Straipsniai

MORALITY THROUGH METAPHOR:
A CROSS-LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Liudmila Arcimavičienė

Department of English Philology
Vilnius University
Universiteto g. 5, LT-01513 Vilnius
Tel.: +370 5 2687 228
E-mail: liudmila.arcimaviciene@gmail.com

1. Introduction

For centuries the on-going debate of the relationship between morality and politics has resulted in the division of such fundamental concepts as the right and the good, justice and equality, democracy and liberty etc (Paul, Miller & Paul 2004, 56).The main issue of this scholarly debate has been centred round the distinction between moral and pragmatic politics. For example, Aristotelian claim is based on the assumption that the proper aim of politics is a moral virtue, whereby good and morally right actions such as care, empathy and emotions dominate (ibid., p. 12).

By contrast, Machiavelli exalts pragmatism over morality, wherein the maintenance of power is of primary importance (ibid., p. 16). Moreover, many political and social scientists and philosophers claim that morality and politics just cannot collaborate, as these are actually two different domains of human experience. Various political scientists believe that politics is about drafting good laws and institutions. Relying on insights about human nature and politics from Machiavelli and Hobbes, Elkin claims that the importance of institution is the best political regime practicable (in Paul, Miller & Paul 2004, 73). Moreover, he goes on to discuss that politics and democracy should not depend upon people pursuing a selfless public moral good. Thus, politics should not be about morality or ethics, but rather it should be devoid of any moral and subjective interpretations.

Elstain challenges this idea by claiming that politics and morality are mutually constitutive, which is due to the subjectivity of description (in Paul, Miller & Paul 2004, 89). The scholar argues that the description of any political event is subjective and yields evaluative implications. Thus, if any description is morally charged, it is important to make the right distinctions and evaluations. Moreover, she states that only by getting the distinctions right

about various political horrors such as genocide or terrorism, people can prevent a slide into a world of indiscriminate horror.

Johnson, as a representative of cognitive science and philosophy, argues that morality is an indispensable concept of any discourse, including the language of politics (1987, 1997). He sees morality as the imaginative material of cognition that shapes human understanding of experience. Moreover, according to Johnson, it is principally metaphoric reasoning that makes possible for people to learn from experience and eventually describe it by means of language (1997, 35).

Since morality is an abstract concept, one of the principle means to make moral judgements about various human experience is a metaphor. Contrary to the traditional understanding of metaphor, cognitive linguists and psychologists perceive it as an indispensable tool of human cognition (Lakoff 2002, Fauconnier & Turner 2002, Kővesces 2005). Thus, metaphor is a result of the complex interaction of cognitive processes, such as identity, integration, imagination, analogy etc., which allow to categorize the world around us through conflating such experiences as bodily, individual, social, cultural etc.

In other words, people tend to categorize abstract concepts, such as emotions, morality or democracy in terms of more specific domains of experience. This happens due to the given human ability to conflate bodily and physical experience with other sensual and non-sensual domains. Consequently, conceptual metaphor leads people throughout their life from early infantry to the late adulthood.

The argument of metaphor as a core part of human culture, life and understanding has been developed by many cognitive linguists and psychologists (Borodistky & Ramscar 2002, Deignan 1995, Kővecses 2005, Lakoff 2002). Just by functioning normally in the world, Lakoff claims, people automatically and unconsciously acquire and use a vast number of metaphors, which are the consequence of the nature of human brains, bodies and the world people inhabit (Lakoff 2002, 59).

Hence, by analysing metaphors, as they are represented in a language, we can learn more about the people who use them as well as their expectations, beliefs, values etc. Johnson puts forward a sound argument that it is the metaphoric character of human moral understanding that allows people to make appropriate judgements about their own and others' experience (1997, 33). Therefore, it should be expected that metaphor is essential to moral understanding.

There are three major models distinguished by political philosophers and scientists that shape the understanding of political events and raise certain moral expectations, namely:

The classical, or traditional, approach to moral politics delineated by such distinguished scholars of philosophy as Machiavelli, Dawkins, Williams, Huxley is known as the **pragmatic** model (Paul, Miller & Paul 2004, 132). According to this model, all people are seen as evil and selfish by their nature. Moreover, morality is understood as a human invention explicitly devised to control those combative and selfish tendencies in a society. Thus, the use of violence and force is a constituent part of political activity.

Secondly, Rawls and Kant argue that moral politics is a **rational** domain led by the maximum use of rationality and rationally calculated political actions (Paul, Miller & Paul

2004, 214). This argument is known as the **rational morality approach** to politics. To be more precise, the basic moral principle is to establish explicit rules of conduct that will enable cooperation among people. This understanding has shaped the universal understanding of duties, as resulted in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which serves as the major principle to make universal judgements.

Finally, the **integrated approach** to moral politics is based on emotional evaluation and led by sentiments (Katz 2002, 215). The claim that human morality is powerfully influenced by emotional responses and is not always governed by the abstract and intellectual rules was supported by Hume, Smith, Westermarck, Darwin (see Katz 2002, 238). In its framework morality is not seen as a conscious and delineate conscious faculty but rather as a cognitive empathy or sentiment such as sympathy, empathy, community concern, which engenders a bond between individuals. This bond is enabled by an individual's capacity to be sensitive to the emotions of others.

2. Research Aims & Methodology

The present study aims at the following research objectives:
   (1) to identify conceptual metaphors that structure the virtual political discourse of two cultures, Great Britain and Lithuania;
   (2) by analysing conceptual metaphors and their entailments to establish morality models that prevail in both languages;
   (3) finally, by identifying morality models, to see whether their representations in both languages are universal or culture specific.

In order to identify MORALITY models governing British and Lithuanian virtual political discourse, electronic archives of the following two websites were accessed: (1)www.economist.com, (2) www.politika.lt. Hence, both English and Lithuanian political articles were accessed via online archives, where they were automatically sorted by the subject and date.

The English data consists of Bagehot articles, i.e. a weekly column on British politics named after one the greatest editor the *Economist*—Walter Bagehot (1826 - 1877). The Lithuanian data consists of automatically selected articles by subject area: political analysis and commentaries of Lithuanian home affairs. The overall number of words in both languages amounts to 415, 670.

Finally, the collected data was analysed in the framework of cognitive linguistics theory, which is exclusively qualitative in nature. This qualitative research method refers to the analysis of linguistic corpus in the following direction: <u>metaphorical linguistic expressions (MLE) → conceptual metaphor (CM)</u>, i.e. MLEs were first identified, then analysed and classified in accordance with the source domain they represent.

It should be noted that the linguistic metaphoric expressions are only illustrations of one or another source domain, e. g. STRENGTH structures the target conceptual domain, a POLITICAL ACTIVITY. Consequently, the CM has the following conceptual represen-

tation: A IS B, e.g. POLITICAL ACTIVITY IS STRENGTH, and the following linguistic representation B: a, b, c, or STRENGTH: **strong** will, **tough** political positioning, **strike** the bill, **force** the minister out of parliament etc. Thus, in order to differentiate between the CM and MLEs, the former is represented with capital letters, i.e. POLITICAL ACTIVITY AS STRENGTH.

3. Research Findings

The research findings show that the CMs in the political discourse of both English and Lithuanian are structured by similar conceptual source domains as indicated in Table 1 below:

*Table 1: **Conceptual Source Domains in English and Lithuanian***

SOURCE domains	STRENGTH	RELATIONSHIP
	No of occurrences	
English	89	111
Lithuanian	152	48

As the table shows, both English and Lithuanian languages are structured through the CMs of **strength** and **relationship**. In other words, both languages are represented by such metaphors as POLITICAL ACTIVITY AS STRENGTH and POLITICAL ACTIVITY AS INTER-PERSONAL RELATIONSHIP. However, the frequency of metaphorical linguistic expression and their entailments have a different scope of representation in both languages, which result in different MORALITY models.

3.1. Integrated MORALITY Model in the British Politics

The research findings suggest that the **Integrated Morality** model prevails in the British political discourse, as the metaphor of RELATIONSHIP (111 instances), predominates over the metaphor of STRENGTH (89 instances).

The analysis of the English data shows that the STRENGTH conceptual metaphor consists of such entailments as the use of physical force and violence, and politicians as being tough, strong, and violent in many cases. The conceptual element of physical force and violence dominates in the conceptual metaphor of STRENGTH. To be more precise, the political activity is seen as a dynamic use of physical force by politicians, e.g.:

(1) *Though the Lords can't **strike bills down**—the government can ultimately get its way by **forcing bills through** under the Parliament Act (...).*

(2) *Indeed, Mr Johnson rapidly became Mr Blair's favourite union boss because he was the only one to support the new leader's **bold stroke** of revising Clause 4 of the party's constitution (...).*

(3) *Until now the main effect of the police investigation has been to feed the public's de-bilitating cynicism about politics. It is, however, an opportunity for Gordon Brown **to push ahead with reform**.*

As the examples above illustrate, the political activity is perceived through the use of physical force, whereby bills can be **struck down** or **forced through**, and **reforms pushed ahead**.

Moreover, politicians themselves are described as strong or weak agents. This political strength is seen as a necessary attribute needed in the bold political action. Hence, those politicians, who lack this potential for physical strength in British politics, are portrayed as weak and incapable of combative political actions. By comparison, strong politicians are those who manage to be tough and exercise their physical strength for political purposes, e.g.:

(4) *Unlike Mr Hague and Iain Duncan Smith, he is **a tough** and experienced **operator** who has prepared himself for the job over many years.*

(5) *Mr Brown strongly supported Mr Blair's **tough stance and political positioning**, if not his highly confrontational tactics.*

(6) *Mr Davis has his **strengths**. He is **tough,** ambitious and more strategic than any of his recent predecessors.*

Thus the analysis of the CM of POLITICAL ACTIVITY AS STRENGTH in the virtual discourse of British politics reveals that physical potency, strength, force and violence are seen as indispensable characteristics of a ***good*** politician. In other words, a good politician is expected to be strong, tough and violent if necessary.

In another conceptual metaphor POLITICAL ACTIVITY AS INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP moral evaluation of politicians is established through the use of the RELATIONSHIP metaphor. According to the research data, British politicians are involved into two types of interpersonal relationships: **love** and **friendship**.

First, love relationship takes place mainly between the Prime Minister and other politicians. In other words, the Prime Minister is a person whose attention is sought for by all other political agents. Besides, there are voters who continuously ***fall in*** or ***out of love*** with the British Prime Minister as in the following:

(7) *Mr Jackson, it is safe to say, **has fallen in love with Mr Blair**, not with Labour. There-in lies a little comfort for the Tories.*

(8) *Partly it is because although voters have **fallen out of love with Tony Blair**, they are not yet desperate for change.*

Another important aspect of British politics, as the data shows, is having as many friends as possible. Thus, political activity is seen through the source conceptual domain of HAVING FRIENDS, wherein less successful politicians are depicted as having fewer friends or even ***loners,*** e.g.:

(9) *Against that, with the admittedly important exception of the prime minister, Mr Blunkett **is short of political friends** these days.*

(10) *(...) in reality Mr Clarke is an **unclubbable loner with few political friends**: his brother Michael once described him as "very detached emotionally (...)".*

Besides, the source domain of friendship is realized through such linguistic expressions as ***ally, bloke, soulmate*** etc., the use of which indicates the level of closeness. Moreover, the relationship among British politicians is fluctuating from very close and intimate to very distant and confrontational, cf.:

(11) *While a few Tory MPs were horrified by the implications of the **spat**—in particular what it said about the White House's view of Mr Howard's chances of becoming prime minister.*

(12) *(...) it means that **the squabbling** between Blairites and Brownites over the manifesto (...) that has dominated media coverage of the conference may be yesterday's story.*

(13) *(...) it is worth recalling that **theirs** <Blair and Brown's> **was a complicated and often tempestuous relationship**.*

As the examples show, to have a mutually satisfactory relationship is rather complicated in British politics. The analysis of the conceptual metaphor of POLITICAL ACTIVITY AS RELATIONSHIP reveals that the confrontational kind of relationship encountered by the British politicians refers to the inappropriate or morally wrong political action leading to various disagreements and conflicts. Most of the politicians are unable to be friends with one another, thus they are unable to cooperate and make effective decisions due to their continuous quarrelling and spats.

Finally, the prevalence of MLEs representing the source domain of RELATIONSHIP indicates that the moral evaluation of British politics is based on the **Integrated Morality Model**. This implies that British politics is more oriented towards emotional rather than pragmatic judgement. Moreover, the extensive use of the RELATIONSHIP metaphor shows that British politics is more focused on personalities than ideologies or parties. Thus, a political agent's personal charisma plays a significant role in establishing political relations with other politicians and as voters. Even more, personal qualities prevail over party ideologies.

Thus, the analysis of the MLEs in British political discourse has revealed that it is structured by the metaphors of STRENGTH and RELATIONSHIP. The prevalence of the latter reveals that British politics might be governed by the **Integrated Morality Model**, wherein the role of emotions and sentiments is complementary to any rational decision-making.

3.2. Pragmatic Morality Model in the Lithuanian Politics

The analysis of the Lithuanian data has shown that its political discourse is also structured by the metaphors of different morality models; however, their scope of variability accounts for the prevalence of the Pragmatic Model. This MORALITY model is represented by

the CM of STRENGTH, yielded in 152 metaphorical linguistic expressions. By contrast, the CM POLITICAL ACTIVITY AS INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP is only in 48 MLEs. Thus, an extensive use of POLITICS AS STRENGTH conceptual metaphor characterizes Lithuanian politics in terms of the Pragmatic Morality Model.

The CM of STRENGTH has the following representation: POLITICAL ACTIVITY IS THE EXERTION OF STRENGTH. This conceptual structuring is mainly realized through the following entailments: POLITICIANS /PARTIES AS PHYSICALLY STRONG / WEAK. In other words, politicians are seen as either physically strong or weak, e.g.:

(14) *Kai jautėsi **stiprus**, Brazauskas nebijojo žmonių, politinių oponentų ir žiniasklaidos, o **dabar bijo savo šešėlio** (...).*

(15) *Nei (...) darbiečių populiarumo reitingai, nei (...) socialdemokratų **silpnėjimas** nenugludino skirtingų požiūrių ir nesuvienodino politinio veikimo būdų (...).*

(16) *Darant rimtą ir atsakingą politinį žingsnį, reikia **turėti pakankamai jėgų** jam įgyvendinti iš tikrųjų (...).*

Thus, a beneficial and meaningful political activity is seen as physical strength or force. As a result, the use of STRENGTH metaphor presupposes that the use of physical force or even violence is a necessary condition for the politicians to reach their political goals. This tendency of forceful politics is reflected by such MLEs, which involve elements of fighting or violence, e.g.:

(17) *Bet jei atsiras politikas ir partija, kurie atsisakys visą savo energiją sutelkti į oponentų **skandinimą**, o sieks nepopulistiškai (...) teikti visuomenei pozityvų ateities projektą (...) – laimės viską, nes šiandien yra laukiamas veiklus ir protingas, o ne tas, kuris atrodo **stiprus dėl to, kad kiti dar silpnesni**.*

(18) *Griežtesnis požiūris į šias lėšas visų problemų neišspręstų, bet gerokai **tramdytų**.*

(19) *(...) partijos (...) pasirašė susitarimą elgtis sąžiningai ir (...) **grumtis su korupcija**.*

The use of the STRENGTH metaphor in the Lithuanian data is counterbalanced by the use of the RELATIONSHIP metaphor, as there are only 48 instances of the latter, compared with 152 MLEs of the former. Despite a noticeable difference, the conceptual metaphor of POLITICAL ACTIVITY AS INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP is very closely connected to the metaphor of STRENGTH.

To be more precise, Lithuanian politicians are involved in a relationship based on force, violence and on-going confrontations. This is reflected in such expressions as having *spites, scandals, rows, taking some violent actions against other politicians* etc., e.g.:

(20) *V. Uspaskicho oponentus pražudė perdėtas pasitikėjimas savimi – vasaros pabai- goje nusprendę, kad (...) Kėdainių kniazius jau nebepavojingas, jie paprasčiausiai **susipjovė tarpusavyje**.*

(21) *Matydamas, su kokiu įkvėpimu konservatoriai **kibo į gaurus** Algirdui Brazauskui, o visi kartu – **į gaurus** Artūrui Zuokui, Darbo partijos lyderis galėjo tik rankas trinti.*

(21) *Tai dėl ko tuomet kuriamas tas aštuonių komitetas? O dėl ko prasidėjo valdančiųjų* **peštynės**?

Thus, the analysis of the STRENGTH and RELATIONSHIP conceptual metaphors in the Lithuanian language reveals that the Pragmatic Morality Model is preferred by Lithuanian politics. According to this model, violence and physical strength are the necessary attributes of a political activity. Moreover, the use of violence as well as force is taken by politicians for granted, and can always be justified. Finally, the prevalence of this model indicates that Lithuanian politics lacks cooperation, mutual agreement and harmonious relationship between politicians.

4. Conclusions

1) The analysis of the virtual political discourse in both English and Lithuanian has shown that both languages are structured by the conceptual metaphors of STRENGTH and RELATIONSHIP.
2) Both cultures conceive of politics in terms of two source domains, which result in the following conceptual representations: POLITICAL ACTIVITY AS (THE EXERTION OF) STRENGTH / FORCE and POLITICAL ACTIVITY AS INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP.
3) However, the research findings reveal that different entailments of these metaphors result in different MORALITY models.
4) The prevalence of the RELATIONSHIP metaphor in the English data shows that the **Integrated Morality Model** is more characteristic of British politics.
5) The analysis of MLEs in English demonstrates that the moral evaluation of British politics is more emotional than pragmatic. Besides, it signals a tendency for personality politics, wherein personalities are more important than parties and their ideologies.
6) The STRENGTH metaphor predominates in the Lithuanian data; hence the **Pragmatic Morality Model** is prevalent in the Lithuanian politics.
7) The analysis of MLEs in Lithuanian reveals that moral evaluation of Lithuanian politics is more pragmatically-oriented, which involves the targeted political actions of the powerful or the strongest. Moreover, it justifies the use of violence; also politicians are divided into weak and strong, who are continuously fighting for their position.
8) Finally, this study has shown that the analysis of MLEs results in CMs that characterize the value and preference systems in different societies and cultures, i.e. differing morality models.

REFERENCES

Borodistky L. & M. Ramscar, 2002. *The experiential basis of meaning.* Accessed on: http://www.stanford.edu/~jurafsky/cogsci03-mat-ram-borod2.pdf

Deignan A., 1995. *Metaphors of Desire*. Accessed on: http://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=hBGWw0HztCwC&oi=fnd&pg=PA21&dq=Deignan+1995&ots=krhtKtHBLA&sig=XbjtYFZ61MR9gw75Fs0LqJeSlzE#PPA21,M1

Fauconnier G. & M. Turner, 2002. *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden complexities.* New York.

Johnson M., 1987. *The Body in the Mind: the Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*. Chicago and London.

Johnson M., 1997. *Moral Imagination: Implications of Cognitive Science for Ethics*. Chicago.

Katz L. D. (ed.), 2002. *Evolutionary Origins of Morality: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives*. UK: Imprint Academic.

Kövecses Z., 2005. *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*. Cambridge: CUP.

Lakoff G. & M. Johnson, 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought.* New York.

Lakoff G., 2002. *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think.* Chicago.

Paul E. F. & F. D. Miller & J. Paul (eds.), 2004. *Morality and Politics*. Cambridge: CUP.

MORALĖS METAFORA: GRETINAMOJI POLITINIO DISKURSO ANALIZĖ

Liudmila Arcimavičienė

S a n t r a u k a

Šio straipsnio tikslas – nustatyti moralės modelius, analizuojant konceptualiąją metaforą politiniame diskurse anglų ir lietuvių kalbose. Remtasi analitiniais straipsniais politikos temomis. Jie pasitelkti iš Interneto tinklalapių www.politika.lt ir www.economist.com elektroninio archyvo. Straipsniai analizuojami remiantis kognityvinės lingvistikos principais bei kokybiniu analizės metodu (Fauconnier & Turner 2002; Kövecses 2005; Lakoff & Johnson 1997, Lakoff 2005; Turner 1994), kurie leidžia atskleisti kalbiniuose pasakymuose (linguistic expressions) glūdinčias konceptualiąsias metaforas. Kalbiniai pasakymai buvo skirstomi pagal tris moralinio vertinimo modelius: (1) **Huxley**, kuris apibrėžia moralę kaip žmonių sąmoningai sukurtą vertinimo skalę, reikalingą kovoje su žmogaus įgimtomis blogybėmis, (2) **Kanto** požiūris į moralę, kaip į racionalų veiksmą glaudžiai siejamą su pareigomis, bei galiausiai (3) **integruotas** požiūris, kai moralus elgesys suvokiamas kaip sentimentų ir emocinių reakcijų pasekmė (Black 1995; Boehm 2000; Flack & de Waal 2002). Išanalizavus konceptualiųjų metaforų kalbinę raišką paaiškėjo, kad straipsniuose vyrauja metaforos POLITIKA KAIP JĖGA ir POLITIKA KAIP TARPUSAVIO SANTYKIAI.

Įteikta 2008 m. spalio 30 d.