mokslo darbai   transactions

RESPECTUS
PHILOLOGICUS

2013 Nr. 23 (28)

I. PROBLEMOS IR SPRENDIMAI /
PROBLEMY I ICH ROZWIĄZANIA

Jurga Cibulskienė

Department of English Didactics
Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences
Studentų St 39, Vilnius LT-08106, Lithuania
E-mail: jurga.cibulskienė@vpu.lt
Research interests: cognitive semantics, conceptual metaphor, political discourse

THE *FORCE* METAPHOR IN CONCEPTUALIZING
ECONOMIC RECESSION

Cognitive metaphor analysts comprehend metaphor as a convenient way of not only talking about real life events but also thinking about them: connecting ideas, explaining abstract ideas that are difficult to grasp, conveying messages and emotions, etc. Thus, metaphor in real-world discourse is increasingly becoming the focus of many cognitive studies. In political discourse, metaphor is seen as an ideological tool of deliberate attempts to influence, persuade and manipulate people. As Charteris-Black (2005: 16) put it, politicians try to establish themselves in a positive light or legitimize themselves, i.e., by presenting evidence that they are charismatic leaders who are capable of running their country efficiently. Legitimization goes hand in hand with delegitimization, i.e., negative other-presentation. Metaphor as a cognitive mechanism of ideology may serve both as positive self-representation and as a tool for fault-finding in others. Thus, the study focuses on how three Lithuanian socio-political groups (the leading party, the opposition, and the media) legitimize themselves and delegitimize their opponents by using FORCE *metaphors to conceptualize the worldwide economic recession. The findings indicate that although the same conceptual metaphor is used for legitimization and delegitimization, its fulfilment scenario appears to be markedly different and it carries different rhetorical implications in the three discourses.*

KEY WORDS: economic recession, Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA), FORCE *metaphor, legitimization, delegitimization.*

Introduction

Alongside fundamental research on metaphor, applied research in specific domains of discourse is increasingly becoming more and more attractive for metaphor scholars. They tend to explore different aspects of metaphor and the social world, which means that more and more importance is attached to context and communication. They largely agree that metaphor, being either a matter of language or thought, or both, plays a significant role in shaping the social world. By the term *context*, I mean the interde-pendence of the linguistic "behaviour" of metaphor and a particular discourse—for example, economic and political, as the focus of the current research is economic recession metaphors used by socio-political groups in Lithuania. Also, it can be seen as a tentative attempt to bridge the gap between the humanities and social sciences. By the term *communication*, I mean the rhetorical power of metaphor—metaphor as a tool to communicate ideas, ideology and, at the same time, to persuade and manipulate the addressee's consciousness.

Thus, this article aims to investigate how the economic recession of the period 2008–2011 is conceptualized via the FORCE metaphor in Lithuania, and what rhetorical implications arise therefrom. The concept of economic recession is viewed from three different perspectives: first, the political party in power (the Conservative Party); second, the opposition (the coalition of the Social Democratic, Labour, and Order and Justice Parties); and third, the Lithuanian media, which is expected to maintain an unbiased stance. Accordingly, three subcorpora were constructed, containing 115,170, 116,392 and 109,883 words respectively.[1]

Methodological framework

The current research into the FORCE metaphor adopts the approach of Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA) (Charteris-Black 2005, Musolff 2004). According to this approach, metaphor is comprehended as a cognitive mechanism of ideology and is analysed following a three-stage procedure: metaphors are first identified; next, they are interpreted; and finally, they are explained (*Identified → Interpreted → Explained*) (Charteris-Black, 2005: 26).

In the stage *Identified*, the key words *krizė* (*crisis*), *sunkmetis* (*hard times*), *sunkumai* (*hardships*) and *nuosmukis* (*decline*) were searched for in the three corpora using the Antconc concordance programme, and afterwards their collocational patterns were established and analyzed in terms of metaphoricity, applying the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP or MIPVU), which was first designed by a group of metaphor scholars (Pragglejaz 2007) and later developed by Steen and his co-workers (Steen *et al.*

2010). However, it was noticed that while searching for the mentioned key words, not all metaphors related to the recession were uncovered. Therefore, a manual search for recession metaphors was also employed, which yielded more accurate and reliable results of the text metaphoricity.

In the second stage, *Interpreted*, the relationship between linguistic metaphors or metaphorical expressions and their corresponding conceptual metaphors was established. The identified metaphorically used words tend to construct a certain scenario which underlies a certain conceptual metaphor. This way the analysis of the discourses of the conservatives, the opposition and the media indicates that the economic recession is comprehended via metaphors of FORCE, JOURNEY, ILLNESS, ENTITY, CAUSE/RESULT, NATURAL PHENOMENON, TEACHING/LEARNING, ENTERTAINMENT, etc. The stages *Identified* and *Interpreted* are quantitatively analysed and the procedure is systematically described in Cibulskienė (2012).

According to Charteris-Black (2005: 28), the third stage, *Explained*, addresses the ideological motivation of language use, where metaphor is comprehended as a pervasive and persuasive tool of argumentation. As the research adopts a critical discourse stance, it focuses on a critical investigation of power inequality—being in power and being in opposition to that power—and on differences expressed via metaphors. Thus, the aim of this research is to look into how the three analyzed participants of Lithuanian political discourse legitimize themselves in their attempts to overcome the economic recession, and how they delegitimize the others via the FORCE metaphor, one of the prevailing conceptual metaphors in the analyzed discourses.

---

[1] For more about the rationale and corpora compilation see Cibulskienė (2012).

The concept of FORCE relates to Talmy's (2000) suggested conceptual structuring scheme, where he sees force as an element of the "Force-Dynamics System." The essence of this system lies in the idea that physical entities interact with each other by exerting force, resisting it, blocking it, or removing the blockage. It has to do with human experience, or naive physics and psychology as Talmy (2000: 410) claims. According to the system, there are two entities which exert force on each other: the agonist is the one that exerts pressure, whereas the antagonist is the one that undergoes the pressure, either overcoming it or failing to overcome it. Talmy's "Force-Dynamics System" is first and foremost related to kinaesthetic perception, which in turn has to do with one of the guiding principles in cognitive linguistics—the embodiment thesis (Lakoff and Johnson 1999, Evans and Green 2006: 532).

The force-dynamic principles can be seen to operate in discourse, pre-eminently in directing patterns of argumentation, but also in guiding discourse expectations and their reversal (Talmy 2000: 409). The idea of force dynamic principles underlying argumentation was supported by a number of studies conducted by metaphor scholars who employ different, narrower, synonymous terms to describe the same FORCE metaphor: FIGHT, WAR, CONFLICT. For example, Goatly (2007: 72) argues that the metaphor of FIGHT, which is primarily grounded on force-dynamic principles, is a metaphor of power often employed by those exerting economic, political or personal power in attempt to conceptualize various activities, arguments and criticism. Moreover, as another FORCE metaphor realization, Charteris-Black (2005) names CONFLICT metaphors—particularly characteristic of

Margaret Thatcher's discourse, for her systematic use of metaphor to communicate political myth is based on conflict metaphors (2005: 89). She sees social and economic problems, trade unions, political opponents, or such ideologies as socialism, as enemies which have to be fought against. Charteris-Black (2005: 97) maintains that the prevalence of CONFLICT metaphors in Thatcher's discourse, which show "centrality to this self-perception as a heroic warrior embattled against large and dangerous forces from the outside" (2005: 98), is indicative of her leadership style. Moreover, Semino (2008: 100–101) employs the term WAR metaphor, which can also be comprehended as one of the FORCE metaphor realizations. She points out that in politics, metaphorical expressions instantiating the WAR metaphor are conventionally used to describe either conflicts between individuals, groups, parties, governments and oppositions, or to illustrate serious and intractable problems and strategies developed in order to solve them. In this way, as Semino observes, such metaphorical expressions as *battle, snipers, war against inflation, combating unemployment*, etc., are used in argumentation.

This paper does not use such previously presented metaphor terms as FIGHT, CONFLICT, or WAR, as the focus is on a broader and more general understanding of the FORCE metaphor, which encompasses the mentioned metaphors without distinguishing them as separate.

Results and discussion

The Identified and Interpreted stages

Metaphorical expressions underlying the conceptual metaphor of FORCE in the discourse of the Conservative Party can be found in 220 tokens, which constitute about

Table 1. **Metaphorical instantiation of the FORCE metaphor.**

Socio-political groups	FORCE metaphorical expressions	Total of all metaphorical expressions	%
The Conservative Party	220	674	33.1
The opposition parties	133	835	15.9
The media	131	753	17.3

one third of all the metaphorical expressions used in their discourse. The number of FORCE metaphorical expressions used by the opposition and the media make up 133 and 131, or 15.9% and 17.3% of all recession metaphors, respectively (see Table 1). It must be noted that the difference between the number of metaphorical expressions used by the Conservative Party and the opposition (and consequently, the media) is statistically significant; having applied a chi-square test, the calculated chi-square value of 60 is well above the requirement that the p-value be at least 3.841. Thus, the results are likely to indicate that the FORCE metaphor is prevalent in the discourse of the Conservative Party, but, while remaining highly important, it is not the number one metaphor in the discourses of the opposition or the media.

The next step was to investigate how this metaphor shows up, i.e., what scenario it suggests in the analyzed discourses. Although it is one of the central metaphors around which the analyzed political and media participants organize their thinking and argumentation, it obviously lacks fulfilment of the scenario; in other words, we can say that there are few conceptual correspondences or mappings that could give rise to a highly elaborate metaphor. This happens due to the nature of the FORCE concept, which has very little detail filled in; i.e., it has a rather skeletal image-schema. This image-schema has two possible manifestations in the analyzed discourses: the

force which the crisis exerts on somebody or something, or the force which somebody exerts on the crisis. Here we can see only two vectors of force exertion—or, speaking in Talmy's (2000) terms, we have the agonist (exerting force) and the antagonist (undergoing force).

Apparently, 70.9% of the metaphorical expressions of the Conservative Party adopt the collocational pattern VERB + CRISIS, whereas just 29.1% fall under the collocational pattern CRISIS + VERB (see Table 2).

In the first pattern, primarily, the word *crisis* collocates with the verb *įveikti (defeat)* and its variant noun phrase *įveikimas* (here *defeat* is a noun)—72.5% of the tokens follow this pattern. The collocation *(su)valdyti krizę* (*manage the crisis*) and its noun derivative *(su)valdymas* (*management*) makes up 20.5%, which seems to be a rather significant part of the remaining metaphorical expressions of the same pattern. Other words collocating with the word crisis have to do with *safeguarding* or *rescuing* the country and its people from the economic recession, *not surrendering* to it and *fighting* it; however, they constitute an insignificant part of the metaphorical expressions falling under this pattern (see Table 2).

The second pattern, CRISIS + VERB, makes up one-third of all FORCE metaphorical expressions. Here the most productive *crisis* collocations seem to be those with verbs expressing some kind of influence.

Table 2. ꜰᴏʀᴄᴇ **metaphor in Conservative Party discourse.**

Patterns	%	Metaphorical collocations	Tokens	%
Exerting force on the crisis: VERB + CRISIS and its noun variants	70.9	*įveikti krizę* (to defeat the crisis) *krizės įveikimas* (defeat of the crisis)	113	72.5
		(su)valdyti krizę (to manage the crisis) *krizės (su)valdymas* (management of the crisis)	32	20.5
		apsaugoti/gelbėti šalį/valstybę/žmones nuo krizės (to protect/rescue the country/state/people from the crisis)	6	3.8
		nepasiduoti krizei (not to surrender to the crisis)	3	1.9
		kovoti su krize (to fight the crisis)	2	1.3
			156	**100**
The crisis exerts force on someone or something: CRISIS + VERB and its noun variants	29.1	*krizė paveikė, lėmė, darė įtaką, sukėlė, privertė, pavertė* (the crisis affected, conditioned, influenced, caused, forced, turned into) *krizės įtaka* (influence of the crisis)	40	62.5
		krizė smogė (the crisis hit) *krizės smūgis* (a hit delivered by the crisis)	9	14
		krizės grėsmė (the threat of the crisis)	6	9.4
		krizės iššūkiai, išmėginimai (challenges posed by the crisis)	5	7.8
		krizės žala (damage inflicted by the crisis), *krizė – bomba* (the crisis as a bomb causing damage)	4	6.3
			64	**100**

For example, *krizė paveikė, lėmė, darė įtaką, sukėlė, privertė, pavertė* (*the crisis affected, conditioned, influenced, caused, forced, made*). They constitute 62.5% of this pattern. In contrast to the mentioned verbs, which are likely to have a more or less neutral character, most other collocation groups tend to assume a rather aggressive character which can be illustrated by the usage of such verbs and their noun derivatives as *smogė* (*hit*)*, smūgis* (*hit* as a noun)*, grėsmė* (*threat*)*, žala* (*damage inflicted by the crisis*)*, bomba* (*crisis as a bomb*).

Although the ꜰᴏʀᴄᴇ metaphor ranks number three in the opposition's discourse, it nevertheless plays a prominent role in conceptualizing the economic recession. The first pattern, VERB + CRISIS, makes up 58.6%, while the pattern CRISIS +

VERB constitutes about 41.4% of all ꜰᴏʀᴄᴇ metaphorical expressions (see Table 3). Clearly, the opposition does not exhibit a marked preference for either pattern.

Table 3 indicates that, similarly to the leading party, the most common collocation which falls under the first pattern is *įveikti krizę* (*to defeat the crisis*), constituting 61.5% of the metaphorical expressions of this pattern. In contrast to the leading party, the opposition clearly emphasises the process of fighting the crisis (*kovoti su krize*), which makes up 16.7%. The collocations which have to do with *managing the crisis* (*(su)valdyti krizę, krizės (su)valdymas*), *protecting the country and rescuing its people from the crisis* (*apsaugoti/ gelbėti šalį/valstybę/žmones nuo krizės*)*, not surrendering to the crisis* (*nepasiduoti krizei*),

Table 3. FORCE **metaphor in opposition parties discourse.**

Patterns	%	Metaphorical collocations	Tokens	%
Exerting force on the crisis: VERB + CRISIS and its noun variants	58.6	*įveikti krizę (to defeat the crisis)* *krizės įveikimas (defeat of the crisis)* *pergalė (victory)*	48	61.5
		kovoti su krize (to fight the crisis)	13	16.7
		(su)valdyti krizę (to manage the crisis) *krizės (su)valdymas (management of the crisis)*	7	9
		apsaugoti/gelbėti šalį/valstybę/žmones nuo krizės (to protect/rescue the country/state/people from the crisis)	5	6.4
		nepasiduoti krizei (not to surrender to the crisis)	3	3.8
		krizė – skydas (crisis as a shield)	2	2.6
			78	**100**
The crisis exerts force on someone or something: CRISIS + VERB and its noun variants	41.4	*krizė paveikė, lėmė, darė įtaką, sukėlė, privertė, pavertė (the crisis affected, conditioned, influenced, caused, forced, turned into)* *krizės įtaka (influence of the crisis)*	25	45.5
		krizė smogė, smaugia, dusina (the crisis hit, strangles, chokes) *krizės smūgis (a hit delivered by crisis)*	12	21.8
		krizės grėsmė (the threat of the crisis)	12	21.8
		krizės žala (damage inflicted by the crisis)	3	5.5
		krizės iššūkiai, išmėginimai (challenges posed by the crisis)	2	3.6
		krizės įkaitai (hostages of the crisis)	1	1.8
			55	**100**

or *the crisis as a shield* (*krizė – skydas*) constitute a minor part of all metaphorical expressions used in this pattern.

Consider the pattern CRISIS + VERB, in which the collocations *krizė paveikė, lėmė, darė įtaką, sukėlė, privertė, pavertė* (*the crisis affected, conditioned, influenced, caused, forced, turned into*) and *krizės įtaka* (*influence of the crisis*) are apparently used most often (45.5%). Next to them, both groups of collocations *krizė smogė* (*the crisis hit*), *smaugia* (*strangles*), *dusina* (*chokes*), *krizės smūgis* (*a hit delivered by the crisis*) and *krizės grėsmė* (*the threat of the crisis*) constitute 12% each and seem to play a significant part in the opposition discourse.

The FORCE metaphor ranks second in the discourse of the media. Unlike the discourses of the Conservative Party and the opposition, the media discourse distinguishes itself in shifting the balance of the two patterns. Hence, the pattern VERB + CRISIS (48.9%) becomes less numerous than the pattern CRISIS + VERB (51.2%), as seen in Table 4. Although the difference is not statistically significant, it is likely to show the tendency to conceptualize the economic recession differently, by switching the focus to other aspects than those discussed by the opposition and particularly the Conservative Party.

The results obtained when analysing the

Table 4. FORCE **metaphor in media discourse.**

Patterns	%	Metaphorical collocations	Tokens	%
Exerting force on the crisis: VERB + CRISIS and its noun variants	48.9	*įveikti krizę* (to defeat the crisis) *krizės įveikimas* (defeat of the crisis)	38	59.4
		apsaugoti/gelbėti šalį/valstybę/žmones nuo krizės (to protect/rescue the country/state/people from the crisis)	12	18.8
		(su)valdyti krizę (manage the crisis) *krizės (su)valdymas* (management of the crisis)	10	15.6
		kovoti su krize (to fight the crisis)	4	6.2
			64	**100**
The crisis exerts force on someone or something: CRISIS + VERB and its noun variants	51.1	*Krizė smogia* (strikes), *trenkia* (hits), *išnaikina* (demolishes), *griauna* (destroys), *žlugdo* (ruins), *sukrečia* (shocks), *drasko* (tears), *apspardo* (kicks), *trenkia su beisbolo lazda* (hits with a baseball bat) *krizės smūgis* (a hit delivered by the crisis)	29	43.3
		krizės grėsmė (the threat of the crisis)	18	26.9
		krizė paveikė, lėmė, darė įtaką, sukėlė, privertė, pavertė (crisis affected, conditioned, influenced, caused, forced, turned into) *krizės įtaka* (influence of the crisis)	17	25.3
		krizės žala (damage inflicted by the crisis)	2	3
		krizės iššūkiai, išmėginimai (challenges posed by the crisis)	1	1.5
			67	**100**

pattern VERB + CRISIS in the discourse of the media were similar to those found previously; the most numerous collocations, *įveikti krizę* (*to defeat the crisis*) and *krizės įveikimas* (*defeat of the crisis*), make up a significant part of this pattern (59.4%, as cf. 72.5% and 61.5% of the Conservatives and the opposition, respectively). The collocations which are related to *protecting the country* and *rescuing its people* constitute 18.8%. A similar number of crisis collocations related to its *management* was also found—15.6%. The collocation *to fight the crisis* (*kovoti su krize*), which is abundant in the discourse of the opposition, is of rather minor importance in comparison with other collocations.

Conversely to the discourses of the Conservative Party and the opposition, the media discourse distinguishes itself in shifting the focus to the pattern CRISIS + VERB. Here the emphasis is laid on collocations carrying strong connotations of an openly aggressive character. The following collocations with the word *crisis*—*smogia* (*strikes*)*, trenkia* (*hits*)*, išnaikina* (*demolishes*)*, griauna* (*destroys*)*, žlugdo* (*ruins*)*, sukrečia* (*shocks*)*, drasko* (*tears*)*, apspardo* (*kicks*)*, trenkia su beisbolo lazda* (*hits with a baseball bat*)—constitute 43.3%. Also, unlike the preceding discourses, the words collocating with *threat* (*krizės grėsmė*) make up the second largest group (26.9%). The collocations exhibiting a more neutral

type of force exertion, which prevail in the preceding discourses, come third, constituting 25.3%. The rhetorical implications of the aggressive character are discussed in the following part of the paper.

The *Explained* stage

The third stage of CMA is integrally related to an attempt to explain the relation between metaphor and its persuasive power. As Charteris-Black (2005: 9) claims, persuasion is seen as "an interactive communicative process in which a message sender aims to influence the beliefs, attitudes and behaviour of the message receiver." In politics, politicians stand for the message sender, whereas the electorate stands for the message receiver. By expressing their opinion on one or another political, social or cultural issue, politicians consciously and/or subconsciously try to make the electorate believe them and at the same time seek to persuade it to delegate the legal right and weighty responsibility to run the country to them, i.e., to vote for them in the upcoming election. This influence is exercised through the process of legitimization and delegitimization, i.e., by presenting themselves in a positive light and by unveiling the negative characteristics of their opponents. Revisiting Aristotle's view on rhetoric, Charteris-Black (2009: 99) suggests that there are several main strategies of legitimization in political discourse. First, politicians legitimize themselves by taking a morally worthy stance, or *ethos*; next, politicians' arguments should be supported with proofs, or *logos*; and what a politician says or how he behaves should arouse the feelings, or *pathos*. Charteris-Black considerably advances classical rhetoric theory by attaching an important role to metaphor in political argumentations

and proposing that metaphor "mediates between these conscious and unconscious means of persuasion—between *logos* and *pathos*, or in other words, cognition and emotion to create a moral perspective on life (or *ethos*)" (2005: 13). In other words, metaphor is likely to be a mediator between cognition and ideology with its conscious sets of ideas, beliefs and values, on the one hand, and emotion which creates political myth, on the other.

The results of the conducted research confirm the idea that metaphor is one of the most powerful and effective tools of legitimization and delegitimization. Taking into consideration that the FORCE metaphor manifestations constitute one-third of all metaphorical expressions in the discourse of the Conservative Party, it is evident that this party seeks to legitimize itself via this metaphor. Consequently, the question arises about its possible reasons for consciously or subconsciously choosing the FORCE metaphor for this purpose. De Landtsheer (2009: 66–69) argues that metaphors have different rhetorical power and divides them into six categories, attaching the highest power to category 6. She attributes FORCE metaphors (she names them *disaster* and *violence* metaphors) to category 4, and points out that the threatening character of these metaphors implies a stronger emotional involvement of the message sender (politicians) and the message receiver (the ordinary people). Thus, by employing the FORCE metaphor, the conservatives attempt to present themselves as powerful and ready to take the necessary measures while at the same time expecting to arouse the empathy of the electorate. Moreover, repetition of the same metaphorical expressions has persuasive power. As Edelman (1988) put it, repetition of the same utterances and formulae is a classi-

cal part of political spectacle and it has the power to make the audience drowsy.

There is an obvious correlation between the frequency of metaphorical FORCE expressions, their rhetorical power as indicated by De Landtsheer (2009), and the situation of the economic recession, which can be perceived as a critical and high-pressure situation resulting in hard-to-predict consequences. Hence, the extremely frequent use of this metaphor by the Conservative Party first of all indicates their attempts to appeal to morality (*ethos*). By acclaiming themselves as the saviours of the country (by protecting the country from the ongoing severe economic recession), they are likely to show that they feel the moral responsibility to tackle the crisis. By presenting themselves as morally worthy and capable of dealing with the economic recession, they try to appeal to the electorate's emotions and convince them that their decision to elect the Conservative Party was prudent. The following examples are clear illustrations of their attempts to legitimize themselves.

(1) *Dabartinį ūkio nuosmukį įveiksime visomis priemonėmis skatindami eksportą, remdami eksportuojančias įmones.* (2009-11-11) [*We will defeat the economic fall/crisis² by using all means to encourage export and by supporting exporting companies.*]

(2) *Telkianti darbui lyderystė padės įveikti visas krizes.* (2008-11-08) [*The leadership which summons us to work will help to defeat all crises.*]

(3) *Taip, mes galime įveikti ekonominį sunkmetį, taip, mes galime apsivalyti ir*

išsišluoti, taip, mes galime eiti permainų keliu. (2008-11-25) [*Yes, we can defeat the economic crisis; yes, we can sweep our country clean; yes, we can take the road of changes.*]

(4) *[...] turime intelektinį potencialą įveikti labai gilią krizę;* (2009-12-02) [*... we have intellectual potential for defeating a very deep crisis.*]

(5) *Šitokia situacija valstybės finansų reikaluose galėtų virsti didžiule grėsme mūsų gyvenimui, jeigu naujoji Vyriausybė nesiimtų radikalių priemonių krizės įveikimui.* (2008-11-08) [*This situation in the financial sector could become a serious threat to our lives if the new Government³ doesn't introduce radical measures to defeat the crisis.*]

(6) *Krizės įveikimo planas artimiausiam laikotarpiui ir visai tolesnei veiklai – yra pamatinis dalykas.* (2008-11-08) [*The plan of the crisis defeat for the nearest future and further actions is the foundation for everything.*]

(7) *Įveikėme krizę todėl, kad jos neišsigandome ir neišsigandome atsakomybės.* (2010-04-15) [*We have defeated the crisis just because we didn't get frightened of it and we didn't get frightened of responsibility.*]

These examples are just a few of many using the metaphorical expression *įveikti krizę* (*to defeat the crisis*). The use of the first-person plural reference *we* combined with future tense in examples (1) and (2) indicates the message sender's moral commitment to tackle the economic recession, whereas the assertive use of the verbs *gal-*

---

² Some translations of the examples may sound awkward in English. All examples were translated by the author.

³ For which read the Conservative Party.

ime (*can*) and *turime* (have) in examples (3) and (4) shows the emphasis on capability to do it. Although example (5) speaks about their determination and ability to overcome the recession, it stands out from the preceding because it is based on antithesis: in the if-clause the leading party introduces the potential serious threat the country faces, whereas the main clause introduces them as fighters who are not afraid to take responsibility. Similarly, with example (6), the conservatives legitimize themselves by claiming that they know how to solve the economic recession because they have a plan which is consequently conceptualized via the BUILDING metaphor—it is the *foundation* of economic revival. Examples (1–6) are taken from the period which can be described as the beginning of the economic recession in Lithuania, therefore, they focus on the measures which will be taken against the recession. In contrast, example (7), which is taken from the late period of the economic recession, demonstrates the completed action, i.e., the leading party has successfully dealt with the recession. The use of the past tense supports the argument (or *logos*), which means that facts and figures indicate the end of the economic recession. In this sentence *logos* works towards confirming their *ethos*, or moral values of responsibility: the Conservative Party has succeeded in managing the recession because they are responsible citizens.

The current findings, which suggest the ample usage of FORCE metaphorical expressions, are backed up by other research; Cibulskienė (2002) focused on the election discourse of Lithuanian political parties and presented results showing that the discourse of the Conservative Party was distinguished by its heavy use of aggressive, full-of-pathos WAR metaphors as compared to other political parties. Lakoff (1995) claims that in the cognitive structures of conservatives there is the conceptual metaphor of MORAL STRENGTH. The point of it is that evil has to be fought and it has to be defeated by any means; if you want to be morally strong, ruthless behaviour against evil is justified. Thus, the frequency of FORCE metaphors points to the conservatives' determination to deal with the economic recession by any means.

Moreover, the ratio between the two patterns used—i.e., *Exerting force on the crisis* (almost 71%) and *The crisis exerts its force on someone or something* (about 29%; see Table 2)—indicates a strong preference for the first pattern, which in turn once more indicates the conservatives' endeavour to appeal to the electorate as being strong enough to tackle the economic recession. Considering the originality of the metaphorical expressions, it has to be noted that the FORCE metaphor obviously lacks novel metaphorical expressions, and that mostly conventional metaphorical expressions are employed in the discourse of the leading party. Also, the conventional metaphorical expressions seem to be reiterated very often. For instance, the metaphorical collocation *įveikti krizę* (*to defeat the crisis*) and its derivative noun collocation *krizės įveikimas* (*the defeat of the crisis*) were used 41 and 72 times, respectively. Although original metaphors seem to be rare, they are mostly of an extended type and stand out in the discourse. Consider the following extended FORCE metaphor:

(8) *Krizės perspektyva verčia jaustis, tarsi sėdėtume ant bombos su laikrodiniu mechanizmu, kuris jau yra paleistas. Kaip gerame trileryje, mes bandome rasti tą laidelį, kurį nukirpus laikrodinis mechanizmas išsijungtų. Be abejo, tai rizikinga,*

bet dar blogiau būtų nieko nedaryti. (2008-11-17) [*The crisis perspective makes us feel like <u>we are sitting on a time bomb which is ready to go off</u> at any moment. Like in a good thriller, we are trying to <u>find the right wire to cut to defuse the bomb</u>. It is undoubtedly risky, but it would be worse to do nothing.*]

This is an example of Pattern 2, *The crisis exerts its force on someone or something*, which focuses on the imminent threat the crisis might pose. The crisis is conceptualized as a high-explosive bomb, and the conservatives present themselves as taking on the huge responsibility of disabling the countdown mechanism. This metaphor is based on the sharp contrast between the bomb threat and the heroic sacrifice made by the leading party. By implying their readiness to sacrifice themselves in order to save the country from the economic recession, the conservatives present themselves as being morally worthy (*ethos*) and seek to appeal to the electorate's emotions, i.e., to establish *pathos*.

The number of metaphorical tokens of the FORCE metaphor in the opposition discourse seems to indicate that it is not the metaphor by which they seek to legitimize themselves. Rather, the process of legitimization and delegitimization is mostly unfolding through metaphors of JOURNEY and TIME, which are abundant in their metaphorical expressions. Nevertheless, the FORCE metaphor, being the third most common in their discourse, cannot be considered unimportant. If we compare the opposition's realization of this metaphor with the Conservative Party's, a superficial look might suggest similar results. An in-depth analysis, however, suggests a slightly different perspective. First of all, the ratio

between the two patterns used by the Opposition tends to be different, as it draws on Pattern 1 less frequently than the leading party. Although this difference is not enormous, it turns out to be statistically significant, with a chi-square of 5.72 (should be at least 3.841). This can lead to the tentative conclusion that the opposition may be focusing less on devising active means to tackle the recession (cf. Pattern 1) than on adopting a passive stance—the economic recession is inevitable (Pattern 2).

Moreover, not only a numerical difference was observed in the use of the two patterns, but also the different plausible reasons why the opposition uses the FORCE metaphor were pinpointed. In the conservatives' discourse, most metaphorical expressions of the first pattern are used to legitimize themselves, i.e., they carry a positive connotation; whereas the opposition discourse of the first pattern appears substantially different because a great variety of Pattern 1 metaphorical expressions are used to blame the leading party for taking inappropriate measures to tackle the recession—i.e., to delegitimize the leading party. Consider the following examples:

(9) *Na, pasakykite man, kodėl Vokietija, Didžioji Britanija, siekdamos <u>įveikti krizę</u>, mažina pridėtinės vertės mokestį, o Lietuva, atvirkščiai – jį didina? Ar vadovaudamasi tokia buhalterine logika A. Kubiliaus Vyriausybė iš tiesų <u>įveiks krizę</u>? O gal atvirkščiai – ją dar pagilins?* (2010-01-14) [*Tell me why in attempt to <u>defeat the crisis</u> Germany, Great Britain are decreasing the VAT, while Lithuania is doing the opposite—is increasing it? Is Kubilius's Government really going to <u>defeat the crisis</u> if it applies this bookkeeping logic? Or will it do the opposite and deepen it?*]

(10) *[…] būtina, kad būsimoji Vyriausybė iš tiesų norėtų <u>įveikti krizę</u>, o jos sprendimai ne gąsdintų mus visus, dar labiau stiprintų biurokratiją bei skurdintų Lietuvos žmones ar „dusintų" verslą, bet padėtų jam ir visiems Lietuvos žmonėms išgyventi artėjantį sunkmetį.* (2010-01-14) [*… it is necessary that the Government would really wish to <u>defeat the crisis</u> and that its solutions wouldn't scare us all and increase bureaucracy, impoverish the Lithuanian people and "choke business to death," but rather would help business and all Lithuanian people to survive the approaching crisis.*]

These and similar examples illustrate the opposition's serious doubts about the incumbent government's ability to overcome the economic recession in Lithuania. Three sequential questions with the metaphorical expression *to defeat the crisis* in one of them combined with the phrase *iš tiesų* (*really*), which adds some uncertainty (9), are aimed to arouse the electorate's grave suspicions about the Government's actions. Also, the words *iš tiesų norėtų įveikti krizę* (*would really wish to defeat the crisis*) in example (10) cast doubt on the fundamental aims of the leading party. Moreover, the metaphorical expression *defeat the crisis* is placed here in antithesis, where on the one hand, all the negative consequences of how the leading party is managing the recession are listed, while on the other, a positive ideal way to govern is proposed which is clearly not ascribed to the leading party. The usage of antithesis and rhetorical questions confirms Charteris-Black's (2006: 29) idea that metaphors do not stand alone in political argumentation, but are often used in combination with other rhetorical strategies.

Examples (11) and (12) are perfect illustrations of how irony is used for delegitimization:

(11) *Maža to, Vyriausybės iššvaistyti dešimtys milijonų litų, skirti propagandai apie butaforinį pagerėjimą ir pasakėčioms apie tai, kaip gerai A. Kubiliaus komanda <u>susidoroja su krize</u>, gali išprovokuoti dar didesnę vidaus krizę, ypač žmonių kišenėse.* (2011-04-17) [*In addition, the millions the Government has squandered on propaganda about sham improvements and fables about how well Kubilius's team <u>is tackling the crisis</u> might provoke an even bigger domestic crisis, especially in people's pockets.*]

(12) *Visgi reikia pripažinti, jog konservatoriai meistriškai „išdūrė" ir užliuliavo tautą bei privertė visus dar kartą patikėti, jog jie išlieka didžiausiais ir realiausias mesijais, <u>išgelbėsiančiais mus nuo krizės</u> ir kitokių sunkumų. Deja, toli gražu...* (2009-06-19) [*However, we have to acknowledge that the conservatives have tricked us so well, lulling the nation and making us believe once again that they are still the greatest and most likely messiahs, <u>saving us from the crisis</u> and other hardships. Unfortunately, far from it...*]

Here, irony communicates the negative attitude of the opposition to the leading party. Example (11) presents the Prime Minister, Kubilius, as telling tales about non-existant improvements. When used in political discourse, *fable*, a type of literary genre which is purely fictional, implies an ironical attitude. The word *sham* also conveys a fictional narrative. Example (12) is on the verge of sarcasm, as it employs the image of a saviour, realized via the lexeme

messiah, and which is an obvious allusion to religious discourse. The notion of *messiah* combined with *tricking* and *lulling* acquires a strong negative connotational power and obviously delegitimizes the leading party.

Pattern 2 is realized similarly to the Conservative Party. The opposition elaborates on the consequences of the recession. However, the concept of a threat is particularly noticeable in their discourse. The focus, however, is different—it is not so much concerned with the apparent threat that the recession poses as with the threat of the recession being escalated by the conservatives. Consider the following examples:

(13) *Lietuva g<u>ąsdinama krize</u>. Kasdien ir metodiškai.* (2009-02-09) [*Lithuania <u>is being threatened with the crisis</u>. Every day and methodically.*]

(14) *Visuomenei reikia daugiau pozityvios informacijos, o ne vien tik <u>gąsdinimų vis nesibaigiančia krize</u> ir niūriu rytojumi.* (2009-12-23) [*The society needs more positive information, not only <u>threats of a never-ending crisis</u> and a gloomy tomorrow.*]

The shift of the patterns in the media discourse, as discussed above, is likely to show the attitude of the third participant in the analyzed discourses. If the Conservative Party tries to legitimize itself by focusing on the first pattern, saying that they are strong enough to cope with the recession, and if the opposition tries to delegitimize the Conservative Party by using the first pattern and emphasizing their inability to cope with the economic recession, it is apparent that they are fighting against each other in order to persuade the electorate to vote for them in the upcoming election. As the media is not interested in being elected,

its functions are different than those of the politicians. First of all, it has to present factual information; next, it has to protect the public interest and mould its opinion; and finally, it wants to entertain the public. The difference between the analyzed parties and the media discourses lies in the extent to which they can express their opinion. It has to be admitted that affiliation to a particular party limits politicians' freedom to express their individual, non-party opinion, whereas journalists are supposed to be fairly free to express their own viewpoint on the ongoing economic recession. The fact that the media puts almost equal importance on both patterns might indicate that the media displays a variety of viewpoints which seem to be balanced in both patterns.

If we consider Pattern 1, it appears that metaphorical expressions are mostly conventional and used in more or less neutral contexts. It seems that the media are presenting factual information about what attempts are being made to tackle the economic recession in the country. Interestingly, such metaphorical expressions as *įveikti krizę* (*to defeat the crisis*)*, krizės įveikimas* (*defeat of the crisis*)*, (su)valdyti krizę* (*manage the crisis*)*, and krizės (su)valdymas* (*management of the crisis*) become intertextual, as they seem to be borrowed from the discourses of the leading party or the opposing parties and cited in the media discourse. As a consequence, this pattern clearly lacks the evaluation which is so characteristic of the previously analyzed discourses.

If Pattern 1 is an example of neutral context and intertextuality, Pattern 2 sharply distinguishes itself from the analyzed discourses in several aspects. First, the Conservative Party and the opposition's discourses focus on the use of conventional

metaphorical expressions such as *krizė paveikė* (*the crisis affected*)*, lėmė* (*conditioned*)*, darė įtaką* (*influenced*)*, sukėlė* (*caused*)*, privertė* (*forced*)*,* and *pavertė* (*turned into*). The media discourse, on the other hand, places a heavy emphasis on the crisis behaving in an aggressive way: *krizė smogė* (*the crisis hit*)*, griauna* (*demolishes*)*, naikina* (*destroys*)*, drasko* (*tears*)*, dusina* (*chokes*). These metaphorical expressions constitute more than 43% of all metaphorical expressions following this pattern, which hints at the importance the media attach to the economic recession. Consider the following examples:

(15) *Kodėl artėjanti <u>krizė smogs be gailesčio?</u>* (2008-10-07) [*Why will the approaching <u>crisis hit us without mercy?</u>*]

(16) *Bet juk ir laukti, kol <u>krizė kals Lietuvai trim beisbolo lazdomis per galvą</u>, nieko nedarydamas A.Kubilius negali.* (2008-11-18) [*But Kubilius cannot wait and do nothing until the <u>crisis hits Lithuania on the head with three baseball bats</u>.*]

(17) *Šiuo atveju laikraščių leidybos pelnas <u>besišvaistantiesiems krizės kirviu</u> būtų kitoks, daugiau politinis, o to sandėrio mastai – siaubingai dideli ir pavojingi.* (2009-01-21) [*In this case, the revenue of publishing would be different for those who <u>are brandishing the crisis axe</u>, more political, while the extent of the bargain would be disastrously huge and dangerous.*]

Novel or original metaphorical expressions underlying the FORCE metaphor stand out in the media discourse. The reasons for this salient feature might be different, but journalists' creativity and originality in attempting to appeal to the audience is not the least factor.

Concluding reflections

The findings of the research point towards the idea that different political "players" (the governing party, the opposing parties, and journalists) construct the 2008–2011 economic recession in Lithuania differently. Although all of them comprehend it via the same conceptual metaphor of FORCE, the metaphorical expressions used by the three socio-political groups constitute different scenarios, which carry different rhetorical implications.

The frequency of the FORCE metaphor in the conservatives' discourse indicates their attempts to legitimize themselves as being morally worthy of taking on the responsibility (*ethos*) and being capable of tackling the economic recession (*pathos*). The metaphor of MORAL STRENGTH comes into focus.

The opposition discourse distinguishes itself in using the FORCE metaphor mainly for the opposite purpose—to delegitimize the leading party. The contextual environment of irony, rhetorical questions, antithesis, etc., in which the metaphors appear suggests the opposition's negative attitude and criticism levelled against the means developed by the leading party to overcome the economic recession.

The different ratio between the two patterns in the analyzed discourses leads to a tentative conclusion that the focus on Pattern 1 in the conservatives' discourse indicates their active stance in political processes, while the opposition appears to focus less on devising active means to tackle the economic recession (Pattern 1) than on adopting a passive stance—the recession is inevitable (Pattern 2).

The analysis of the media discourse indicates a balance between Pattern 1 and Pattern 2 which might suggest the diversity of viewpoints reflecting the seemingly objective stance of the media. Furthermore, the FORCE metaphorical expressions used in the media can be divided into those which are citations of politicians (intertextuality) and those which are original, created for a particular purpose and having fairly aggressive connotations, i.e., which express the journalists' points of view.

Although the FORCE metaphor prevails in the discourse of the Conservative Party and it is one of the most important metaphors in the discourses of the opposition and the media, there are other significant metaphors also used to conceptualize the economic recession in Lithuanian socio-political discourse. For example, the conceptual metaphors of JOURNEY, ILLNESS and NATURAL PHENOMENON are abundant in metaphorical expressions and their scenarios are likely to be more developed. Thus, further research must be undertaken to obtain an overall picture of the recession metaphors.

References

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

CIBULSKIENĖ, J., 2012. Metaphors of economic and financial crisis: Identified, Interpreted and Explained. *Respectus Philologicus,* 22(27), 156–166.

CHARTERIS-BLACK, J., 2009. Metaphor and political communication. *In*: A. MUSOLFF and J. ZINKEN (eds.), *Metaphor and Discourse.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 97–115.

CHARTERIS-BLACK, J., 2005. *Politicians and Rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

DE LANDTSHEER, C., 2009. Collecting Political Meaning from the Count of Metaphor. *In*: A. MUSOLFF and J. ZINKEN (eds.), *Metaphor and Discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

EDELMAN, M., 1988. *Constructing the Political Spectacle*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

EVANS, V.; GREEN, M., 2006. *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

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

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

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

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

PRAGGLEJAZ, 2007. A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol,* 22(1), 1–39.

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

STEEN, G.; DORST, A.; HERRMANN, B.; KAAL, A.; KRENNMAYR, T.; PASMA, T., 2010. *A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

TALMY, L., 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Jurga Cibulskienė

Lietuvos edukologijos universitetas, Lietuva

Moksliniai interesai: kognityvinė semantika, konceptualioji metafora, politinis diskursas

EKONOMINĖS KRIZĖS KONCEPTUALIZAVIMAS *JĖGOS* METAFORA

Santrauka

Kognityvinės metaforos tyrėjai suvokia metaforą ne tik kaip galimybę kalbėti apie gyvenimo įvykius, bet ir kaip mąstymo būdą: idėjų jungimą, abstrakčių ir sudėtingų minčių paaiškinimą, informacijos ir emocijų perteikimą, t. t. Metafora – itin populiarus kognityvinių tyrimų objektas. Politiniame diskurse metafora suvokiama kaip ideologinė priemonė, kuria siekiama paveikti, įtikinti ir manipuliuoti žmonėmis. Pasak J. Charteriso-Blacko, politikai stengiasi parodyti save itin teigiamai, t. y. legitimuotis įrodymais, atskleidžiančiais jų lyderiavimo charizmatiškumą, gebėjimus tinkamai valdyti šalį. Legitimizacija yra neatsiejama nuo delegitimizacijos, t. y. neigiamo „kito“ pristatymo. Tad pagrindinė metaforos, kognityvinio ideologijos mechanizmo, funkcija yra savęs teigiamas parodymas, o kitų – neigiamas. Straipsnyje analizuojama, kaip, konceptualizuojant pasaulinę ekonominę krizę, trys Lietuvos sociopolitinės grupės (valdančioji partija, opozicija ir žiniasklaida) legitimizuoja save ir delegitimizuoja oponentus naudodami JĖGOS metaforą. Tyrimas rodo, kad ta pačia konceptualiąja metafora grindžiama ir legitimizacija, ir delegitimizacija. Tačiau metaforos veikimo scenarijus skirtingas, skiriasi trijų sociopolitinių grupių diskursų retorinės implikacijos.

KEY WORDS: ekonominė recesija, kritinė metaforų analizė (CMA), JĖGOS metafora, legitimizacija, delegitimizacija.

Jurga Cibulskienė

Litewski Uniwersytet Nauk Edukacyjnych, Litwa

Zainteresowania naukowe: semantyka kognitywna, metafora konceptualna, dyskurs polityczny

METAFORA *SIŁY* W KONCEPTUALIZACJI KRYZYSU GOSPODARCZEGO

Streszczenie

Badacze metafory kognitywnej traktują metaforę nie tylko jako dogodny sposób opisu rzeczywistych zdarzeń, ale też jako sposób myślenia o tych zdarzeniach: łączenie idei, objaśnianie pojęć abstrakcyjnych i skomplikowanych idei, przekazywanie informacji i emocji, etc. Metafora w prawdziwym życiu coraz częściej staje się przedmiotem badań kognitywnych. W dyskursie politycznym metafora jest pojmowana jako narzędzie ideologiczne, za pomocą którego dąży się do wywierania wpływu, perswazji i manipulacji. Jak twierdzi Charteris-Black, politycy starają się przedstawić siebie w korzystnym świetle, innymi słowy – dążą do legitymizacji własnej osoby, np. dostarczając dowodów na to, że są charyzmatycznymi przywódcami potrafiącymi należycie rządzić państwem. Legitymizacja jest nierozerwalnie związana z delegitymizacją, tj. przedstawianiem „innego” w negatywnym świetle. Tak więc funkcją metafory, będącej kognitywnym mechanizmem ideologii, jest pozytywna autoprezentacja oraz doszukiwanie się ujemnych cech u innych osób. W niniejszym opracowaniu zaprezentowano wyniki badania dotyczącego sposobów autolegitymizacji trzech grup społeczno-politycznych na Litwie (partii rządzącej, opozycji i mass mediów) i delegitymizacji oponentów z wykorzystaniem metafory SIŁY jako konceptualizacji światowego kryzysu gospodarczego. Wyniki badania dowodzą, że mimo zastosowania tej samej metafory konceptualnej dla legitymizacji i delegitymizacji scenariusz jej działania jest zupełnie inny, różne są także jego implikacje retoryczne w dyskursach trzech grup społeczno-politycznych.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: kryzys gospodarczy, krytyczna analiza metafory, metafora SIŁY, legitymizacja, delegitymizacja.