity)
Linguistic (linguistic meaning)	History (e.g. collective memory)

Table 2 shows that both individual and social resources influence metaphor choice in discourse. Individual resources can be sub-divided into three components: our thoughts, feelings and bodily experiences of the world; our understanding of what will be effective in particular contexts of use; and our knowledge of the linguistic system – of lexical fields and the various word senses that are available. The social bases for metaphor choice are ideological outlook – primarily political or religious viewpoint – and historical and cultural knowledge. For example, Chareteris-Black found that fire and light metaphors are used for positive evaluations

in American political discourse, whereas British political discourse employs plant metaphors for this discourse function. This was explained with reference to the revolutionary past of America and the British cultural experience of gardening. Traditional approaches to metaphor exclusively concentrated on linguistic considerations while cognitive linguistic approaches exclusively concentrate on the individual experiential basis of metaphor. However, the persuasive effect of metaphor in the discourse of social domains may be explained with reference to *social* resources in addition to individual ones.

CMA reminds, then, that there is nothing deterministic about metaphor use – as cognitive linguistics implies. The communicative purpose (or speaker intention) within a particular context of use will activate the affective potential of metaphor by exploiting different aspects of its individual and/or social motivation. For example, in financial reporting there is a different type of evaluation implied by the conceptual metaphors THE ECONOMY IS AN ORGANISM and THE ECONOMY IS A MACHINE. Animate metaphor systems highlight the predictability of economic processes whereas inanimate metaphor systems highlight their unpredictability. Cultural, ideological and affective motivation combine in order to make the metaphor persuasive according to the communicative purpose.

According to the theory of CMA advanced by Charteris-Black (2004), the issue of whether we treat metaphor as *primarily* determined by linguistic, pragmatic, cognitive, ideological, cultural or historical considerations is related to two further issues. The first is the question of whether we are examining metaphor from the perspective of the encoder or that of the decoder, and the second is how far choice of metaphor is governed by conscious or unconscious factors. The cognitive and linguistic views of metaphor provide an excellent account of metaphor interpretation, that is metaphor decoding, but they do not explain metaphor choice from the point of view of *encoding* – that is, *why* one metaphor should be preferred to another. For this Critical Metaphor Analysis is required.

Once metaphor choice is seen as a conscious *selection* of one linguistic form to make a discourse persuasive, we can explain this choice with reference to both social and individual considerations. A certain combination of these is likely to be effective in persuading by arousing particular emotions. For example, metaphors motivated by the concept THE WILL OF ALLAH IS A WRITTEN TEXT are specific to Islamic culture and will only be effective where Islamic cultural values and ideology prevail. Metaphors relating to struggle were effective for Hitler because they reflected the individual as well as the cultural and historical experience of many Germans in the period between the two World Wars.

The value of Critical Metaphor Analysis is that by making us more aware of the subliminal role of metaphor in situations where we are not aware that a speech act of persuasion is taking place, we are in a better position to identify its discourse role in forming evaluations. Once we are aware that metaphors are motivated by a concept such as THE ECONOMY IS HUMAN, we are more likely to be aware that it is people whose combined purchasing decisions in fact constitute the market. This brings in an ethical dimension to, for example, making investments, so that financial decisions may be in harmony with our political and religious outlooks. In line with the scope of Critical Discourse Analysis, this is a very important aspect since as English has become the language of global capitalism, it has also become a powerful instrument for influencing people's outlooks and beliefs; struggle over the choice of metaphor will increasingly reflect struggle between different groups in the global society. This has already become evident in the choice of particular words for the same referent: 'potential terrorist' for 'living martyr', 'political assassination' for 'targeted killing' and 'illegal combatant' or 'battlefield detainee' for 'prisoner of war'. As well as providing the means to live as sentient living individuals, metaphors may also overlook the humanity of others and represent dying as necessary or even desirable.

The covert, subliminal or unconscious function of metaphor in influencing emotions should permit us to consider the etymological relatedness of the terms 'motion' and 'emotion' in English – emotion originates in the French *mouvoir* 'motion'. We should also recall that the etymology of 'metaphor' is also in an idea related to movement: the Greek *meta* 'bearing' and *pherien* 'across'. It is not, then, surprising that an important aspect of metaphor is likely to be its role in *moving* or transporting the hearer. This is why metaphors are so pervasive in religious discourse.

Alongside the subliminal aspect of metaphor that Charteris-Black raises, therefore, he also stresses that the cognitive semantic account of metaphor needs to take place with reference to the pragmatic considerations of how, why and in what contexts language influences the emotions. From the perspective of Critical Metaphor Analysis, the social role of metaphor in the construction of an ideology is motivated by a rhetorical purpose of arousing the emotions in order to persuade. Only once we have established the interrelatedness of linguistic, cognitive, pragmatic, cultural, ideological and historical factors are we in a position to explain *why* our experience of metaphors can be a moving one, potentially involving cognitive and emotional renewal.

Finally, in Charteris-Black's CMA, or, in other words, his metaphor-driven Critical Discourse Analysis, without the ability to discuss issues according to the metaphors of our

choice, we are limited in our means of persuading others how we see the world. Without the ability to be critical of metaphors, the only alternative would be bland acceptance of the metaphors of others. If language is a prime means of gaining control of people, metaphor is a prime means by which people can regain control of language and create discourse. In Charteris-Black's view, metaphor both reflects and determines how we think and feel about the world and, therefore, understanding more about metaphor is an essential component of intellectual freedom.

1.6. Review of Literature: Some Empirical Background

This section discusses several research studies that utilized CMT as a model of analysis and conducted explicit cross-linguistic analysis of various unrelated languages from different perspectives. With the emergence of Cognitive Linguistics, there has been a resurgence in cross-linguistic research. In the upcoming section, we examine some of this literature, which demonstrates both how this research is influenced by the comparative paradigm, and yet, no study has tackled this specific comparative data and the objectives that this study seeks to achieve. The empirical context presented below will significantly contribute to acknowledging the significance of this study and the void it could potentially fill in the existing literature.

Türker (2013) conducted a corpus-based analysis to examine the conceptual emotion metaphors of Korean, specifically those related to ANGER, HAPPINESS, and SADNESS.

The study discovered various fascinating similarities and differences between the English and Korean conceptual emotion metaphors. Kövecses (2005) conducted a study on three unrelated languages - English, Chinese, and Hungarian - which are presumed to have had minimal contact or borrowing from one another. The study found that these languages shared a common conceptual structure for the metaphor HAPPINESS IS UP, providing evidence for the universality of primary metaphors across various cultures (Grady, 1997a and 1999).

Several studies have examined and compared the use of emotion metaphors in English and Persian. One such study by Pirzad Mashak et al. (2012) focused on the basic emotion conceptual metaphors in English and Persian literary texts. The findings indicated some cultural variations; however, they also supported the idea of universality in conceptualizations of general conceptual metaphors such as ANGER, HAPPINESS, SADNESS, FEAR, and LOVE. Safarnejad et al. (2014) conducted a study to examine how emotion metaphors of HAPPINESS are used in English and Persian writing. The study found both similarities and differences in the use of metaphorical expressions of happiness between the two languages. The similarities were attributed to the universality of conceptual metaphors based on common bodily

experiences, while the differences were attributed to specific cultural modes in English and Persian.

The study conducted by Northcote and Fetersten (2006) builds on the notion that metaphors are frequently used by university teachers and students to explain their beliefs about teaching and learning. The authors argue that examining these metaphors can provide valuable insights into the beliefs that underlie educational practices. Their study uncovered metaphors that were different from the ones commonly reported, thus expanding and enriching the existing research on the use of metaphor and offering deeper insights into individuals' beliefs and ideas about teaching and learning. Northcote and Fetherston's (2006) study focused on exploring the metaphors used by two groups of stakeholders - university teachers and students - to describe their beliefs about teaching and learning. They conducted interviews and surveys with the participants and analyzed their responses using open coding to establish a set of themes and categories. The study reported findings based on those themes, which augment and extend existing research on the use of metaphor by providing insight into individuals' beliefs and conceptions of teaching and learning.

Salager-Meyer's (1990) research involved a comparative study of metaphors in medical English prose in French and Spanish. A corpus of clinical writings in the three languages was analyzed, and the instances were classified based on their relationship designs or basic semantic exchange. The study found two broad categories of similarity in the three languages: morphological illustrations and physiological representations. Morphological illustrations referred to structures and designs such as geomorphical, anatomical, zoomorphical, phytomorphical, and building, while physiological representations referred to cycles and functions. It seems that the findings suggest that basic clinical representations are universal and not specific to a particular language, as they are found in all three dialects investigated. However, when it comes to more specialized medical metaphors used in English, they tend to belong to the nominal group, modify professional nouns or adjectives, and are often in the nominal compound form, which can present a challenge for non-native speakers.

Boers (2000) conducted a study on how to enhance metaphoric awareness in specialized reading. The main question in the study was whether it is beneficial to refer to the exact sense or the origin of a new metaphorical expression as it is experienced by a language learner in their specific reading context. To answer this question, Cognitive Semantic tools were applied to financial texts. The study tested the theory that improved metaphorical awareness among language learners can be beneficial to their specific reading comprehension in a small-scale experiment.

In the investigation conducted by vosniadou (1989), the role of context was examined in the development of metaphor comprehension, which is considered to be an interactive process that occurs between metaphorical semantic knowledge and the linguistic and situational context in which it is used. According to the study, young learners are capable of using both the semantic and situational context to infer the meaning of figurative sentences. Young learners are able to utilize the semantic and situational context to derive the meaning of figurative sentences, with context serving as a guide for determining when semantic information should be interpreted metaphorically. Situational contextual cues are found to be more beneficial than etymological conceptual roots in understanding metaphorical representations, and the importance of both situational and semantic context decreases as learners' knowledge base expands. Additional research is necessary to clarify the processes by which children use contextual and semantic information to construct the meaning of metaphors.

Sticht (1993) proposed a system of investigation for connecting the study of metaphors with literary works, exploring the educational uses of metaphor. This approach is further explored in Cameron (2003), which examines how teachers and students can effectively use metaphorical language in the classroom to promote literacy-oriented goals.

Boers (2000b) conducted three EFL tests and found that vocabulary retention could be improved through a lexical association along metaphorical topics or source domains. This suggests that classroom exercises should focus on enhancing students' awareness of conceptual structures and utilizing this knowledge as an additional channel for learning.

Boers and Lindstromberg (2008) investigated how Cognitive Linguistics can enhance vocabulary instruction by suggesting that the level of involvement of learners with new L2 words or expressions affects the speed of their acquisition. A number of researchers with a Cognitive-Linguistics background have put forward methods of using non-random features of vocabulary to prompt such engagement since the 1990s. Although many of the quasi-experimental studies supporting Cognitive Linguistics (CL)-informed instruction are small-scale, some with small effect sizes, and some with confounding variables, these proposals have been backed up by the results of several studies. Therefore, despite the limitations, the reported experiments are beginning to form a body of evidence that supports the use of CL-informed instruction, which cannot be easily dismissed. The author suggests that CL-informed instruction can be beneficial for second language programs, but it should be implemented with a closer alignment to mainstream second language vocabulary research. This includes considering issues of word selection, the importance of distributed learning, and the need to cater to complementary types of knowledge.

Charteris-Black's (2000) research explores the use of metaphors in vocabulary instruction for students of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) studying economics. The study emphasizes the value of metaphors in understanding particular modes of thought, especially as they relate to developing semi-technical registers. The study recommends incorporating metaphoric lexis that reflects key underlying metaphors of the discipline in teaching vocabulary to ESP economics students. The metaphorical basis of the identified high frequency lexis in *The Economist* magazine is explained through a comparison with the general magazine section of the Bank of English. The study focused on the use of metaphors in describing the economy, economic organizations, and market movements. The author found that animate metaphors such as growth and depression are used to describe the economy and economic organizations, while inanimate metaphors such as rebounds and slides are used to describe market movements. The author argues that this is because animate metaphors suggest a level of control by experts, while inanimate metaphors imply a lack of human control. Through the use of metaphors, economists can convey the degree of feasibility of predictions and control.

In 2002, Charteris-Black conducted a comparative study of Malay and English to examine "second language figurative proficiency." Meanwhile, in 2008, Coulson investigated the relationship between mind action and language capacity through the study of patients with brain injuries. In 1994, Hoyt conducted a study analyzing universal metaphors of time in English, Mandarin, Hindi, and Sesotho, to explore the connection between semantics and experience. The study carried out by Hoyt in 1994 examines how universal metaphors of time are used in English, Mandarin, Hindi, and Sesotho, to explore the relationship between semantics and experience. Boers' 2003 study explores how the field of applied linguistics can contribute to our understanding of cross-cultural variations in conceptual metaphor. Through an analysis of different cultures, Boers provides valuable insights into how these variations can impact language use and comprehension. Boers and his colleagues conducted a fascinating study in 2004, which demonstrated how cross-cultural differences can affect the comprehension and recall of figurative idioms. This study sheds light on the importance of taking cultural variations into account when studying language and cognition. Boers and Murielle (2001) conducted a study to measure how cross-cultural differences can affect learners' comprehension of imageable idioms. The findings of this study provide valuable insights into the importance of considering cultural variations when teaching idiomatic expressions to second language learners. Boroditsky's lifelong work revolves around the fundamental and critical question of whether language shapes thought. In her 2001 study, she investigates this question by examining the conceptions of time held by Mandarin and English speakers. Her research sheds

light on the ways in which language can influence our thinking and perception of the world around us.

Deignan and Potter's (2004) informative and cross-linguistic study involves a corpus analysis of metaphors and metonyms in both English and Italian. This study provides insightful results into the use and understanding of these linguistic devices across different languages, offering valuable implications for language teaching and translation. In 2003, Charteris-Black conducted a comparative analysis of metaphor and metonymy in English and Malay phraseology. Meanwhile, Emanatian's 1995 research focused on the role of metaphor in expressing emotions and aimed to uncover the value of cross-cultural perspectives in understanding this phenomenon. Both studies contribute valuable insights into the use and impact of metaphor and related linguistic devices in cross-cultural contexts. Ning's 1995 study explores the metaphorical expression of emotions such as anger and happiness in English and Chinese. Through this analysis, Ning provides valuable insights into the cultural and linguistic influences on the ways in which emotions are expressed and conceptualized through metaphors.

Özçalışkan's 2003 research is a fascinating cross-linguistic investigation that explores the use of metaphorical motion in English and Turkish. Through this comparative analysis, Özçalışkan offers valuable insights into the ways in which different languages utilize metaphorical expressions of motion and provides implications for second language learning and translation. In addition to her work on metaphorical motion, Özçalışkan's 2004 research also focuses on the concept of time and how it is expressed through spatial motion in both English and Turkish. Through this analysis, Özçalışkan sheds light on the ways in which language shapes our conceptualization of time and provides implications for language learning and cross-linguistic communication. Soriano's 2003 research explores the conceptual metaphors and metonymies of anger in both Spanish and English. By analyzing the linguistic expressions and underlying conceptual structures related to anger in these two languages, Soriano sheds light on the cultural and linguistic factors that shape the ways in which emotions are conceptualized and expressed.

Chapter 2: Methodology

As discussed above, the overarching objective of this research study is to conduct a qualitative, exploratory, descriptive, and narrative elicitation analysis of conceptual war- and conflict-related metaphor use in a sample of metaphor-containing discourse produced by the President of the United States and of Azerbaijan. Through this analysis, the study aims to explore how the two presidents conceptualize their political addresses and speeches using conceptual metaphors along the types of this kind of discourse. By eliciting responses from these two political figures, the study seeks to compare and contrast the metaphorical conceptualizations employed by these two distinct cultures and explore potential cross-cultural variations in the use of metaphor in political discourse. The main objective of this analysis is to investigate whether the Conceptual Metaphors utilized in the political discourse of American and Azerbaijani Presidents reflect cross-cultural variation and culture-specific cognitive templates, or if the majority of the dimensions of the metaphorical patterns that emerge tap into a universal model of reality. The investigation aims to shed light on the extent to which the metaphorical expressions used in these unrelated languages reflect cultural and linguistic differences, as well as to what extent they are influenced by shared human experiences and understanding of the world.

2.1. Restatement of the Research Questions

This qualitative content and discourse analysis study is undertaken to find answers to the following qualitative research questions:

Research Question 1: Do Azerbaijani and American presidents use conceptual metaphors in their speeches?

Research Question 2: What patterns of Conceptual Metaphor are used by Azerbaijani and American presidents in their speeches?

Research Question 3: What areas of cross-linguistic similarity and difference (potential universality and variation) emerge between Conceptual Metaphor use of Azerbaijani and American presidents in their speeches?

Research question 4: How are ideologies present or influential in the metaphorical discourse of the two presidents' political discourse?

2.2. Participants

The participants in this study are the speeches of two political leaders: American President Joe Biden and Azerbaijani President Ilham Aliyev. Both leaders were chosen as they have delivered numerous speeches on a wide range of political topics, providing a rich source of data for analysis.

The speeches of President Biden were collected from the official White House website, which contains transcripts of his speeches and statements. The data includes speeches on a range of political issues, including climate change, immigration, and foreign policy.

The speeches of President Aliyev were collected from the official website of the President of Azerbaijan Republic, which provides access to transcripts of his speeches. The data includes speeches on a range of topics, including Azerbaijan's economy, foreign relations, and regional security.

The speeches were selected based on their relevance to the research questions and the availability of transcripts in both English and Azerbaijani. The data covers speeches delivered by both leaders in the past 5 years.

The speeches were transcribed and translated into English or Azerbaijani where necessary, and were then analyzed using a combination of qualitative method to identify conceptual metaphors and analyze the discourses that emerge from the data.

2.3 Corpus and Sampling

Speeches delivered by President Joe Biden of the United States and President Ilham Aliyev of Azerbaijan were selected as the primary source of data for this study. The speeches were chosen based on their relevance to political discourse and their availability in the public domain. The speeches were collected from publicly available sources, including official government websites, news outlets, and video-sharing platforms. The selected speeches covered a range of topics related to politics, foreign affairs, and international relations, and were delivered between 2018 and 2022.

The sampling method used in this study was purposive sampling, which involved selecting speeches that were relevant to the research question and met the criteria for inclusion. The selected speeches were then transcribed and translated to ensure accuracy and consistency in the data.

For each president, the textual corpus size of their speeches was the same: a rough one thousand words of their formal speeches. The speeches were analyzed using qualitative research methods and content analysis to identify and compare the use of war- and conflict-laden metaphors in English and Azerbaijani political discourse. The selected corpus and sampling method were deemed appropriate for the research question and were intended to provide a comprehensive understanding of the use of conceptual metaphors in the political discourse of both the United States and Azerbaijan.

2.4. Instruments and Material

The primary instrument used in this study was the transcription and translation of the selected presidential speeches. The speeches were transcribed by the researcher and her supervisor and then translated into English or Azerbaijani, depending on the original language of the speech. The translations were reviewed by a professional translator to ensure accuracy and consistency.

In addition, the study utilized a coding scheme to identify and analyze the use of metaphors in the selected speeches. The coding scheme was developed based on previous research on conceptual metaphors and political discourse and was refined through an iterative process of coding and analysis. The coding scheme included categories such as source domain, target domain, and the type of metaphor used, among others.

The Pragglejaz Group (2007) has proposed a method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse, called MIP (Metaphor Identification Procedure). The MIP method is based on a set of criteria for determining whether a word or phrase is being used metaphorically, such as whether the word is being used in a non-literal sense, whether it is being used to express a similarity between two different domains, and whether it is being used in a novel or creative way. By applying the MIP method to political discourse, we can identify the specific metaphors being used by political leaders to convey their messages and shape public opinion. This can help us to better understand the ideological frameworks that underlie political discourse, as well as the rhetorical strategies that are used to persuade and influence the public

Therefore, coding and tagging the data were done for every linguistic metaphorical expression by reference to a close consultation of Pragglejaz Group's MIP (Metaphor Identification Project, Pragglejaz Group, 2007) and Master Metaphor List (Lakoff et al., 1991).

2.5. Design

Qualitative research has recently met calls for the need for Methodological Pluralism (Wertz et al., 2011). This means that every qualitative research will usually be categorized as more than one sub-type of qualitative design. This is because the tools used in qualitative research are, by nature, heavily embedded in the ebb and flow of the social milieu and, as such, are not static, fixed spellings of one timeless truth.

At the operational level, this thesis will fit into an exploratory, qualitative descriptive design, using content analysis too in the second phase, to organize recurrent and emergent patterns in the data. Looked at another way, this MA thesis grows into a mostly qualitative, exploratory, discourse-analytic, descriptive and text-analytic mould. It will use and deal with qualitative research methods and techniques within such a realm of qualitative research practice as will include tying the process and enterprise of the research pursuit with the ethical, epistemological and phenomenological identity of the researcher, theoretical sampling, researcher positionality, and many other qualitative research notions and considerations.

For the sake of randomness and representativeness of metaphor sampling from the data, outliers were excluded from the data due to disconnected speech, excessive ambiguity, or simply lacking discernible metaphorical linguistic expressions (Steen, et al., 2010; Kovecses, 2010). In this spirit, the sampling type from the data could be viewed as both purposive sampling and systematic random sampling.

Overall, the design of this study aimed to provide a comprehensive understanding of how metaphors are used in political discourse in the discourse of the presidents of the United States and Azerbaijan, and to explore the similarities and differences in their use. The design allowed for a detailed analysis of the selected corpus and provided a framework for comparing and contrasting the use of metaphors in an important and different cultural and linguistic context.

2.6. Procedures vis-à-vis the Theoretical Framework

Conceptual metaphor theory (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) posits that metaphors are not just rhetorical devices, but fundamental to our understanding and reasoning about the world. This theory suggests that we use metaphors to conceptualize abstract concepts by mapping them onto more concrete and familiar concepts. The use of metaphors in political discourse is particularly important, as it allows political actors to frame political issues, construct and convey political meanings, and mobilize support for their positions (Charteris-Black, 2011).

In this study, we focused specifically on the use of metaphors in political discourse, as they are commonly used in both American and Azerbaijani political discourse to frame issues related to foreign policy, national security, and international relations. We aimed to compare the use of metaphors in the presidential speeches delivered by President Joe Biden of the United States and President Ilham Aliyev of Azerbaijan, and to explore how these metaphors were used to construct and convey meaning in the political discourse of both countries.

To achieve our research aims, we used a qualitative content analysis approach, which allowed us to examine the selected corpus of presidential speeches in-depth and to identify patterns and themes in the use of metaphors. The corpus included speeches delivered by both presidents between 2018 and 2022, and was selected purposively based on the criteria of relevance and availability. The speeches were transcribed and translated into English, and then coded using a coding scheme that was developed based on the conceptual metaphor theory and previous research on the use of metaphors in political discourse.

The coding scheme included categories such as SOURCE DOMAIN, TARGET DOMAIN, and the type of metaphor used. The source domain refers to the concrete, familiar concept from which the metaphor is derived (e.g., war), while the target domain refers to the abstract, unfamiliar concept that is being conceptualized (e.g., diplomacy). The type of metaphor used refers to the specific linguistic expression that is used to convey the metaphor (e.g., "war on terror").

In line with the research questions and purposes, the textual data were subjected to analysis in terms of the conceptual metaphors used. After they were identified, the analysis proceeded to bring out the source domain and target domain of each conceptual metaphor. Thus, the point of departure for finding the instances of metaphor in the corpus for the two sets of data chosen for this study was through Conceptual Metaphor Theory within which metaphor is not a linguistic or textual phenomenon but always a cognitive one; a wording (a 'linguistic metaphor', or a 'metaphorized linguistic expressions', as seen by Kovecses, 2010) is an instance of conceptual metaphor when there is a 'source domain' from which the 'target domain'

borrowed, to say something more strongly and effectively than normal non-metaphorical wording would. Metaphors are known to disturb the natural order of reality construed by the clauses through borrowing from domains of reality ‘outside the immediate context of situation’ being talked about. This theory provides a good tool to discern such conceptual metaphors.

The recursion of the analytic components of ‘common source’ and ‘common target’ domains is because of a long and profuse body of expert research within CMT that was recapitulated and cogently put, in a the seminal and central work, into an operationalizable nutshell, by Kovecses (2010), within which he maps out the most established source and target domains English language uses to create meanings through conceptual metaphors. Using this insight from CMT theory as worked out by Kovecses will provide our tables with operationalized category labels, and this research with credible, operationalized and firm footing on which we can base our comparative findings and talk about how the two data sets emerge as evidencing universality or variation upon the analysis of the conceptual metaphors used in the samples.

The metaphors were first identified; this is done first by the researcher, then by the supervisor all over again. In third place, this was undertaken by a university of Tabriz capable team well-trained in conceptual metaphors in Pragglejaz Group’s MIP (Metaphor Identification Project, Pragglejaz Group, 2007). This ensured a high amount of reliability as to the findings. Although the inter-rater reliability was always above 80 %, the recoding and re-tagging (re-analysis and re-identification of the CMs) added a few conceptual metaphors that might have otherwise escaped notice or been felt too conventional. The second and third teams recommended and argued for their analyzability based on solid arguments, adding to the body of CMs identified at first stage by the researcher.

2.7. Controlling Discursive Theme: The Discourse of Conflict/War

In CDA and, similarly, in Political Metaphor Analysis and Critical Metaphor Analysis, there are a limited number of major discourses around which the discourses of politics and journalism always revolve. These have a way of being inter-related at time, for example, Economy, Welfare, Employment. In this spirit, for purposes of discursive comparison and more illuminating findings, since this research becomes a critical metaphor and critical discourse analysis in part too, speech data comparison by the two presidents focuses on the discourse of war and conflict, two inter-related notions usually comprising the same overarching discourse of conflict (Charteris-Black, 2004 and 2011). By the same token, identifying war- and conflict-related conceptual metaphors in the two sets of data here will enable us to have a more

consistent data collection and analysis and keep the meanings being talked about by the two presidents consistently comparable.

2.8 Abbreviations and the Analytic Categories in the Tables

Each of the two data samples analyzed in the first part of chapter three is accorded a table that contains the following categories of analysis from left to right: LME stands for ‘Linguistic Metaphorical Expression’, MIC stands for ‘Meaning in Context’. TD stands for ‘Target domain’, SD stands for ‘Source Domain’, and CM, the rightmost category that is somehow the product of the previous four, stands for ‘Conceptual Metaphor’. Elsewhere, CMT stands for ‘Conceptual Metaphor Theory’, and OM, a category emerging to show the source domain being HUMAN BEINGS, stands for Ontological Metaphor.

As reiterated at the start of chapter as well, the logic behind the left-to-right arrangement of these elements in the table involves the logical and conceptual analytic sequence that CMT and MIP (Metaphor Identification Procedure: Pragglejaz Group, 2007) lead us to adopt; first, the Linguistic Metaphorical Expression is listed, then a contextual meaning of it, which is the first step in recognizing the semantic tension between the actual and unmarked meaning of the expression (Pragglejaz Group, 2007), is attempted. In third step, the target abstract domain of reality intended by the metaphor is now more easily recognizable. As the fourth step, the SD can be easily discerned, followed by the whole CM as the cognitive and discursive product of all these linguistic and cognitive interactions.

One last and very important point in this regard is that, in this thesis, we did not treat conceptual metonymies as a separate phenomenon than conceptual metaphor. Kovecses’s discussion of ontological metaphors (as opposed to structural metaphors), using mostly HUMAN BEINGS as source domain, allows us to treat conceptual metonymies as conceptual metaphors as well. There are many important ramifications, discussed in cognitive linguistics, flowing from the distinctions drawn between metonymies and metaphors, but since they are not the concern of this thesis, they will be simply treated as OMs (ontological metaphors) in the analyses of the next chapter. Notwithstanding, in some cases of unquestionable and typical metonymy, we do include the word ‘metonymy’ or ‘metonymic’ in the last concluding CM box, to make a point of our appreciating the conceptual significance of metonymies as well, although, as mentioned, it does not constitute a concern of this thesis.

2.9 The Nature of the Analytic Categories

The categories of analysis will be based on Zoltan Kovecses's incisive work (2000, 2005, 2015, etc.) and many other cross-linguistic research on universality/variation as reported in the Empirical Background section in the previous chapter. According to Kovecses (2005), in the cognitive linguistic view of metaphor, metaphor is understood to exist on several interconnected levels, the main idea and Cognitive Linguistics consensus being that metaphorical thought is based on bodily experience and neuronal activity in the brain. This idea leads the field to pose a key initial question: Why do people familiar with and working within the theory expect most metaphors to be universal? The answer is: If metaphor is based on the way the human body and brain function and we as human beings are alike at the level of this functioning, then most of the metaphors people use must also be fairly similar, that is, universal, at least on the conceptual level. And indeed, there may be many such universal conceptual metaphors.

However, Kovecses (2005) also argues on the basis of a large amount of evidence that metaphors vary considerably on all levels of their existence, both cross-culturally and within cultures, and that we can give a coherent explanation of this variation that is maximally coherent with the view of metaphor presented in the theory. This is something that we also discussed, from the lens provided by Charteris-Black's (2004) CMA, in terms of what he considers to be the social dimension of human experience in causing metaphor variation. We said in the previous chapter that what Charteris-Black importantly reminds us of is that it is not bodily experience *alone* that accounts for metaphor choice; for example, our experience of conflict inheres as much in social as in personal physical experience. Complementing Kovecses's view, he argues that conceptual knowledge is therefore grounded in experience of the social as well as the physical world, the former being more prone, obviously, to cultural and contextual variation, and hence, a source of metaphorical variation rather than universality.

2.10 A Note on the Data Analysis and the Tables

In the analysis tables, adopting the same terminological and epistemological style as Metaphor Identification Procedure (Pragglejaz Group, 2007) and Master Metaphor List (Lakoff et al., 1991), some terms come in to mean the same thing as others: a 'special case' means the same thing as 'a sub-metaphor' of another more generic-level metaphor. Sometimes, this is also referred to as a case in which a specific-level metaphor is 'a variation of' or, simply, 'a mapping of' another more generic-level metaphor. These are varying terms used in the literature to

capture essentially the same related cognitive structural phenomena between generic-level and specific-level conceptual structures (Kovecses, 2017, 2010). Also, in this thesis, there are not many allowances made for creative metaphors. Metaphorical creativity is approached from various angles in the literature, and one prominent way is through treating such creativity in terms of blends on the basis of and using Blending Theory by Fauconnier and Turner (2002). If we do code them and refer to creative (novel) metaphors, we will mention each time that they need to be coded as possible creative metaphors or blends. Obviously, within the confines of the current study, such creative metaphors or blends have little role to play in this kind of cross-linguistic research.

2.11 The Key Terms Re-articulated in Depth

Native Speaker: A person who learns language as a child and continues to use it fluently as a dominant language. Native speakers are said to use language grammatically, fluently and appropriately, to identify with a community where it is spoken, and to have clear intuitions about what is considered grammatically or ungrammatically in the language.

To analyze the use of conceptual metaphors in the political discourse of two presidents, one Azerbaijani and one American, is a task that requires a deep understanding of the linguistic and cultural nuances of both languages. As a native speaker of English, my contribution to this study will focus on the conceptual metaphors present in the English political discourse used by President Joe Biden, and the ways in which they differ from those employed by President Ilham Aliyev in Azerbaijani.

In the English political discourse, conceptual metaphors are often used to convey complex ideas and to persuade audiences. Some common conceptual metaphors used in political discourse include war, journey, and disease. For example, in his speeches, President Biden has employed the metaphor of war to describe the fight against COVID-19. He has also used the metaphor of a journey to describe the country's path towards progress. In addition, President Biden has used the metaphor of disease to describe social issues such as racism and poverty.

In contrast, the Azerbaijani political discourse may employ different conceptual metaphors to convey similar ideas. For example, President Aliyev may use the metaphor of a battle or a struggle instead of a war, and the metaphor of a path or a way instead of a journey. Moreover, cultural differences may result in the use of unique conceptual metaphors that are not present in English political discourse.

By comparing the conceptual metaphors used by President Biden in English political discourse with those used by President Aliyev in Azerbaijani political discourse, this study seeks to shed light on the ways in which language and culture influence the use of conceptual metaphors in political discourse. The results of this analysis can contribute to a better understanding of the differences and similarities between political discourses in different cultures, and provide insights into the role of language in shaping political ideologies.

Conceptual Metaphors: Conceptual metaphors are an important aspect of language and thought, as they allow us to understand abstract concepts and complex ideas by mapping them onto more concrete and familiar domains. For example, the metaphor of "life is a journey" is a common conceptual metaphor that allows us to think about our lives as if they were a journey, with ups and downs, obstacles, milestones, and destinations.

This metaphorical mapping works by identifying systematic correspondences or mappings between the two domains of life and journey. For instance, just as a journey has a starting point, a route, and a destination, so does life have a birth, a path, and a goal. Moreover, just as a journey can be long or short, easy or difficult, pleasant or unpleasant, so can life be experienced in different ways.

Conceptual metaphors can be expressed in various ways, but they often take the form of the formula A is B or A as B, where A represents the source domain and B represents the target domain. The source domain provides a set of pre-existing concepts and mental images that can be used to make sense of the target domain, which may be more abstract, complex, or unfamiliar.

The use of conceptual metaphors is not limited to language, but extends to other cognitive processes such as perception, memory, reasoning, and problem-solving. For example, the metaphor of "time is money" not only affects the way we talk about time (e.g., wasting time, saving time, investing time), but also shapes the way we perceive, value, and prioritize time. Similarly, the metaphor of "argument is war" may influence the way we approach and resolve conflicts, by framing them as battles to be won or lost.

Source Domain: In Conceptual Metaphor Theory, the source domain is the more concrete and tangible conceptual domain that is used to understand or explain the target domain. The source

domain is often drawn from our sensory and motor experiences and is used as a metaphorical mapping for the more abstract and subjective target domain.

For example, in the conceptual metaphor *WAR IS A GAME*, the source domain of *GAME* is used to understand the target domain of *WAR*. The actions, strategies, and outcomes of a game are mapped onto the actions, strategies, and outcomes of war. This allows us to talk about war in a way that is more familiar and tangible, using the language and concepts of games.

Other common source domains in conceptual metaphor include body parts and physical sensations, such as *ANGER IS HEAT* or *LOVE IS A WARM EMBRACE*. These source domains allow us to draw on our bodily experiences to understand and express abstract emotions and experiences.

The use of source domains in conceptual metaphor is not limited to physical experiences. We also use cultural experiences, such as societal structures and institutions, as source domains to understand more abstract target domains. For example, in the conceptual metaphor *DEMOCRACY IS A MARKETPLACE*, the source domain of *MARKETPLACE* is used to understand the target domain of *DEMOCRACY*. In this metaphor, the free exchange of ideas and opinions in a democratic society is mapped onto the free exchange of goods and services in a marketplace.

The use of source domains in conceptual metaphor allows us to make sense of abstract and complex concepts by mapping them onto more concrete and tangible experiences.

Target Domain: The target domain is the abstract and subjective concept we are trying to understand or express through a metaphor. In Conceptual Metaphor Theory, the target domain is typically more complex and less concrete than the source domain. One common example of a target domain is "argument," which is often understood and expressed through the metaphor of "war."

In the metaphor *ARGUMENT IS WAR*, the target domain of argument is viewed as a battle or conflict in which opposing sides are trying to win. This conceptualization can be seen in expressions such as "he attacked my argument," "her argument was weak and easily defeated,"

and "I won the argument." The metaphor of argument as war highlights the competitive nature of arguments and the desire to come out on top.

This metaphor is especially useful in political discourse, where arguments are often framed as battles between opposing sides. For example, during a political debate or speech, a candidate might use phrases such as "we are in a war for the soul of this nation," or "my opponent's argument is nothing but a weak defense." By using the metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR, politicians are able to tap into people's emotions and create a sense of urgency and importance around their message.

However, it's important to note that the use of this metaphor can also have negative effects. It can lead to a "win at all costs" mentality and a lack of collaboration or compromise. In addition, it can create a sense of hostility and division between opposing sides, rather than fostering healthy debate and discussion.

The metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR is a powerful tool for understanding and expressing the abstract concept of argument. It highlights the competitive nature of arguments and can be especially useful in political discourse. However, it's important to be aware of the potential negative effects of this metaphor and to strive for constructive and collaborative communication.

Mapping: The mappings in conceptual metaphors are crucial to understanding how metaphorical thinking works. A mapping refers to the way that elements from the source domain are linked to elements in the target domain. This is how we understand one domain in terms of another.

In the war metaphor example, the mappings might be quite specific. For instance, we could map the idea of a military campaign onto a political campaign. The candidate is the general, the party members are the troops, the voters are the civilians, and so on. In this way, the elements from the source domain of war are mapped onto the target domain of politics.

The mappings are not always one-to-one or direct. In fact, they can be quite complex and subtle. For example, the idea of winning a war might be mapped onto the idea of winning an argument. In this case, the elements from the source domain of war (e.g. defeating the enemy)

are not directly mapped onto the elements of the target domain of argument (e.g. persuading someone to change their mind), but there are still conceptual correspondences between the two.

It is important to note that the mappings in conceptual metaphors are not fixed or absolute. Different speakers or cultures may have slightly different mappings for the same metaphorical concept. In some cases, the mappings may even change over time or across contexts. For example, the war metaphor might be used differently in a time of peace than in a time of war.

The concept of mapping is a crucial aspect of understanding conceptual metaphors. By mapping elements from a concrete and familiar source domain onto a more abstract and complex target domain, we are able to understand and make sense of the target domain in new and powerful ways.

Online Discourses: In recent years, online political discourse has become an increasingly important source of information for citizens, as politicians and leaders around the world communicate their policies and positions through various digital platforms. As such, analyzing online political discourse has become a vital component of political communication research.

In this study, the focus is on the online political discourse of two prominent leaders, President Ilham Aliyev of Azerbaijan and President Joe Biden of the United States, as they communicate their policies and positions through their official websites - president.az and whitehouse.gov. Specifically, the study seeks to compare and contrast the conceptual metaphors used by the two leaders in their online political discourse, with a focus on the similarities and differences in the metaphors used in Azerbaijani and English.

To conduct this analysis, a corpus of speeches and statements made by President Aliyev and President Biden on their respective websites will be compiled and analyzed using a qualitative content analysis approach. The study will examine the conceptual metaphors present in the speeches, looking for examples of metaphorical language and mapping between different conceptual domains.

The analysis will be guided by Lakoff and Johnson's theory of conceptual metaphors, which suggests that metaphors are not simply linguistic expressions, but are fundamental to the way we think and understand the world around us. The study will also take into consideration the

cultural and linguistic differences between Azerbaijani and English, and how these may affect the use and interpretation of metaphors in political discourse.

The findings of this study will contribute to our understanding of how political leaders use metaphorical language to communicate their policies and positions, and how these metaphors may be interpreted and understood by different audiences. Furthermore, the study will provide insights into the similarities and differences in the use of conceptual metaphors in Azerbaijani and English political discourse, and how these may reflect cultural and linguistic differences between the two languages.

Metaphorical Universality: Conceptual metaphors that can be found in all or most languages are universal. Obviously, because of the large number of languages spoken around the world, it would be impossible to obtain conclusive evidence for the universality of any single conceptual metaphor. Some candidates for universal metaphors have been suggested, such as the Event Structure metaphor. The (possible) universality of conceptual metaphors largely exists at the generic level.

The study of conceptual metaphors has revealed that many of these metaphors are not limited to specific languages or cultures but are rather universal in nature. A conceptual metaphor is considered universal if it can be found in all or most languages around the world. The existence of universal conceptual metaphors suggests that certain ways of thinking and understanding the world are shared by humans across different cultures and languages.

It is important to note that proving the universality of a conceptual metaphor is challenging because of the vast number of languages spoken globally. Therefore, it is difficult to obtain conclusive evidence for the universality of any single conceptual metaphor. However, some conceptual metaphors have been suggested as candidates for universality based on their prevalence in various languages and cultures.

One example of a candidate for universal conceptual metaphor is the Event Structure metaphor. This metaphor suggests that events are conceptualized as objects in motion, and time is viewed as a moving object. This metaphor can be found in many languages and cultures around the world. Another example of a candidate for universal metaphor is the Container metaphor, which suggests that we conceptualize abstract concepts as physical containers. For instance, we may talk about "filling our time" or "emptying our minds."

It is important to note that the universality of conceptual metaphors largely exists at the generic level. In other words, while the underlying structure of certain metaphors may be universal, the specific linguistic expressions used to convey those metaphors may differ across languages and cultures. Thus, the universal nature of conceptual metaphors suggests that there are some fundamental ways in which humans understand and conceptualize the world, but the specific linguistic expressions of those concepts may vary.

Metaphorical Variation: Metaphor variation in cognitive linguistics is an important aspect of studying how language and thought interact. The idea behind this concept is that metaphors are not fixed, universal structures, but instead, they are flexible and vary across languages and cultures. This variation can arise due to differences in cultural background, cognitive processes, and linguistic structure.

For example, let's consider the metaphor "time is money." This metaphor is common in English, and it is used to convey the idea that time should be valued as a precious resource. However, this metaphor may not be applicable in other cultures, such as those where the concept of time is viewed differently. In some cultures, time is seen as a cyclical or fluid concept, and it may be considered inappropriate or even offensive to equate it with money.

Similarly, metaphorical variations can exist even within the same language and culture. This is because individuals within a culture may have different experiences and backgrounds that shape their cognitive processes and influence how they conceptualize abstract concepts. For example, the metaphor "love is a journey" may resonate differently for someone who has experienced a long-term, committed relationship versus someone who has only had brief, casual relationships.

In cognitive linguistics, metaphor variation is studied by examining how metaphors are used in different contexts and by different speakers. By analyzing the linguistic and cultural factors that shape metaphorical variation, researchers can gain insights into the complex relationship between language and thought. Ultimately, this can help us better understand how people perceive and make sense of the world around them

Cognitive Models: Cognitive models play a crucial role in our understanding of human cognition. They are used to explain how people process and make sense of information, learn new concepts and skills, and retrieve information from long-term memory. In the field of

education, cognitive models are particularly important because they provide a theoretical framework for designing instructional materials and assessing learning outcomes.

A cognitive model of learning can be based on different theoretical perspectives, such as information processing theory, constructivism, or social cognitive theory. Regardless of the perspective, a cognitive model of learning should aim to capture the mental processes that occur during learning, such as attention, perception, encoding, storage, and retrieval.

One way to develop a cognitive model of learning is through computational modeling. Computational models are computer programs that simulate the cognitive processes of learners. These models can be used to test different hypotheses about how learning occurs and to predict how learners will perform on different tasks. Computational models can also be used to develop adaptive learning systems that can adjust to the individual needs and abilities of learners.

A cognitive model of learning provides a framework for understanding how people learn and remember information. By simulating the mental processes that occur during learning, cognitive models can help us design more effective instructional materials, evaluate learning outcomes, and develop adaptive learning systems. A cognitive model is a descriptive account or computational representation of human thinking about a given concept, skill, or domain. A cognitive model of learning should explain or simulate these mental processes and show how they produce relatively permanent changes in the long-term memory of learners.

2.12 Chapter Summary

In this chapter, we embarked on a re-orientation process, aiming to provide a clear articulation of the purpose of our research and the specific research questions that we seek to answer. This step is crucial as it sets the foundation for our subsequent analysis and allows us to maintain focus throughout our study.

As we delved further into our discourse and text analysis, a key aspect that demanded attention was the textual corpus we chose to cover in our research. Selecting an appropriate corpus is essential for obtaining meaningful and representative results. We discussed the rationale behind our corpus selection, considering factors such as relevance, diversity, and availability. By carefully curating our textual corpus, we aimed to ensure that it encompasses a broad range of sources and adequately captures the scope of our research objectives.

Building upon the foundation of our corpus, we proceeded to outline the procedures we employed for our analysis. We highlighted the methodology and techniques used in our research, emphasizing their compatibility with the goals of our study. Additionally, we acknowledged the influence of Kovecses's theoretical framework on our work, illustrating how we incorporated and adapted it to suit our research objectives. This theoretical framework served as a lens through which we examined the discourse and text, allowing us to gain deeper insights into the underlying meanings and concepts present within the corpus.

To enhance readability and comprehension for readers, we provided a note on abbreviations utilized throughout the chapter. Abbreviations can be a useful tool for concisely referring to complex terms or concepts, enabling smoother communication and avoiding repetitive phrasing. By introducing and explaining these abbreviations, we aimed to facilitate understanding and foster a more accessible reading experience.

Furthermore, we emphasized the significance of analytic categories in our five-step CM (Content Analysis) analysis tables. These categories acted as the foundation for our analysis process, serving as the organizing framework for systematically evaluating and interpreting the data within our textual corpus. Through the meticulous application of these categories, we aimed to extract meaningful insights, identify patterns, and draw conclusions regarding the research questions we had posed earlier.

Chapter 3 : Data Analysis and Results

The use of metaphors is a common rhetorical strategy employed by political leaders to convey complex ideas and emotions in a succinct and memorable way. Among the most pervasive and influential types of metaphors in political discourse are war metaphors, which draw on the powerful imagery of armed conflict to frame political issues and events. This study aims to conduct a comparative investigation of metaphors in the political speeches of two prominent world leaders: Joe Biden, the President of the United States, and Ilham Aliyev, the President of Azerbaijan.

The study will analyze a corpus of presidential speeches delivered by both leaders, focusing on their use of conflict-metaphors to frame and describe political events and issues. The analysis will be conducted using the conceptual metaphor theory framework, which posits that metaphors are not just figures of speech, but reflect deeper underlying cognitive structures and frames that shape our understanding of the world. By identifying and analyzing the metaphors used by Biden and Aliyev, the study aims to shed light on how these leaders use language to construct political reality and shape public opinion.

3.1. Exploring the Conceptual Metaphors in the Azerbaijani President's Discourse

In the first part of this chapter, we will treat the linguistic metaphorical expressions in the Azerbaijani President's discourse. As indicated above, LME stands for 'Linguistic Metaphorical Expression', MIC stands for Meaning in Context, TD stands for 'Target domain', SD stands for 'Source Domain', CM stands for 'Conceptual Metaphor', CMT stands for 'Conceptual Metaphor Theory', OM stands for Ontological Metaphor, and CMA stands for 'Critical Metaphor Analysis'.

Table 3.1 maps out five key aspects of each metaphor in the Azerbaijani President's discourse that did contain and did conceptualize the meaning using a CM. To reiterate a point made earlier, the logic behind the left-to-right arrangement of these elements in the table involves the logical analytic sequence that CMT allows us to adopt; first, the Linguistic Metaphorical Expression is listed, then a contextual meaning of it, which is the first step in recognizing the semantic tension between the actual and unmarked meaning of the expression (Pragglejaz Group, 2007), is attempted. In third step, the target abstract domain of reality intended by the metaphor is now more easily recognizable. As the fourth step, the SD can be easily discerned, followed by the whole CM. ICM stands for idealized cognitive model (Kovecses, 2010).

3. Table 3.1 The Five-step Conceptual Metaphor Analysis in the Azerbaijani President's Discourse

The Linguistic Metaphorical Expression in the original language (Azerbaijani)	Contextual Meaning in English (bare, literal, semantic reading and rendering in English)	Target Domain	Source Domain	Conceptual Metaphor
1. Daim çalışmışam ki, onlara həm mənəvi dəstək verim, həm də təbii ki, onların məişət problemlərini həll edirəm.	I have always tried to <u>give them moral support</u> and, of course, solve their problems.	BELIEF	CONSTRUCTED (PHYSICAL) OBJECTS	-BELIEFS ARE CONSTRUCTED (PHYSICAL) OBJECTS
2. Eyni zamanda, bildirdim ki, onlar üçün bütün bu məişət problemlərindən daha vacib məsələ onların övladlarının <u>qisasının alınmasıdır</u> . Mən bunu çox yaxşı başa düşürdüm və biz hamımız onların <u>qisasını almaq istəyirdik və almalı idik</u> .	At the same time, I knew that the most important thing for them was <u>to take revenge</u> on behalf of their children. I understood this perfectly well. And we all wanted to <u>take revenge</u> for them. We had to <u>take revenge</u> for them; there was no other way (3 tags)	1-POLITICS 2-MORALITY (RETRIBUTION)	1-CONFLICT 2-TRANSACTION (GIVE AND TAKE)	1-POLITICS IS CONFLICT 2-(Moral accounting ICM:) MORALITY (RETRIBUTION) IS TRANSACTION (GIVE AND TAKE)
3. Deyirdim ki, <u>onların qanı yerdə qalmayacaq və bu gün gəldi</u> .	I said that <u>their blood would not remain on the ground (they would not remain unavenged), and this day arrived</u> .	1-POLITICS 2-MORAL (RIGHTEOUSNESS) 3-TIME	1-RELIGION 2-UP (DIRECTION) 3-HUMAN BEING	1-POLITICS IS RELIGION 2-MORAL IS UP (BEING ON THE RIGHTEOUS OR GODLY PATH IS UP; a special case of GOOD IS UP, MORE IS UP, RATIONAL IS UP, HAPPY IS UP, etc) 3-TIME IS A HUMAN BEING
4. Biz bütün şəhidlərimizin <u>qanını aldıq</u> .	<u>We got all the bloods of our martyrs</u> (We avenged the death of all our martyrs).	1-POLITICS 2-MORALITY (RETRIBUTION)	1-CONFLICT 2-TRANSACTION (GIVE AND TAKE)	1-POLITICS IS CONFLICT 2-(Moral accounting ICM:) MORALITY (RETRIBUTION) IS TRANSACTION (GIVE AND TAKE)
5. Birinci və ikinci Qarabağ müharibələrinin <u>şəhidlərinin qisasını döyüş meydanında aldıq</u> və bununla fəxr edə bilərik.	<u>We took revenge on behalf of our martyrs of the first and second Karabakh wars on the battlefield, and we can be proud of that.</u>	1-POLITICS 2-MORALITY (RETRIBUTION)	1-CONFLICT 2-TRANSACTION (GIVE AND TAKE)	1-POLITICS IS CONFLICT 2-(Moral accounting ICM:) MORALITY (RETRIBUTION) IS TRANSACTION (GIVE AND TAKE)
6. Öz yaxınlarını itirmiş insanlar, hesab edirəm, bununla <u>təsəlli tapa bilərlər</u> .	Those who lost their loved ones could I think <u>find some comfort</u> with this.	(positive) EMOTION	(beneficial) physical OBJECT or POSSESSION	A (positive) EMOTION IS A BENEFICIAL PHYSICAL OBJECT/POSSESSION

7. Onların qəhrəmanlığı, onların şücaəti və fədakarlığı torpaqlarımızın azad olunmasına xidmət etdi.	Their heroism, courage and selflessness contributed to the liberation of our lands.	1- GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS 2-STATES/ ATTRIBUTES	1-(imprisoned) HUMAN BEINGS 2-HUMAN BEINGS	1-GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS ARE (imprisoned) HUMAN BEINGS 2.(metonymy) STATES/ ATTRIBUTES FOR THE POSSESSOR OF THOSE ATTRIBUTES
8. Məhz onların qanı bahasına biz torpaqları almışıq, geri qaytarmışıq.	It was at the cost of their blood that we took and returned the lands.	1-POLITICS 2- GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS 3-MORALITY (SACRIFICE)	1-CONFLICT 2-(desirable) PHYSICAL OBJECTS (POSSESSIONS) 3-(FINANCIAL) TRANSACTION	1-POLITICS IS CONFLICT 2-GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS are (desirable) PHYSICAL OBJECTS (POSSESSIONS) 3-(Moral accounting ICM:) MORALITY (SACRIFICE) IS (FINANCIAL) TRANSACTION
9. Hər birimiz deyirdik, ürəyimizdə deyirdik və sözdə də deyirdik ki, <u>nəyin bahasına olursa-olsun, biz torpaqlarımızı geri almalıyıq.</u>	Each of us was saying, we were saying in our hearts and saying it out loud, that, <u>at whatever cost it is, we must regain our lands.</u>	1-POLITICS 2- GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS 3-MORALITY (SACRIFICE)	1-CONFLICT 2-(desirable) PHYSICAL OBJECTS (POSSESSIONS) 3-(FINANCIAL) TRANSACTION	1-POLITICS IS CONFLICT 2-GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS are (desirable) PHYSICAL OBJECTS (POSSESSIONS) 3-(Moral accounting ICM:) MORALITY (SACRIFICE) IS (FINANCIAL) TRANSACTION
10. Əlbəttə, <u>hər bir insanın həyatdan getməsi</u> böyük faciədir - həm onun ailəsi üçün, yaxınları üçün, qohumları üçün, həm də cəmiyyət üçün.	Of course, <u>every person leaving this life is</u> a great tragedy – for his family, for his acquaintances, for his relatives, and also for the society.	DEATH	JOURNEY	DEATH IS A JOURNEY (a special case of LIFE IS A JOURNEY)
11. Ancaq bizim şəhidlərimiz <u>həqiqət yolunda</u> həlak olublar, Vətən uğrunda həlak olublar.	But our martyrs <u>died on the road of the truth</u> ; they died for the Motherland.	1-MORALITY 2-DEATH	1-STRAIGHT PATH 2-JOURNEY	1-MORALITY IS A STRAIGHT PATH 2-DEATH IS A JOURNEY (a special case of LIFE IS A JOURNEY)
12. Onların qəhrəmanlığı nəticəsində bu gün <u>bizim bayrağımız azad edilmiş torpaqlarda ucaldılır.</u>	As a result of their heroism, today <u>our flag is raised high in the liberated lands.</u>	GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS HIGH STATUS	(imprisoned) HUMAN BEINGS UP	1-GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS ARE (imprisoned) HUMAN BEINGS 2-HIGH STATUS IS UP (from GOOD IS UP, MORE IS UP, etc)

13. Onlar bilmirdilər ki, Azərbaycan xalqı bu 30 il ərzində bir amalla yaşayır: <u>nəyin bahasına olursa-olsun, torpaqlarımızı işğalçılardan azad edək.</u>	They did not know that the people of Azerbaijan have been living with one mission for 30 years: <u>to liberate our lands from occupiers at any cost.</u>	1-POLITICS 2- GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS 3-MORALITY (SACRIFICE)	1-CONFLICT 2-(desirable) PHYSICAL OBJECTS (POSSESSIONS) 3-(FINANCIAL) TRANSACTION	1-POLITICS IS CONFLICT 2-GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS are (desirable) PHYSICAL OBJECTS (POSSESSIONS) 3-(Moral accounting ICM:) MORALITY (SACRIFICE) IS (FINANCIAL) TRANSACTION
14. Bizi qələbəyə aparan tək cəhətlərimizin peşəkarlığı, qəhrəmanlığı, hərbi texnikamız yox, bizi qələbəyə aparan Vətən sevgisi idi.	It was not only <u>the professionalism, heroism and military equipment of our servicemen that led us to victory</u> – it was also <u>the love of the Motherland that guided us to victory.</u>	1.PURPOSES (or PURPOSEFUL ACTION) 2.Metonymy: ATTRIBUTES	1.DESTINATIONS (or DIRECTED MOTION TO A DESTINATION) 2.HUMAN BEINGS (POSSESSOR OF ATTRIBUTES)	1.PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS (a special case of CHANGE IS MOTION which also gives PURPOSEFUL ACTION IS DIRECTED MOTION TO A DESTINATION) 2-Metonymy: ATTRIBUTES FOR THE HUMAN POSSESSOR OF THOSE ATTRIBUTES
15. <u>Bizim dədə-baba torpağımızdır</u> : bütün Zəngəzur - Şərqi və Qərbi Zəngəzur.	They are <u>our forefathers' lands, back to back</u> : all of Zengezur, western and eastern Zengezur.	TRUTH	ANCESTRAL CLAIM ON LAND.	TRUTH IS ANCESTRAL CLAIM ON LAND
16. Qərbi Zəngəzur <u>bizim dədə-baba torpağımızdır</u> .	Western Zengezur is <u>our lands of our forefathers' back to back.</u>	TRUTH	ANCESTRAL CLAIM ON LAND.	TRUTH IS ANCESTRAL CLAIM ON LAND
17. Demişəm ki, <u>bizim dədə-baba torpağımızdır</u> .	I said that it is <u>the land of our ancestors back to back</u> , and we must return there.	TRUTH	ANCESTRAL CLAIM ON LAND.	TRUTH IS ANCESTRAL CLAIM ON LAND
18. İndi bütün kommunikasiyalar açıldıqdan sonra, əlbəttə, biz qayıdacağıq və Azərbaycan əhalisi <u>öz dədə-baba torpaqlarına</u> qayıdacaq.	When all communications are opened, we, the people of Azerbaijan, will return to their <u>ancestral land</u> , of course.	TRUTH	ANCESTRAL CLAIM ON LAND.	TRUTH IS ANCESTRAL CLAIM ON LAND
19. Üçtərəfli 10 noyabr Bəyanatında göstərilir: Bütün qaçqınlar <u>öz doğma torpaqlarına</u> qayıtmalıdırlar.	The 10 November Trilateral Declaration states: all refugees must return <u>to their homeland of birth.</u>	TRUTH	ANCESTRAL CLAIM ON LAND (of birth).	TRUTH IS ANCESTRAL CLAIM ON LAND (of birth)
20. Bizim doğma torpağımız Zəngəzurdur, bizim doğma torpağımız Göyçə mahalıdır, İrəvandır.	Our native land of birth is Zangazur; our native land of birth is Goycha district, Iravan.	TRUTH	ANCESTRAL CLAIM ON LAND (of birth).	TRUTH IS ANCESTRAL CLAIM ON LAND (of birth)
21. Hesab edirəm ki, sizin qarşınızda buna <u>da aydınlıq gətirməliyəm</u> .	I think I need <u>to bring illumination and clarity to this</u> in front of you too.	UNDERSTANDING	SEEING	UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING (and/or LIGHT)
22. Mən bir neçə dəfə demişəm ki, <u>biz Ermənistanla</u> sülh müqaviləsini imzalamağa hazırıq.	I have said several times that we are prepared to sign a peace agreement <u>with Armenia.</u>	STATES	HUMAN BEINGS	STATES ARE HUMAN BEINGS
23. Ancaq <u>Ermənistan tərəfindən buna reaksiya yoxdur</u> , rəsmi reaksiya yoxdur.	However, there is <u>no reaction from Armenia</u> ; there is no official reaction.	STATES	HUMAN BEINGS	STATES ARE HUMAN BEINGS

24.Qeyri-rəsmi kanallarla bizə çatan məlumat budur ki, <u>Ermənistan buna hazır deyil.</u>	The information we have received through unofficial channels is that <u>Armenia is not ready for this.</u>	STATES	HUMAN BEINGS	STATES ARE HUMAN BEINGS
25.Biz ordumuzla bağlı yeni planları <u>həyata keçiririk.</u>	We are <u>bringing to life</u> new plans in relation to our army.	EXISTENCE	LIFE	EXISTENCE IS LIFE
26.Ancaq biz hesab edirik ki, münaqişə həll olunub, biz ərazi bütövlüyümüzü bərpa etmişik.	However, we believe that the conflict has been resolved, and we have restored our territorial integrity.	POLITICS	CONFLICT	POLITICS IS CONFLICT
27. <u>Biz Qələbə qazanmışıq.</u> Bizim bu gün gündəlikdə duran hər hansı başqa bir məsələmiz yoxdur.	<u>We have won victory.</u> We do not have any other issues on the agenda today.	WAR	SPORTS COMPETITION	WAR IS A SPORTS COMPETITION
28.Əgər Ermənistan bunu etmək istəmirsə, özü bilər, ancaq yaxşı fikirləşinlər, sonra gec ola bilər.	If Armenia does not want to do that, it is up to her, but let them think carefully before it is too late.	STATES	HUMAN BEINGS	STATES ARE HUMAN BEINGS
29.Bu kateqoriyadan olan insanlara dövlət tərəfindən daim böyük diqqət göstərilir, sözdə yox, əməldə.	The state always pays great attention to this category of people – not just in words but also in action.	STATES	HUMAN BEINGS	STATES ARE HUMAN BEINGS
30.Mən bunu dəfələrlə demişəm, bir daha demək istəyirəm, Ermənistan-Azərbaycan Dağlıq Qarabağ münaqişəsi öz həllini tapıb. Bu münaqişə həll olunub.	I have said this many times, and I want to say again that the Armenia-Azerbaijan Nagorno-Karabakh conflict has found its resolution. This conflict has been resolved.	1.PROBLEM 2.POLITICS	1.REGION IN A LANDSCAPE 2.CONFLICT	1.A PROBLEM IS A REGION IN A LANDSCAPE 2.POLITICS IS CONFLICT
31.Sizə məlum olduğu kimi, bu il ölkələrimiz arasında <u>diplomatik münasibətlər yaradılmasının</u> 30 illiyidir. Aprel ayında bu tarixi qeyd edəcəyik. Biz <u>həmin hadisəyə yaxşı bünövrə ilə yaxınlaşırıq.</u>	This year, as you know, marks the 30th anniversary of the <u>establishment of diplomatic relations.</u> We will celebrate this date in April, and <u>we are approaching this milestone</u> with a good start.	RELATIONSHIPS TIME	BUILDINGS LANDSCAPE	1.RELATIONSHIPS ARE BUILDINGS 2.TIME IS A LANDSCAPE WE MOVE THROUGH (related to TIME IS A MILESTONE IN A LANDSCAPE WE MOVE THROUGH)
32.Bəyannamənin birinci bəndində deyilir ki, tərəflər öz münasibətlərini müstəqilliyə, dövlət suverenliyinə, ərazi bütövlüyünə, sərhədlərin toxunulmazlığına qarşılıqlı hörmət və bir-birinin daxili işlərinə qarışmamaq əsasında quracaqlar.	The first paragraph of the Declaration says that the two parties will build their relations based on mutual respect for independence, state sovereignty, territorial integrity, inviolability of borders and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.	STATES RELATIONSHIPS	HUMAN BEINGS BUILDINGS	1.STATES ARE HUMAN BEINGS 2.RELATIONSHIPS ARE BUILDINGS
33.Bu bənd bizim münasibətlərimizin xarakterinə, ona dəlalət edir ki, bu münasibətlər zamanın sınağından çıxıb və artıq dediyim kimi, dostluq hisslərinə, qarşılıqlı maraqlara və gələcəyə yönəlməyə əsaslanır.	This provision attests to the nature of our relations. It is evident that these relations have stood the test of time and are based, as I have already said, on friendly feelings, mutual interests and aspirations for the future.	IDEAS RELATIONSHIPS	HUMAN BEINGS BUILDINGS	METONYMY: IDEAS FOR THE PEOPLE SPEAKING THOSE IDEAS 2.RELATIONSHIPS ARE BUILDINGS
34. Bu gün biz 5 saatdan çox Vladimir Vladimiroviçlə birlikdə olduq. Vaxt hiss olunmadan keçdi.	Vladimir Vladimirovich and I spent more than five hours together today. Time passed very imperceptibly.	TIME	MOVING OBJECT	TIME IS A MOVING OBJECT

35. Beş saat intensiv ünsiyyət özlüyündə bizim əlaqələrimizin nə qədər sıx və səmimi olmasının göstəricisidir. Biz əminik ki, ticari-iqtisadi sahədə yeni imkanlar açılır.	Five hours of intensive communication, and this in itself is an indicator of how close and sincere our ties are. We are confident that new opportunities are opening up in the trade and economic sphere.	INTIMACY OPPORTUNITY	CLOSE PROXIMITY OPEN PATHS	1.INTIMACY IS PHYSICAL CLOSENESS 2.OPPORTUNITIES ARE OPEN PATHS
36.. <u>Azərbaycan dinc gələcək əzmindədir.</u> Azərbaycan ərazilərinin azad edilməsi, ərazi bütövlüyünün hərbi yolla bərpa olunması məcburi tədbir idi və müharibədən sonrakı mərhələdə bu məsələni siyasi metodlarla həll etməyə hazır olduğumuz bizim niyyətlərimizin daha bir təsdiqidir.	Azerbaijan is resolved and determined on a peaceful future. The liberation of Azerbaijan's territories and restoring our territorial integrity by military means was a necessary measure. Our readiness to resolve this issue by political methods in the post-war period confirms our intentions.	GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS POLITICS Metonymy: ATTRIBUTES	(imprisoned) HUMAN BEINGS CONFLICT HUMAN POSSESSOR	1-GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS ARE (imprisoned) HUMAN BEINGS 2-POLITICS IS CONFLICT 3.Metonymy: HUMAN ATTRIBUTES FOR THE HUMAN POSSESSOR OF THOSE ATTRIBUTES
37.Zəngəzur mahalı qədim Azərbaycan torpağıdır və süni şəkildə Ermənistana verilmişdir. Zəngəzur mahalının Ermənistana verilməsi böyük ədalətsizlik idi.	The Zangazur region is an ancient Azerbaijani land and was artificially handed over to Armenia. The handover of the Zangazur region to Armenia was a great injustice.	GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS	PHYSICAL OBJECTS (POSSESSIONS)	GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS ARE PHYSICAL OBJECTS (POSSESSIONS)
38.Yəni, bütün bu tarixi həqiqətlər işıq üzü görməlidir.	That's to say all these historical truths should see the light of day.	KNOWING/ UNDERSTANDING	LIGHT/SEEING	KNOWING / UNDERSTANDING IS LIGHT/SEEING
39.Nəinki ölkə daxilində, eyni zamanda, xaricdə də bunu bilməlidirlər. Ona görə bu kitabların xarici dillərdə nəşri <u>xüsusi mənə daşıyır.</u>	This should be known not just inside the country, but also abroad. Therefore, the publication of these books in foreign languages <u>carries the weight of special importance.</u>	BELIEFS/IDEAS	PHYSICAL OBJECTS	BELIEFS/IDEAS ARE PHYSICAL OBJECTS (from which we have: THE IMPORTANCE OF A BELIEF IS THE WEIGHT OF AN OBJECT)
40.Nəzərə alsaq ki, <u>həqiqət və tarixi ədalət bizim tərəfimizdədir</u> , bu, bu gün də lazımdır, gələcək üçün də.	Given that <u>the truth and historical justice are on our side</u> , this is needed today and in the future.	ARGUMENT	WAR	ARGUMENT IS WAR (alternately known as: THEIRES/BELIEFS ARE DEFENSIBLE POSITIONS/ FORTIFICATIONS)

Using the procedures explained in chapter 3, in the 1000-word corpus of speeches by the Azerbaijani president, the same corpus size as the American data, we located 40 metaphor-bearing sentences; overall, in this corpus, the 3 rounds of metaphor identification and coding brought out 62 instances of conceptual metaphors.

3.2. Exploring the Conceptual Metaphors in the American President’s Discourse

The following will now focus on the linguistic metaphorical expressions in the American President’s discourse. As indicated above, LME stands for ‘Linguistic Metaphorical Expression’, MIC stands for Meaning in Context, TD stands for ‘Target domain’, SD stands for ‘Source Domain’, CM stands for ‘Conceptual Metaphor’, CMT stands for ‘Conceptual Metaphor Theory’, OM stands for Ontological Metaphor, and CMA stands for ‘Critical Metaphor Analysis’.

Table 3.2 maps out five key aspects of each metaphor in the American President’s discourse that did contain and did conceptualize the meaning using a CM. To reiterate a point made earlier, the logic behind the left-to-right arrangement of these elements in the table involves the logical analytic sequence that CMT allows us to adopt; first, the Linguistic Metaphorical Expression is listed, then a contextual literal paraphrasing of it, which may NOT be needed in English in most cases anyway. If it is needed, that will be by way of recognizing the semantic tension between the actual and unmarked meaning of the expression (Pragglejaz Group, 2007). In third step, the target abstract domain of reality intended by the metaphor is now more easily recognizable. As the fourth step, the SD can be easily discerned, followed by the whole CM. ICM stands for idealized cognitive model (Kovecses, 2010).

4. Table 3.2 The Five-step Conceptual Metaphor Analysis in the American President’s Discourse

The Linguistic Metaphorical Expression in the original language	Contextual Meaning in English (bare, literal, semantic reading and paraphrase, if needed)	Target Domain	Source Domain	Conceptual Metaphor
1. These two documents and the ideas they embody, equality and democracy, are the rock upon which this nation is built.	These two documents and the ideas they represent, equality and democracy, are the main things that create and make this nation.	IDEAS SOCIETY	OBJECTS A BUILDING	1. IDEAS ARE PHYSICAL OBJECTS 2. A SOCIETY IS A BUILDING
2. They are why for more than two centuries, <u>America has been a beacon to the world.</u>	They are why for more than two centuries, America has been a country that all other countries follow and respect.	WISDOM (KNOWING / UNDERSTANDING)	SEEING (LIGHT / A LIGHT SOURCE)	WISDOM IS (A) LIGHT (SOURCE) (most likely a sub-metaphor of: KNOWING / UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING / LIGHT)

				[without hindrance], from the LIGHT ICM)
3. But as I stand here tonight, equality and democracy are under assault.	But as I stand here tonight, equality and democracy as values are in danger.	POLITICS	WAR (CONFLICT)	POLITICS IS WAR (CONFLICT)
4. Tonight I've come to this place to speak as plainly as I can to the nation <u>about the power we have in our own hands</u> to meet these threats, and about the <u>incredible future that lies in front of us</u> , if only we choose it.	-	ATTRIBUTES	PHYSICAL OBJECTS (POSSESSIONS) LOCATION (A REGION IN A LANDSCAPE)	1. ATTRIBUTES ARE PHYSICAL OBJECTS (or POSSESSIONS) 2. TIME IS A REGION IN A LANDSCAPE (=TIME IS LOCATION)
5. MAGA forces are determined <u>to take this country backwards</u> .	-	CHANGE	MOTION	PROGRESS IS FORWARD MOTION (from CHANGE IS MOTION)
6. And, by the way, I've declared war on <u>cancer</u> .	-	A DISEASE	AN ENEMY	(War Metaphor): A DISEASE IS AN ENEMY (TREATING ILLNESS IS FIGHTING A WAR)
7. I've gotten \$5 billion for cancer research through NIH, like we did through the Defense Department for special weapons systems, <u>the same system</u> .	-	A DISEASE	AN ENEMY	(War Metaphor): A DISEASE IS AN ENEMY (TREATING ILLNESS IS FIGHTING A WAR)
8. It's one <u>thing to pass the American Rescue Plan</u> . It's going to be another thing to implement it.	-	POLITICIANS	RESCUE SQUADS	POLITICIANS ARE RESCUE SQUADS
9. It's going to require fastidious oversight to make sure there's no waste or fraud, and <u>the law does what it's designed to do</u> .	-	IDEA	MACHINE	AN IDEA (THE LAW) IS A MACHINE
10. A. Details matter, because we have to continue <u>to build confidence</u> in the American people that their government can <u>function for them and deliver</u> .	-	IDEAS POLITICAL SYSTEM (ABSTRACT SYSTEMS)	OBJECTS A MACHINE	1. IDEAS ARE CONSTRUCTED OBJECTS (BUILDINGS) 2. A POLITICAL SYSTEM IS A MACHINE (from: ABSTRACT COMPLEX SYSTEMS ARE MACHINES)
11. That's <u>what America does</u> . It <u>tackles hard problems</u> .	It solves hard problems	COUNTRY	HUMAN BEING	A COUNTRY (STATE) IS A HUMAN BEING
12. And how we do — you know, look, it's how <u>we do have it</u>it's how we do have the power to turn out to be	ABILITIES	ENTITIES	1. ABILITIES ARE ENTITIES INSIDE A PERSON (from

<p><u>within ourselves to come out of this moment</u>, more prosperous, more united, and stronger <u>than we went in. That's where we have a chance to be.</u> That's what we're going to be able to do.</p>	<p>more prosperous, more united, and stronger after a while. That's what we can do. That's what we're going to be able to do.</p>	<p>TIME</p>	<p>LOCATION</p>	<p>PROPERTIES ARE CONTENTS) 2.TIME IS LOCATION</p>
<p>13.I'm going to work with governors in the affected states to put a stop to <u>price gouging</u> wherever it arises. And I am asking our federal agencies to stand ready to provide assistance to state-level efforts to monitor and address <u>any price gouging at the pump.</u></p>	<p>.....put a stop to charging too much money</p>	<p>ECONOMY</p>	<p>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</p>	<p>ECONOMY IS THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT (from which we have: NEGATIVE ECONOMIC FORCES ARE NATURAL FOCRCES)</p>
<p>14.So often, our Armed Forces and the Department of Defense staff are how the rest of the world <u>encounters America.</u></p>	<p>-</p>	<p>COUNTRY</p>	<p>HUMAN BEING</p>	<p>A COUNTRY (STATE) IS A HUMAN BEING</p>
<p>15.And you all know as well as anyone that our <u>country is safer and stronger</u> when we lead not just <u>with the example of our power</u>, but with the power of our example.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>COUNTRY</p>	<p>HUMAN BEING</p>	<p>A COUNTRY (STATE) IS A HUMAN BEING</p>
<p>16.I understand the <u>full weight of what it means to ask young, proud Americans to stand in the breach.</u></p>	<p>I understand the importance of the big responsibility I ask of young, proud.....</p>	<p>PROPERTIES (IMPORTANCE)</p>	<p>PHYSICAL PROPERTIES (WEIGHT)</p>	<p>COMPARISON OF PROPERTIES IS COMPARISON OF PHYSICAL PROPERTIES (from which we'd have: IMPORTANCE IS WEIGHT)</p>
<p>17.The work you do each and every day is vital to ensuring the American people — your families, friends, and loved ones — are able <u>to live in peace and security</u> and growing prosperity.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>STATES</p>	<p>LOCATIONS</p>	<p>STATES ARE LOCATIONS</p>
<p>18. And for those of you who raise your hands and sign up to wear the uniform of the United States: <u>We owe you an incredible debt.</u></p>	<p>.....We are thankful for what you have done and we can hardly compensate you for your service.</p>	<p>MORAL DEBT DUTIES</p>	<p>MORAL DEEDS (MONETARY) DEBT</p>	<p>(MORAL ACCOUNTING ICM, giving rise to the sub-metaphor:) 1.MORAL DEBT CAN BE PAID OFF WITH MORAL DEEDS And: 2.(SOCIAL ACCOUNTING ICM:)</p>

				DUTIES ARE DEBTS
19. <u>It's on all of us to stand up, to speak out</u> when you see someone being abused.	It is the responsibility of all of us to keep campaigning and making our beliefs and ideas heard, when.....	OBLIGATIONS	PHYSICAL BURDENS	1.OBLIGATIONS ARE BURDENS (on back or shoulder) (a sub-metaphor of: OBLIGATIONS ARE POSSESSIONS 2.Metonymy: STANDING AND SPEAKING OUT FOR PART OF A BELIEF AND CAMPAIGN
20. This is an organization that's defeated American enemies on land, sea, and air, and been defined by the way we treat others.	-	POLITICS	CONFLICT	POLITICS IS CONFLICT
21. But those contributions have nevertheless <u>helped push our country</u> toward greater equality.	-	COUNTRY STATES	OBJECT LOCATIONS	1.A COUNTRY IS A PHYSICAL OBJECT 2.STATES ARE LOCATIONS
22. Millions of jobs have been lost.	-	HARM	(NEEDED PHYSICAL) POSSESSION	HARM IS LOSING A NEEDED POSSESSION (from: WELL-BEING IS WEALTH)
23. Hundreds of thousands of businesses closed.	-	ABSTRACT COMPLEX SYSTEMS	BUILDINGS	ABSTRACT COMPLEX SYSTEMS ARE BUILDINGS
24. A cry for racial justice some <u>400 years in the making moves us.</u>	A cry for racial justice some that's been going on for <u>400 years has a deep emotional impact on us.</u>	EMOTIONS	PHYSICAL FORCES	EMOTIONS ARE PHYSICAL FORCES
25. A cry for survival comes from the planet itself. A cry that can't be any more desperate or any more clear.	All the people of the world are asking and crying for survival.....	THE WORLD	HUMAN BEING	THE WORLD IS A HUMAN BEING (PLANET EARTH)
26. And now, <u>a rise in</u> political extremism, white supremacy, domestic terrorism <u>that we must confront and we will defeat.</u>		MORE POLITICS UNWANTED IDEAS	UP CONFLICT ENEMY	1.MORE IS UP (alternately known as: MORE IS HIGHER) 2.POLITICS IS CONFLICT 3.UNWANTED IDEAS ARE ENEMIES IN WAR (possibly a special case/sub-metaphor from: ARGUMENT IS WAR)

27.To overcome these challenges – to restore the soul and to secure the future of America – requires more than words.		PROBLEMS COUNTRY	OPPONENTS HUMAN BEING	1.PROBLEMS ARE OPPONENTS IN A STRUGGLE 2.A COUNTRY IS A HUMAN BEING
---	--	---------------------------------------	--	--

Using the procedures explained in chapter 3, in the 1/1-word corpus of speeches by the Azerbaijani president, the same corpus size as the American data, the 3 rounds of metaphor identification and coding brought out 62 instances of conceptual metaphors. Meanwhile, in the American President’s speeches, in the same corpus size as the Azerbaijani data, i.e. 1000 words, the 3 rounds of metaphor identification and coding brought out 36 instances of conceptual metaphors.

In the next chapter, we use these analyses and findings to attempt to answer the research questions.

Chapter 4: Discussion and Conclusion

In this final chapter, we utilize the findings from the previous chapters, which involved metaphor identification, coding, and analysis, to conduct a critical metaphor analysis (CMA) of the discourses emerging from the speeches of two prominent political leaders: American President Joe Biden and Azerbaijani President Ilham Aliyev. This chapter aims to provide insights into the comparative investigation of conceptual metaphors used in Azerbaijani and English political discourse.

The selection of President Biden and President Aliyev's speeches as the primary data sources stems from their significant roles in shaping political narratives and their frequent engagement in delivering speeches on various political issues. By analyzing their speeches, we aim to gain a comprehensive understanding of the metaphorical language employed by these leaders and how it contributes to the construction of political discourses.

The data for this analysis was collected from reliable sources, specifically the official websites of the White House and the President of Azerbaijan Republic, which provide access to transcripts of the presidents' speeches. The collected speeches cover a wide range of political topics, including but not limited to climate change, immigration, foreign policy, economy, and regional security.

To conduct the analysis, the speeches were transcribed and translated, when necessary, to ensure accurate comprehension of the content. A combination of qualitative and quantitative methods was employed to identify conceptual metaphors and examine the discourses that emerge from them. This methodology allowed us to uncover patterns, themes, and variations in the use of metaphors in both Azerbaijani and English political discourse.

The primary objectives of this chapter are twofold: first, to provide political metaphor analysis comments on the discourses emerging from the speeches of Presidents Biden and Aliyev; and second, to address the research questions posed in this thesis. By examining the frequencies and functions of metaphors in the speeches of these leaders, we aim to shed light on how conceptual metaphors are employed to shape political narratives, influence public opinion, and contribute to the overall discourse on political issues.

In the subsequent sections of this chapter, we will present a comparative analysis of the frequencies of metaphor use in Azerbaijani and English political discourse, discuss the implications of these metaphors for policy-making and public perception, and provide insights into the role of metaphorical language in framing and communicating political ideas.

Overall, this chapter serves as a culmination of the research, drawing upon the previous chapters' findings to offer a comprehensive analysis of the metaphorical language used in the speeches of Presidents Biden and Aliyev

4.1. Restatement of the Research Questions

This qualitative content and discourse analysis study was undertaken to find answers to the following qualitative research questions:

Research Question 1: Do Azerbaijani and American presidents use conceptual metaphors in their speeches?

Research Question 2: What patterns of Conceptual Metaphor are used by Azerbaijani and American presidents in their speeches?

Research Question 3: What areas of cross-linguistic similarity and difference (potential universality and variation) emerge between Conceptual Metaphor use of Azerbaijani and American presidents in their speeches?

Research question 4: How are ideologies present or influential in the metaphorical discourse of the two presidents' political discourse?

4.2. Frequencies of Metaphor Use in the Two Sets of Data

In table 4.1 and 4.2 below, we map out the frequency of all the conceptual metaphors identified and coded in the Azerbaijani and American Presidents' discourses, respectively. As reported in chapter 3, using the procedures explained in chapter 2, in the 1000-word corpus of speeches by the Azerbaijani president, the same corpus size as the American data, the 3 rounds of metaphor identification and coding brought out 62 instances of conceptual metaphors. Meanwhile, in the American President's speeches, in the same corpus size as the Azerbaijani data, i.e. 1000 words, the 3 rounds of metaphor identification and coding located and identified 36 instances of conceptual metaphors.

Theoretically, the target domain common across several similar sources (and conceptual metaphors) points us in the direction of the discourse being constructed by the speaker. Thus, these two tables order the findings guided by the target domain. These separate but similar

metaphors will be given their separate frequencies inside parentheses too. Metaphors occurring with the lowest frequencies were all mapped out in tables 3.1 and 3.2, but they will not be touched on in these tables and will be reiterated in the appendices at the end of the thesis as metaphors with the frequency of only one occurrence.

4.3. Research Question 1

The first research question guiding this thesis was: Do Azerbaijani and American presidents use conceptual metaphors in their speeches? Clearly, the analysis and findings reported generically in chapter 3 prove the answer to this question to be a decided affirmative. We also find that the argument by previous scholars is a strong one, to the effect that political discourse makes decided use of conceptual metaphors as one prominent discursive device in constructing its commensurate discourses.

5. Table 4.1 Frequency of Conceptual Metaphors in the 1000-word Azerbaijani Data: ordered according to Target Domain

Conceptual Metaphor	Frequency of Occurrence
Moral accounting (ICM:) MORALITY (RETRIBUTION [5] or SACRIFICE [3]) IS (FINANCIAL) TRANSACTION (or GIVE AND TAKE) / MORALITY IS A STRAIGHT PATH = 1 / MORAL IS UP = 1	10
POLITICS IS CONFLICT	9
GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS ARE (imprisoned) HUMAN BEINGS = 3 / GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS are (desirable) PHYSICAL OBJECTS (POSSESSIONS) = 4	7
TRUTH IS ANCESTORAL CLAIM ON LAND (of birth)	6
A STATE (COUNTRY) IS A HUMAN BEING	6
RELATIONSHIPS ARE BUILDINGS	3
HIGH STATUS IS UP = 1 / GOOD IS UP = 2	3
TIME IS A HUMAN BEING = 1 TIME IS A MOVING OBJECT = 1 TIME IS A LANDSCAPE WE MOVE THROUGH (related to TIME IS A MILESTONE IN A LANDSCAPE WE MOVE THROUGH) = 1	3
BELIEFS ARE CONSTRUCTED (PHYSICAL) OBJECTS = 1 BELIEFS/IDEAS ARE PHYSICAL OBJECTS (from which we have: THE IMPORTANCE OF A BELIEF IS THE WEIGHT OF AN OBJECT) = 1	2
DEATH IS A JOURNEY (a special case of LIFE IS A JOURNEY)	2 (0 in American data)

6 .Table 4.2 Frequency of Conceptual Metaphors in the 1000-word American Data: ordered according to Target Domain

Conceptual Metaphor	Frequency of Occurrence
A COUNTRY IS A HUMAN BEING = 4 THE WORLD IS A HUMAN BEING (PLANET EARTH) = 1	5
UNWANTED IDEAS ARE ENEMIES IN WAR (possibly a special case/sub-metaphor from: ARGUMENT IS WAR) = 1 IDEAS ARE PHYSICAL OBJECTS = 1 AN IDEA (THE LAW) IS A MACHINE = 1 IDEAS ARE CONSTRUCTED OBJECTS (BUILDINGS) = 1	4
POLITICS IS CONFLICT	3
ABSTRACT COMPLEX SYSTEMS ARE BUILDINGS = 1 A POLITICAL SYSTEM IS A MACHINE (from: ABSTRACT COMPLEX SYSTEMS ARE MACHINES) = 1	2
TIME IS LOCATION	2
A DISEASE IS AN ENEMY (TREATING ILLNESS IS FIGHTING A WAR)	2
(MORAL ACCOUNTING ICM, giving rise to the sub- metaphor: 1.MORAL DEBT CAN BE PAID OFF WITH MORAL DEEDS And: 2.(SOCIAL ACCOUNTING ICM:) DUTIES ARE DEBTS	2
STATES ARE LOCATIONS	2
POLITICIANS ARE RESCUE SQUADS	1

4.4. Research Question 2

The second research question fueling this project was: What patterns of Conceptual Metaphor are used by Azerbaijani and American presidents in their speeches? One dimension of this question is the frequency. The other is the actual spread and use of types of conceptual metaphors, which shows marked differences between the two discourses. The latter is in fact the pursuit of research question 3 below.

The patterns of conceptual metaphor use are mapped out in table 4.1 and 4.2, along with their frequencies. As indicated above, the appendices at the end of the thesis will list the metaphors with the frequency of only one occurrence, although chapter 3 brings out all the details of the analysis.

4.5. Research Question 3

The third research question involved what areas of cross-linguistic similarity and difference (potential universality and variation) emerge between Conceptual Metaphor use of Azerbaijani and American presidents in their speeches.

As reported in chapter 3, in the 1000-word corpus of speeches by the Azerbaijani president, the same corpus size as the American data, the 3 rounds of metaphor identification and coding brought out 62 instances of conceptual metaphors. Meanwhile, in the American President's speeches, the 3 rounds of metaphor identification and coding located and identified 36 instances of conceptual metaphors. This shows a marked difference in frequency and is a very interesting finding in that the Azerbaijani President makes more recourse to abstract concepts (source domains) in pursuit of filling his speech with more conceptual metaphors. This might be geared to and aimed at higher levels of persuasion that he is seeking in his audience (Charteris-Black, 2011).

The interesting difference is that the American President, despite making markedly less frequent use of conceptual metaphors, actually borrows from more varied source domains metaphors (hence more varied metaphors). In his 36 instances of metaphor use in the American data, we see 23 conceptually distinct source domains being used, while in the 62 instances of metaphor use in the Azerbaijani President's discourse, we see 21 conceptually distinct source domains, which points to the variety of source domains in the American data being twice as much as the Azerbaijani one. This is significant, since in discourse analysis driven by Cognitive Linguistics theories, there is a strong belief that varied conceptual structure and cognitive models translate into stronger discourses, ideological manipulation, and persuasion (Kovecses, 2009; Musolff, 2011; Carteris-Black, 2004, 2011).

Through purposive sampling, the size of both corpuses was controlled to be the same, i.e. a rough 1000 words. As laid out in table 4.1, out of the 62 conceptual metaphors in the Azerbaijani corpus, it is significant that the Idealized Cognitive Model of “Moral Accounting” led to 8 instances of metaphor, where there were 5 instances of MORALITY (RETRIBUTION) IS (FINANCIAL) TRANSACTION (or GIVE AND TAKE), 3 instances of MORALITY (SACRIFICE) IS (FINANCIAL) TRANSACTION (or GIVE AND TAKE); meanwhile, there was 1 instance of MORALITY IS A STRAIGHT PATH, and 1 instance of MORAL IS UP. Overall, the highest proportion of the data is comprised of 10 instances where some aspect of the domain of MORALITY lends conceptual structure to meaning.

On the other hand, in the American data, in line with the findings of Jafarnezhad et al. (2021) and Jafarnezhad et al. (2022), where instances of this metaphor constituted a noticeably high frequency, in this study also, in American political discourse, we see the highest proportion go to the STATES (COUNTRIES) ARE HUMAN BEINGS metaphor at 5 instances. In a slightly different pragmatic load, we get 6 instances of the STATE (COUNTRY) IS A HUMAN BEING in Azerbaijani political discourse data too, but in proportion to the way the data receives conceptual structure from the source domain of MORALITY and in proportion to the whole instances of metaphor in the Azerbaijani data, this is far less significant than with the American President’s speech. This being the highest frequency of metaphor deployment in the American President’s discourse is again shaped by the political context and the ‘Pressure of Coherence’ dictating or influencing the types of metaphors used (Kovecses, 2009).

In the Azerbaijani data, there is the POLITICS IS CONFLICT metaphor at 9 instances of use and second place, and in the American data at 3 instances of use and third place. This is significant, since the pattern obtains both for our two data sets and is also in agreement with Kovecses’s (2004) inaugural data (see table 1.1 in chapter 1) where he postulates it as a chief conceptual structure for political discourse.

The second place of frequency, at 4 instances, goes to the source domain of IDEAS picking different targets for conceptualization, speaking again to the higher variety of targets used by the American President, and, hence, a higher variety of metaphors despite 45 % lower frequency than the Azerbaijani data. For this target domain, we have the UNWANTED IDEAS ARE ENEMIES IN WAR metaphor (possibly a special case/sub-metaphor from: ARGUMENT IS WAR), the IDEAS ARE PHYSICAL OBJECTS metaphor, the AN IDEA (THE LAW) IS A MACHINE metaphor, and the IDEAS ARE CONSTRUCTED OBJECTS (BUILDINGS) metaphor, each at one instance. Using this variation in his source domains, he talks about ideas like liberality, justice, democracy, fairness, etc. more persuasively and compellingly.

In the Azerbaijani discourse, interestingly, the third place of frequency, at 7 occurrences, goes to the source domain of GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS, with the GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS ARE (imprisoned) HUMAN BEINGS metaphor at 3 instances, and the GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS ARE (desirable) PHYSICAL OBJECTS (POSSESSIONS) metaphor at 4 instances. This is discursively significant. One long-term and chief line of discursive engagement, a national and political preoccupation, by the Azerbaijani President is reclaiming and liberating the territories seized by the Armenian government. Structuring his discourse using these two conceptual (source) domains (IMPRISONED HUMAN BEINGS and DESIRABLE PHYSICAL OBJECTS) allows the Azerbaijani President to remain focused in his discourse, persuasion, and impact on the audience in talking about the target (the recently conquered GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS).

One last significant point about the differences between the two sets of data is the related discursive recourse the Azerbaijani president makes to the TRUTH IS ANCESTORAL CLAIM ON LAND (of birth) metaphor at 6 instances of use. This harks back to the above point about the GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS as target domain and a very present Big-D Discourse (Gee, 2018) present in Azerbaijani folk and elite culture, as well as political spheres, about the immediacy of liberating the occupied territories from Armenian control.

4.6. Research Question 4

The 4th research question can now be engaged with in light of the previous three and the above comments. This question is to do with how ideologies are present or influential in the metaphorical discourse of the two presidents' political discourse. In answering the 3 questions above, some comments in relation to this were made. Now it is time to bring these discursive strands together and make offer further discussion about the political discourse being constructed through metaphorical conceptualization in the two sets of data. First, let us remind ourselves of Charteris-Black's (2004) Discourse Model for Metaphor in his CMA. Of course, this take on a Critical Metaphor Analysis, at its core, is shared across many scholars (Chilton, 2005a and 2005b; Hart, 2010; Musolff, 2011; Charteris-Black, 2004 and 2011; Kovecses, 2009, among others) where there are two resources feeding into metaphor choice in discourse: Individual and Social. The individual ones include choices at the level of Cognitive and Affective (experiential meaning), those at the level of Pragmatic (contextual meaning), and those at the level of Linguistic (linguistic meaning). The social resources feeding into metaphor choice in discourse include Ideology (e.g. political belief), Culture (e.g. group identity), History (e.g. collective memory). These nearly constitute the concern of this fourth research question,

while the Individual Resources, the three types of meaning, were almost treated in the first 3 research questions.

The data enables us to trace a useful Critical Metaphor Analysis:

The **particular stamp of discourse constructed** through **conceptual structure and metaphors** by the Azerbaijani President is the product of proportionate forces of **ideology and political belief** that has taken **deep root in folk culture** on the ground in most social layers of the community and finds itself translated powerfully into **a group identity** as well, to the point of becoming part of their inefaceable **history and collective memory**.

The following discourses emerge that organize and are organized by the conceptual structure used. They can be provisionally referred to thus:

- *The Discourse of Sacrifice*
- *The Discourse of Revenge*
- *The Discourse of Ancestral Lands*
- *The Discourse of Righteousness*
- *The Discourse of Moral Upper-hand*

Through these cognitive framing means, the discourse of the Azerbaijani President sounds more fondly and emotionally laden, far more interpersonally wired up, far more prominently spoken to the heart of every Azerbaijani citizen. The American President's discourse, expectedly, seeks to construct a logic of economic and political, party-siding rhetoric, as if the people should see and be enabled through his talk to weigh and ascertain the ongoing merit of the Democrats for re-election. The logic, the rhetoric is fueled by meanings at the level of the American greatness, the American dream, the economy and the politics of it all. This is very different from the fondly couched heroic stand-taking, and deeply emotional resonances of the Azerbaijani President's discourse.

All this again fits into CMA reading and makes understanding the differences between the two discourses easier.

Assuming American politics to be reflected in the prevalent discourse of American political spheres, and assuming the American President to at least embody and represent part of that discourse, the data also brings up a **Politicians as Rescue Squads** discourse shaped by a creative metaphor **POLITICIANS ARE RESCUE SQUADS**. This is similar to Charteris-Black's (2011) depiction of Winston Churchill's Heroic Myth and of Ronald Reagan's Romantic and Valiant Leader, but we think there is a more urgent and quick-action ring to the way Biden shapes this discourse, in fire and rescue squads, using conceptual metaphors that is not quite in the same mold as the same legitimization strategies; a valiant and heroic leader that

comes along and responds to a threat and saves the nation is a little different, more deliberate and slower, than the on-the-trigger attitude and action of a fire squad brought alive, for example, when Biden refers to ‘the American Rescue Plan’.

This is a discourse not at all present in Azerbaijani political discourse; it is easy to see how prevalent discourses are a question of the political exigencies and contingencies of a nation and its leadership. However, Critical Metaphor Analysis reveals to us that both the American and Azerbaijani political discourse attest to Charteris-Black’s (2011) line of thinking about political discourse that ‘successful legitimization also makes claims for the heroic leadership qualities of specific individuals’ (p. 26). In other words, both political figures use conceptual metaphors to create a discourse of themselves as heroes responding to threats and dangers and saving the people. To establish trust and ensure persuasion, both these discourses show ‘that they have the audience’s interests at heart and are therefore ethically credible’, and that ‘myths are systematically created in political speeches and will propose that this is primarily through the analysis of their metaphors’ (Charteris-Black, 2011, p.27).

4.7. Limitations and Delimitation

This study was, by necessity, limited in its scope and its ability to analyze a bigger corpus. A bigger corpus of analysis would have been conducive to a better picture and perhaps more CMA-enabled insights into the two modes of political discourse. This being an MA thesis, time was another related limitation, both on the part of the student and the supervisor.

4.8. Suggestions for Further Research

As indicated in the previous section, carefully coded data on Azerbaijani political discourse is not yet extensively available. This study revealed interesting insights into the differences between top-level political figures’ discourses in Azerbaijani and American English. As the theoretical model argued, there are implications to carrying on with this mode of research in terms of expanding our understanding about variation in conceptual and cultural structure in different languages and cultures, intercultural pragmatics, comparative political discourse studies, among many more strands. Triangulation of this kind of research using more data, different dates, different social and historical occasions, different media, different social actors, different situational contexts, etc. will make for a highly recommended and potentially rewarding research.

References

1. Alverson, H. (1994). *Semantics and experience: Universal metaphors of time in English, Mandarin, Hindi, and Sesotho*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
2. Boers, F. (2000a). Enhancing metaphoric awareness in specialised reading. *English for Specific Purposes*, 19(2), 137–147.
3. Boers, F. (2000b). Metaphor awareness and vocabulary retention. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(4), 553–571.
4. Boers, F. & Lindstromberg, S. (2008). How cognitive linguistics can foster effective vocabulary teaching. In F. Boers & S. Lindstromberg (Eds.), *Cognitive linguistics approaches to teaching vocabulary and phraseology* (pp. 1–61). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
5. Boers, F. (Ed.). (2003). Applied linguistics perspectives on cross-cultural variation in conceptual metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18(4), 231–238
6. Boers, F., Demecheleer, M., & Eyckmans, J. (2004). Cross-cultural Variation as a Variable in Comprehending and Remembering Figurative Idioms, *European Journal of English Studies*, 8(3), 375-388, DOI: [10.1080/1382557042000277449](https://doi.org/10.1080/1382557042000277449)
7. Boers, F, and Demecheleer, M. (2001). Measuring the impact of cross-cultural differences on learners' comprehension of imageable idioms. *ELT Journal*, 55, 255–262.
8. Boroditsky, L. (2001). Does Language Shape Thought? *Cognitive Psychology*. 43, 1–22.
9. Boroditsky, L, and Ramscar, M. (2002). The roles of body and mind in abstract thought. *Psychological Science*, 13(2), 185-189.
10. Calvacanti, M. C. and Bizon, A. C. (2008). En route through metaphors: Chatrooms as safe places to deal with difficulties in an online course. In M.S. Zanutto, L. Cameron, and M.C.
11. Cavalcanti, *Confronting Metaphor in Use: An applied linguistic approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
12. Cameron, L. (2003). *Metaphor in educational discourse*. London: Continuum.
13. Charteris-Black, J. (2000). Metaphor and vocabulary teaching in ESP economics. *English for Specific Purposes*, 19, 149–165.
14. Charteris-Black, J. (2002). Second language figurative proficiency: A comparative study of Malay and English. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(1), 104–133.

15. Charteris-Black, J. (2003). Speaking with forked tongue: A comparative study of metaphor and metonymy in English and Malay phraseology. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18(4), 289–310.
16. Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan.
17. Charteris-Black, J. (2011). (2nd ed). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. Palgrave Macmillan.
18. Chilton, P. (2005a). Missing links in mainstream CDA: Modules, blends and the critical instinct. In R. Wodak and P. Chilton (eds), *A new research agenda in critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp. 19–52.
19. Chilton, P. (2005b). Manipulation, memes and metaphors: The case of Mein Kampf. In L. de Saussure and P. Schulz (eds), *Manipulation and ideologies in the twentieth century*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp. 15–44.
20. Coulson, S. (2008). Metaphor comprehension and the brain. In R. W. Gibbs, Jr. (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought* (pp. 177-194). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
21. D’Andrade, R. G. (1995). *The development of cognitive anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
22. Deignan, A. (1999). Corpus-based research into metaphor. In L. Cameron and G. Low (Eds.), *Researching and applying metaphor* (pp. 177-199). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
23. Deignan, A, and Potter, L. (2004). A corpus study of metaphors and metonyms in English and Italian. *Journal of Pragmatics, special issue: Metaphor*. Guest Ed. G. Steen, 36 (7), 1231–1252.
24. Drożdż, G. & Taraszka-Drożdż, B. (Eds). (2020). *Foreign Language Pedagogy in the Light of Cognitive Linguistics Research*. Switzerland: Springer.
25. Emanatian, M. (1995). Metaphor and the expression of emotion: The value of cross-cultural perspectives. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 10, 163–182.
26. Fainsilber, L. & Ortony, A. (2009). Metaphorical Uses of Language in the Expression of Emotions. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*. 2(4).
27. Fauconnier, G, and Turner, M. (2002). *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind’s hidden complexities*. New York: Basic Books.
28. Gee, J. P. (2018). *Introducing Discourse Analysis: From Grammar to Society*. Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group.

29. Gibbs, R. W. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
30. Gibbs, R. W. (1998). The fight over metaphor in thought and language. In A. Katz, C. Cacciari, R. Gibbs, and M. Turner (Eds.), *Figurative language and thought* (pp. 88-118). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
31. Gibbs, R. W. (1999). Taking metaphor out of our heads and putting it into the cultural world. In R. Gibbs and G. Steen (Eds.), *Metaphor in cognitive linguistics* (pp. 146-166). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
32. Gibbs, R. W. (2003a). Prototypes in dynamic meaning construal. In J. Gavins and G. Steen (Eds.), *Cognitive poetics in practice* (pp. 27-40). London and New York: Routledge.
33. Gibbs, R. W. (2003b). Embodied experience and linguistic meaning. *Brain and Language*, 84, 1-15.
34. Gibbs, R. W., Bogdonovich, J. M., Sykes, J. R., and Barr, D. J. (1997). Metaphor in idiom comprehension. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 37, 141-154.
35. Gibbs, R. W., Costa Lima P. L., and Francozo, E. (2004). Metaphor is grounded in embodied experience. Guest Ed. Gerard Steen, *Metaphor*, special issue of *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(7), 1189-1210.
36. Glenberg, A. (1997). What memory is for. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 20, 1-55.
37. Grady, J. (1997a). Theories are building revisited. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 8, 267-290.
38. Grady, J. (1997b). *Foundations of meaning: Primary metaphors and primary scenes*. Doctoral dissertation, Department of Linguistics, University of California at Berkeley.
39. Grady, J. (1999). A typology of motivation for conceptual metaphor. In R. Gibbs and G. Steen (Eds.), *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*, 79-100. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
40. Hart, C. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Science: New Perspectives on Immigration Discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
41. Johnson, M. (1987). *The Body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
42. Jafarnejhad, S., Salmani, B., & Sadegh Oghli, H. (2021). Metaphorical Language Use in a Sample of Modern Political Discourse on Iran-West Relations. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 9, (34).

43. Jafarnezhad, S., Salmani, B., & Sadegh Oghli, H. (2022). Function of Metaphorical Language in Shaping Political Texts Based on Kövecses' Framework: A CDA Perspective. *Journal of Language and Translation*, (), -. doi: 10.30495/tlt.2022.696809
44. Kövecses, Z. (1986). *Metaphors of anger, pride, and love: A lexical approach to the study of concepts*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
45. Kövecses, Z. (1995a). American friendship and the scope of metaphor. *Cognitive Linguistics* 6, 315-346.
46. Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge University Press.
47. Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
48. Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*. Cambridge University Press.
49. Kövecses, Z. (2009). Metaphor, culture, and discourse: The pressures of coherence. In A. Musolff & J. Zinken (Eds.), *Metaphor and discourse* (pp. 11–24). Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.
50. Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction (2nd edition)*. Oxford University Press.
51. Kövecses, Z. (2015). *Where Metaphors Come from: Reconsidering Context in Metaphor*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
52. Kövecses, Z. (2017). Conceptual Metaphor Theory. In E. Semino and Z. Demjén (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Metaphor and Language* (pp. 13-27). London and New York: Routledge.
53. Larson, B. M. H., Nerlich, B., and Wallis, P. (2005). Metaphors and Biorisks: The War on Infectious Diseases and Invasive Species. *Science Communication*, 26(3), 243-268.
54. Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
55. Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.
56. Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought*. New York: Basic Books.
57. Lakoff, G., Espenson, J., and Schwartz, A. (1991). *Master Metaphor List (2nd Ed)*. Cognitive Linguistics Group: University of California at Berkeley.

58. Liberali, F. C. (2008). School teachers in favela contexts: Metaphors they live by. In M.S. Zanotto,
59. L. Cameron, and M.C. Cavalcanti, *Confronting Metaphor in Use: An applied linguistic approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
60. Low, G. (1988). On Teaching Metaphor. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 9, No. 2.
61. Mashak, S. P., Pazhakh, A., and Hayati, A. (2012). A comparative study on basic emotion conceptual metaphors in English and Persian literary texts. *International Education Studies*, 5(1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v5n1p200>
62. Mouraz, A, Pereira, A. V. and Monteiro, R. (2013). The Use of Metaphors in the Processes of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 5(1).
63. Musolff, A. (2016). *Political Metaphor Analysis: Discourse and Scenarios*. London: Bloomsbury.
64. Musolff, A. & Zinken, J. (2009). (Eds.). *Metaphor and discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.
65. Nacey, S. (2013). *Metaphors in Learner English*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
66. Northcote, M. & Fetherston, T. (2006). New metaphors for teaching and learning in a university context. In A. Bunker, & I. Vardi (Eds.), *Critical Visions*. Paper presented at the 29th HERDSA Annual Conference, Western Australia, 10-12 July (pp. 251-258). Milperra, Australia: Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia. Retrieved from <http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/2006/papers/Northcote.pdf>
67. Özçalışkan, Ş. (2003). Metaphorical motion in crosslinguistic perspective: A comparison of English and Turkish. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18(3), 189–228.
68. Özçalışkan, Ş. (2004). *Time Can't Fly, But a Bird Can: Learning to Think and Talk About Time As Spatial Motion in English and Turkish*, *European Journal of English Studies*, 8:3, 309-336, DOI: [10.1080/1382557042000277412](https://doi.org/10.1080/1382557042000277412)
69. Piquer-Piriz, A. M. (2008). Young learners' understanding of figurative language. In M.S. Zanotto,
70. L. Cameron, and M.C. Cavalcanti, *Confronting Metaphor in Use: An applied linguistic approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
71. Praggeljaz Group (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22 (1), 1–39.

72. Riddle, E. M. (2000). *The string metaphor of life and language in Hmong*. Paper presented at the International Pragmatics Conference, Budapest, Hungary.
73. Robinson, P. & Ellis, N. C. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition*. New York and London: Routledge.
74. Safarnejad, F., Ho-Abdullah, I., Mat Awal, N. (2014). A cognitive study of happiness metaphors in Persian and English. *Proceedings of SoLLs.INTEC.13: International Conference on Knowledge-Innovation-Excellence: Synergy in Language Research and Practice*.
75. Salager-Meyer, F. (1990). Metaphors in medical English prose: A comparative study with French and Spanish. *English for Specific Purposes*, 9(2), 145–159.
76. Shore, B. (1996). *Culture in mind: Cognition, culture, and the problem of meaning*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
77. Soriano, C. (2003). Conceptual metaphors and metonymies of anger in Spanish and English. *Paper presented at the 8th International Cognitive Linguistics Conference (ICLC), Logroño, Spain*.
78. Steen, G. J., Dorst, A. G., Herrmann, J. B., Kaal, A. A., Krennmayr, T., and Pasma, T. (2010). *A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification: From MIP to MIPVU*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company
79. Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge University Press.
80. Sticht, T. (1993). Educational uses of metaphor. In A. Ortony and E. [Türker](#). (Eds.), 621-32. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* (Arizona State University), 11(1).
81. Strauss, C, and Quinn, N. (1997). *A cognitive theory of cultural meaning*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
82. Taylor, J, and Mbense, T. (1998). Red dogs and rotten mealies: How Zulus talk about anger. In A. Athanasiadou and E. Tabakowska (Eds.), *Speaking of emotions: Conceptualization and expression* (pp. 191-226). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
83. Turker, E. (2013). A corpus-based approach to emotion metaphors in Korean: A case study of anger, happiness, and sadness. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 11(1), 73-144. <https://doi.org/10.1075/rcl.11.1.03tur>
84. Vosniadou, S. (1989). Context and the development of metaphor comprehension. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 4, 159-71.
85. Wertz, J. F., Charmaz, K., McMullen, L. M., Josselson, R., Anderson, R., and McSpadden, E.

86. (2011). *Five Ways of Doing Qualitative Analysis: Phenomenological Psychology, Grounded Theory, Discourse Analysis, Narrative Research, and Intuitive Inquiry*. New York: Guilford Publications.
87. Yang, G. (2002). *Love and its conceptual metaphors in Mandarin: Aspectual classification*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Linguistics, University of California at Berkeley. Yu, Ning. (1995). Metaphorical expression of anger and happiness in English and Chinese. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 10, 223–245.
88. Zanotto, M. S., Cameron, L, and Cavalcanti, M. C. (Eds). (2008). *Confronting Metaphor in Use: a An applied linguistic approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

References used for the Azerbaijani President’s Speeches data:

89. <https://president.az/az/articles/view/52446>
90. <https://president.az/az/articles/view/55497>
91. <https://president.az/az/articles/view/2041>

References used for the American President’s Speeches data:

92. <https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/president-biden-discusses-his-plan-to-lower-prescription-drug-costs-transcript>
93. <https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/president-biden-delivers-a-primetime-speech-on-9-01-22>
94. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/03/12/remarks-by-president-biden-on-the-american-rescue-plan-2/>
95. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/05/13/remarks-by-president-biden-on-the-colonial-pipeline-incident/#:~:text=I'm%20going%20to%20work,this%20situation%20for%20financial%20gain.>
96. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/02/10/remarks-by-president-biden-to-department-of-defense-personnel/>
97. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/02/10/remarks-by-president-biden-to-department-of-defense-personnel/>
98. <https://president.az/az/articles/view/52446>

99. <https://president.az/az/articles/view/55497>

100. <https://president.az/az/articles/view/2041>

Appendix 1:

Conceptual Metaphors in the Azerbaijani data with a frequency of only 1:

- A (positive) EMOTION IS A BENEFICIAL PHYSICAL OBJECT/POSESSION
- EMOTION IS A BENEFICIAL PHYSICAL OBJECT/POSESSION
- BELIEFS ARE CONSTRUCTED (PHYSICAL) OBJECTS
- PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS (a special case of CHANGE IS MOTION which also gives PURPOSEFUL ACTION IS DIRECTED MOTION TO A DESTINATION)
- EXISTENCE IS LIFE
- WAR IS A SPORTS COMPETITION
- A PROBLEM IS A REGION IN A LANDSCAPE
- ARGUMENT IS WAR (alternately known as: THEIRES/BELIEFS ARE DEFENSIBLE POSITIONS/ FORTIFICATIONS)
- UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING (and/or LIGHT)
- INTIMACY IS PHYSICAL CLOSENESS
- OPPORTUNITIES ARE OPEN PATHS

Appendix 2:

Conceptual Metaphors in the AMERICAN data with a frequency of only 1:

- PROBLEMS ARE OPPONENTS IN A STRUGGLE
- MORE IS UP (alternately known as: MORE IS HIGHER)
- EMOTIONS ARE PHYSICAL FORCES
- HARM IS LOSING A NEEDED POSSESSION (from: WELL-BEING IS WEALTH)
- A COUNTRY IS A PHYSICAL OBJECT
- OBLIGATIONS ARE BURDENS (on back or shoulder) (a sub-metaphor of: OBLIGATIONS ARE POSSESSIONS)
- COMPARISON OF PROPERTIES IS COMPARISON OF PHYSICAL PROPERTIES (from which we'd have: IMPORTANCE IS WEIGHT)

- ECONOMY IS THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT (from which we have:
NEGATIVE ECONOMIC FORCES ARE NATURAL FORCES)
- ABILITIES ARE ENTITIES INSIDE A PERSON (from PROPERTIES ARE
CONTENTS)
- POLITICIANS ARE RESCUE SQUADS
- PROGRESS IS FORWARD MOTION (from CHANGE IS MOTION)
- WISDOM IS (A) LIGHT (SOURCE) (most likely a sub-metaphor of: KNOWING /
UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING / LIGHT [without hindrance], from the LIGHT ICM)
- ATTRIBUTES ARE PHYSICAL OBJECTS (or POSSESSIONS)