

**A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF METAPHOR IN SELECTED
ACCEPTANCE AND INAUGURAL SPEECHES OF PRESIDENT GOODLUCK
JONATHAN AND PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA**

BY

Halima Morenikeji LAWAN

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERARY STUDIES
FACULTY OF ARTS
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA-NIGERIA**

JANUARY, 2016

**A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF METAPHOR IN SELECTED
ACCEPTANCE AND INAUGURAL SPEECHES OF PRESIDENT GOODLUCK
JONATHAN AND PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA**

BY

**Halima Morenikeji LAWAN
MA/ARTS/2921/2011-12**

**A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF POSTGRADUATE
STUDIES**

AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA, NIGERIA

**IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD
OF A**

MASTER OF ARTS (ENGLISH) DEGREE

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERARY STUDIES
FACULTY OF ARTS**

AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA NIGERIA

JANUARY, 2016

DECLARATION

I declare that the work in this dissertation entitled **A Critical Discourse Analysis of Metaphor in Selected Acceptance and Inaugural Speeches of President Goodluck Jonathan and President Barack Obama** has been carried out by me in the Department of English Language. The information derived from the literature has been duly acknowledged in the text and a list of references provided. No part of this thesis was previously presented for another degree or diploma at this or any other institution.

HALIMA MORENIKEJI, LAWAN

CERTIFICATION

This dissertation entitled **A Critical Discourse Analysis of Metaphor in Selected Acceptance and Inaugural Speeches of President Goodluck Jonathan and President Barack Obama** by Halima Morenikeji Lawan meets the regulations governing the award of the Masters of Arts Degree of the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

Dr S. A. Abaya
Chairman, Supervisory Committee

Date

Dr Amodu Jonah
Member, Supervisory Committee

Date

Dr A. A. Liman
Head of Department of English

Date

Prof. K. Bala
Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies

Date

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to Almighty Allah and the loving memory of my Dad.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My heartfelt appreciation goes to my supervisors: first Dr S.A. Abaya (I really appreciate your contribution and the promptness in attending to my work. Most of the time I was the one who delayed submitting my file, but hardly did it stay with you longer than necessary. Thank you for your dedication to my work.) and to Dr Amodu Jonah (words cannot be enough to express my gratitude to you; not only did you give me the materials I needed for the work, but also you sacrificed your time and energy to see my work take a good shape, Thank you Sir.)

Members of the 2011/2012 masters class, I tremendously enjoyed the exchange of ideas. To Abdul, thank you very much for always being on the net to source the material for me as you added a great deal to my work, your contribution, time and energy helped me a great deal. God bless you.

To my father and brothers I thank you for all your support. To my very good friends Bully, Shaddy, David and all, I say thank you for being there and helping out especially Shaddy for allowing me to use the e-library at any point in time. You are the best. To Mr Ola thank you very much for going through my work all the way without any complaint.

Lastly to my mother who encourage and fought for me in all aspects, may Allah continue to bless and protect you always.

ABSTRACT

In recent times, there has been a pragmatic shift in the interest of linguists from language form to language functions especially from Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) perspective. Several attempts have been made by scholars to investigate what people do when they use language. The use of metaphor in speeches abounds as studies carried out by Lakoff (1980) and Barbour (1974) suggests that metaphor goes beyond aesthetics and colouration in language use; but performs meaning beyond the surface level. The purpose of this work therefore is to analyse through Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA) which is an aspect of CDA, the metaphoric use of language in President Goodluck Jonathan and President Barack Obama's acceptance and inaugural speeches. The speeches were carefully selected and the study paid attention to the functions and roles metaphors play in speeches and cohesively, the different forms of metaphors used in the speeches. With a total of twelve (12) types of metaphors used, the study finds out that metaphors perform different functions besides being element of literary aesthetic or verbose display of intellect in language proficiency. These functions include the ability to establish common ground, the tendency to create ambiguous and obscure statements, the ability to use metaphoric language as elements of lies and deception and other functions. In the light of the above findings, the study concludes that the use of metaphoric language (pointing to different types of metaphors) in the analysed presidential speeches performs two major functions: the pragmatical, power relation and the political— that is the supposition of interaction that displays social relations and power differential and struggle. It is pragmatical when the choice of metaphor only performs the function of emphasising the truth-value of a statement but by default, utterances do not correspond with semantic interpretations; it is that of power when its use exercises power, shows power struggle or a power differential and it is political when the use is aimed at persuading and winning support, lying or deceiving the public.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page	i
Declaration	ii
Certification	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements.....	v
Abstract	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables	x

CHAPTER ONE

1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Background of the Study	2
1.3 Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.4 Research Questions	6
1.5 Aim and Objectives.....	6
1.6 Significance of the Study	7
1.7 Scope and Delimitation.....	7
1.8 Justification for the Study	8

CHAPTER TWO : LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Preamble	10
2.2 Previous Studies on Political Language.....	10
2.3 Relationship between Language and Politics	12
2.4 An Overview of Political Discourse	14
2.4.1 Presidential Speeches as a Form of Political Discourse	15
2.5 What Is Metaphor? (Metaphor as a Linguistic Concept).....	17
2.5.1 What Metaphor Is Not? (By Thomas Hohstadt)	19

2.5.2	Theories of Metaphor.....	22
2.5.3	Different Forms/ Types of Metaphor	28
2.5.4	Scope of Metaphor.....	35
2.5.5	The Study of Metaphor in the Domain of Political Discourse.....	36
2.6	The Emergence and Development of Critical Discourse Analysis.....	38
2.7	Different Approaches to the Study of Critical Discourse Analysis	40
2.8	Critical Discourse Analysis and the Analysis of Political Speech.....	42
2.9	Critical Metaphor Analysis	44
2.10	Theoretical Framework.....	49

CHAPTER THREE : METHODOLOGY

3.1	Sources of Data.....	51
3.2	Method of Data Collection.....	51
3.3	Sample and Sample Procedure.....	52

CHAPTER FOUR : DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1	Preamble	54
4.2	The Different Forms of Metaphor Used in the Speeches	54
4.3	The Functions and Role Metaphors Performs in the Speeches.....	56
4.3.1	Metaphor as a Means of Establishing a Common Ground	57
4.3.2	Metaphor as a Form of Ambiguity.....	59
4.3.3	War Metaphor	60
4.3.4	Journey Metaphor	62
4.3.5	Oriental Metaphor (More Is Up; Less Is Down).....	65
4.3.6	Ontological Metaphors.....	66
4.3.7	Conventional/ Creative Metaphor.....	68
4.3.8	Building Metaphors	69
4.3.9	Story Metaphors.....	70

4.4	The Differences and Similarities between Obama’s and Jonathan’s Use of Metaphors	72
4.4.1	Differences and Similarities in the Use of Metaphors by Obama and Jonathan	73
4.4.2	Findings.....	74

CHAPTER FIVE : SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.1	Preamble	77
5.2	Summary.....	77
5.3	Conclusion and Suggestion.....	77
	References	81
	Appendices	86

LIST OF TABLES

Table	55
4.2.1: The Different Forms of Metaphor used in Barack Obama’s Speeches	55
4.2.2: The Different Forms of metaphor used in President Goodluck Jonathan’s Speeches.....	56

CHAPTER ONE

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This study emphasizes the use of metaphor in presidential speeches. Critical Discourse Analysis and other methodologies are used in order to explicate the different communicative and social functions of metaphor in the speeches analysed. Language is a vital tool for communication and most of our social lives depend on the use of language or speaking with one another. Language is a means of communication within a speech community and it helps to establish and maintain relationships among people or a group of people in a given society. The mind of one human can reach the mind of another by the process of speaking. Speaking is the cement that holds friendships, families, communities, Societies, and governments together (Philips et al, 1985).

People have to engage themselves in communication for any meaningful development or change to take place in the environment. At a formal level of interaction, there are several forms of public discourse these are, sermons, motivational speech, paper presentations, debates, political speech etc. Schaffner (1996) supports the fact that language is an important factor in political speeches; he opines that “any political action is prepared, accompanied, controlled, and influenced by language”.

Politics is an act or science of influencing people’s beliefs on a civic level when there are more than two people involved. Politics itself is a mixture of the high and the low. It is the realm in which people attempt to make real some of their highest aspirations: their desire for political freedom, longing for justice, hope for peace and security. At the same time, politics is laced with individual and group seeking their selfish interests at the expense of others Lasswell (1978).

Politics is also a struggle for power in order to put certain political, economic and social ideas into practice Bayram (2011). In this process, language plays a crucial role. The aim of

political speeches is to persuade the audience on the validity of political claims. However, it is a challenging task, because the audiences of political speeches are broad which makes the language use in such a domain complicated.

Political speeches aim at a wide range of audience; hence, language use in the hands of politicians stands a risk of being misinterpreted if not properly rendered. Orwell (1946) concludes that English language is appalling. He also criticised the English of his time by citing examples from “verbal false limbs”, “pretentious dictions”, “meaningless words” and “dying metaphors”. These features outlined by Orwell, are some of the ways language is used to deceive people by those in power. The language used by those in power is what Orwell termed as “Newspeak”. But to a politician, this kind of language is risk free. It commits the speaker to nothing. A clear language is risky to a politician.

Delivering a speech is very important to any politician; to a President, the task of making a speech begins during their acceptance and inauguration speech. Thus, this study carried out a Critical Discourse Analysis of metaphoric language use in Presidential Speeches. The study employs as case studies, the acceptance and inaugural speeches of Nigeria’s President, Dr Goodluck Jonathan and President Barack Obama of the United States of America. The former was sworn in as the first South-South elected President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria on the 29th of May, 2011 after emerging as the winner in the 2011 April general elections on the platform of the People’s Democratic Party while the latter who was also sworn-in as the 44th and (the 1st African- American) President of the United State of America in 2009 after emerging as the winner in 2008 November election on the Democrats platform.

1.2 Background of the Study

A universal concept of every natural language is that it is able to express metaphor, especially in Indo-European languages e.g. English, French, German, Greek etc. All these languages abound with examples of metaphor, even in non-literary context in the description or

comparison of one thing (person, object, experience, concept, and place) in terms of another. Most languages have the ability to use metaphor; however, languages may differ to a large extent on how they express metaphor due to its phenomenon of creative dynamism. The way a French speaker will use metaphor in speech is quite different from how a native speaker of English, Chinese, Yoruba, Hausa, and Igbo will use it.

One interesting problem in language study is the use of metaphor in all walks of life. One of its mysteries is the public confusion in encountering metaphorical expressions that says something that is different from what it really means, and that is why Hawkes (1980:1) says metaphor is a “language which does not mean what it says”. This fact indicates that the user of metaphor looks like a liar or deceiver. For instance, when Romeo said to Juliet ‘your eyes are homes of silent prayers’, he did not actually mean to say Juliet’s eyes is a place/home to make prayers, or when Juliet said to Romeo ‘the light that shines from your eyes’, she did not also mean to say that Romeo’s eyeballs is radiating or shining on the chamber they stayed. When a poet says or writes “the wind is a bird”, s/he did not mean to say that the wind has wings and tail to flap around. These examples are part of many examples that creates the impression of metaphor as an expression full of ‘absurdity and falsity’ Max-Black (1993:21). The use of metaphor by politicians in various speeches to achieve different communicative functions spurs up the desire to find out the different strategies and the role metaphor play in President Goodluck Jonathan’s and President Barack Obama’s acceptance and inaugural speeches. A linguistic analysis of political speeches cannot be successful without relating the details of linguistic behaviour to political behaviour. In order to achieve this, Bayram (2010) suggests two methods in which an analysis can integrate linguistic behaviour with political behaviour. The first method is to state the analysis from the linguistic micro-level and ask which strategic functions specific structures (word choice, syntactic structure) fulfil. While the second method is to start the analysis from macro-level, that is, the communicative

situation and the function of the text, then ask which linguistic structures have been chosen to fulfil the different functions.

Interestingly, the choice to adopt both President Goodluck and Barack Obama speeches, as the experimental subjects of this research is clearly defined by what their presidency means to the average citizens of their respective country. They represent change and transformation to their respective citizens and these they have promised to achieve, for the people in their inaugural speeches. Thus, this study finds out their communicative competence and all linguistic characteristics that were employed by both presidents to achieve their goals, especially metaphors and metaphoric elements and this, the research work adopts the second method of analysis (macro-level).

The emphasis on this study is therefore on the use of metaphor in presidential speeches. CDA and other methodologies were employed in order to explicate the different communicative and social functions metaphor performs in these speeches.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Metaphor is a universal linguistic device. In literary use, metaphor is defined as an indirect comparison between two or more seemingly unrelated subjects typically using “is a” to join the first subject, for example “Abdul is a wolf”. This is an elliptical form compared to simile sentence “Abdul is like a wolf”. Metaphor is commonly confused with simile, which compares two subjects using “like” or “as”, an example of simile “she’s as white as snow”. Metaphor simply takes form: “the first subject is a second subject”. Subroto (1986:45) said that metaphorical expression can be categorised as metaphor if it can give a new enjoyment in reading language expression, kicking out monotony and enlivening inanimate object, and actualising something that which actually crippled or paralysed. Metaphor seems direct, easy to understand and analyse but it goes beyond that. Lakoff and Johnson gives a different

picture of what metaphor entails. In their book “*Metaphors We Live By*” talks about the cognitive study of metaphor. They claim that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but also in thoughts and action. In essence, metaphor goes beyond a sentence like “man is a wolf” or “Abdul is a wolf”. The essence of metaphor is to understand and experience one kind of thing in terms of another. Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 3-5).

The outstanding uniqueness and specification of metaphor has made it a tool for politicians to pass on their messages through speech to the public. The choice of metaphor in political speech is not only dependent on its grammatical significance but more importantly for an implicit political action driven by the need to maintain power through the skilful use of language.

A political speech being what it is, is a form of social mass communication, usually made considering some vital linguistic features ranging from dictions to syntax and semantics. But a clever observation is the common use of metaphors as a formidable device in most political speeches as a way of strengthening the (unit of) message contained in the speech. This has consequently pre-empts the normative conception of metaphors as being a linguistic concept strictly within the domain of literature and literary postulations. That is, metaphor is no longer literature-centred but also features as subject to grammatical occupation especially since a political speech is grammatically focused. Hence, understanding the functional nature of metaphors in political speeches whether it is simply a literary device or a pure grammatical establishment will greatly help in understanding the implicit and explicit messages contained in the speeches. And perhaps such understanding might even allow for the audience to uncover the true intentions of the speech giver by simply understanding the metaphors and their implications. For these reasons stated above and more, this study intends to investigate, identify and analyse the use of metaphors by Obama and Jonathan and further more discuss the different types of metaphors and the manner in which they are used in these presidential

speeches. However, in order to achieve all of these, the following questions become critical and discourse imperative to this research.

1.4 Research Questions

The following, are the research questions to guide the study:

- (i) How do metaphors work in acceptance and inaugural speeches?
- (ii) What are the different techniques used by these presidents to reflect metaphor in their speeches?
- (iii) To what extent is power exercised through the choice of different forms of metaphoric language use in presidential speech?
- (iv) What are similarities or differences that exist between the speech of the president of Nigeria and United States of America in their use of metaphor?
- (v) What are the political implications of metaphor as a means of exercising power in the presidents' speeches?

1.5 Aim and Objectives

This study aims at carrying out a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of metaphor in the presidential speeches of Nigeria's and United States of America's president. Thus, the objectives of this study include the following:

- i) To analyse how metaphor works in presidential speeches.
- ii) To identify the different techniques employed by both presidents to bring about metaphor.
- iii) To describe how power is exercised through the different choice of metaphor in presidential speech.

- iv) To identify the similarities and differences in the use of metaphor by the president of Nigeria and the United States of America.
- v) To indicate the political implications of the exercise of power through the choice of metaphor by the presidents.

1.6 Significance of the Study

Several researches have been carried out on political discourse such as Geis (1987), Fairclough (1989), Wilson (1990), Van Dijk(1993), Hamba (2010), Hawkes (1980), Abaya (2011), Ahmed (2012),and Josiah (2012).Interestingly, none of these studies above used CMA as their theoretical framework in analysing metaphor in political discourse. This research, therefore, aims at filling this vacuum left by previous studies thereby adding fresh ideas to existing literature on language and political discourse.

This study is approached from a Critical Metaphorical Analysis perspective, as a preferred theoretical framework which will significantly help language researchers, especially those interested in metaphors and other language and literary figurative elements be acquainted with a new and certainly interesting model to analyse discourses as against the flowery areas of Discourse Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis.

This research also open up a new field of interest to linguists to explore different functions metaphor performs in sentences and utterances. This research therefore will be a reference material to students of critical discourse analysis, pragmatics and language of politics as well as those interested in the analysis of political discourse.

1.7 Scope and Delimitation

This research intends to analyse the acceptance and inauguration speeches of President Goodluck Jonathan of Nigeria and President Barack Obama of United States of America

respectively, mainly as sample texts for the research and further more as items of political similitude from two different Presidents from different countries and continent in the hope that the research will bring to fore that metaphor is a common phenomenon shared by politicians in their speeches anywhere in the world. For an in-depth analysis, this research limits itself to the analysis of only four (4) speeches. Two speeches from each president are sampled due to time constraint and for the ease of research and for scholarly-adequate analysis to be carried out. The linguistic element that is analysed is metaphor. The analysis employs the three parameters put forward by Charteris-Black (2004) for critical metaphor analysis of political discourse as proposed under Critical Discourse Analysis.

1.8 Justification for the Study

Speeches especially by Presidents of nations are given to communicate with the people. These speeches are resourceful measures often delivered with charisma and eloquent grandiosity by the addressee to create an effect in the psychological register of the people. These speeches usually employ literary tropes and figurative devices; especially metaphors, to create formal aesthetics and help paint words into pictures in the mind of the people. One thing presidential speeches world over, have in common is the true fact that, they carry promises and message of hope. Quite a number of research works have been carried out by several linguist and researchers revealing the different forms, types and functions metaphors play in a political speech, indicating the various types of the metaphors and focusing on a couple of them (2-3 types) but only a few of these works have actually worked on all the forms and types of the metaphors in one speech and analyse them all. It is even quite notable that the few who have tried analysing metaphors, have done so using other linguistic phenomenon as their theoretical framework. None has sufficiently and effectively used the Critical Metaphorical Analysis as the theoretical structure of analysis, more so, on speeches

by either, President Goodluck or President Obama. Thus, this research justifies the use of metaphors in certain Presidential speeches of President Obama and President Jonathan –both relevant to the political history of their countries as first time president from a particular race or region—and uncover: if these metaphors are deliberately employed or just their way subconsciously into the minds of the speech-maker/writers, If the employment of metaphors in the speech is well intended or just an item of language beautification further showing power elements and differentials, If these agreement speeches and all its message of promises and hope are delivered in a vacuum, If the aesthetic effects employed in the speech are deliberate elements of lies and deceit and If without literary tropes and figurative devices, especially metaphors, the speeches will remain smart and sensible and still bear the message of promises and hope.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Preamble

This chapter reviews studies on political discourse and language of politics. The emphasis is on the works of several scholars who have examined the language of politics in the time past. Political discourse or language of politics has become an essential part of the twenty first century consumption pattern and this has led to a number of academic and textual analyses to reflect different perspective as they affect and relate to language use.

2.2 Previous Studies on Political Language

Various linguists and scholars have created excellent scholarship and analysis on Political Discourse and the relationship between Language and Politics. Scholars like Ayeomoni (2005), Jimoh (2008), Akodu (2008), Abaya (2011), Abdulrasheed (2011), Ugbong (2011) and so many others have worked on this area.

Ayeomani (2005) worked on linguistic-stylistic investigation of the language of Nigerian political elite. In his work, he discusses that the language of the political elite in Nigeria is excessively figurative and metaphorical. Thus, the political elite use these features of language towards acquisition and consolidation of power and also towards achieving their political aims. Jimoh (2008) on the other hand worked on a Critical Discourse Analysis of Political issues on Ondo State in selected Nigerian newspapers. Jimoh holds forth that both linguistic features of lexis could be linked with extra-linguistic events in a manner that reveal a socio-cognitive interface between language and politics; to show how CDA can be helpful in the interpretation of text, how the role of context is quite significant to the interpretation of political discourse, how pragmatic interpretation is equally relevant in the analysis of discourse and how manipulative and bias political figures can be. Akodu (2008) also carried

out an analysis of ambiguity in political discourse in selected Nigerian newspapers. Akodu's work was within the realm of pragmatics. She debates that ambiguity is a key factor of language of politics; she also stressed the fact that it is mostly used as a strategy by politicians to create confusion and misrepresentation of meaning in the interpretation of political discourse.

Abaya (2011) also worked in the range of pragmatics; his work was on pragmatic analysis of military coup discourse/speeches with examples from Nigerian military coup announcements. Abaya postulates that military background and formats of coup announcements share a lot of features of language and politics such as how the military coup announcements are used for sensitisation, appeal, persuasion or sway the public to support the overthrow of either military or civilian governments.

Anifowose's work which was reviewed in Abdurashheed (2011), focused on the analysis of memoranda from the Federal House of Representative, Abuja, Nigeria. From the study, memoranda are measured to be an aspect of political discourse. This is so because, memoranda are employed to make people believe in a certain ideology and to persuade people to take a certain course of action. Ubong (2012) also worked within the ambit of pragmatics, and his work is on the pragmatic analysis of President Goodluck Jonathan and Barack Obama's inaugural addresses. In his work, shows the importance of pragmatics in human communication or interaction using the speech act theory depending on context, situation and shared previous knowledge of both the speakers and hearers. For instance, the research revealed that socio-cultural and the socio-political differences of the speakers are displayed in their speech act.

This work although on political discourse analysis is quite different from the other works reviewed above. Primarily, this work analyses the use of metaphor in presidential speech of Goodluck Jonathan of Nigeria and Barack Obama of the United States of America. The

analysis of this work falls within the ambit of Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA) an analysis element under the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA).

The Relationship between Language and Politics, Political Discourse, Critical Discourse Analysis and Metaphor

Under this section, the following topics are reviewed, ranging from the relationship between language and politics, an overview of political discourse, presidential speeches as a form of political discourse, what metaphor is and what it is not?, theories of metaphor, different forms/types of metaphor, critical discourse analysis and the analysis of political speeches, the emergence and development of critical discourse analysis, the different approaches to the study of critical discourse analysis, critical metaphorical analysis and the different approaches to the study of critical metaphor analysis.

2.3 Relationship between Language and Politics

According to Aristotle as cited in Anifowose (2005), “man is self-preserving by nature”. Man thinks and acts (whether as an individual or as a group) with foremost regard for his interest, in addition to this his general awareness of how much can be achieved by selection of language appropriate to each kind of occasion/situation. Therefore, of all the resources available to man, his most cherished explored and exploited resource is language.

Language provides man with variant selections and possibilities which he uses language to manipulate and control people to achieve desired interest, which are often politically inclined. Language therefore, is the hallmark of political activity. Harris (1979) cited in Lekan (2003) states that “language is the means by which political ideas are transmitted to the community”. In order to know the relationship between language and politics, one must know the definition of both Language and Politics.

Language does not have a single definition that adequately addresses it, but quite a number of linguists have given different definitions of it. Robins (1979) defines language as a symbol system based on pure or arbitrary conventions...infinitely extendable and modifiable according to the changing needs of the conditions of the speakers. This definition indicates that it is impossible to enhance any form of social, economical, emotional and political relations in a society without the use of language.

While Essien (2003:14) defines language as “a system of structural arbitrary vocal symbols by means of which human beings make meaning and communicate, meet, interact with each other in a given community”. The two definitions are explicit enough, showing that language is a system, that is, it incorporates rules and principles in which sounds, structures, and meanings are integrated for communication. Man is specie endowed with the ability to receive and produce language to enable him co-exist with others. Language can be used positively to teach, explain, direct, inspire, encourage, or negatively to mislead, deceive, manipulate, lie etc. thus, language creates power and become an area where power can be applied as evident in the role it plays in politics.

Politics on the other hand, can be seen as an act of managing issues or affairs in a given society. Hann (1998) cited in Abaya (2008) defines politics “as a process of solving problems... and these process take place through communication.

There is surely a link between language and politics since the process of politicking is achieved through communication. Language is basically the vehicle that gives politics expression. It is impossible for political ideas and discourse to be disseminated in a society without the use of language.

Chilton (2004:5) defines politics on two levels. First, “as a struggle for power between those who seek to assert and maintain their power; and those who seek to resist it” and second, “as cooperation, as the practices and institutions a society has for resolving clashes of interest

over money, power, liberty and so on. The first definition indicates that power struggling or the struggle for power is the essences of politics, while the second definition views politics as the management of conflicting interest in a non-violent manner indicating examples of what the cause of conflicts may be. As stated earlier, language is just the vehicle that gives expression to politics.

The study of the relationship between language and politics is not a new field of venture, as Essien (2003), Bayram (2010) and Abaya (2011) all believe that the study of the relationship between the two concepts was made prominent within the field of linguistics by Sapir and Whorf in their study of language and thought popularly known as Sapir-Whorfian hypothesis. Pierre (2000) was explicit enough to say that language is not only a means of communication in political discourse, but also an instrument of symbolic power by which individuals pursue their interest. Based on the awareness of the close relationship between language and politics, the researcher is convinced that metaphor as an element of language cannot be objectively used by politicians for its grammatical function. There will be factors that will accompany its usage which could be as a result of power.

2.4 An Overview of Political Discourse

The easiest and not altogether misguided answer is that political discourse is identified by its actors or authors, viz, and politicians. Indeed, the vast bulk of studies of political discourse are about the text and talk of professional politicians or political institutions, such as presidents, and prime ministers and other members of government, parliament or political parties, both at the local, national and international levels. However, limiting the definition of political discourse to mainly the principle actors and authors is like reducing the actual picture of what political discourse really entails. As such, for a broader coverage of what

political discourse means, the definition should be extended to include every relevant participants whether or not they are directly involved in the professional art of politics.

Based on this proposition, Schaffer (1996) states that the identification of what is a political discourse should be on the function and the focus of the discourse. The function will be whether the discourse performs a certain political action even if a politician does not present it, but the point that it performs a political action can be viewed to be a political discourse. The theme deals with any topic that has a relationship with politics, such as political ideas, political relations, or political future. Accordingly, all the following can be classified as political discourse: parliamentary debates, law, constitution, propaganda, media interviews, presidential speeches and so on. This study focuses on presidential speeches.

2.4.1 Presidential Speeches as a Form of Political Discourse

Presidential speeches consist of the genres of political discourse which is the focus of this study. Ubong (2012) sees a presidential speech as part of political affairs where the leader expresses appreciation to people and vow to be committed to the course of transforming and taking responsibility for their nations respectively. Akmal (2010) sees presidential speech as a part of political state of affairs. Once a person becomes a president, there will always be a time when s/he will have to make a speech. In general, political speeches reflect the values, beliefs and philosophy of a particular group or party. Although, most political speeches have been carefully crafted by talents before they are delivered to the public; most presidential speeches share some common features in the aspect of style, content and rhetoric.

Adetunji (2006:234) is of the view that presidential speeches represent institutional voices because presidents are considered the “most eligible representative of their countries, whose word therefore bear a semantic loads of their nations’ ethos and soul”. Because of this vital function presidential speeches perform, there are many archives of presidential speeches. This has contributed to different linguistic investigations into presidential speeches from

different linguistic enquiries such as pragmatics (Chalton and Schaffner, 1997 Adetunji, 2006), discourse analysis (Miller, 2004 Okpanachi, 2004), and the stylistics (Adegoju, 2005, Oha, 1994). In addition, presidential speeches can be delineated into their thematic preoccupations such as inaugural address, address to party congress, campaign speech, acceptance speech and so on. In this study, we attempt to analyse metaphor in the acceptance and inaugural speeches of Goodluck Jonathan and Barack Obama's.

The content of inaugural is often in touch with times. Many presidents will focus on the major and central subjects that are relevant to their times, because on one hand, an effective public speech is one that is adapted to the need of the audience Katula(2001:18). Inaugurals are designed not just to state the president's political visions and missions, but also to win as much support as possible for his audience for the president Wilson (1994:5-6).

In order to achieve this effectiveness of persuasion; many presidential inaugurals take the advantage of emotional appeals. The president tries to arouse the feeling of his audience, as to attract the attention to listen to what he is talking about, to motivate them and to boost their morale. For example, Barak Obama said

“At this moment America has carried on not simply because of skill or vision of those in high office, but because we, the people have remained faithful to the ideals of our forebears and true to our founding documents....so it has been; so it must be with this generation of Americans.”

Such a sentence shows its powerful persuasiveness with existing emotion. In addition the president also employs a variety of trope such as rhetoric, antithesis, parallelism and metaphor to create the emotional impact and to attain the goal of persuading people to support him. Among these tropes, metaphor appears to be used more widely and serve the purpose more effectively, which to a great extent enhance the force and vividness of language. As Jeffrey and Katz (1996:127) point out that metaphor in politics are applied to convey policies, convince, or persuade the public for action or to characterize political

opponents. Thus, it perfectly emphasises the president's political motivations, as Edelman, (1977:36) argues that metaphors are employed in order to provide the motivation or justification to behave in a particular manner.

However, it helps people interpret the speech in an easy way, as Thompson (1999:186) claims that until and unless that metaphorical leap of understanding is made, there is no participation in politics or political discourse. Also it should be noted that inaugural and acceptance speeches are valuable sources of both historical and comparative data about the country's president which can serve as archive and historical documents for people.

2.5 What Is Metaphor? (Metaphor as a Linguistic Concept)

Metaphor is one subject matter that has been flowery among linguists and quite a number of definitions, views and theories exist in the literature about metaphor. In simple terms, a metaphor compares two objects or things without using the words "as" or "like". However, the concept of metaphor cannot be limited to a simple grammatical function. As it would be verified, metaphor is used for diverse functions which would be inducted in this work. It is a "linguistic, cognitive and logical phenomenon". Hawkes (1972:1), metaphor is derived from the Greek word 'metaphora' meaning "to carry over". This entails the transfer of features of one subject to another such that the latter is seen in the light of the former which is usually much more conventional. Lakoff and Johnson (1987) proposed that human thinking and sense making relies on metaphor, which is then revealed in language. They claim metaphor enables a partial comprehension through the process of imaginative rationality.

They call this an "experientialist synthesis" because they show that our understanding of the world necessarily arises out of our interactions with it. In cognitive linguistic view, metaphor is defined as understanding one conceptual domain (A) in terms of another conceptual domain (B). Kovecses (2002:4) cited in Hu (2010:3) states that the fact that CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN (A) IS CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN (B) is regarded as the conceptual metaphor, in

which, the domain (B) from which one draws metaphorical expression to understand the conceptual domain (A) is called the source domain, while the domain (A) that is understood in this way is called the “target domain”. And the conceptual correspondence between the two domains is referred to as a mapping Kovecses (2006:6). A good example of a metaphorical expression is “THE ARGUMENT IS WAR”, ARGUMENT is the target domain, while WAR is the source domain. Pradopo (1987:66) states categorically, that metaphors consists of two terms that is term or tenor (principal term) and second term or vehicle (secondary term). The main term or tenor talks about the compared entities, while the second term or vehicle talks about the comparison or the things compared. It was then said that metaphors see things by the medium of other entities.

Subroto (1995:38) explains that metaphors are based on two referents. The first referent is called tenor and the second is called vehicle. The similarity of the two referents is the basic builder of metaphor creation. According to him, one important factor in the activity of metaphor is the distance between the tenor and the vehicle. If the distances between the two are close in their similarity level, the metaphor is less expressive and effective. While if the similarity level of both elements is not so real, the metaphor has expressive power. A metaphorical expression like “black wolf” to depict “night shadow” in Arthur Rimbaud’s poem is an example of effective and expressive metaphor Subroto (1995:39). Casaku (2004) states that metaphors help to identify and capture design concepts, as well as define goals and requirements. Casaku and Kreitter (2005) opines that creative thinking enables one to perceive a problem from unorthodox and innovative perspectives, which will enhance their creativity, designers use different types of principles, tools and heuristics such as metaphors. Metaphors can be viewed from two aspects. Firstly, its creativity and true values and secondly, it can also play a role of giving false messages, contradictions and irony because of its flexibilities. From the descriptions above from different scholars on the concept of

metaphor, it can be summed up that the concept of metaphor is complex and interesting, and its description should be from a cross-linguistic approach.

2.5.1 What Metaphor Is Not? (By Thomas Hohstadt)

Thomas Hohstadt (2010) gave couple points and explanation of what he believes metaphor is not. In his words, he states that:

- Metaphors are not part of the literal world. They have nothing to do with language.
- Metaphors are neither, logical ideas, objective truths, nor absolute knowledge.
- Metaphors are not mere figure of speech, descriptive images or colourful language.
- Metaphors are not their message (the truth in metaphor is not space/ time itself).
- Metaphors are not space/ time objects
- Metaphors are neither of us nor by us do (they not submit totally to our control).

(i) The pride of the dictionary.

To begin, metaphor is not "literal." He points out that though metaphor remains the single most important "literary device," it is still not "literal." For "literal" means "not metaphorical." He states that a clever linguist would convince one otherwise. He says "in their literal world, they seek to judge metaphors, but metaphors only judge them. They seek to master metaphors, but metaphors cannot be mastered. After all, the literal world requires matter-of-fact meanings, and metaphor has none of these. The literal world seeks literal "truth," and metaphor has only non-literal truth".

He points out that the dictionary—the ultimate pride of all linguists—contains only "dead" metaphors. Through use and misuse, these metaphors have turned into common "ideas." A "live" metaphor, on the other hand, lies beyond common ideas . . . it ignores the science of the sentence . . . it doesn't "argue about semantics." Indeed, a true metaphor finds its meaning in the very death of these categories. We could say, "Language dies in order to live."

In this rebirth, metaphor passes outside language itself. It is "extralinguistic." It creates new rules, puts forth new realities. Yet, its "other world" domain in no way suggests nonsense. Instead, this "otherness" promises even greater degrees of certainty. He argues that linguists may say, "Yes, but we can at least transcribe or paraphrase the metaphor." Not so. Nonsense does not translate. It does not lend itself to paraphrase. If it does, it was never a true metaphor.

He goes ahead to say that metaphor has nothing to do with language. When it comes to metaphors, we can say "The medium is *not* the message." Metaphor depends, instead, "on the 'pre-semantic surface' of human experience for its power. That's the reason we comprehend metaphor across cross-modal media—moving from seeing to hearing to tasting to feeling to moving.... For metaphor "speaks" in "non-literal" similarities. He states that "Language is a tissue of dead metaphors."

(ii) Logical Illumination?

In this area, he points out that "it makes sense that metaphor does not make sense". He says that metaphors refuse the narrow structure of ideas. It ignores the easy explanation of things we have known before. And it denies the objective "truth" of "absolute" knowledge.

For metaphor is fluid and reflective. It can't be argued with or dismissed like a proposition. It is, instead, illumination, not logic . . . rapture, not reason . . . recognition, not cognition . . . vision, and not report. And, though it may use space-time objects, it is not a space-time object. Metaphor grows totally indispensable when the message is too great or the gap too wide. It's the only way we roll back the frontiers of nonsense. Indeed, "It does not teach by induction or deduction. It teaches by 'abduction'. And, though non-literal, metaphor is always expressive. It speaks directly to the heart. Or, in the words of Blaise Pascal, it speaks to the reasons of the heart, "whereof Reason knows nothing." "(Metaphor) erupts at the surface of consciousness when the crust of reality is too weak to support the status quo."

(iii) "Figures of Speech?"

Here, he says...literal or not, metaphors are loved because they embellish our language. We love to reach into our common basket of decorative images, colourful idioms, and figurative figures. We love to project the illusions and illuminations of our culture with all their possible ornamentations. We project not only the customs and powers of culture; we revel as well in the latest novelties, current fads, superficial makeovers, and cosmetic detours. Yes, many "live" metaphors dance across the land in celebration of our current styles, tastes, and modes. But in all these metaphors serve only self-reflecting mirrors. And their refreshing newness reveals only an emerging triviality. Even linguists have little use for such common sentimentality. And scholars refuse such vacuous divergence. For finally—other than the pleasures of decor—nothing profound happens with these "figures of speech. "There are standards of (spiritual) excellence that transcend both individual tastes and cultural norms.

(iv) Heroic Achievements?

He accepts that metaphors are for us, but they are not of us or by us. He says that their power is not our power. They are neither the fruit of heroic exploits nor the genius of self-will. For the vision in a metaphor is autonomous. It is something spoken to us, not by us to ourselves. In other words, metaphor is not a monologue of reinvented wisdom from the past. It is not a one-way regrouping of former insights. Nor is it a soliloquy of things previously known. We cannot invent Spirit, in other words, nor spiritualize our inventions. For metaphor rises above the pride of our ideas, the projections of our thoughts or the comfort of our opinions; it transcends, as well, the "poetic license" of our subjectivities . . . the assumed anointing of our pent-up passions... and the clever catharsis of our psychological conditions. Woe unto "those who prophesy out of their own mind and heart.

So, metaphor does not submit totally to our control. We "allow" it more than we "elicit" it. For metaphor couples our response to His action. And, since Spirit requires no mediation, the

forms we give metaphors remain secondary. In other words, "No prophecy ever originated because some man willed it." "It never came by human impulse." As a result, the power in metaphor is "confronted" rather than invented. We are the "discoverers" rather than the Creator. "The future does not come as the result of our doing, but must break into the present and transform it."

(v) Artistic Masterpieces?

He points out here that "metaphor/metaphors are not the message. That it has no power in itself. It is not the Truth toward which it points". All the externals to a metaphor—the media, the space/time objects—represent things other than their message. He points out that when Isaiah wrote, "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow," his choice of colours and frozen water had nothing to do with either sin or grace. Isaiah drew a possible likeness from the supposedly alike—though in reality, they are unlike. His metaphor and message were distinct and dissimilar. The Truth of Isaiah's message was even independent of his metaphor.

Today, many complex metaphors may comprise an artistic masterpiece, but even the masterpiece is not their meaning. For truth in a work of art is something not found in the work of art? We may feel its strange seduction, but finally, "Overwhelming beauty points beyond itself". So metaphor is the most profound bridge between our realm and another realm . . . the most unfathomed medium between the world of the observer and something "not there" . . . the most incarnate messenger between paradox and Truth. In other words, it does not exist for itself. It exists only for an interpreter. It has no other reason to exist! "Art is only a means to life, to the life more abundant. It is not in itself the life more abundant."

2.5.2 Theories of Metaphor

Metaphorical use of language can be traced to a much earlier time, theorizing about this subject is believed to have begun with Aristotle (Leezenberg, 2001:15). He is credited for

“initiating a pernicious and all-encompassing Western tradition that treats metaphor not only based on similarity, but also as deviant from literal language, and as a matter of language rather than thought.” He was more concerned with the types of metaphor and the ways in which they work rather than addressing questions like; what makes a good metaphor, what happens to the meanings of the words used figuratively or whether metaphors can be true. In his summation, “all words are either current strange, metaphorical, ornamental, coined, lengthened, contracted, or altered” (Leezenberg, 2001:31).

Aristotle generically defines metaphor as “transference of a name belonging elsewhere”. Described here are both the process of transfer itself and the word being transferred? This definition does not involve referents (things) or meanings (concepts). To him, metaphor simply involves a relocation of words not in a deviant or improper manner but in a new context without suggesting that said word is out of place. He goes ahead to distinguish four types of “metaphorical” transfer; from genus to species that is, using a more generic term instead of the available and more specific one. For instance saying ‘*the senate*’ in place of the ‘*the senate president*’. The second classification is from species to genus, example using a specific number, saying, ‘*a billion thanks*’ for the general ‘*many thanks*’. From species to species involves the use of a different class, ‘*praying for alms*’ as against ‘*begging for alms*’. The fourth transfer is according to the analogous or proportionally. In other words, a transference where there is an equation based on analogy. Not all these transfers would be regarded as metaphor today.

The first two are more of synecdoche and the third metonymy. The fourth type is what scholars today consider a genuine case of metaphor. This view of metaphor as an analogy is what makes Aristotle’s theory a “comparison view of metaphor”. Aristotle requires that a metaphor be appropriate otherwise the utterance will be improper because metaphors put

things “in certain light and thus can give us a specific appreciation of the object described”
Leezenberg, (2001:40).

He also considers metaphor useful and necessary for stylistic purposes because; they make things clearer, they lend a lofty and dignified quality to language, they fill semantic gaps and above all, metaphors can make an unfamiliar object familiar.

In the early part of the twentieth century there arose the Referentialist views on metaphor which describe the effect of a metaphor primarily in terms of a resemblance between the referents of the expressions it contains. Scholars in this school of thought are Cicero, Quintilian, Mooij, etc. They see metaphor as a condensed comparison. To them metaphor originates from a need to express notions for which no words are in existence. In the expression ‘*a rich harvest*’ for instance, use of the more common economic term ‘*rich*’ expresses the magnitude of the harvest.

Cicero defines metaphor “as the compression of a simile into a single word which is put in a ‘strange’ place”. He places no constraints on concepts to be used in either source or target domains. In essence, “we can use the names of anything in nature with respect to something else” Leezenberg, (2001:70). For a metaphor to be considered “good” however, the speaker/writer should avoid false analogy, far-fetched similarities and vulgarity. Simply put, the interpretation and evaluation of a metaphor go hand in hand, such that an incomprehensible metaphor gives no pleasure.

While Quintilian, defines metaphor “as shorter form of simile, while there is this further difference, that in the latter we compare some object to the thing we wish to describe, whereas in the former this object is actually substituted for the thing”. He argues that metaphor is a natural turn in speech and can be used even unconsciously by uneducated persons. It is used for its clarity in meaning and for aesthetic effects.

The Referentialists also posit that the referent of an expression, that is the object denoted determines the interpretation of the metaphor. In the example ‘*Annie is a snake*’, an understanding only comes in line with *Annie* being seen as sharing a property of a *Snake*, that of shrewdness.

Mooij (1976:19) backs this by saying the subject of a metaphor may be “a thing and its properties, a situation and its causes and effects,” but the thing referred to “does not need to exist in reality.” He also sees metaphors as dualistic in that they have a kind of double meaning; the literal and the figurative meaning derived from it. They are in essence a function of the literal interpretation, “since the expressions typically retain their literal reference, as it is the properties of the term as applied literally that determine the metaphorical interpretation” Leezenberg, (2001:72).

There also exists a casual Referentialist account of what metaphor is. Within this framework Davidson (1979) attempts to say what metaphor is by stating what it is not. To him, “metaphor belongs exclusively to the domain of use. It is something brought off by the imaginative employment of words and sentences, and depends entirely on the ordinary meanings of those words and hence on the ordinary meanings of the sentences they comprise” Davidson, (1979:31). He adds that “metaphors mean what the words, in their most literal interpretation, mean, and nothing more.” They lead to insights but they do not express them, rather a metaphor makes the hearer/reader perceive a similarity, or likeness, it does not assert it, but merely invites the hearer/reader to find one. It therefore requires a creative effort on the part of the hearer/reader for interpretation. Davidson sees metaphor as causing or inspiring, rather than as expressing insights into likeness between things, Leezenberg (2001:126).

In the second half of the twentieth century the Descriptivist school began to gain grounds. Scholars like Beardsley (1978), Black (1979) argue that metaphorical interpretation occurs at

another level of meaning that of “sense”, that is, the descriptive information associated with it rather than at the level of reference or extension as the referentialists claim. In other words, metaphorical interpretation involves applying properties that are associated with the word rather than the properties that the object refers to. Metaphor is thus regarded here as word approach rather than thing approach Beardsley (1979) cited in Leezenberg(2001: 79).

This view is referred to as “verbal-opposition theory”, “tension theory” Beardsley, (1962, 1979) and “interaction theory” Black (1962, 1979). In this school of thought, it is argued that metaphor involves a change in meaning or sense and not just in the reference. Such that if we say, “*folake is a lion*” or “*kola is a pig*”, it is not the literal sense of ‘lion’ or ‘pig’ that determines the interpretation but that “lion” or “pig” here acquires a new metaphorical sense. They also hold that dissimilarity plays as much a crucial role as similarity in the recognition of a metaphor. Leezenberg (2001:79) iterates that it is “a lack of similarity, expressed as a logical opposition or semantic clash between the words that warrants the recognition of a metaphor.”

Like in the classical period, metaphor is reduced to the level of simile and vice versa. Metaphor also has a broader sense here. It includes other tropes like simile, irony, metonymy, etc., such that metaphorical change of meaning comes to be seen as a central kind of meaning transfer.

Following the interactionist tradition, metaphor has come to be accepted as essentially cognitive rather than rhetorical, that is, more of a matter of thought than mere expression. An all-encompassing definition of metaphor is not possible because it operates at multiple levels of context, the word, phrasal or sentential levels. Words are seen as tools and have potential uses which only become actualized when used in a particular setting. And on its own, every sentence is potentially ambiguous and can be understood either literally or metaphorically. To buttress this, Cohen and Margalit (1972:736) aptly remark; “in speech it is knowledge of

background facts or of the socio-physical context of utterances, along with certain presumptions of appropriateness, that helps a hearer to recognize whether the speaker intends a literal or a metaphorical meaning of a particular utterance of a word, phrase or sentence.”

This argument forms the basis of what is known as the pragmatic view of metaphor which interprets meaning from the perspective of the speaker/writer than from that of the word, phrase or sentence. To Searle (1981:250), words and sentences have only the meanings that they have but “metaphorical meaning is always speaker’s utterance meaning.” By linking metaphor to the intention of the speaker/writer, the interpreter looks beyond the metaphorical meaning of the words themselves to the context of use.

Macky (1990:56) puts forward an important refinement by introducing the role of analogy. He defines metaphor as “that figurative way of speaking (and meaning) in which a subject is depicted in terms of a symbol, which is related to it by analogy” which is itself defined as “a relationship between two realities in which there are significant similarities and noticeable differences.” One can therefore speak of positive analogies which point out similarities and negative analogies which have to do with differences. Ricoeur, (1977:7) states that, the most intimate and ultimate abode of metaphor “is neither the name, nor the sentence, nor even discourse, but the copula of the verb *to be*. The metaphorical ‘is’ at once signifies both ‘is not’ and ‘is like. In this way, metaphors use multiple analogies, positive, negative and neutral, to both inform and prompt independent thought. Barbour (1974:17), opines that . . . a metaphor proposes analogies between the familiar context of a word and a new context into which it is introduced. There is a tension between affirmation and denial; in other words, both positive and negative analogy is present. For metaphors, as for models, it is the neutral analogy which invites exploration, and which prevents reduction to a set of equivalent literal statements. Metaphors . . . [are] irreducible because they are open-ended.

2.5.3 Different Forms/ Types of Metaphor

Different scholars have proposed the different forms/types of metaphor; however, this study situates its analysis within the model of the forms/types of metaphor proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). Lakoff and Johnson's book talks about the cognitive study on metaphor and states that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but also in thought and action. Below is a brief outline of different forms or types of metaphor proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980).

- (1) **Conceptual metaphors:** Conceptual metaphor is also known or called cognitive metaphor, it is the understanding of one idea, or conceptual domain in terms of another, and for example "price is rising" this is understanding quantity in terms of directionality. Conceptual metaphors are said to be seen in our everyday language and lives. They are said to shape not just our communication, but also shape the way we think and act. In Lakoff and Johnson's book *Metaphor we live by* (1980), explain how metaphor reflects in the everyday language, which in most cases one do not notice. A common example is the statement "Argument is war". This metaphor shapes language in the way one view argument as "war" or a "battle" to be won. It is uncommon to hear someone say "she won the argument" or "she attacked every weak point in her argument". Conceptual metaphors are often used to understand theories and models. It uses one idea and links it to another to better understand the concept.
- (2) **Conventional metaphors and creative metaphors:** a metaphor helps a language user to enhance the expressiveness of s/he message or messages. Conventional metaphors exist at a certain point between literal and metaphorical uses and reflect a process that was originally metaphorical becomes established within a language. Ungerer and Schmid (2001:117) say that they are unconsciously built into the language by long-established conventions and are important. Lakoff and Turner

(1989:55) also assert that a metaphor is conventionalized to the extent that it is automatic, effortless and generally established as a model of thought among members of linguistic community. Generally, there is always not a clear-cut distinction between conventional metaphors and creative metaphors, because of the differences between individuals' experience of language. Lyons(1977) cited in Hu (2010:5) argues that it is impossible to draw a sharp distinction between the spontaneous sex tension of meaning by individual speakers on particular occasions and their use of pre-existing meaning of a lexeme that are to be found in a dictionary. The extent to which a metaphor is active might differ between different individuals of a language; it is also possible between speakers of different languages, for metaphors which have been lexicalized in one language may not overlap with those that have become lexicalized in another. Thus, a conventional metaphor in one language may be an innovative or creative one to a speaker of another language.

- (3) **Structural metaphor:** A structural metaphor is a way of understanding one concept in terms of another. An examination is made of the structured and systematic way that metaphorical concepts work, with a number of examples such as “Rational Argument is War” and “Time is money” to demonstrate the “entailments” (i.e. the systematic relationships between metaphors and their subcategories – for example “Time is money” entails that “Time is a limited resource”, which entails that “Time is a valuable commodity”. Lakoff and Johnson are careful to emphasise that the metaphorical structuring they describe can only ever be partial (time is not *actually* money). In viewing a concept (such as time) with a metaphor, some aspects of that concept are revealed, for instance, the way time is treated as a commodity, and other things are hidden. A different metaphor such as “Time is a landscape we move

through” would reveal other aspects of the concept as in the sense that “my 20th birthday is looming up on the horizon”.

- (4) **Oriental metaphor:** as stated earlier Structural metaphors are a way of understanding one concept (often an abstract one) in terms of another (often a more concrete one). Oriental metaphors can be overlaid on structural metaphors, and often provide a spatial dimension such as “up or down” and “in or out”. The authors say that these Oriental metaphors arise specifically because of the kinds of bodies we have as human beings, and the kind of environments we live in especially as English speakers, meaning, they are *experiential*. Examples of Oriental metaphors are “happy is up; sad is down” and “virtue is up; depravity is down”.
- (5) **Ontological metaphors:** A common way to understanding our experiences in the world is by viewing them as objects, or substances such as “I’ve got a *mountain* of work to do” or “share prices are *falling through the floor*”. This makes them easier to refer to, categorise, and quantify. Lakoff and Johnson reasonably suggest that our experience of objects and our own bodies gives rise to this phenomenon, and they use the term “ontological metaphor”. Ontological metaphors can be containers, for example “how did you *get out of* doing the washing up?”, or “now you’re *in* trouble”. Another example of ontological metaphors is in personification – such as “the cancer caught up with him”, or “his professionalism would not let him cheat”. This is different to metonymy, where an entity is referred to through a related entity. Sometimes the metonymous entity is a part of the whole being referred to. Examples of these are: “the Hereford United manager brought in some muscle to help out the central defence” or the use of “The Press” to refer to a group of journalists, other examples are:

THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS

“...this is a *shaky* argument”, “what’s the *foundation* for that idea?”

IDEAS ARE FOOD

“... I can’t digest your ideas when you say them that quickly”, “that’s food for thought”

LOVE IS A PHYSICAL FORCE

“... I can feel the magnetism between us”, “I’m really attracted to you”

LIFE IS A CONTAINER

“I’ve led a full life”, “there’s no room for you in my life By, Mark Waters (2008)

(6) War Metaphors: the use of “war” as metaphor is an ancient literary and rhetorical trope.

In political usage, war metaphors are used to manage a perceived societal problem, with the concept taking the place of an individual or state enemy in true war. James Childress via www.ask.com describes the use of war as a metaphor as a “dilemma” i.e. in debating social policy through the language of war, the moral reality of war is often forgotten. Lakoff and Johnson in their book “Metaphors We Live by” (1980), provided a stimulating example for this research work in Jimmy Carter’s 1974 speech excerpt “War on Energy Crisis”, whereas (Lakoff and Johnson) described his (Jimmy Carter) application of “war” as a metaphor giving to the energy crisis experienced by his administration in 1974.

They argue that this metaphor determined ways of acting in relation to gas shortages which by implication was creating socio-economic complications for the American society. Lavine Summers in his discourse review of Nell Bernstein’s article “War on Drugs”, further provided an insight to the semantic operation of war as metaphor by explaining simply, how applying the war metaphor to drug problems make dealing with the problems less effective. In answering to the discourse point of view on the article, Summers reports that it is logically apparent that only criminals in this case (drug peddlers) and war criminals, are put in prison, but not sick people; that are put in hospitals. In “Metaphors We Live by” Lakoff and Johnson

describe Jimmy Carter's application of "war" as metaphor for the energy crisis of 1974. Other high-profile examples include the War on Poverty, War on Cancer, War on Drugs, War on Gangs, War on Women, and the War on Christmas. President George W. Bush in 2001 coined the phrase "War on Terrorism" (or "War on Terror") after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Other early examples of war as metaphor in US political discourse include J. Edgar Hoover's "War on Crime" in the 1930s.

(7) Journey Metaphors: The use of "journey" as a metaphor is to motivate the listeners/audience and also paint a picture or visualize on how to manage a perceived communal problem. Politicians employ journey metaphors in their speeches to help the citizen see themselves as travellers who are marching towards a destination where there are difficulties, routes and crossroads but success at the end. For a country to be successful it has to face or encounter challenges, difficulties and trouble along the way. Therefore, journey metaphors are employed in a speech by a political figure to indicate that the citizens/audience are travellers who are travelling to achieve their goals. Lakoff (1993: 227) purports that: it is difficult to find expressions used to talk about the subject of life, which directly or indirectly are not metaphorical in some way. The conceptual metaphor "a purposeful life is a journey" is cited widely in the literature e.g. in Lakoff (1993). This is realized linguistically through the expressions such as "he got a head start in life", "he's without direction in life", and "I am where I want to be in life".

(8) Human Metaphors: According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980) cited in Hu-Xu (2010:14) states that personification is a special type of ontological metaphor where the object is further specified as being a person so that a wide variety of experiences with non-human entities can be described in terms of human motivation, characteristics and activities. Therefore, by adopting the human metaphor, it is possible to make people understand other phenomena in human terms, such as motivation, characteristics and actions. In the political speeches, the

conceptual metaphor **THE NATION IS A PERSON** is often adopted to describe some phenomena. Here, some aspects of a person are mapped onto the nation, which helps people to easily understand several specific concepts of the nation. The following shows the mapping:

Source Domain	Target Domain
Disposition	Quality
Growth	Development
Health and Strength	Economic Condition and Power

At this point, disposition is mapped onto quality, growth is mapped onto development and health and strength is mapped onto economic condition and power.

(9) Story Metaphors:

Story metaphor proposes optimism in the face challenges. It clearly marks the life and time of a people and their preoccupations from time past to present and future possibilities. It is summarily the total existence of a people accessed from socio-cultural perspective. Summarily, a story metaphor explains the life transition of a people from i.e. where they are coming from, where they have been and where they are heading to. A common way of understanding and telling experiences or journey in life is by viewing them as story substances. A story metaphor which is also called a life metaphor gives a short history of the author's journey in life which helps the audience connect and relate to his tale. It makes it possible for the people to understand the journey, huddles, pain, hope and accomplishment of the speaker which brings about understanding and connection between the author and audience. Politician's use story metaphors to carry their audience along and also give them hope on achieving a goal. They break all boundaries by giving every detail of their life history: the bad and ugly periods, tell how hard they had to struggle then link the success to

their present state. They present their audience with possibilities of change and hardship but the hope of a better tomorrow. For example President Goodluck Jonathan's statement "*I was not born rich, and in my youth, I never imagined that I would be where I am today, but not once did I ever give up....*" Adopting a story metaphor simply gives the history or story of the journey of the speaker.

(10) Building metaphors: Building metaphor is another form of conceptual metaphor that indicates the architecture of language use. The structure of a bridge is a good example of what building metaphor is like, this indicates a linkage between two separate phenomena which conceptually cannot hold together or find a common ground of compelling association. Gareth Morgan (1997) in his "Classic Text Images of Organization" explains; that the use of building metaphor implies a way of thinking and a way of seeing that pervade on how we understand our world generally. This form of metaphors uses structures to describe the concept of life. He used the word sponsorship as the logical examples of all the parts that make up a bridge are important. Without one bit, the other bits would either collapse, cease to be functional, or be structurally weakened and he drew up the architectural definitions of:

Support: The structure that props up a bridge. Even if a plank is rested across a gap to make a bridge, the two ends are what provide the support.

Span: Span is defined by *wikipedia* as the distance between two intermediate supports for a structure. The span is a significant factor in finding the strength and size of a beam as it determines the maximum bending moment and deflection.

Foundation: The portion of a structure that transfers the weight of that structure into the ground. What this means in plain terms is that it is the *span* that provides the functional purpose of the bridge, but without the necessary number of *supports* a point of weakness is reached through bending under an unevenly distributed load. None of this will matter if the *foundation* established is not sufficient to carry out the 'heavy lifting' necessary. A bridge as

a fundamental example of the building metaphor, is a structure which enables different functions. As a metaphor, a bridge between people enables the passage of ideas, it connects people who are in different places, it enables help to be connected, it opens up the opportunity for people to be helped, it reduces isolation, it is a more efficient way of getting to another point. It increases the range of options available, and the list continues. The Presidents in their speeches contend that building metaphors are critical in the quest to eradicate extreme poverty. Certainly, just building “bridges” would be an act of folly if they are built with no purpose or are merely ornamental. Perceptively, the process of inquiry of ‘what is not working here, and what are we doing ok at?’ is related to the building metaphor. Metaphorically, building with purpose, is an emphatic message pressed in their respective speeches, which in turn emphasizes direct efforts into strengthening and even crossing the bridges established by others in order to make interests, inquiry and efforts more productive.

2.5.4 Scope of Metaphor

A scope is the summary of a particular concept or topic. It gives an insight and understanding on a particular subject or topic. The scope of metaphor simply means the range of cases, that is, the target domains to which a given source concept applies. In metaphor, what has been observed is that a single source concept can characterize many distinct target domains.

In fact, the specific source domains appear to characterize not just one target concept but several. For example, the concept of “building” applies not only to “theories” but also to “societies”, the concept of “war” applies not only to “argument” but also to “love”, while the concept of “fire” applies not only to “love” but also to “anger”. From all these examples and more, an interesting empirical and theoretical question is asked: how many and what kind of target domains does a single source concept apply to? Since the scope of metaphor handles the range its cases, it give a better answer and understanding to the question raised above.

2.5.5 The Study of Metaphor in the Domain of Political Discourse

There are quite a number of studies on the analysis of metaphor in the domain of politics. Andreas Musoloff's book *Metaphor and Political Discourse* sheds light on the discursive behaviour of metaphor and also highlights the need for rethinking some theoretical claims of cognitive linguistics. Because of the author's impressive expertise which he gained in the area of discourse analysis on the topic of Europe over the years, his corpus-based cognitive analysis constitutes a significant methodological contribution to the study of the dynamics of metaphor. Generally, the book combines the strength of rigorous linguistic methodology with the intuitive insights of cognitive linguistics' view of metaphor, and the result is fascinating, because it provides a new perspective on the study of political discourse.

In Layoff's article, "*Metaphor, Morality, and Politics*", he brought in metaphor into political speeches, and used it as an analytical tool to help people have a better understanding of ideology and value in political speeches. In the article, American government were justifying the war against Iraq, but concealing the fact that it was for its own interest. He pointed out some conceptual metaphors which reveal America's diplomacy to Iraq.

Hu (2001) also studied the rhetoric in politics. In his article "*Rhetoric In Politics and Its Knowledge Spreading*" he studied different political speeches with different backgrounds, and he pointed out that several common forms of rhetoric are often widely used, including metaphors, metonymy, euphemism, repetition and parallelism as well as antithesis or contrast parallelism, which in political speeches have a great deal of powerful effect in the spreading of political knowledge.

Hu also claimed that according to different backgrounds, political rhetoric can be classified into five types, namely, head rhetoric, campaign rhetoric, situation rhetoric, institution rhetoric and opposite rhetoric. Making us understand that political discourse can hardly be carried out effectively without rhetoric.

Cen (2009) also studied different political speeches from pragmatic point view. And he adopted Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP) and Politeness Principle (PP). He states that the maxim of quality in CP requires participants in conversation communication to obey the following rules: (a) do not say what you believe to be false and (b) do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence, as political discourse must be truthful, thus being persuasive, encouraging and convincing.

Edelman (1964, 1971, and 1988) contented, that the core of political communication is the ability of the politician to use metaphor and symbols that awaken latent tendencies among the masses. In Ortony's (1975) compactness thesis, he discussed how metaphors are important in conveying a great deal of information in a concise manner. Edleman (1971:65) state that metaphors and myths are devices for simplifying and giving meaning to complex and bewildering sets of observation that evoke concern. He further suggests that what makes a metaphor effective is that it evokes a part-to-whole relation, which can be seen in two forms. Firstly, a particular metaphor can become symbolic of a broader issue, solving a metaphor at the more local level which addresses the issue at the broader level. This simply means that political metaphors can justify a course of action. A good example is Franklin.D. Roosevelt "...who did this during the great Depression with his new Deal metaphor. The country in the throes of the Depression thought that all hope/directions were lost. When certain specific programs, such as specific public works programs, were put in place, these became metaphors for the large issue of the country. Confidence in the country grew, and the United States was pulled out of the depression. Edelman says that metaphors justify courses of action are especially effective during times of heightened public anxiety, when the public needs to be reassure that there is some sense or organisation to the problem at hand and that the government is addressing it. This may be the reason why the cold war was as successful as a metaphor for the general security of the country, and issues such as defence spending

were accepted by and large, by the public. While the second implication of metaphors is generating a part-to-whole relation is that simple metaphors that render complex issues and understandable make the issues relevant to the general population. These make the public feel a part of the political process and supportive of decisions by political elite Thompson (1996). Edelman (1964) states that the goal of political discourse is not to find novel metaphors that mobilize public opinion but to use simple metaphors that are repeated continuously. He says that politicians often use metaphors that resonate with latent opinions and become symbolic or coded speech. The repetitions of such metaphors result in:

“Dulling the critical faculties rather than awakening them. Chronic repetition of cliches and stale phrases that serve simply to evoke a conditioned, uncritical response is a time-honored habit among politicians and mentally restful one for their audiences. The only information conveyed by speaker who tells an audience of businesspeople that taxes are too high and that public spending is waste is that he is trying to prevent both himself and the audience from thinking and to make all present join a favoured liturgy consisting of the ritualistic denunciation of the symbols taxes and spending” (pp124-125)

Stone (1988:118) makes a connection between political problems and stories. Stories have a beginning, middle and end, with some sort of change or transformation. They also have heroes, villains and victims, with good battling evil. She suggested that: metaphors are important devices for strategic representation policy analysis. On the surface, they simply draw a comparison between one thing and another, but in a more subtle way, they usually imply a whole narrative story and prescription for action. For this reasons, and more, the study identifies the use of metaphor, its context of use and its intended effect in the inaugural and acceptance speeches of Goodluck Jonathan and Barack Obama’s.

2.6 The Emergence and Development of Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) emerged from “Critical Linguistics” (CL) which developed at the University of East Anglia in the 1970’s, presently; the terms are now often interchangeable. Sociolinguists paid little attention to social hierarchy and power. Most

sociolinguistic research at that time aimed at describing and explaining language variation, language change and the structures of communicative interaction, with limited attention to issues of social hierarchy and power Labov (1972).

CDA hitherto referred to as Critical Linguistics (CL) was first re-developed in Lancaster school of linguistics of which Norman Fairclough was the most prominent figure. Ruth Wodak also contributed largely to this field of study. This approach draws from several fields in the humanities and social sciences, such as critical linguistics as stated earlier. Fairclough been the prominent figure in CDA, developed a three dimensional framework for studying and understanding discourse, where the aim was to map three separate forms of analysis onto one another: analysis of (spoken or written) language texts, analysis of discourse practice (processes of text, production, distribution and consumption) and analysis of discursive events as instances of socio-cultural practice. Fairclough combined three levels of analysis for his interpretations. The micro, meso, and macro level. At the micro-level, the analyst considers the text's syntax, metaphoric structure and certain rhetorical devices. While at the meso-level involves studying the text's production and consumption, focusing on how power relations are enacted. And at the macro-level, analysis is concerned with inter-textual understanding/ trying to understand the broad, societal currents that are affecting the text being studied.

The approach draws from social theory and contributions come in from Antonio Gramsci, Louis Althusser, Karlmarx, Michel Foucault, Jurgen Habermas and Pierre Bourdieu in other to examine ideologies and power relations involved in discourse. As a movement, CDA began in 1992, at a meeting in Amsterdam with presentations by Van Dijk, Fairclough, Van leeuwen and Wodak, which was later published as a special issue of *Discourse and Society* (4, 2, 1993). Gradually the group expanded and continued to meet annually from 1992. An early collection of influential papers was published a few years later by Coulthard (1996).

Ever since CDA, became a fast growing increasingly interdisciplinary movement. A large scale interaction conference was held in Valencia in 2004. Also, two journals started in 2004, Critical Discourse Studies and The Journal of Language and politics. So far, critical discourse analysis has moved towards more explicit dialogue between social and practice, greater interdisciplinary approach, contextualization and greater attention to the multimodality of discourse. The theoretical basis to the study of this work is CDA and thus, it is the main theory in which metaphor will be examined and elaborated.

2.7 Different Approaches to the Study of Critical Discourse Analysis

A socio-cognitive model - The main representative of this approach is Teun Van Dijk, most of his critical work focuses on the reproduction of ethnic prejudices and racism in discourse and communication. This model suggests that most of the things or topics people talk about are things that exist in their minds. He aimed at reconstructing ethnic attitudes and ideologies from everyday conversation. An analysis of 'frequent' topics, for example, suggests what speakers 'have on their minds', or as he explains it, "what the hierarchies are of their personal mental models of ethnic events as well as the structures of ethnic attitudes". This simply means people discourse or talk about things based on how important it is listed in their thoughts or mind. Most of his critical works are concerned with prejudice and racism in discourse. One of this uses is the consideration of how Netherlander and Californian Caucasians talk about ethnic minorities and what role these conversations play in the reproduction of ideology. Van Dijk recently has turned to more general questions of abuse of power and the reproduction of inequality through ideologies.

In his view, which integrates elements from his earlier studies on cognition, those who control most dimensions or discourse (preparation, setting, participants, topics, style, rhetoric, interaction, etc.) have the most power. He argues that no direct relation can or should be constructed between discourse structures and social structures, but that they are always

mediated by the interface of personal and social cognition. Cognition, according to van Dijk, is the missing link of many studies in Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis, which fail to show how societal structures influence discourse structures and precisely how societal structures are in turn enacted, instituted, legitimated, confirmed or challenged by text and talk.

Sociological and historical model- Ruth Wodak and her group in Vienna University proposed this model of CDA. They based their model on sociolinguistics in the Bernsteinian tradition, and on the ideas of the Frankfurt school, especially those of Jürgen Habermas. Wodak conducted studies on institutional communication and speech barriers in court, in schools and in hospital clinics, and recently she has focused on sexism, and contemporary anti-Semitism and racism in settings of various degrees of formality. The unique feature of this approach is the attempt to use all the background information in analysing different layers of spoken or written text. Wodak (2002:69-70) gave a couple of features for the historical approach to CDA as follows:

- The approach is interdisciplinary. Wodak like every other linguist acknowledges the intricacy of the relationship between language and society. As a result, she admits that CDA is interdisciplinary in nature.
- She views the interdisciplinary nature at two levels, theory and practice. She combines argumentation theory and rhetoric with Halliday's functional linguistics.
- The Methodology and theory are chosen through eclecticism
- The approach is more of problem oriented rather than emphasizing some special language issues.
- In the approach, the analyst is always on the move between theory and empirical data.
- Historical context goes under investigation then incorporated into analysis of discourse and texts.

Discourse as social practice model- This model is by Norman Fairclough (1985, 1989, 1993) who sees the value of CDA as a method to be used alongside others in research on social and cultural change, and as a resource in struggles against exploitation and domination (1993: 133-134). Fairclough believes that our language shapes our social identities and interactions, knowledge systems, and beliefs, which is also shaped by them in turn. In *Language and Power*, he calls his approach Critical Language study and considers the first aim of his approach as helping to correct the vast negligence in relation to the significance of language in creating, maintaining and changing the social relations of power. And this approach is theoretical in nature, while the second approach is practical in nature. It is about helping to raise awareness to the question that how language can influence the dominance of one group of people over the others. He believes awareness is the first step towards emancipation for it to be able to reach this goal; Fairclough puts a great emphasis on raising the level of people's consciousness.

2.8 Critical Discourse Analysis and the Analysis of Political Speech

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is an interdisciplinary approach to the study of discourse. It views language as a form of social practice and focuses on the ways social and political domination is reproduced by text or talk. Fairclough (1989:20). Wodak and Reisigl (2001:17) observe that "being critical" does not imply the common sense meaning of being negative, rather it means not taking things for granted, opening up complexity, challenging reductionism, dogmatism and dichotomies. It equally means opaque structures of power relations and ideologies manifest.

VanDijk (2001:352) adds that proposing alternatives is also a part of being critical, as we find a more or less critical perspective in such areas as Discourse Analysis (DA), Rhetoric, Stylistics, Sociolinguistics etc. Holmes (2008) also contributed saying, critical discourse analysis differs from methods of describing discourse such as Discourse Analysis (DA) and

Conversational Analysis (CA) on its “critical” stance. “Critical” is specially used to indicate the connections and the things hidden from the audience- such as the connections between language, power and ideology Fairclough (1989). While Van Laeeuwen (2006) says CDA is founded on the insight that text and talk play a key role in maintaining and legitimizing inequality, injustice and oppression in society. CDA basically reveals the hidden motivations behind a text or behind the choice of a particular method of research to interpret that text.

A researcher of Critical Discourse Analysis aims at exposing the ideological and power-driven use of language. The exercise of power in modern society is increasingly achieved through ideology, and more particularly through the ideological workings of language Fairclough (1989:2). A language is not powerful on its own, ‘it gains power by the use powerful people make of it Wodak (2002:10). This shows why CDA often choose the perspective of those who suffer, and critically analyses the language use of those in power and who are responsible for the existence of inequalities. On the bases of the emphasis on analysing the language use of those in power, this study analyses the speeches of President Goodluck Jonathan of Nigeria and Barack Obama of the United States of America.

One of CDA’s interests is the way in which linguistic forms are used in various expressions in the manipulations of power. This study, therefore, seeks to identify the ways in which the listeners are manipulated through the choices of words and constructions particularly how the choice of metaphor is used in showing power differentials, inequality and oppression.

Proponents of CDA are often criticised for putting their ideological agenda upfront as they are often after uncovering operations by those in power. They are accused of being activists instead of analysts. CDA is also criticised for often believing or assuming that there are always hidden ideologies and power dimensions behind discourse. Critics wonder why language can never be considered a neutral object in CDA, Blommert (2000).

Despite all this criticisms, for the past three decade, CDA has still been able to establish itself as a strong discipline in the study of political discourse. In certain analyses, where there is little ambiguity about the political nature of a corpus such as in the analysis of political speeches, CDA tends to provide an appropriate and systematic theoretical framework for the analysis of political discourse. Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA) is one of the several approaches that were derived from CDA. It was developed by Jonathan Charteris-Black as an approach to the analysis of metaphors in political discourse. Its purpose is to identify the intentions and ideologies underlying language use. In this study CMA seem appropriate and will be adopted for the model of analysis.

2.9 Critical Metaphor Analysis

Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA henceforth) is one of the several approaches to Discourse Analysis that is derived from CDA and it was developed by Jonathan Charteris-Black in his Book *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. It is an approach used in analysis metaphor in political speech. The purpose of this methodology is to identify the covert intentions (possibly unconscious) and ideologies underlying language use. CMA consists of three stages: identification, interpretation and the explanation of metaphors. The identification of metaphors deals with determining which metaphors are present in a text, and whether they show semantic tension between a literal source domain and a metaphorical target domain. And the interpretation of metaphors aim at determining the type of social relations that are constructed through the metaphors identified. While the Explanation of metaphors deals with the way metaphors interact within the context in which they occur. The identification stage is divided into two parts: preliminary identification of metaphors, and confirmation of identified metaphors. The first part involves a close reading of the corpus with the aim of identifying the metaphors. This is done based on the criteria included in the definition of metaphor proposed by Charteris-Black:

A metaphor is a linguistic representation that results from the shift in the use of a word or phrase from the context or domain in which it is expected to occur to another context or domain where it is not expected to occur, thereby causing semantic tension. It potentially has linguistic, pragmatic and cognitive characteristics.

Only those metaphors that satisfy these criteria are considered. Meaning, those metaphors showing incongruity or semantic tension (either at linguistic, pragmatic or cognitive levels) resulting from a shift in domain. Metaphors that are frequently used with a metaphoric sense due to the definition above are then classified as metaphor keywords.

The second part consists of selecting which of the metaphors identified in the preliminary stage will be included in the next stage of the analysis. The basis for selecting a given metaphor is whether its use is generally, and not almost always, metaphorical. If its use is almost always metaphorical, it means that there is no longer semantic tension, in which case the metaphor is not included in the final analysis. Charteris-Black recurs to different types of corpora to determine if the word identified as a metaphor in the corpus of the study can be included in the final analysis. To illustrate the identification stage, Charteris-Black gives the example of one of George W. Bush's most frequently used metaphors after the September 11 attacks: "to fight a crusade against terror." To determine whether this would be a metaphor that could be used in a critical metaphor analysis of Bush's speeches, Charteris-Black searches the phrase "crusade against" in the University of Birmingham's Bank of English. His results reveal that the most common words that accompany the phrase are corruption, slavery, communism, abortion, Islam and poverty.

Though the metaphorical use of "crusade against" is more frequent than the Literal use (in the religious sense of the word), it is not frequent enough to say that there is not semantic tension when the phrase is used in cases such as "crusade against slavery" or "crusade against

corruption.” Therefore, it should be included in a critical metaphor analysis of Bush’s speeches. As Charteris-Black asserts:

Even though these metaphoric uses are more frequent in the corpus than literal ones, I propose that they are still metaphoric because a semantic tension results from the use of a term from the domain of religious Struggle in non-religious domain of activity (i.e. social reform).

Charteris-Black argues that any word has the potential to be a metaphor if the context makes it such and if the speaker intends it such. Identifying metaphors this way enables us to determine the proportion of word’s uses that are metaphorical and to exclude literal uses from quantification. Additional corpora provide extensive context to decide whether there is semantic tension that justifies the inclusion of the metaphor in the analysis.

At the interpretation stage, Charteris-Black brings in the cognitive linguistic metaphor theory developed by Lakoff and Johnson. This approach is based on the idea that the human mind is inherently embodied, thought is mainly unconscious, and abstract concepts are fundamentally metaphorical. The Interpretation consists of establishing a relationship between metaphors and their cognitive and pragmatic factors. It involves the identification of conceptual metaphors, and the consideration of their roles in constructing socially relevant representations. For example, in the speech of George W. Bush’s metaphor “to fight a crusade against terror,” Charteris-Black identifies the conceptual metaphor POLITICS IS RELIGION. He argues that “in order to make a claim for a conceptual metaphor, there is necessarily a need for other linguistic forms that are motivated by the same idea.” Thus, for example, he finds evidence of POLITICS IS RELIGION in Bush’s famous phrase “the axis of evil, “as well as in other phrases. Therefore, POLITICS IS RELIGION would be a good conceptual metaphor worth considering in the analysis of Bush’s political discourse. The last stage of CMA is based on the explanation of ideological motivations of language use. When

we identify, in a political speech, the words that come from the semantic field of conflict, we find that some of them are literal while others are metaphorical. According to Charteris-Black, the mere fact of identifying a conceptual metaphor, such as POLITICS IS CONFLICT, does not only constitute a way of interpreting the interrelation between literal and metaphorical words, but it is also a way of explaining essential differences in ideological points of view. Meaning, one politician may often recur to POLITICS IS ETHICS while another one may use POLITICS IS CONFLICT. Each of these conceptual metaphors reveals a different ideological motivation. Charteris-Black defines ideology as “a belief system through which a particular social group creates the meaning that justify its existence to itself. To him, ideology “is therefore an exercise in self-legitimization”. This definition expands Martin Seliger’s conception of ideology, and fits the definition given by Robert Hodge and Gunther Kress. Seliger In his book *Ideology and Politics* defines ideologies as:

“Sets of ideas by which men posit, explain and justify end and means of organized social action, and specifically political action, irrespective of whether such action aims to preserve, amend, uproot or rebuild a given social order” cited in (Moreno2008)

While for Charteris-Black, ideology is more than that. It incorporates not only the systems of beliefs that are linked to political practice, but also those that are linked to⁵⁹ religious practices. This view matches the one proposed by Hodge and Kress in their book

“Language as Ideology”, where ideology is defined as follows:

A systematic body of ideas, organized from a particular point of view. Ideology is thus a subsuming category, which includes sciences and metaphysics, as well as political ideologies of various kinds, without implying anything about their status and reliability as guides to reality.

Although Charteris-Black argues that metaphor is an essential linguistic and cognitive resource used by politicians to justify their existence and self-legitimization, he

acknowledges that they are not the only way of articulating ideology. Nevertheless, given that they draw on two domains by relating abstract concepts with our experience of concrete realities, they constitute a highly effective way of making an abstract ideology accessible.

In addition, as metaphors tap into emotions, they make abstract concepts seem personal and connected to human nature. Hence, metaphors play a crucial social role in forming and communicating ideologies. This is an essential element in creating discourses of legitimization and delegitimization. Also, Charteris-Black points out that one of the most common ways to communicate ideologies is through myth, which he defines as “a story that provides an explanation of all the things for which explanations are felt to be necessary. These could be the origins of the universe, the causes of good and evil, the origin of the elements, of male and female, or anything else that is believed to be mysterious”. He concludes that a critical examination of political discourse is essential in order for a narrative explanation to be considered a myth rather than a reality. Therefore, the analysis of the metaphors employed by politicians seems essential when distinguishing between myth and reality.

Finally, Charteris-Black stresses that in CMA the cognitive semantic approach needs to be complemented with both a study of the social context in which the speeches were given, and an analysis of the overall context of metaphor. This is part of the explanation stage. In addition, he argues that we cannot treat cognitive characteristics of metaphors in isolation from other persuasive rhetorical features in the context of the discourse. He states that in order to determine why one conceptual metaphor is preferred over another, we need to consider rhetorical issues such as the intentions of the political leader within specific speech-making contexts: Metaphors are not a requirement of the semantic system, but are matters of speakers’ choice. Cognitive semantics and Critical Metaphor Analysis are important linguistic contributions towards a theory of rhetoric for political communication.”

In conclusion, CMA will be used in analysing the Presidential speeches of Goodluck Jonathan and BarackObama's acceptance and inaugural speeches. Although there is an element of subjectivity in the stages of interpretation and explanation, this element can be significantly reduced when taking into consideration the context in which the metaphor occurs, and the contexts in which the speeches were given. In addition, by using a corpus approach to critical metaphor analysis, the element of subjectivity is also reduced given that many instances supporting the identified conceptual metaphor need to be found in order to consider this metaphor in the analysis. Finally, by classifying metaphors into source domain, the analysis can be improved as this allows us to determine trends and compare different speeches.

2.10 Theoretical Framework

The Fairclough (1989) Critical Discourse Analysis is a foreground to understanding the concept of political speeches. The model gives the general picture of the place of language in society. Fairclough (1989) presents a general picture which elaborates on the relationship between language and power and the relationship between language and ideology. The scholar believes that language is centrally involved in power struggles and struggles for power and that it is so involved through its ideological properties. Hence, analysing language/discourse as a social practice "one commits oneself not just to analyzing text, nor just to analyzing processes of production and interpretation, but to analysing the relationship between texts, processes and their social conditions" (Fairclough, 1989:26).

These social conditions involved both the immediate conditions of situational context and the more remote conditions of institutional and social structures. This includes the relationship between texts, interaction and the contexts corresponding to three dimensions or the stages of Fairclough Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA): description, interpretation and explanation.

However, understanding that political speeches do not take place in a vacuum; that is all political speeches are embedded in a specific context and therefore, a political speech cannot be understood without taking into consideration its context explicates the reason why Charteris-Black Critical Metaphoric Analysis (1994) becomes the preferred framework for this study. Also, since it has already been established that political speeches are often dominated by not just grammatical phenomena but also metaphorical allusions heightens the preference of CMA as the actual framework of analysis.

The theoretical framework is anchored on Critical Metaphoric Analysis (CMA) which is an aspect/model of Critical Discourse Analysis as proposed by Charteris-Black (1994). The choice of Charteris-Black's CMA as the framework for this study is borne out the following reasons: firstly, Critical Metaphoric Analysis consists of three stages: identification, interpretation and the explanation stage of metaphors. Firstly the identification stage of metaphors deals with determining which metaphors are present in a text, and whether they show semantic tension between a literal source domain and a metaphorical target domain which has been stated before. Secondly, the interpretation stage of metaphors which aims at determining the type of social relations that are constructed through the metaphors identified. And lastly, the explanation stage of metaphors is the way the metaphors interact within the context in which they occur. For this study, the different shades of meaning attached to the use of metaphor in political speeches are explored.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Sources of Data

This Chapter is concerned with the method in which the research work is carried out. Sources of data, method of data collection, method of data analysis and analytical procedure constitute the main focus of this chapter.

The data for this study was downloaded from the internet via these websites:

www.whitehouse.gov/blog/inaugural-address,

www.vanguardnews.com/jonthansinauguraladdress

www.vanguardngr.com/2011/05,

[www.guardian.co.uk>news>worldnews>nigeria](http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/worldnews/nigeria),

[www.telegraph.co.uk>home>news>worldnews>](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/home/news/worldnews)

www.barackobama.com.

Four speeches are used and analysed for this study, two speeches each from both presidents.

The main body of the text is taken from the relevant sections of the presidential speeches. In other words, an abstract of a political speech is used whenever a metaphor and related features is spotted in the discourse and the usage is considered a good characteristic to the purpose of our discussion. The Appendix is labelled 1, 2, 3, and 4. Appendix 1 is Barack Obama's Acceptance Speech in 2009, Appendix 2 is Barack Obama's Inaugural Address in 2013, Appendix 3 is Goodluck Jonathan's Acceptance Speech in 2010 and Appendix 4 is Goodluck Jonathan Inaugural Address in 2011.

3.2 Method of Data Collection

The data for this research was downloaded from the internet. Each speech of the presidents were downloaded from different websites and later printed. The printed copies are attached as Appendix.

3.3 Sample and Sample Procedure

It was observed in the speeches that President Barak Obama Barack used a total of 59 different forms of metaphors with “conceptual metaphor” as the most frequently used while President Goodluck Jonathan used 34 different forms of metaphors also with ‘conceptual metaphor’ as the highest number. It was observed that the two presidents used more of conceptual metaphors, although Obama used more forms of metaphors than Jonathan. On a general note, metaphors were employed by both presidents in their speeches for various functions.

The method of analysis is textually based. This analysis considers three aspects of data: the analysis of rhetorical context, the analysis of textual features and the contextual analysis of text. The analysis of rhetorical context involves analysing the speaker, his role or position and the audience. The exigencies, which prompted the speaker to talk and the type of discourse, examined as well. The second aspect analyses the textual features such as the issues being addressed and the main claim of the speaker. And the last aspect is placing the text within social and political context. This has to do with how the speech relates to other speeches and its place in the analysis of political speeches. Textual analysis helps the researcher to combine large amount of textual information and to systematically identify its properties especially on key words or phrases, in this case metaphor, and make valid conclusions on its functions in the overall communicative event. In other to achieve this, the three stages of analytical procedure proposed by Charteris-Black are used. These are:

- (1) **Identification:** this stage is concerned with the formal properties of a text and the presence of metaphor in the text.
- (2) **Interpretation:** this stage is concerned with the relationship between text and interaction by seeing the text as the product of process of production and as a resource in the process of interpretation. The types of metaphors in the text.

(3) **Explanation:** this stage is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context, with the social determination of the process of production and interpretation, and their effects. The way the metaphors interact within the context in which they occur.

Analysis is the major aim in all these stages, but the nature of their analysis differ in each stage. The first stage limits itself to labelling the formal properties of the text. This research concentrates on the identification and labelling of the different types of metaphor used in the speeches of President Goodluck Jonathan and Barack Obama's speech. The second stage is the cognitive process of the participants and their interactions. This is concerned with the ideological mind-sets that prompt and control the different choices of one type of metaphor to the other that is, its context of use. And the last stage, aims to explain the relationship between social events and power structures that affect those events and are affected by them that is, their intended effect. At this stage, our main focus is looking at the connection between the choices of metaphor and social structures and how these choices affect one another in the overall communicative event.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Preamble

In this chapter all the forms of metaphors used in the two speeches are analysed and explained in a detailed way ranging from conceptual metaphors, war metaphors, story metaphors, journey metaphors etc. Each forms of metaphor as used by both presidents covers several specific meanings and each was extracted from the data and will be discussed and analysed with examples of specific metaphorical expressions.

The presentation and analysis of data collected is based on the three stages of text analysis proposed by Jonathan Charteris-Black in his Book "*Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*" (2004). These are identification, interpretation and explanation. The first stage of the analysis starts with the identification of different forms of metaphor used in the speeches. Subsequently, in the interpretation stage, the different functions of metaphors in the speeches are pointed out.

The last stage deals with the overall relationship between the functions of metaphors and the social and political contexts of the speeches. The chapter also compares and contrasts the speeches of President Goodluck Jonathan and that of President Barak Obama on the aspect of these metaphors.

4.2 The Different Forms of Metaphor Used in the Speeches

This stage is concerned with the formal properties of the text by limiting itself to labelling the formal properties. Hence, this stage will concentrate on the identification and labelling of the different types and forms of metaphors used in the selected presidential speeches. The tables below are the summary of the different forms of metaphor used in the speeches of President Barack Obama and President Goodluck Jonathan.

Table 4.2.1: The Different Forms of Metaphor used in Barack Obama's Speeches

Forms of metaphor	Inaugural Address 1	Acceptance Address 2	Total	%
Conceptual metaphor	25	18	43	72.9
War metaphor	1	2	3	5.1
Human metaphor	-	-	-	
Journey metaphor	2	4	6	10.2
Building metaphor	-	-	-	-
Conventional/Creative metaphor	2	-	2	3.4
Oriental metaphor	1	1	2	3.4
Ontological metaphor	2	-	2	3.4
Light metaphor	-	-	-	-
Story metaphor		1	1	1.7
Dead metaphor	-	-	-	
Total	33	26	59	97.7

Table 4.2.2: The Different Forms of metaphor used in President Goodluck Jonathan’s Speeches

Forms of metaphor	Declaration of intention speech	Inaugural address	Total	%
Conceptual metaphor	11	15	26	76.5
War metaphor	1	-	1	2.9
Human metaphor	-	-	-	-
Journey metaphor	-	2	2	5.9
Building metaphor	-	-	-	-
Conventional/ creative metaphor	-	3	3	8.8
Orientalational metaphor	1	-	1	2.9
Ontological metaphor	-	-	-	-
Light metaphor	-	-	-	-
Story metaphor	1	-	1	2.9
Dead metaphor	-	-	-	-
Total	14	20	34	99.9

The two tables 4.2.1 and 4.3.2 represent the different forms of metaphors used by President Barack Obama and Goodluck Jonathan. Table 4.2.1 shows that Barack Obama used a total of 59 different forms of metaphors with “conceptual metaphor” as the most frequently used form, representing 72.9% of the total usage. While Table 4.3.2 shows that Goodluck Jonathan used 34 different forms of metaphors also with ‘conceptual metaphor’ as the highest number, representing 76.5% of total usage. From the tables above, the two presidents used more of conceptual metaphors, although Obama used more forms of metaphors than Jonathan. On a general note, metaphors were employed by both presidents in their speeches for various functions

4.3 The Functions and Role Metaphors Performs in the Speeches

These are the second and third stages of text analysis, that is, the stage of interpretation and explanation. The interpretation stage deals with the relationship between text and interaction

by seeing the text as the product of the process of production and as a resource in the process of interpretation. This deals with the cognitive processes of the participants and their interactions.

The second stage basically is concerned with the ideological mindsets that prompt and control the speakers to choose different forms of metaphors from the other. This section outlines different functions metaphors perform in the speeches of President Goodluck Jonathan and President Barrack Obama. The third stage on the other hand explains the relationship between metaphors, power and politics and how this relationship reflects in the overall communicative event.

4.3.1 Metaphor as a Means of Establishing a Common Ground

Different metaphors were employed to create a common ground by the two Presidents. In all their presentations, they use metaphors as a strategy in creating a common ground between them and their audience. This method is a way of exercising power to persuade and get their audience to be receptive to their ultimate proposal. The establishment of the common ground serves two purposes for the Presidents: firstly, it helps create a linkage between them and their audiences, through the identification of the joint experiences the Presidents share with the audiences, which because of power differentials do not exist. And secondly, the common ground helps the Presidents to gradually introduce more controversial issues without the audience's immediate attention. The following extracts indicate the different metaphors used in the speeches:

Extract 1, Appendix 1: *...we the People have remained faithful to the ideals of our forbearers, and true to our founding documents.*

Extract 2, Appendix 1: *For we, the people, understand that our country cannot succeed when a shrinking few do very well and a growing many barely make it. We believe that America's prosperity must rest upon the broad shoulders of a rising middle class. We know*

that America thrives when every person can find independence and pride in their work; when the wages of honest labor liberate families from the brink of hardship.

Obama's choice of the inclusive pronouns "we" and "our" was just not to indicate the contrast between the middle class and lower class but also to show that he belongs to the middle class and this is to his advantage because the over whelming majority of his audience and supporters are from the middle and lower class. He shows the audience how important and vital they are to the growth of America. America remains on top not because of those in high offices but because of the loyalty and dedication of the ordinary American people, especially, the middle-lower class which he steadfastly associates himself with. While in the second part he tries to pass a message that togetherness, dedication and understanding is a vital tool to keep the country together.

Extract 4. Appendix 4: *At the polls, "we saw the most dramatic expression (sic) of the hunger for democracy"...*

Extract 5. Appendix 4: *We are ready to take off on the path of sustained growth and economic development. In our economic strategy, there will be appropriate policy support to the real sector of the economy, so that Small and Medium Enterprises may thrive.*

From the extract above, Jonathan also used the inclusive pronoun "we" to identify himself with the masses as being one and part of them. In this statement he goes ahead to acknowledge the old and physically challenged people in an attempt to create a bond between himself and the audience. He tries to associate himself with them so that he will be able to gain their trust and pass his message deeply. Also President Jonathan in his rhetoric tried to establish common ground with the less privileged in the country, he express an understanding and respect for their socioeconomic position, reassure them of his goodwill to them, and

highlight the similarity of their present situation with his past. He makes the audience believe that his concern is their “*instantaneous needs and priorities*”, “*to solve the everyday problems that confront the average Nigerian*” and also help the economic sector “so that the small and medium sector can thrive” which is to the benefit of all Nigerians.

Power can be exercised in two ways: one, in the disguise of power that is, the Presidents disguised their present status and try to place themselves on the same level with the people and two, in the ability to control the discourse in a way that the listeners are situated to be on a common ground with the Presidents. This strategy is comprehensibly diplomatically based on the fact that the main intention of politicians is to persuade people. In this sense, the Presidents tried to sway the addressees to see them (the presidents) as ordinary citizens as they are.

4.3.2 Metaphor as a Form of Ambiguity

The use of metaphor to express ambiguity by the politicians revolves around the nature of the statements containing metaphor, which is not only to describe a straightforward state of affairs in the world, but is also used as a special means of targeting something located at the level of language itself. The use of metaphors, therefore, entails the duality of function: descriptive and metalinguistic. These functions are reflected in Obama and Jonathan’s speeches, thus:

Extract 6: Appendix1: *we, the people still believe that enduring security and lasting peace do not require perpetual war.*

In **Extract 6**, the source domain is clearly marked in the clausal statement “*we the people*” while the target domain is reflected in their “*believe*”. In this extract, Obama’s speech is clearly marked with obscurity of essence by inferring on the people’s belief. But he failed to

communicate to the people his “own” opinion on the subject of using war as a tool to achieving lasting peace and security.

Extract 7: Appendix 3: *“I have no enemies to fight*

The source domain in **Extract 7** is “I have no enemies” while the target domain is “to fight”. Here, it is obvious that Jonathan has enemies, because the position itself attracts enmity. But from his statement, he tries to play a neutral ground in his statement so as to prove that he is harmless. The ambiguity clearly portrays the connection between language and power where the Presidents deliberately shy away from the truth and look for means of pleasing all the people through their choice of ironical metaphor, which has diverse interpretations. The political implication is that it helps both Presidents to win the support of diverse groups represented in the audience.

4.3.3 War Metaphor

The conceptual metaphor POLITICS IS WAR is frequently expressed or used in daily language and has been deeply rooted in peoples mind. In fact the presidential election campaign itself is a form of war, because at that moment, all the candidates will try all means to fight for the presidential position. For example, during the election period, people will find that most of the words that they read in the news reports are used to describe a war, such as battle, fight, head on, defend and protect are often used to describe the intensive and fierce presidential election campaign. Elections usually become *battlefields*; words turn to *weapons*; and opponents are *enemies*. Even when it is an inaugural speech, war lexicon is still evidenced like in the case of Obama’s,

Extract 8, Appendix 1: *our nation is at war, against a far-reaching network of violence and hatred.*

Extract 9, Appendix 1 *“We will not apologize for our way of life, nor will we waver in its defense, and for those who seek to advance their aims by inducing terror and slaughtering innocents, we say to you now that our spirit is stronger and cannot be broken; you cannot outlast us, and we will defeat you.”*

The metaphorical expression in **extract (8)**, “at war”, and “a far-reaching network of violence and hatred” is the source domain while the “our nation” is the target domain. In this statement it can be seen that the political condition of the country is in terms of war. Categorically, the utterance describes a war that is being waged upon terrorism. The utterance reflects terrorism an act of war against innocent lives in the United States and beyond. While in **Extract 9**, *“We will not apologize for our way of life, nor will we waver in its defense, and for those who seek to advance their aims by inducing terror and slaughtering innocents, we say to you now that our spirit is stronger and cannot be broken; you cannot outlast us,”* is the source domain, and *“we will defeat you” (terrorist)* is the target domain. This utterance further substantiate the import of **extract 8**, the need to win a war against terrorism is considered foremost and thus the resilience shown by the people in the face of adversities is the potent weapon needed to win this war. The speaker tries to identify with his people through the use of such pronouns as “we” and “us” which portrays the collectiveness of the American people united against terrorism. Through this fragment, listeners evoke “real” battles in their minds. They join Obama’s courageous leadership in defense of justice, and against those who attempt to frighten them by references to *terror* and *slaughter*.

Extract 10, Appendix 3: *The fight against corruption is a war in which we must all enlist, so that the limited resources of this nation will be used for the growth of our commonwealth.*

Extract 11, Appendix 4: *We fought for decolonization. We will now fight for democratization.*

In extract 10, the source domain is “*we must all enlist, so that the limited resources of this nation will be used for the growth of our commonwealth.*” While the target domain is “*the fight against corruption is a war*”. Jonathan here makes it obvious and calls the attention of his audience to help him in the fight/war against corruption.

He wants his audience to believe that the major problem of the economy in Nigeria is because of the corruption in government. And the ability to fight and flush out these individuals will help the growth of the economy and make a better standard of living for all Nigerians. While in **Extract 11**, he makes it obvious that the battle is on, they have fought for decolonization, and he and the people are ready to fight for democratization (equality among the people.).

Power is exercised by both presidents, firstly they try to show the passion they have for their country and then stylishly enforce their audience to join them in the fight to the survival of their country against (terrorism) in the case of Obama and (corruption) in the case of Jonathan.

4.3.4 Journey Metaphor

The conceptual metaphor POLITICAL ACTIVITY IS A JOURNEY is another productive metaphor in political speech (M. P. Guitart, 2005). In journey metaphors, there is always a traveler who is marching towards a destination where there are obstacles, routes and crossroads. For a country to be successful it has to face or encounter challenges, difficulties and trouble along the way. Therefore, when a journey metaphor is employed in a speech by a politician or president, it indicates that the citizens are travelers who are traveling to achieve their goals.

Extract 12, Appendix 1: . . . *this is the journey we continue today.*

Extract 13, Appendix 1: *let it be said by our children's children that when we were tested we refused to let this journey end.*

Extract 14, Appendix 1: *Our journey has never been one of short-cuts or settling for less. It has not been the path for the faint-hearted [...] Rather, it has been the risk-takers, the doers, the makers of things - some celebrated but more often men and women obscure in their labor, who have carried us up the long, rugged path towards prosperity and freedom.*

The source domain in the metaphoric expression in extract 12, is the phrase “*this is the journey we continue today*”, while the target domain is “*American political life*”. The former gave an expression that the American people are the travelers having a journey to a certain destination. While, in extract 14, the source domain is “*Our journey has never been one of short-cuts or settling for less. It has not been the path for the faint-hearted*” and the target domain also is “*American political life*”.

From extract 12 and 13, it is obvious that American people are travelers. Obama uses this conceptual metaphor to call on people to participate actively in the journey to develop their country. Back then in 2009, the American economy was badly weakened, jobs were shed and businesses shuttered, which was a major problem then. In order to get the people's attention, Barack Obama focused on these issues and encourages the people not to give up but to join him in the journey to face the challenges and get through the tough period.

While in extract 14, it is the metaphor of a journey where *long, rugged paths* are taken and shared, above all, by every hard-working American whereas *short-cuts* and *easy paths* belong to others. This metaphor is an obvious praise towards the people whose subsequent positive emotional reaction is enduring and perseverant. Obama calls on his people's toughness and endurance to be able to overcome the hardship. He points out that his people need more effort to finish this journey that's why he said “*Our journey has never been one of short-cuts*”. By saying “*short cuts*”, he tries to encourage his people to travel with enduring spirits

and not be afraid to take the long way to achieve their goals. Similarly, in the part, “It has not been the path for the faint-hearted” he tells his people that travellers who only enjoy leisure should be avoided, as now they are on the path where people should walk together and get through the tough period.

In the above utterance, Obama exercises power by employing empathy and been praise-generous to the American people of the past who have survived many incidences with their unfaltering American spirit of endurance, while also admonishing the contemporary American people to follow in the footpath of their forbears.

Extract 15, Appendix 3: *Our country is at the threshold of a new era; an era that beckons for a new kind of leadership; a leadership that is uncontaminated by the prejudices of the past; a leadership committed to change; a leadership that reinvents government, to solve the everyday problems that confront the average Nigerian.*

Extract 16, Appendix 3: *. . . the moment is right, the signs are heart-warming, and we are ready to take off on the path of sustained growth and economic development.*

The source domain in the metaphoric expression in extract 15, is the phrase “*Our country is at the threshold of a new era*”, while the target domain is “*the Nigerian political life*”. The former gave an expression that the Nigerian people are also travelers, who are about to set off on a new journey to a new beginning with a government who will travel with them to the right destination.

Jonathan in his statement makes a promise to “his” people for a free and fair election and also shows how transparent his regime will be, unlike the past government which Jonathan indirectly referred to as being socio-economically and politically contaminated (corrupt). So he calls on the people to join him in the progress of the country at large, after all he never thought he could ever be where he is right now, but not for once did he ever give up. While in

Extract 16, the source domain is “*we are ready to take off on the path of sustained growth*

and economic development”, while the target domain is still “*the Nigerian political situation*” Jonathan in his inaugural speech calls on the Nigerian people’s strength and endurance to be able to overcome the hardship in the society. And their dreams should be built on hard work not short cuts, he salutes the Nigerian workers who built the communities, cities and country, but he wants them all to join him in the journey to advance the course of the country. That is why he says it is time to fight for the growth and development of the country. The two presidents used the power of discourse to control the emotions of the audience so as to be able to lure them and make them believe that, with hard work, dedication, and patience there will be better days ahead.

4.3.5 Orientational Metaphor (More Is Up; Less Is Down)

The conceptual metaphor CHANGE ARE MOVEMENT is another productive metaphor that shows the pattern of change in political speech. Indicating the rises and fall in the economy.

Extract 17, Appendix 2: *our economy is badly weakened, a consequence of greed and irresponsibility on the part of some, but also our collective failure to make hard choices and prepare the nation for a new age. Homes have been lost; jobs; businesses shuttered.*

Extract 18, Appendix 1: *Our citizens, seared by the memory of those we have lost, know too well the price that is paid for liberty*

The source domain in **Extract 17** is the phrase “*badly weakened*”, “*have been lost*” and “*shuttered*”, while the target domain are “*economy*”, “*homes*”, “*jobs*” , “*business*”. By making the statement “*our economy is badly weakened and homes have been lost; jobs shed; businesses shuttered*”, Obama is trying to indicate the physical basis of Americans current economic condition, that if there is a decrease in physical objects like a container or pile, the weakened economic condition like homes that have been lost, jobs shed and businesses shuttered simply means that the economic level has gone down. But if it is otherwise, there is an increase in the substance of the physical object; the level goes up.

Extract 18, Appendix 3: *As I travel up and down our country, I see a nation blessed by God with rich agricultural and mineral resources and an enterprising people. . . .*

The source domain is the phrase “*I see a nation blessed by God with rich agricultural and mineral resources*” and “*an enterprising people*” while the target domain is the “*economy*”.

The expression “*I travelled up and down our country*” indicates Jonathan’s movement “around” the country; stating the extent of knowledge and understanding he has acquired from this journeys within the country which acquaints him with the “*rich agricultural and mineral resources and the enterprising people*”.

From this journeys, he knows how blessed the country is and the people in it and he recognises that these people just need the opportunity to bring more to the table. And since he has gone down such a journey he is the best candidate to help the country pedal towards that destination. That is a destination where Nigeria is built on the virtue of love and respect for one another, through the essence of unity, industry, hard work and good governance. Obama and Jonathan also used the power of persuasion in their discourse to control the emotions of the audience. Jonathan first of all uplift their spirits by saying nice things about the country and the people then make them believe he is the right person to help them out of the bad situation. While Obama gives the statistics of the issues behind America’s problems pointing out the origin of the issue which he recommends that certain hard choices will bring the country back to its initial stage.

4.3.6 Ontological Metaphors

The conceptual metaphor STATES ARE LOCATIONS is another productive metaphor that are used in understanding one concept (an abstract one) in terms of another (often a concrete one).

Extract 19, Appendix 2: *that we are in the midst of crisis is now well understood. Our nation is at war, against a far-reaching network of violence and hatred.*

Extract 20, Appendix 1: *our citizens, seared by the memory of those we have lost, know too well the price that is paid for liberty.*

Extract 21, Appendix 1: *. . . yet, every so often the oath is taken amidst gathering clouds and raging storms.*

In **extract 19**, the source domain is the phrase “the midst of” and “Our nation is at war, against a far-reaching” while the target domain is “crisis” and “network of violence and hatred”. The metaphorical expression gave an impression that the state of the American crisis is located on a particular position. That is a position which is located at the middle not at the peripheral position or the edge.

This kind of metaphor is what the cognitive linguist calls the “spatial metaphor”. It is a metaphorical expression which shows the position of an object in the frame of “space” or spatial one. The American people are facing a form of crisis and also have the fear of the long distance threat of the international terrorist which they think spread violence and hatred universally. Obama makes this statement in a way of acknowledging the ongoing war on terror, however, he makes no clear reference to the “terrorist body” (al-Qaeda).

In **Extract 21**, the source domain is “*amidstgathering clouds and raging storms*” While the target domain is “the oaths” or “the presidential oaths of American presidents”.The metaphorical expression “*oath is taken amidst gathering clouds and raging storms*” can be expanded as “*Within*” that is at the middle of something, especially something causing enthusiasm or fright. So, basically the “gathering clouds and the raging storms” metaphorically refers to the state of strong feelings of sadness and nervousness felt by the American people about their bad socio- economic situation of recent times.

Power is been exercised through perceptive clarion call. Obama’s exercises power by stating the obvious, by emphasizing on the veritable fact that, he will be taking charge of a government fraught with internal crises and a nation on the cusp of terrorism attacks. Obama

power gathers more momentum by instilling fear in the people's mind, by employing hard-meta words like "raging clouds", "violence" and "hatred" which implies the odds against the American nation and its people.

4.3.7 Conventional/ Creative Metaphor

The conceptual metaphor ACTIONS ARE TRANSFER is another type of creative metaphor that is used to enhance the expressiveness of the user's message or messages.

Extract 22, Appendix 2: *The time has come to reaffirm our enduring spirit; to choose our better history; to carry forward that precious gift, that noble idea, passed on from generation to generation: the God-given promise that all are equal, all are free, and all deserve a chance to pursue their full measure of happiness.*

In **Extract 22**, the source domain in the phrase is "*that precious gift, that noble idea*" while the target domain is "*; to carry forward*" and *passed*". This metaphor can be analysed as the speaker been the guardian of a certain generation of Americans, who has received a gift (encoded) from a past generation and feels a strong urge to pass on the same gift of ideas treated as (objects) into words (containers) and send these (along a conduit) to another generation as a bearer who takes the idea/objects out of the word/containers.

Extract 23, Appendix 1. I also wish to pay tribute to our founding fathers, whose enduring sacrifices and abiding faith in the unity and greatness of our country, *laid the foundation of our nation.*

Extract 24, Appendix 1: *a decade ago, it would have been a mere daydream to think that a citizen from minority group could galvanize national support, on an unprecedented scale, to discard ancient prejudices, and win the peoples mandate as president of our beloved country.*

The source domain in **extract 23** is "*whose enduring sacrifices and abiding faith in the unity and greatness of our country*" and *laid the foundation of our nation*", while the target domain is "*founding fathers*". Apparently, the foundation of a nation cannot be "laid"

literally; the figurative phrase “*laid the foundation*” represents the essence of the great nation Nigeria. An essence which has been forthrightly preserved through phenomenal values such as faith, unity and sacrifices fostered by the founding fathers. In **Extract 24**, the source domain in the phrase is “*a decade ago*”, while the target domain is “*the citizen*”. This metaphor explains a maturing period of development from prejudiced and sentimental beliefs in Nigeria which holds that a person from any of the minority ethnic groups cannot aspire to power in governance and come out victorious. It portrays how the nation has become politically inclusive and potentially civilized, ushering in a new government dispensation where all barriers and obstacles have been collapsed garnering unprecedented support for his presidential ambition. The presidents explore the Power of Dynamism. This is a proposition to the people’s cognitive ability to accept changes and be radical in their belief which has developed fully over a period of time.

4.3.8 Building Metaphors

The conceptual metaphor STATES IS A MOTION OVER A LANDSCAPE is another form of a metaphor that indicates the architecture of language use.

Extract 25, Appendix: *These are the indicators of crisis, subject to data and statistics. Less measurable but no less profound is a sapping of confidence across our land - a nagging fear that America's decline is inevitable, and that the next generation must lower its sights.*

In **Extract 25**, the source domain is the phrase “*Across our land*” while the target domain is the phrase “*Less measurable but no less profound is a sapping confidence*”. According to Lakoff conceptual metaphor the manner of action is the manner of motion towards landscape. Forces which affect actions are forces which affect motions. Progress made is distance travelled or distance from goal. The phrase “*A sapping of confidence across our lands*”, gives us an impression that confidence is an abstract thing with physical presence which can come over a land. Obama uses this metaphor to indirectly tell us that the American people are now

ready to face the fear of the weakening confidence in their psychological condition spreading all over the country. They are ready to overcome the deep rooted fear about the unavoidable decline of American economy and hegemony. Obama wants to describe the current condition of America and his plan for big improvement towards the country. Power is reflected in the speaker's ability to make the audience see the advantages presented in the economic disadvantages. And this he further pursue by manipulating their consciousness to believe that the elected democratic dispensation will present better hopes and opportunity than that of its republican predecessor.

4.3.9 Story Metaphors

The conceptual metaphor ACHIEVING A PURPOSE IS AGRICULTURE is another form of metaphor that gives the history or story of the journey of the speaker.

Extract 26; Appendix 1: . . . *To those leaders around the globe who seek to sow conflict, or blame their society's ills on the West - know that your people will judge you on what you can build, not what you destroy.*

Extract 27, Appendix 2: progress does not compel us to settle centuries-long debates about the role of government for all time- but it does require us to act in our time.

In **Extract 26** the source domain in the sentence is the phrase “*seek to sow*” while the target domain is “the conflict”. The quotation indicates that the principle for understanding the domain of agriculture can be applied in terms of the domain of achieving a purpose. This has a unique metaphorical story line: the people who want to achieve a common goal are farming the land together; with their common life purpose seen as the farming crops and the resultant harvest crops is perceived as the end product of their collective effort.

Extract 27; Appendix 3: *I was not born rich, and in my youth, I never imagined that I would be where I am today, but not once did I ever give up. Not once did I imagine that a child from*

Otuoke, a small village in the Niger Delta, will one day rise to the position of President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. I was raised by my mother and father with just enough money to meet our daily needs. In my early days in school, I had no shoes, no school bags. I carried my books in my hands but never despaired; no car to take me to school but I never despaired. There were days I had only one meal but I never despaired. I walked miles and crossed rivers to school every day but I never despaired. Didn't have power, didn't have generators, studied with lanterns but I never despaired. In spite of these, I finished secondary school, attended the University of Port Harcourt, and now hold a doctorate degree. . . .

The source domain from the extract above is “*I was not born rich, and in my youth, I never imagined that I would be where I am today, but not once did I ever give up*”. While the target domain is “*Not once did I imagine that a child from Otuoke, a small village in the Niger Delta, will one day rise to the position of President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria*”.

The President informed the audience that his concern is the “immediate needs and priorities of our people” and “to solve the everyday problems that confront the average Nigerian.” The reconstruction of his childhood experiences as a metaphor of hope and regeneration, this is to motivate or manipulate the minds of people within his target audience that he is one of them and that hence, “*my story symbolizes my dream for Nigeria.*” Jonathan prudently picked words and phrases that connect him psychologically with the audience. He informed them that “*I was not born rich*”; never “*imagined that I would be where I am today*”; was raised by “*my mother and father with just enough money to meet our daily needs*”; “*had no shoes, no school bags*”; had to carry “*my books in my hands*”; and could only afford “*one meal*” some days. . . .

Jonathan used these rhetorical tactics to construct affinity and commonality with the masses and to reassure them that he understands the meaning of poverty and suffering. He gives the impression that he identifies with the dilemma of the “ordinary Nigerian” and assures them of

his friendship and understanding: *“You are all my friends and we share a common destiny...I am one of you and I will never let you down.”* His mission then seems to be the redemption of the *“millions of Nigerians whose potentials for greatness are constrained by the lack of basic infrastructure,”* and to nurture from this group who are *“disadvantaged by the lack of opportunities”* an army *“who can make a difference in the service of their country”*. Power is exercised in implementing some lies as truth via repeating the concept until they are accepted to be true. This can be linked with what Hitler (1964:404) says, that *“whenever a lie is unremittingly repeated, it is possible to make people believe that heaven is hell-and hell is heaven; the greater the lie the higher the repetition”*. The two presidents used the story metaphors in order to be able to persuade the people and make their stories believable. Obama continues to hit on the fact that his present government will bring America back in line while Jonathan continues to tell his past stories to make the people believe he will make a difference.

4.4 The Differences and Similarities between Obama’s and Jonathan’s Use of Metaphors

This section analyses the differences and the similarities in the speeches of Barack Obama and Goodluck Jonathan. The differences arise from the fact that the speeches are delivered in different geographical areas and to different audiences diverse in terms of exposure, experience, level of education and more essentially between a native speaker and an L2 speaker. The similarity between the two speakers is the fact that they are both politicians and Presidents in their respective countries. Likewise, they share similar experiences, since they hail from the minority group in their various societies.

There are differences in the method in which Obama and Jonathan used the forms of metaphors. The first difference is the frequency in use. Obama uses more metaphors than Jonathan. In Obama’s inaugural address, fifty nine (59) different forms of metaphors were

used as against the thirty-four (34) used by Jonathan in his inaugural address. Nevertheless, both the Presidents made use of different forms of metaphors at different sections in their speeches.

4.4.1 Differences and Similarities in the Use of Metaphors by Obama and Jonathan

The functions and the different forms of metaphors perform in the speeches differ in some ways between Obama and Jonathan. While there are instances where Obama used ontological and building metaphors to communicate critical messages, Jonathan did not employ it for such purposes.

This could be that Obama, being a native speaker, is alert to the different functions of metaphors and how they are structurally employed to pass on messages effectively. Another reason could be political. Looking at the different functions metaphors perform, such as the mitigation and the additives (Orientational, Ontological and Building metaphors), Obama presented his speech in a society that takes serious whatever is promised. Failure to fulfil those promises affects the chances of the candidate or the party to win an election. It is on the basis of this premise that Obama chose metaphors to reduce the illocutionary force of his promises, so that in a situation that the promises are not fulfilled its responsibility could be shifted to circumstances and not the politicians. For Jonathan not to have used these metaphors (Ontological and Building), this could be understood on the premise that Nigerian democracy is not so advanced. Winning elections can be on your regions or party affiliations not so much on fulfilling promises or bringing in fresh idea to the fore. Despite these differences, various functions of metaphors are similar in both speeches. Both Presidents used several forms of metaphors; from war metaphors, journey metaphors, building metaphors, creative and conventional metaphors etc. as a form of ambiguity and as well as for the purpose of establishing common ground.

4.4.2 Findings

This work examined the different forms of metaphors used by Obama and Jonathan in their speeches. The work identifies the different functions/forms metaphors perform other than simplification, persuasion, motivation as well as the connection between the use of metaphors and power.

The functions of metaphors in political discourse or presidential speeches may be different. According to the discussion and analysis presented above, the three obvious functions of the metaphors used are, simplification, persuasion and motivation. And there are three main functions that are widely accepted by different scholars which are shown below. Others are common ground, ambiguity, winning support, lies and deceit.

Simplification is the first function metaphors perform in the speeches. Politics is vague and complicated, thus it will be difficult for common people to understand it if the politicians do not try to make it familiar to them. Thompson (1999:186) states that, until and unless that metaphorical leap of understanding is made, there is no participation in politics or political discourse. The journey of politics is a familiar topic to people, thus journey metaphors are often adopted by politicians to make it easy for the audience to understand.

Persuasion is the second function metaphors perform in the speeches. (Jeffery 1996:127) states that metaphor use in politics or political speeches are applied to convey strategies, convince, manipulate and persuade the audience for action or to characterize political opponents.

Motivation is the third function metaphors perform in the speeches. In order to encourage people to behave in a particular way, politicians bring in motivational talks. For example, in journey metaphors, they often paint a picture that the final destination will be perfect, likewise in the war metaphors, they assertively tell people the final conquests belong to the American people in the case of Obama and to the Nigerian people in the case of Jonathan,

which offers motivation to the audiences to fight, act and behave in a particular way. The presidents were creative enough to use metaphors in a different manner e.g. as common ground, ambiguity etc. In the light of the above, the following are other findings:

- i. The study found out that Obama used metaphors recurrently than Jonathan. Obama used a total number of 59 metaphors while Jonathan only used 34. This is so because Obama has innate knowledge of the syntactic structures of the language, which a second language speaker like Goodluck may not have.
- ii. The study also found out that out of the different forms of metaphors identified, Obama was more conscious of how he used the forms than Jonathan in the case of attaching ‘not’ by the former and ‘never’ by the latter. This demonstrates that Obama knows the inherent ambiguous nature and function of ‘not’ in speech presentation more than Jonathan, who is not a native speaker.
- iii. Both Presidents use metaphors to perform different functions as opposed to the traditional function of simplicity, persuasion and motivation they both used it as a means of establishing a common ground, and as a means of creating ambiguous statements.
- iv. Both presidents use metaphors as a means of exercising power on the audience. For example, story metaphors were used to force a choice from a limited number of options presented and a common ground was exercised in concealing power. This happened when the Presidents disguised their present status and focused on their past.
- v. The use of metaphors has helped the two Presidents politically to persuade and gather support and put themselves on the side of their listeners.
- vi. The use of metaphors by the Presidents reflects the key features of the language of politics, such as ambiguity, persuasion, winning support and lies/deceit.

- vii. The choice of metaphor by the Presidents is ideologically base. For instance, Obama's speeches reflect the Democrat ideology of liberalism, while Jonathan's reflect the ideology of the political elite deceiving the masses that they are also poor.

To sum it up, the functions above enables the presidents to make use of metaphors to achieve their goals, and at the same time, the audience will not only easily understand their various political goals but also they will be greatly motivated and encouraged, which is to the best interest of the politician's/ presidents and the country at large.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Preamble

This is the last chapter of this study. It gives the summary of the whole work, conclusion and suggestions to the study.

5.2 Summary

This study is on “A Critical Discourse Analysis of Metaphor in Selected Acceptance and Inaugural Speeches of President Goodluck Jonathan’s and President Barack Obama. The study has five chapters. Chapter one, is titled introduction and discusses the background of the study, the statement of the research problem, aim and objectives, the significance of the study and the scope and delimitation of the study. Chapter two reviews related concepts to the study and presents the theoretical framework. Concepts such as critical discourse analysis: its nature, emergence and different approaches; critical metaphor analysis: its origin, emergence and different approaches, metaphors: what it is and what it is not, forms and scope; the relationship between language and politics, political discourse, the features of political discourse and presidential speeches. Chapter three is the methodology and constitutes the source of data, the method of data collection and the analytical procedure. Chapter four is data presentation and analysis. While in this chapter, the data on metaphors was presented vis-a-vis its functions and the findings. Chapter five is the summary of the whole work and the conclusion to the study.

5.3 Conclusion and Suggestion

This study is on “A Critical Discourse Analysis of Metaphor in selected Acceptance and Inaugural Speeches of President Goodluck Jonathan and Barack Obama”. The presidential inaugural and acceptance speech is an important form of political discourse. The new president normally takes the advantages of the speech to advertise his fundamental political

life and belief. In order to prove to the audience the political views and stands of the new government, metaphors are often adopted by these politician's or presidents in their addresses to make their speeches more convincing. This study has analysed political metaphors in the acceptance and inaugural speeches of President Barack Obama of the United States of America and his Nigerian counterpart, President Goodluck Jonathan, by applying conceptual metaphor theory by Lakoff and Johnson and Critical Metaphor Analysis by Jonathan Charteris-Black.

Through the research, several specific forms of conceptual metaphors are used to specifically answer the research questions. Some huge similarities were found in: journey metaphors, AMERICA OR AMERICAN PEOPLE AND NIGERIA OR NIGERIAN PEOPLE AS TRAVELLERS, in war metaphors, where the people are made to see themselves as FIGHTERS AND DEFENDERS of their country and in ontological metaphors WHERE THE PEOPLE ARE PORTRAYED AS RESILIENT AND PERSEVERANT IN THE FACE OF THE LOOMING TERRORISM AGAINST THEIR COUNTRY. It can also be seen in the analysis that the source domain of these metaphors are closely related to the audience's daily life and experience, which make the abstract political speeches understandable for the common people, thus together playing a very important persuasive role by arousing strong emotional responses.

Based on the findings, it is clearly noted that metaphors being a creative element of language sometimes tolerate ambiguity or obscurity and politicians are quite aware of this development. Therefore, the study concludes that politicians – not just President Obama and President Goodluck but generally – employ metaphors as an effectual element in their tirades of lies and deception to misguide the people. Through these, they are able to gain the people's trust, vote, confidence and sympathy without the people knowing that the effect of metaphors – as used by the politician – has played on their consciousness. The study also concludes by

stating that, beside the purely traditional function of metaphors which are simplification, persuasion and motivation in the declarative statements in the Presidents' speeches; metaphors are also found to perform different functions that include creating a common ground, used as ambiguity and so on. These functions metaphors perform help in asserting and exercising power more especially in controlling and constraining the content of discourse, power struggles and ideological power. The political implication of exercising power in the speeches of the Presidents is to persuade, win support, lie and deceive the public.

In line with the main thrust of Critical Discourse Analysis, the study believes that having the understanding that social order affects the use of language contributes to creating an awareness and consciousness that could stop the trend in using language to show class inequality, power differentials and perpetual domination. The critical awareness of the power of language is the first step towards emancipation from the perpetual use of language by those in power to deceive ordinary citizens and maintain power through different choices of linguistic elements. There are three reasons for the use of metaphors in the speeches of the Presidents examined: the grammatical, that of power and the political. It is grammatical when the choice of metaphors only performs the function of opposing the truth-value of statement; it is that of power when its use is to enforce power, show a power struggle or power differential. It is political when the use is aimed at persuading, winning support, lying or deceiving the public. Finally, there are many opportunities and facts to make a lingual research like this particularly a research on metaphorical expressions of world's famous speeches like that of President Barack Obama and Goodluck Jonathan's Acceptance and Inaugural speeches. This study requires deeper and broader observation, interpretation and analysis of the outstanding figurative and unique features of formal speech. This suggestion is

aimed to all language researcher and the students of English departments to look into the beauty, function, creativity and dynamism of the functions of metaphor.

REFERENCES

- Abaya, A.S. (2004). "Political Correctness and National Development" *Nigeria EducationForum*. Vol. 18 (1) Pp 139 – 150.
- Abaya, A.S. (2011). *A Pragmatic Analysis of Military Coup Discourse: Example from Nigerianmilitary coup speeches*. VDM VerlagDr Muller Gmbh&Co.Kg Saarbrucken (Germany)
- Abaya, A.S. (2011). "A Critical Discourse Analysis of *Saworo Ide*, A Yoruba home video". Paper presented at the Society of Nigeria Theatre Artists (SONTA) at Ahmadu BelloUniversity, Zaria from 14th – 18th November.
- Abdulrasheed, R.S. (2011). "*Textuality: An Analysis of Memoranda from the Federal House of Representatives, Abuja, Nigeria*". Being second postgraduate seminar paper presented in partial fulfilment of the award of degree of doctor of philosophy (Ph.D) English language, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.
- Akodu, E.F. (2008). "*A Pragmatic Analysis of Ambiguity in Political Discourse in Selected Nigerian Newspapers (1999-2005)*". Being a seminar presented in partial fulfilment of requirements for award of the doctor of philosophy (Ph.D) degree in English language, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.
- Austin, J.L. (1962) *How to do things with words*. New York: Oxford University.
- Ayeomoni, M. O. (2005) "*A Linguistic-Stylistic Investigation of the Language of the NigerianPolitical.Nebula* Vol. 2.2
- Bach, K. and Harnish, R. (1979). *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*. Cambridge:MIT Press.
- Bayram, F. (2010). "*Ideology and Political Discourse. A Critical Discourse Analysis of Erdogan'sPolitical Speech*. ARECLS Vol. 7 pp 23 - 40
- Beard, A. (2000) *TheLanguage of Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Block, R. and Trager, C.L. (1945). *Outline of linguistic analysis*. Baltimore: LinguisticsAssociation of America/Wavery Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2005) *Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan. *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. London:Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Chilton, P.(2004). *AnalysingPolitical Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Crystal, D. (2008).*A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 6th ed. Oxford: Cambridge University Press.
- Edelman, M. (1964).*The Symbolic Uses of Politics*: Chicago University Press.

- Essien, O. (2003). "Language and power." University of Ibadan Inaugural Lecture 27th November. Retrieved from internet 20th July, 2011.
- Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Discourse Analysis: Papers in the Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1996). *Rhetoric and Critical Discourse Analysis: a reply to Titus Ensink and Christopher Sauer*. *Current Issues in Language and Society* Vol. 3(3) 286-289
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Critical Discourse Analysis: the Critical Study of Language*. New York. 62
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Longman
- Fong Kin wai, D. (2008) *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Political Speeches*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Language Studies, Hong Kong Baptist University.
- Geis, M. (1987). *The Language of Politics*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Greenbaum, S. (1996). *English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grundy P. (2008). *Doing Pragmatics* 3rd ed. London: Hodder Education.
- Halliday, M.A.K (1989). *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold
- Heritage J. and Greatbatch, D. (1986) "Generating Applause: a Study of Rhetoric and Response at the Party Political Conference". *American Journal of Sociology* Vol. 92 Pp. 110 - 157
- Holmes, J. (2008). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* 3rd ed. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Horn, L. and Kato, Y. (2000). *Introduction: Negation and Polarity at the Millennium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hamba, A. (2010) *The use of Metaphor in Barack Obama's inauguration speech*. New York: Longman
- Hawkes, T. (1980). *Metaphor*. New York: Methuen & Co.
- Jimoh, H. (2008). *Critical Discourse Analysis of Political issues on Ondo State in selected Nigerian Newspapers*. Ondo: Yailiam Press.
- Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse Analysis*. 2nd ed. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

- Lakoff, George. "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor." *Metaphor and Thought*. Ed. Ortony, Andrew. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. 202-251.
- Lawler, J.M. (2007). "Negation and Negative Polarity". *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language sciences*.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman.
- Love, A (2000) "Democratic Discourse? Realizing Alternatives in Zimbabwe Political Discourse" *Zambezia* Vol.xxvii (1) Pg. 27 – 45.
- Matthews, P.H. (2007) *Concise dictionary of linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mele, M.L. (2009). "Popular music and the female identity: a critical discourse analysis" Unpublished PhD thesis, Department of English, University of Maiduguri.
- Mey, J.L. (2001) *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Moreno, M.A. (2008) "Metaphors in Hugo Chavez's Political Discourse: Conceptualizing nation, Revolution and Opposition". Unpublished PhD Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Hispanic and Luso – Brazillian Literatures and Languages. The City University of New York.
- Muhammad, A. (2010). "Negation in Hausa: A minimalist analysis." Unpublished PhD thesis, Department of Modern European Languages and Linguistics, Usmanu Dan Fodiyo University, Sokoto.
- Philips, M. G. Kelly, L., Kougl M. K (1984) *Speaking in public and private*. Indiana: Bobbs Merrill Educational
- Strachan, J.C. (2010) "Does gubernatorial rhetoric matter? An analysis of gubernatorial inaugural rhetoric in three distinct States". A paper presented at the 2010 State Politics and Policy Conference, Springfield, June 3 – 5.
- Thorne, S. (2001) *The Language of War*. London: Routledge.
- Thomas, L. and Wareing, S. (eds) (1999). *Language, Society and Power: An Introduction*. London: Routledge
- Ubong, E. J. (2012) "Pragmatic Analysis of President Goodluck Jonathan and Barack Obama's Inaugural Addresses." Uyo: Scholar' Press (Nig.) Ltd.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993) Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse and Society* 4(2) 249-83.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1998). "Critical Discourse Analysis" in Tannen, D., Schiffrin, M. And Hamilton, H. (eds). *Handbook of Discourse analysis*.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2005) *War Rhetoric of a Little Ally. Political Duplicatives and Aznar's Legitimization of the War in Iraq*. *Journal of Language and Politics* 4:1 69-91

- VanLeeuwen, T. (2006). “*Critical Discourse Analysis*” in Mey, J.L. (ed) *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics* 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Elsevier
- Vershueren, J. (2001) *Semiotics and Language*.Cobley, P. (ed) London: Routledge
- Wilson, J. (1990) *Politically Speaking: the Pragmatic Analysis of Political Language*.Cambridge MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Yunana, A. (2012) “*A critical Discourse Analysis of Negation in Selected Nigerian and United States of America Presidential Speeches*” presented in partial fulfillment of the award of Master’s degree in English language, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

SOME ONLINE PUBLICATION/RESOURCES

www.whitehouse.gov/blog/inaugural-address

www.vanguardnews.com/jonthansinauguraladdress

www.vanguardngr.com/2011/05,

[www.guardian.co.uk>news>worldnews>nigeria](http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/worldnews/nigeria),

[www.telegraph.co.uk>home>news>worldnews>](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/home/news/worldnews)

www.barackobama.com

Appendix 1

Obama Inaugural Address

20th January 2009

(www.whitehouse.gov/blog/inaugural-address)

My fellow citizens: I stand here today humbled by the task before us, grateful for the trust you have bestowed, mindful of the sacrifices borne by our ancestors. I thank President Bush for his service to our nation, as well as the generosity and cooperation he has shown throughout this transition. Forty-four Americans have now taken the presidential oath. The words have been spoken during rising tides of prosperity and the still waters of peace. Yet, every so often the oath is taken amidst gathering clouds and raging storms. At these moments, America has carried on not simply because of the skill or vision of those in high office, but because we the People have remained faithful to the ideals of our forbearers, and true to our founding documents. So it has been. So it must be with this generation of Americans.

That we are in the midst of crisis is now well understood. Our nation is at war, against a far-reaching network of violence and hatred. Our economy is badly weakened, a consequence of greed and irresponsibility on the part of some, but also our collective failure to make hard choices and prepare the nation for a new age. Homes have been lost; jobs shed; businesses shuttered. Our health care is too costly; our schools fail too many; and each day brings further evidence that the ways we use energy strengthen our adversaries and threaten our planet.

These are the indicators of crisis, subject to data and statistics. Less measurable but no less profound is a sapping of confidence across our land - a nagging fear that America's decline is inevitable, and that the next generation must lower its sights.

Today I say to you that the challenges we face are real. They are serious and they are many. They will not be met easily or in a short span of time. But know this, America - they will be met. On this day, we gather because we have chosen hope over fear, unity of purpose over conflict and discord. On this day, we come to proclaim an end to the petty grievances and false promises, the recriminations and worn out dogmas, that for far too long have strangled our politics.

We remain a young nation, but in the words of Scripture, the time has come to set aside childish things. The time has come to reaffirm our enduring spirit; to choose our better history; to carry forward that precious gift, that noble idea, passed on from generation to generation: the God-given promise that all are equal, all are free, and all deserve a chance to pursue their full measure of happiness.

In reaffirming the greatness of our nation, we understand that greatness is never a given. It must be earned. Our journey has never been one of short-cuts or settling for less. It has not been the path for the faint-hearted - for those who prefer leisure over work, or seek only the pleasures of riches and fame. Rather, it has been the risk-takers, the doers, the makers of things - some celebrated but more often men and women obscure in their labor, who have carried us up the long, rugged path towards prosperity and freedom.

For us, they packed up their few worldly possessions and traveled across oceans in search of a new life. For us, they toiled in sweatshops and settled the West; endured the lash of the whip and ploughed the hard earth. For us, they fought and died, in places like Concord and

Gettysburg; Normandy and KheSahn. Time and again these men and women struggled and sacrificed and worked till their hands were raw so that we might live a better life. They saw America as bigger than the sum of our individual ambitions as; greater than all the differences of birth or wealth or faction.

This is the journey we continue today. We remain the most prosperous, powerful nation on Earth. Our workers are no less productive than when this crisis began. Our minds are no less inventive, our goods and services no less needed than they were last week or last month or last year. Our capacity remains undiminished. But our time of standing pat, of protecting narrow interests and putting off unpleasant decisions - that time has surely passed. Starting today, we must pick ourselves up, dust ourselves off, and begin again the work of remaking America. For everywhere we look, there is work to be done. The state of the economy calls for action, bold and swift, and we will act - not only to create new jobs, but to lay a new foundation for growth. We will build the roads and bridges, the electric grids and digital lines that feed our commerce and bind us together. We will restore science to its rightful place, and wield technology's wonders to raise health care's quality and lower its cost. We will harness the sun and the winds and the soil to fuel our cars and run our factories. And we will transform our schools and colleges and universities to meet the demands of a new age. All this we can do. And all this we will do.

Now, there are some who question the scale of our ambitions - who suggest that our system cannot tolerate too many big plans. Their memories are short. For they have forgotten what this country has already done; what free men and women can achieve when imagination is joined to common purpose, and necessity to courage.

What the cynics fail to understand is that the ground has shifted beneath them - that the stale political arguments that have consumed us for so long no longer apply. The question we ask today is not whether our government is too big or too small, but whether it works whether it helps families find jobs at a decent wage, care they can afford, a retirement that is dignified. Where the answer is yes, we intend to move forward. Where the answer is no, programs will end. And those of us who manage the public's dollars will be held to account - to spend wisely, reform bad habits, and do our business in the light of day - because only then can we restore the vital trust between a people and their government.

Nor is the question before us whether the market is a force for good or ill. Its power to generate wealth and expand freedom is unmatched, but this crisis has reminded us that without a watchful eye, the market can spin out of control - and that a nation cannot prosper long when it favors only the prosperous. The success of our economy has always depended not just on the size of our Gross Domestic Product, but on the reach of our prosperity; on the ability to extend opportunity to every willing heart - not out of charity, but because it is the surest route to our common good.

As for our common defense, we reject as false the choice between our safety and our ideals. Our Founding Fathers, faced with perils we can scarcely imagine, drafted a charter to assure the rule of law and the rights of man, a charter expanded by the blood of generations. Those ideals still light the world, and we will not give them up for expedience's sake. And so to all other peoples and governments who are watching today, from the grandest capitals to the small village where my father was born: know that America is a friend of each nation and every man, woman, and child who seeks a future of peace and dignity, and we are ready to lead once more.

Recall that earlier generations faced down fascism and communism not just with missiles and tanks, but with the sturdy alliances and enduring convictions. They understood that our power

alone cannot protect us, nor does it entitle us to do as we please. Instead, they knew that our power grows through its prudent use; our security emanates from the justness of our cause, the force of our example, the tempering qualities of humility and restraint. We are the keepers of this legacy. Guided by these principles once more, we can meet those new threats that demand even greater effort - even greater cooperation and understanding between nations. We will begin to responsibly leave Iraq to its people, and forge a hard-earned peace in Afghanistan. With old friends and former foes, we'll work tirelessly to lessen the nuclear threat, and roll back the specter of a warming planet. We will not apologize for our way of life, nor will we waver in its defense, and for those who seek to advance their aims by inducing terror and slaughtering innocents, we say to you now that our spirit is stronger and cannot be broken; you cannot outlast us, and we will defeat you. For we know that our patchwork heritage is a strength, not a weakness. We are a nation of Christians and Muslims, Jews and Hindus - and non-believers. We are shaped by every language and culture, drawn from every end of this Earth; and because we have tasted the bitter swill of civil war and segregation, and emerged from that dark chapter stronger and more united, we cannot help but believe that the old hatreds shall someday pass; that the lines of tribe shall soon dissolve; that as the world grows smaller, our common humanity shall reveal itself; and that America must play its role in ushering in a new era of peace. To the Muslim world, we seek a new way forward, based on mutual interest and mutual respect. To those leaders around the globe who seek to sow conflict, or blame their society's ills on the West - know that your people will judge you on what you can build, not what you destroy. To those who cling to power through corruption and deceit and the silencing of dissent, know that you are on the wrong side of history; but that we will extend a hand if you are willing to unclench your fist.

To the people of poor nations, we pledge to work alongside you to make your farms flourish and let clean waters flow; to nourish starved bodies and feed hungry minds. And to those

nations like ours that enjoy relative plenty, we say we can no longer afford indifference to the suffering outside our borders; nor can we consume the world's resources without regard to effect. For the world has changed, and we must change with it. As we consider the road that unfolds before us, we remember with humble gratitude those brave Americans who, at this very hour, patrol far-off deserts and distant mountains. They have something to tell us, just as the fallen heroes who lie in Arlington whisper through the ages. We honor them not only because they are guardians of our liberty, but because they embody the spirit of service; a willingness to find meaning in something greater than themselves. And yet, at this moment - a moment that will define a generation - it is precisely this spirit that must inhabit us all.

For as much as government can do and must do, it is ultimately the faith and determination of the American people upon which this nation relies. It is the kindness to take in a stranger when the levees break, the selflessness of workers who would rather cut their hours than see a friend lose their job which sees us through our darkest hours. It is the firefighter's courage to storm a stairway filled with smoke, but also a parent's willingness to nurture a child, that finally decides our fate.

Our challenges may be new. The instruments with which we meet them may be new. But those values upon which our success depends - honesty and hard work, courage and fair play, tolerance and curiosity, loyalty and patriotism - these things are old. These things are true. They have been the quiet force of progress throughout our history. What is demanded then is a return to these truths. What is required of us now is a new era of responsibility - a recognition, on the part of every American, that we have duties to ourselves, our nation, and the world, duties that we do not grudgingly accept but rather seize gladly, firm in the knowledge that there is nothing so satisfying to the spirit, so defining of our character, than giving our all to a difficult task.

This is the price and the promise of citizenship. This is the source of our confidence - the knowledge that God calls on us to shape an uncertain destiny. This is the meaning of our liberty and our creed - why men and women and children of every race and every faith can join in celebration across this magnificent mall, and why a man whose father less than sixty years ago might not have been served at a local restaurant can now stand before you to take a most sacred oath.

So let us mark this day with remembrance, of who we are and how far we have traveled.

In the year of America's birth, in the coldest of months, a small band of patriots huddled by dying campfires on the shores of an icy river. The capital was abandoned. The enemy was advancing. The snow was stained with blood. At a moment when the outcome of our revolution was most in doubt, the father of our nation ordered these words be read to the people: "Let it be told to the future world...that in the depth of winter, when nothing but hope and virtue could survive...that the city and the country, alarmed at one common danger, came forth to meet [it]." America. In the face of our common dangers, in this winter of our hardship, let us remember these timeless words. With hope and virtue, let us brave once more the icy currents, and endure what storms may come. Let it be said by our children's children that when we were tested we refused to let this journey end, that we did not turn back nor did we falter; and with eyes fixed on the horizon and God's grace upon us, we carried forth that great gift of freedom and delivered it safely to future generations.

Thank you. God bless you and God bless the United States of America.

Appendix 2

Obama's Inaugural speech 2013. (www.barackobama.com)

Vice President Biden, Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the United States Congress, distinguished guests, and fellow citizens:

Each time we gather to inaugurate a president; we bear witness to the enduring strength of our Constitution. We affirm the promise of our democracy. We recall that what binds this nation together is not the colors of our skin or the tenets of our faith or the origins of our names. What makes us exceptional – what makes us American – is our allegiance to an idea, articulated in a declaration made more than two centuries ago:

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.”

Today we continue a never-ending journey, to bridge the meaning of those words with the realities of our time. For history tells us that while these truths may be self-evident, they have never been self-executing; that while freedom is a gift from God, it must be secured by His people here on Earth. The patriots of 1776 did not fight to replace the tyranny of a king with the privileges of a few or the rule of a mob. They gave to us a Republic, a government of, and by, and for the people, entrusting each generation to keep safe our founding creed. For more than two hundred years, we have.

Through blood drawn by lash and blood drawn by sword, we learned that no union founded on the principles of liberty and equality could survive half-slave and half-free. We made ourselves anew, and vowed to move forward together.

Together, we determined that a modern economy requires railroads and highways to speed travel and commerce; schools and colleges to train our workers.

Together, we discovered that a free market only thrives when there are rules to ensure competition and fair play.

Together, we resolved that a great nation must care for the vulnerable, and protect its people from life's worst hazards and misfortune.

Through it all, we have never relinquished our skepticism of central authority, nor have we succumbed to the fiction that all society's ills can be cured through government alone. Our celebration of initiative and enterprise; our insistence on hard work and personal responsibility, are constants in our character.

But we have always understood that when times change, so must we; that fidelity to our founding principles requires new responses to new challenges; that preserving our individual freedoms ultimately requires collective action. For the American people can no more meet the demands of today's world by acting alone than American soldiers could have met the forces of fascism or communism with muskets and militias. No single person can train all the math and science teachers we'll need to equip our children for the future, or build the roads and networks and research labs that will bring new jobs and businesses to our shores. Now, more than ever, we must do these things together, as one nation, and one people.

This generation of Americans has been tested by crises that steeled our resolve and proved our resilience. A decade of war is now ending. An economic recovery has begun. America's possibilities are limitless, for we possess all the qualities that this world without boundaries demands: youth and drive; diversity and openness; an endless capacity for risk and a gift for reinvention. My fellow Americans, we are made for this moment, and we will seize it – so long as we seize it together.

For we, the people, understand that our country cannot succeed when a shrinking few do very well and a growing many barely make it. We believe that America's prosperity must rest upon the broad shoulders of a rising middle class. We know that America thrives when every

person can find independence and pride in their work; when the wages of honest labor liberate families from the brink of hardship. We are true to our creed when a little girl born into the bleakest poverty knows that she has the same chance to succeed as anybody else, because she is an American, she is free, and she is equal, not just in the eyes of God but also in our own.

We understand that outworn programs are inadequate to the needs of our time. We must harness new ideas and technology to remake our government, revamp our tax code, reform our schools, and empower our citizens with the skills they need to work harder, learn more, and reach higher. But while the means will change, our purpose endures: a nation that rewards the effort and determination of every single American. That is what this moment requires. That is what will give real meaning to our creed.

We, the people, still believe that every citizen deserves a basic measure of security and dignity. We must make the hard choices to reduce the cost of health care and the size of our deficit. But we reject the belief that America must choose between caring for the generation that built this country and investing in the generation that will build its future. For we remember the lessons of our past, when twilight years were spent in poverty, and parents of a child with a disability had nowhere to turn. We do not believe that in this country, freedom is reserved for the lucky, or happiness for the few. We recognize that no matter how responsibly we live our lives, any one of us, at any time, may face a job loss, or a sudden illness, or a home swept away in a terrible storm. The commitments we make to each other – through Medicare, and Medicaid, and Social Security – these things do not sap our initiative; they strengthen us. They do not make us a nation of takers; they free us to take the risks that make this country great.

We, the people, still believe that our obligations as Americans are not just to ourselves, but to all posterity. We will respond to the threat of climate change, knowing that the failure to do

so would betray our children and future generations. Some may still deny the overwhelming judgment of science, but none can avoid the devastating impact of raging fires, and crippling drought, and more powerful storms. The path towards sustainable energy sources will be long and sometimes difficult. But America cannot resist this transition; we must lead it. We cannot cede to other nations the technology that will power new jobs and new industries – we must claim its promise. That is how we will maintain our economic vitality and our national treasure – our forests and waterways; our croplands and snowcapped peaks. That is how we will preserve our planet, commanded to our care by God. That’s what will lend meaning to the creed our fathers once declared.

We, the people, still believe that enduring security and lasting peace do not require perpetual war. Our brave men and women in uniform, tempered by the flames of battle, are unmatched in skill and courage. Our citizens, seared by the memory of those we have lost, know too well the price that is paid for liberty. The knowledge of their sacrifice will keep us forever vigilant against those who would do us harm. But we are also heirs to those who won the peace and not just the war, who turned sworn enemies into the surest of friends, and we must carry those lessons into this time as well.

We will defend our people and uphold our values through strength of arms and rule of law. We will show the courage to try and resolve our differences with other nations peacefully – not because we are naïve about the dangers we face, but because engagement can more durably lift suspicion and fear. America will remain the anchor of strong alliances in every corner of the globe; and we will renew those institutions that extend our capacity to manage crisis abroad, for no one has a greater stake in a peaceful world than its most powerful nation. We will support democracy from Asia to Africa; from the Americas to the Middle East, because our interests and our conscience compel us to act on behalf of those who long for freedom. And we must be a source of hope to the poor, the sick, the marginalized, the

victims of prejudice – not out of mere charity, but because peace in our time requires the constant advance of those principles that our common creed describes: tolerance and opportunity; human dignity and justice.

We, the people, declare today that the most evident of truths – that all of us are created equal – is the star that guides us still; just as it guided our forebears through Seneca Falls, and Selma, and Stonewall; just as it guided all those men and women, sung and unsung, who left footprints along this great Mall, to hear a preacher say that we cannot walk alone; to hear a King proclaim that our individual freedom is inextricably bound to the freedom of every soul on Earth.

It is now our generation's task to carry on what those pioneers began. For our journey is not complete until our wives, our mothers, and daughters can earn a living equal to their efforts. Our journey is not complete until our gay brothers and sisters are treated like anyone else under the law – for if we are truly created equal, then surely the love we commit to one another must be equal as well. Our journey is not complete until no citizen is forced to wait for hours to exercise the right to vote. Our journey is not complete until we find a better way to welcome the striving, hopeful immigrants who still see America as a land of opportunity; until bright young students and engineers are enlisted in our workforce rather than expelled from our country. Our journey is not complete until all our children, from the streets of Detroit to the hills of Appalachia to the quiet lanes of Newtown, know that they are cared for, and cherished, and always safe from harm.

That is our generation's task – to make these words, these rights, these values – of Life, and Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness – real for every American. Being true to our founding documents does not require us to agree on every contour of life; it does not mean we will all define liberty in exactly the same way, or follow the same precise path to happiness.

Progress does not compel us to settle centuries-long debates about the role of government for all time – but it does require us to act in our time.

For now decisions are upon us, and we cannot afford delay. We cannot mistake absolutism for principle, or substitute spectacle for politics, or treat name-calling as reasoned debate. We must act, knowing that our work will be imperfect. We must act, knowing that today's victories will be only partial, and that it will be up to those who stand here in four years, and forty years, and four hundred years hence to advance the timeless spirit once conferred to us in a spare Philadelphia hall.

My fellow Americans, the oath I have sworn before you today, like the one recited by others who serve in this Capitol, was an oath to God and country, not party or faction – and we must faithfully execute that pledge during the duration of our service. But the words I spoke today are not so different from the oath that is taken each time a soldier signs up for duty, or an immigrant realizes her dream. My oath is not so different from the pledge we all make to the flag that waves above and that fills our hearts with pride.

They are the words of citizens, and they represent our greatest hope. You and I, as citizens, have the power to set this country's course.

You and I, as citizens, have the obligation to shape the debates of our time – not only with the votes we cast, but with the voices we lift in defense of our most ancient values and enduring ideals.

Let each of us now embrace, with solemn duty and awesome joy, what is our lasting birthright. With common effort and common purpose, with passion and dedication, let us answer the call of history, and carry into an uncertain future that precious light of freedom.

Thank you, God Bless you, and may He forever bless these United States of America.

Appendix 3

SPEECH BY PRESIDENT GOODLUCK EBELE JONATHAN DECLARING HIS CANDIDACY FOR THE PDP PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES

by Goodluck Jonathan on Saturday, September 18, 2010 at 7:32am

(www.vanguardnews.com/jonthansinauguraladdress)

SPEECH BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA, DR. GOODLUCK EBELE JONATHAN, GCFR, ON THE OCCASION OF THE DECLARATION OF HIS CANDIDACY FOR THE PDP PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES, TODAY 18TH SEPTEMBER, 2010.

PROTOCOL

Forty months ago my predecessor in office and I embarked on a joint ticket in the governance of our great country, Nigeria. Sadly, he passed away on the 5th of May 2010. MAY HIS GENTLE SOUL REST IN PERFECT PEACE, AMEN.

With the death of President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua, the mantle of leadership of our great nation fell on me. However, the days leading to my presidency were very trying times for our nation. We confronted those moments and their challenges to national security with patriotism and care. I appreciate the role played by the National Assembly, Governors, Civil Society groups, the mass media, and other patriotic Nigerians. The late President Yar'Adua and I shared great dreams for our country. We toiled together to realize those dreams in order to justify the confidence Nigerians reposed in us. Together we swore to execute a joint mandate and today I come before you to make a pronouncement based on that undertaking.

The past four months that I have served as President of Nigeria have opened my eyes to the vast potentials of this office as a potent instrument for the transformation of our country. I discovered that by sheer willpower, I could end the long queues and price fluctuations in our petrol stations. Today, all our refineries are working, saving us huge amounts of funds spent on importation of petroleum products.

I discovered that by insisting that the right things be done, we could begin a turnaround in our power sector by involving the private sector in power generation and distribution. As you can see from the lower quantities of diesel that you are buying today, power generation has significantly improved. I have put in place new gas policies and very soon, we will be saying goodbye to gas flaring in our oil fields. Working with the National Assembly, we rolled out a law that requires companies operating in the oil and gas sectors of our economy to utilize an appreciable percentage of their goods and services from local sources. We saw to it that normalcy began to return to the Niger Delta by ensuring government's fidelity to its promises, and this has helped to stabilize our national revenue.

In the last few months, I embarked on monumental projects in our road infrastructure to end the carnage on our federal highways. I began several projects to make our water resources available for drinking and farming. I targeted our educational system to return quality and competitiveness to them. I re-addressed our drive for self sufficiency in food production. I have taken bold steps to confront our security situation. In this regard, we are pursuing the revision of our laws to be more responsive to international conventions and more punitive to criminals.

I set the stage for free and fair elections by constituting an electoral commission comprising of Nigerians with impeccable credentials for firmness and incorruptibility. I charged our anti-corruption agencies to speed up the war against corruption, and respect no sacred cows in the

process. In the management of the economy, I advocated a more transparent banking industry, price stability, low inflation, and aggregate increase in productivity as a way to drive us to a more prosperous economy. In International Relations, I advanced the respectability accorded our country by effective engagement in global fora.

From the moment I was sworn in as President, I came under intense pressure to make a declaration concerning my political future, but declined to do so because it would have immediately distracted us from all the development initiatives we have accomplished so far.

As President and leader of this government, I decided not to place partisan politics above the immediate needs and priorities of our people. I therefore told Nigerians to give me time to concentrate on my work, and that at the appropriate time, I would make a public statement on my political future after widespread consultations. Those consultations have now been concluded. The Independent National Electoral Commission has recently announced a timetable for the 2011 general elections in the country. My party, the Peoples Democratic Party, has also published a timetable for its primaries. In the circumstances and after a thorough self-examination and prayers with my family, I, GoodluckEbeleAzikiwe Jonathan have decided to humbly offer myself as a candidate in the Presidential Primaries of our great party, the People's Democratic Party, in order to stand for the 2011 Presidential elections. I pledge once again to all the people of this nation that they will have a free and fair election, even as I stand to be a candidate. In this race, I have the honour to have as my running mate, Architect NamadiSambo, the Vice President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. Our country is at the threshold of a new era; an era that beckons for a new kind of leadership; a leadership that is uncontaminated by the prejudices of the past; a leadership committed to change; a leadership that reinvents government, to solve the everyday problems that confront the average Nigerian.

I was not born rich, and in my youth, I never imagined that I would be where I am today, but not once did I ever give up. Not once did I imagine that a child from Otuoke, a small village in the Niger Delta, will one day rise to the position of President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. I was raised by my mother and father with just enough money to meet our daily needs.

In my early days in school, I had no shoes, no school bags. I carried my books in my hands but never despaired; no car to take me to school but I never despaired. There were days I had only one meal but I never despaired. I walked miles and crossed rivers to school every day but I never despaired. Didn't have power, didn't have generators, studied with lanterns but I never despaired.

In spite of these, I finished secondary school, attended the University of Port Harcourt, and now hold a doctorate degree.

Fellow Nigerians, if I could make it, you too can make it!

My story is the story of a young Nigerian whose access to education opened up vast opportunities that enabled me to attain my present position. As I travel up and down our country, I see a nation blessed by God with rich agricultural and mineral resources and an enterprising people. I see millions of Nigerians whose potentials for greatness are constrained by the lack of basic infrastructure.

I see Nigerians who can make a difference in the service of their country but are disadvantaged by the lack of opportunities.

My story symbolizes my dream for Nigeria. The dream that any Nigerian child from Kaura- Namoda to Duke town; from Potiskum to Nsukka, from Isale-Eko to Gboko will be able to realize his God-given potentials, unhindered by tribe or religion and unrestricted by

improvised political inhibitions. My story holds out the promise of a new Nigeria. A Nigeria built on the virtues of love and respect for one another, on unity, on industry, on hard work and on good governance.

My fellow Nigerians, this is what has brought me to Eagle Square today. I have come to say to all of you, that GoodluckEbeleAzikiwe Jonathan is the man you need to put Nigeria right. I have come to launch a campaign of ideas, not one of calumny. I have come to preach love, not hate. I have come to break you away from divisive tendencies of the past which have slowed our drive to true nationhood. I have no enemies to fight. You are all my friends and we share a common destiny.

Let the word go out from this Eagle Square that Jonathan as President in 2011 will herald a new era of transformation of our country; an era that will end the agony of power shortage in our country. Let the word go out from here that I will be for the students, teachers and parents of Nigeria, a President who will advance quality and competitive education. Let everyone in this country hear that I shall strive to the best of my ability to attain self-sufficiency in food production.

Let the word go out that my plans for a Sovereign Wealth Fund with an initial capital of \$1billion will begin the journey for an economic restoration. This restoration will provide new job opportunities and alleviate poverty. Let the word go out that our health sector will receive maximum priority in a new Jonathan administration, a priority that will ensure maximum health care and stop our brain drain.

Let all the kidnapers, criminal elements, and miscreants that give us a bad name be ready for the fight that I shall give them. Let the ordinary Nigerian be assured that President Jonathan will have zero tolerance for corruption. Let the international community hear that today I

have offered myself to lead a country that will engage them in mutual respect and cooperation for the achievement of international peace and understanding. To help me in these tasks effectively, I will re-train, revamp, and motivate the civil service. My dear good people of Nigeria, I got here today by the power of God and the support of all Nigerians; all ethnic groups, North, South, East and West. I am here today because of your support and prayers. I want all of you to know that I am one of you and I will never let you down! I want you to know that I will keep hope alive; I want you to know that your time has come. I stand before you today, humbly seeking your support for me, GoodluckEbeleAzikiwe Jonathan, to run for the office of the President of Nigeria with Architect NamadiSambo as my running mate.

We will fight for JUSTICE!

We will fight for all Nigerians to have access to POWER!

We will fight for qualitative and competitive EDUCATION!

We will fight for HEALTH CARE REFORMS!

We will fight to create jobs, for all Nigerians!

We will fight corruption!

We will fight to protect all Citizens!

We will fight for your rights!

My dear country men and women, give me your support, give me your votes and together we will fight to build a great nation of our dreams!

I cannot end this speech without thanking you all for attending this occasion. Your huge attendance is a loud testimony of your support for us. For this I am very grateful. I pray that the Almighty God abides with you and sees you safely back to your respective destinations. When you return, tell all those at home that as we celebrate our fifty years anniversary as a nation, Goodluck has come to transform Nigeria and I will never let you down.

Thank You.

May God Bless you all!

And may God bless the Federal Republic of Nigeria! GOODLUCK EBELE AZIKIWE
JONATHAN, GCFR.

Appendix 4

Goodluck Jonathan's inauguration address

On May 29, 2011 · In News

Below is President Goodluck Jonathan's inauguration address on the occasion of his swearing-in as President, Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of Nigeria on May 29, 2011.

([www.guardian.co.uk>news>worldnews>nigeria,](http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/worldnews/nigeria))

PROTOCOL

1. My Dear Compatriots, I stand in humble gratitude to you, this day, having just sworn to the oath of office as President, Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of our great nation.

2. I thank you all, fellow citizens, for the trust and confidence, which you have demonstrated through the power of your vote. I want to assure you, that I will do my utmost at all times, to continue to deserve your trust.

3. I would like to specially acknowledge the presence in our midst today, of Brother Heads of State and Government, who have come to share this joyous moment with us,. Your Excellency's, I thank you for your solidarity. I also wish to express my gratitude, to the Representatives of Heads of State and Government who are here with us. My appreciation also goes to the chairperson of the African Union and other world leaders, our development partners, and all our distinguished guests.

4. I want to specially thank all Nigerians for staying the course in our collective commitment to build a democratic nation. To members of the PDP family and members of other political parties, who have demonstrated faith in our democratic enterprise, I salute you.

5. At this juncture, let me acknowledge and salute my friend and brother, Vice-President Namadi Sambo; and my dear wife, Patience, who has been a strong pillar of support.

6. I thank her for galvanizing and mobilizing Nigerian women for the cause of democracy. In the same vein, I owe a debt of gratitude to my mother and late father. I cannot thank them enough.

7. I cannot but pay tribute to our late President, Alhaji Umaru Musa Yar'Adua, with whom we won the Presidential election four years ago, when I contested as his running mate. May God bless his soul.

8. I also wish to pay tribute to our founding fathers, whose enduring sacrifices and abiding faith in the unity and greatness of our country, laid the foundation for the nation. We take enormous pride in their contributions. The pivotal task of this generation is to lift our fatherland to the summit of greatness.

9. Your Excellency's, Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen, earlier this year, over seventy-three million eligible Nigerians endured all manner of inconvenience just to secure their voters cards, in order to exercise the right to choose those that will govern them.

10. At the polls, we saw the most dramatic expressions of the hunger for democracy. Stories of courage and patriotism were repeated in many ways, including how fellow citizens helped

physically challenged voters into polling stations to enable them exercise their franchise. The inspiring story of the one hundred and three year old man and many like him across the country, who struggled against the physical limitations of age to cast their vote, is noteworthy.

11. Such determination derives from the typical Nigerian spirit of resilience in the face of the greatest of odds. That spirit has, over the years, stirred our hopes, doused our fears, and encouraged us to gather ourselves to build a strong nation even when others doubted our capacity.

12. Today, our unity is firm, and our purpose is strong. Our determination unshakable. Together, we will unite our nation and improve the living standards of all our peoples whether in the North or in the South; in the East or in the West. Our decade of development has begun. The march is on. The day of transformation begins today. We will not allow anyone exploit differences in creed or tongue, to set us one against another. Let me at this point congratulate the elected Governors, Senators, members of the House of Representatives and those of the States Houses of Assembly for their victories at the polls.

13. I am mindful that I represent the shared aspiration of all our people to forge a united Nigeria: a land of justice, opportunity and plenty. Confident that a people that are truly committed to a noble ideal, cannot be denied the realization of their vision, I assure you that this dream of Nigeria, that is so deeply felt by millions, will indeed come to reality.

14. A decade ago, it would have been a mere daydream to think that a citizen from a minority ethnic group could galvanize national support, on an unprecedented scale, to discard

ancient prejudices, and win the people's mandate as President of our beloved country. That result emanated from the toil and sacrifice of innumerable individuals and institutions, many of whom may never get to receive public appreciation for their effort.

15. Only a couple of days ago, I received an entry on my Facebook page. It was sent by Mr. Babajide Orevba.

He wrote to inform me that I had lost a great fan. That fan was his father, Mr. Emmanuel Bamidele Orevba. The deceased, the son told me, was no politician, but had campaigned enthusiastically for my ticket. Tragically,

Overwhelmed by the joy of our victory, he collapsed, and passed on three days later. I pray God Almighty to grant his soul eternal rest.

16. The success of the 2011 elections and the widespread acclaim which the exercise received was due to the uncommon patriotism and diligence exhibited by many Nigerians, including members of the Armed Forces,

National Youth Service Corps (NYSC) and others. Unfortunately, despite the free, fair and transparent manner the elections were conducted, a senseless wave of violence in some parts of the country led to the death of ten members of the NYSC and others. These brave men and women paid the supreme sacrifice in the service of our fatherland. They are heroes of our democracy. We offer our heartfelt prayers and condolences in respect of all those who lost their lives.

17. In the days ahead, those of us that you have elected to serve must show that we are men and women with the patriotism and passion, to match the hopes and aspirations of you, the great people of this country. We must demonstrate the leadership, statesmanship, vision,

capacity, and sacrifice, to transform our nation. We must strengthen common grounds, develop new areas of understanding and collaboration, and seek fresh ideas that will enrich our national consensus.

18. It is the supreme task of this generation to give hope to the hopeless, strength to the weak and protection to the defenceless.

19. Fellow citizens, the leadership we have pledged is decidedly transformative. The transformation will be achieved in all the critical sectors, by harnessing the creative energies of our people.

20. We must grow the economy, create jobs, and generate enduring happiness for our people. I have great confidence in the ability of Nigerians to transform this country. The urgent task of my administration is to provide a suitable environment, for productive activities to flourish. I therefore call on the good people of Nigeria, to enlist as agents of this great transformation.

21. My dear countrymen and women, being a Nigerian is a blessing. It is also a great responsibility. We must make a vow that, together, we will make the Nigerian Enterprise thrive.

22. The leadership and the followership must strive to convert our vast human and natural resources into the force that leads to a greater Nigeria. The Nigeria of our dreams must be built on hard work and not on short cuts.

Let me salute the Nigerian workers who build our communities, cities and country. They deserve fair rewards, and so do the women that raise our children, and the rural dwellers that grow our food.

23. The moment is right. The signs are heart-warming. We are ready to take off on the path of sustained growth and economic development. In our economic strategy, there will be appropriate policy support to the real sector of the economy, so that Small and Medium Enterprises may thrive. Nigeria is blessed with enormous natural wealth, and my Administration will continue to encourage locally owned enterprises to take advantage of our resources in growing the domestic economy. A robust private sector is vital to providing jobs for our rapidly expanding population. But this must be a collaborative effort.

24. We must form technical and financial partnerships with global businesses and organizations. We live in an age where no country can survive on its own; countries depend on each other for economic well-being. Nigeria is no different. Returns on investment in Nigeria remain among the highest in the world. We will continue to welcome sustainable investment in our economy.

25. We will push programs and policies that will benefit both local and foreign businesses, but we must emphasize mutual benefits and win-win relationships. The overall ongoing reforms in the banking and financial sectors are therefore designed to support the real sector of the economy.

26. To drive our overall economic vision, the power sector reform is at the heart of our industrialization strategy. I call on all stakeholders, to cooperate with my administration, to ensure the success of the reforms.

27. Over the next four years, attention will be focused on rebuilding our infrastructure. We will create greater access to quality education and improved health care delivery. We will pay special attention to the agricultural sector, to enable it play its role of ensuring food security and massive job creation for our people.

28. The creation of the Nigerian Sovereign Investment Authority will immensely contribute to strengthening our fiscal framework, by institutionalizing savings of our commodity-related revenues. With this mechanism in place, we will avoid the boom and bust cycles, and mitigate our exposure to oil price volatility.

29. The lesson we have learnt is that the resolution of the Niger Delta issue is crucial for the health of the nation's economy. In the interest of justice, equity and national unity, we shall actively promote the development of the region. I believe that peace is a necessary condition for development.

30. Fellow citizens, in every decision, I shall always place the common good before all else. The bane of corruption shall be met by the overwhelming force of our collective determination, to rid our nation of this scourge. The fight against corruption is a war in which we must all enlist, so that the limited resources of this nation will be used for the growth of our commonwealth.

31. I am confident that we have every reason to look to the future with hope. We owe ourselves and posterity the duty of making this country respectable in the comity of nations. Nigeria, as a responsible member of the international community, will remain committed to

the maintenance of global peace and security. We will continue to play an active role in the United Nations. Our role in the African Union, ECOWAS, and the Gulf of Guinea will be enhanced to ensure greater human and energy security.

32. Your Excellencies, Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a new dawn for Africa. We fought for decolonization. We will now fight for democratization. Nigeria, in partnership with the African Union, will lead the process for democracy and development in Africa. In particular, we will support the consolidation of democracy, good governance and human rights in the continent. Africa must develop its vast resources to tackle poverty and under-development.

33. Conscious of the negative effect of insecurity on growth and development, my Administration will seek collaboration at bilateral and multilateral levels, to improve our capability in combating trans-border crimes. In this regard, we will intensify our advocacy against the illicit trades in small arms and light weapons, which have become the catalyst for conflicts on the African continent. All Nigerian diplomatic missions abroad are to accord this vision of defending the dignity of humanity the highest priority.

34. My fellow countrymen and women, Nigeria is not just a land of promise; it shall be a nation where positive change will continue to take place, for the good of our people. The time for lamentation is over. This is the era of transformation. This is the time for action. But Nigeria can only be transformed if we all play our parts with commitment and sincerity. Cynicism and skepticism will not help our journey to greatness. Let us all believe in a new Nigeria. Let us work together to build a great country that we will all be proud of. This is our hour.

35. Fellow Compatriots, lift your gaze towards the horizon. Look ahead and you will see a great future that we can secure with unity, hard work and collective sacrifice.

36. Join me now as we begin the journey of transforming Nigeria. I will continue to fight, for your future, because I am one of you. I will continue to fight, for improved medical care for all our citizens. I will continue to fight for all citizens to have access to first class education. I will continue to fight for electricity to be available to all our citizens. I will continue to fight for an efficient and affordable public transport system for all our people. I will continue to fight for jobs to be created through productive partnerships.

37. You have trusted me with your mandate, and I will never, never let you down.

38. I know your pain, because I have been there. Look beyond the hardship you have endured. See a new beginning; a new direction; a new spirit.

39. Nigerians, I want you to start to dream again. What you see in your dreams, we can achieve together. I call upon all the Presidential candidates who contested with me to join hands with us as we begin the transformation of our country.

40. Let us work together; let us build together; let us bequeath a greater Nigeria to the generations to come.

41. I thank you! God bless you all! And God bless the Federal Republic of Nigeria.