An Analysis of the Use of Metaphors in Political Rhetoric in Local Elections

Nikolina Borčić[*]
Mirela Holy[**]
Ivona Čulo[***]

SUMMARY

Political discourse has always been more or less ideological, since ideology is inseparable from discourse and politics. The concepts of nation and the national are a part of every ideology. This article studies the synergy between political communication about nation and national and discourse structure through the use of metaphors of personification and argumentation in constructing political identities in the selected politicians' statements during the local elections of 2016 and 2017 in Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia. Therefore, the paper studies which argumentative and metaphorical frameworks politicians in Croatia, Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina use with regard to their own countries and/or the neighbouring countries. The research was focused on studying the metaphor **state as person** *in the argumentation of the selected Croatian, Serbian and Bosnian-Herzegovinian politicians in the political television show Pressing, which is broadcast on N1 television in all the three states in the same format. The aim was to describe the interrelationship between linguistic realizations of the opinion patterns and the intention of stressing specific political messages by referring to national identity. A parallel analysis has shown that the chosen metaphors are most frequently represented in the political discourse of the analysed Serbian politicians. National argumentation is*

---

[*] Nikolina Borčić, PhD, lecturer, Veučilište VERN' / VERN' University of Applied Sciences (Zagreb), e-mail: nikolina.borcic@vern.hr
[**] Mirela Holy, PhD, lecturer, Veleučilište VERN' / VERN' University of Applied Sciences (Zagreb), e-mail; mirela.holy.@vern.hr
[***] Ivona Čulo, prof., B.A., lecturer, Sveučilište Sjever / University North, (Koprivnica), e-mail: ivona.culo1@gmail.com

*predominantly directed to negative evaluation of the current political situation, and of the future situation as well, should no changes take place. The selected Bosnian and Herzegovinian politicians' rhetoric also relies on metaphorical expressions that lead to the metaphor **state as person**, but to a much more limited extent. Similar to the Serbian politicians' rhetoric, the analysis of Bosnian politicians has also shown that they use negative argumentation to emphasize current challenges. The Croatian sample has shown a domination of expressions that point to the metaphors **party as person** and a **city as person**, while the metaphor **state as person** has been neglected. Therefore, this shows that the national identity narrative is not common for the rhetoric of the Croatian local elections.*

Keywords: conceptual metaphors, argumentation, discourse on the national, local elections, national identity

Introduction

Political messages affect public attitudes through the media and steer discussions about public discourse. The primary aim of political discourse is to inform and persuade the general public or potential voters to accept specific viewpoints and, consequently, to induce or discourage an action (Charteris-Black, 2005; 2014). The way a politician communicates his or her attitudes, the language that the speaker uses, is one of the mechanisms for achieving credibility. A politician's choice of language is influenced by their assumptions concerning the level of their audience's knowledge (Charteris-Black, 2014: xvi). "Political language looks to remove doubt, because people expect their leaders to present a plan of well-defined future actions, rather than a set of hypothetical abstraction." (Charteris-Black, 2014: 109).

On the discourse level, the basis of political messages is argumentation. Argumentation uses different rhetorical skills, eristic techniques and evidence to maximize the power of persuasion (Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969). On the textual or linguistic level, it is possible to achieve persuasion by using different linguistic mechanisms, such as the use of unclear words or phrases, the use of euphemisms, verbal acts of declaration, promises, but also the use of conceptual metaphors (Charteris-Black, 2005; 2014). According to Conceptual Metaphor Analysis (CMT), a conceptual metaphor implicates the understanding of one domain of knowledge in terms of another. This paper looks at how metaphors of personification are used as a rhetorical strategy in political discourse with the aim of constructing a political image based on nationhood.

The emphasis of this paper is on the analysis of the language used in the statements of politicians who run for specific positions in local elections, either for themselves or their parties. Local elections are the kind of elections which are in a political sense most closely dealing with the electorate bodies' concrete problems and allow the decision-making process at the lowest operational level within an institutional structure or hierarchy. In political science literature, local elections are often seen as a second-order system. This means that the voters' turnout on local elections will generally be considerably lower, since voters consider these elections as less important (Schakel, 2015a; Schakel and Dandoy, 2014, cf. Raos, 2017: 29). On the other hand, local elections are a significant indicator of the consolidation of democracy in transition countries (Koprić, 2007). The main starting point of the paper is that ideology is inseparable from discourse and politics, and the main focus is on metaphorical frameworks which exist in politicians' rhetoric in relation to their own countries and/or to the neighbouring countries. Therefore, the politicians' statements made in the political talk show *Pressing* on N1 TV have been studied in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia.

The paper consists of an introductory part, followed by a theoretical part with an emphasis on political discourse and political metaphors, while the third part describes the conducted research. The conclusive chapter serves to integrate the starting theory and the research results with the proposal of guidelines for further research.

The theoretical background

Building a political image based on discourse

Political discourse is based on communicating ideas, beliefs, and ideologies. In this respect, an ideology represents a principle whereupon beliefs have been formed (Van Dijk, 2006). The term ideology was defined by Stuart Hall (1997) as a set of mental frameworks which include concepts, categories, ideas and systems of images shared by members of a certain group. Freeden (1996) comprehends ideology as a political system of beliefs. Although the term has been used as the opposite of objective knowledge (Van Dijk, 2006: 728), as a system of ideas, beliefs and views, ideology is in fact a platform for constructing a political image. Van Dijk (2002) defines ideology as a group's social representation. Ideologies control the discourse in and about politics. While speaking, writing or reading, we use our mental models as the cognitive basis for producing texts (Charteris-Black, 2014). According to Van Dijk (2002: 1), "ideology, discourse and politics create a triangle which poses interesting theoretical and analytical questions."

According to Girnth (2002), public opinion, an inter-party system of values, politi-cal marketing and legislative procedures have the biggest effect on discourse forma-tion. There is also another factor which acts on the present political communication. Charteris Black (2005) stresses the importance of media context used and spoken by politicians. They became a part of our everyday life because we watch and listen to them in our homes, and they adjust the way of their communication accordingly. The purpose of public appearances in political talk shows such as *Pressing* is pre-cisely to show identity and image, as well as to manage the image in the wanted direction among the public. Therefore, it is obvious that the informative-persuasive function is dominant in political speeches. According to Josef Kopperschmidt (1986: 97), the informative-persuasive function is dominant because it offers a be-lievable justification and argumentation of information, where the emphasis is on credibility. Grünert (1984: 36) points out that public discourse with the mentioned attributes has the strength to form public opinion.

Politics and its discourse are highly personalized nowadays. Hence, political com-munication could be described as a common ground for verbal acts of informing, argumentation, proving, bolstering unity, national feelings, self-assessment, criti-cizing other shareholders' public discourse. (Borčić, 2017). It is apparent that views towards one's own state and/or neighbouring states are fundamental in creating an ideology. Equally, the content and argumentation modelling in political messages are affected by politicians' personal motivation and the voters' system of values, as well as, in principle, the criterion of doing work for public good. Therefore, this paper questions whether the rhetoric of politicians competing in local elections serves as a frame for communicating national identity, using the metaphor **state as person**, and if referring to one's state has been an integral part of the image that they would like to present to the public.

Conceptual metaphors in political discourse

The theoretical framework of this paper includes the primary Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), first introduced in the book *Metaphors We Live by* (1980/2015) by authors George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. Lakoff and Johnson (2015: 10) consider metaphors to be the integral part of our thought and reasoning processes, which consequently leads to the conclusion that they are fundamental to understanding a language. A conceptual metaphor consists of source and target domains, where the source domain corresponds with the target domain (Lakoff and Johnson, 2015: 3-5; Kövecses 2002: 4-6; Lakoff and Johnson, 2015: 7-14). "Domains are understood as sets of non-expert, 'encyclopedic' knowledge and experiences that competent mem-

bers of a discourse community have about any given topic. This knowledge is typically organized around some basic, 'prototypical' concepts at the centre and includes associated sets of less well-defined concepts of the periphery" (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 252-254, cf. Musolff, 2016: 8). This correspondence between the source and the target domain is called mapping (Stanojević, 2013: 37-82), and in mapping only one aspect of the source domain is highlighted, while the other aspects remain hidden. At the level of language use, metaphors from the source domain are named linguistic metaphors. According to Lakoff and Johnson (2015: 15-46), Conceptual Metaphor Theory distinguishes three ways of mapping within cognitive process: structural, ontological and orientational. In that paper, we focused on metaphors of personification. Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 34) define personification as "a general category that covers a very wide range of metaphors, each picking out different aspects of person or ways of looking at a person."

As stated in recent literature on political language (Girnth 2002; Kopperschmidt, 1986; Charteris-Black, 2005; 2014; Lakoff 1991; 2002; 2004; 2008; Musolff, 2006; 2016; Goatly, 2007), a metaphor in political rhetoric (cf. Musolff, 2016) is an effective rhetorical tool for subtle transmission of feelings in a political message. According to Musolff (2016: 112), conceptual metaphors "become politically effective if and when they are integrated into seemingly plausible scenarios with a minimal narrative structure and an argumentative and evaluative default bias." Metaphors of personification are therefore common to political discourse because it allows us to think about our and/or their nation based on what we know about ourselves (Musolff, 2016: 26). When talking about politics, these metaphors can give human characteristics to political topics, and therefore they transfer and provoke different associations about the topic (Charteris-Black, 2004; 2014; Chilton, 2004; Goatly, 2007; Musolff 2016).

Charteris – Black (2005: 205) argue that metaphors are "very effective in the communication of policy because they provide cognitively accessible ways of communicating political policy through drawing on ways of thinking by analogy". "**Nation as body** and **nation as person** are metaphors which seem to be grounded in the most immediate source domain imaginable: what could be more familiar to speakers than their own bodies and personalities?" (Musolff, 2016: 115). These metaphors are based on a metonymic process in which the concept of a state also refers to the concept of a country, but also to the concept of a nation (Šarić, 2015: 51). Therefore, the discussion about the differences between the concepts of state and nation is beyond the scope of this paper, since all three relate to the same metaphor system (Šarić, 2015: 48). Metaphors linked to the concepts of state, country and nation are a part of the images of their members and non-members. Those

metaphors and the nation argumentation are discourses that establish a national image (Šarić, 2015: 49).

Nationhood has to be constructed in narratives, and within those narratives the political metaphor **nation as person** can be used in order to achieve a "specific diplomatic and propaganda effects in a public forum" (Musolff, 2016: 101). According to Lakoff (2002; 2006; 2008), the preferred metaphor in political discourse concerning foreign politics is personification. "Just as people do, states enter into social relationships with other states, […] Our policies are designed to be consistent with such metaphorical estimations of 'national personalities.'" (Chilton and Lakoff, 1995: 38-9, cf. Musolff, 2016). From the narrative or scenario-oriented point of view, a nation/state personification has an impact on the construction of a collective image that "is able to speak with one voice and act as a single entity" (Musolff: 2016: 104). They can also be used as a rhetorical device in order to highlight "the most positive and plausible national self-presentations and, in case of conflicts, the starkest vilification of the enemy side" (ibid). Personal and social identity can, therefore, be communicated through personification in order to create trust among the public. Accordingly, political metaphors of personification could be called **social face** metaphors (eg. Musolff, 2016: 105).

Conceptual metaphors in political discourse, or political metaphors, have, therefore, great potential regarding suggestive interpretation and evaluation, if used in a discursively established narrative (Charteris-Black 2014: 157, Musolff, 2016: 111). The interpretation perspectives provide a platform for characterization of, for example, one's nation or one's party as better and more just.

Research

Research design and questions

So far, the research (Lakoff, 1991; 2002; 2004; 2008; Musolff, 2016; Charteris-Black, 2005; 2014) has shown that personification metaphors are dominant when it comes to political topics concerned with external affairs. Foreign affairs are a common topic in political campaigns prior to parliamentary and presidential elections, whereas politicians who are running for office on a local level rarely hold public speeches on topics outside of their scope of authority. Therefore, the aim of this paper is to examine whether the metaphor **state/nation is person** is also present in the discourse of the politicians running for candidacy on a local level. Furthermore, the idea is to investigate which parts of a person's identity are projected and what is the evaluation potential of this. In continuation, the following questions are given:

1) Do the analysed politicians from Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina use the conceptual metaphors **state as person** in their TV appearances during local elections?

2) In which way do the analysed politicians from Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina use the conceptual metaphors **state as person** in their TV appearances during local elections?

3) In which way do the analysed politicians frame their own country rhetorically in their TV appearances during local elections, and in which way do they do the same for the neighbouring countries?

Sample and methodology

In order to accomplish the research aim and to answer the questions, an analysis has been conducted on the corpus of the N1's program *Pressing*. N1 is CNN's exclusive partner and has headquarters in Zagreb, Sarajevo and Belgrade. N1 broadcasts via all cable operators in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia, as well as operators in Slovenia. *Pressing* is a talk show hosting mostly political figures and it is broadcast from Zagreb, Sarajevo and Belgrade. The same broadcasting format in the three states ensured the objectivity of the research sample. The research covered the appearances of three politicians from each country during their last local elections.

The research was further conducted on the basis of the qualitative analysis of metaphor and argumentation. The analysis was first performed by text analysis in order to identify linguistic metaphors, which was done according to the Pragglejaz metaphor identification process (Pragglejaz Group, 2007: 1-39), as part of the Pragglejaz project[1]. The focus of the study was primarily on the use of the political metaphor **state as person**, but also on the use of **person** source domain with other target domains. The mapping process between the source and target domains could indicate commonly opinion pattern about the dominant topic. Furthermore, the research examined to what extent the national identity was used in local elections, if at all. The last step of the research involved a contextual analysis of the use of the source domain, with the emphasis on the analysis of the narrative in which the metaphor is used.

---

[1] The members of the Pragglejaz Group are Peter Crisp, Ray Gibbs, Alan Cienki, Graham Low, Gerard Steen, Lynne Cameron, Elena Semino, Joe Grady, Alice Deignan and Zoltan Kövecses. The name of the project has been derived from the initial letters of first letters of their names (Pragglejaz Group, 2007).

Findings and discussion

*The analysis of political statements made
in Pressing and aired on N1 Bosnia and Herzegovina*

The Pressing web pages offer four (4) available shows aired on N1 Bosnia and Herzegovina in the period before the local elections held on 2 October 2016. The campaign lasted from 2 September 2016 until 30 September 2016. Only one show, the *Pressing* broadcast on 14 September 2016 was dedicated to local elections. The guests were Mr. Damir Nikšić, an independent candidate for the Head of the Centar Municipality, Sarajevo, Mr. Fuad Kasumović, an independent candidate for Mayor of Zenica and Mr. Konstantin Savić, an independent candidate for the Head of the Teslić Municipality. This is quite significant and leads to the conclusion that local elections do not attract Bosnian viewers. The show was hosted by Amir Zukić; it started at 8 p.m. and lasted for 54 minutes and 13 seconds. It started with a coverage that recounted events from the local campaign and concluded that "poverty has introduced a new epoch in political marketing", as the candidates gave the voters free hamburgers, free dental prostheses, free light bulbs, etc. The candidates used different, sometimes bizarre, strategies to attract the voters' attention. Zukić explained that the guests stood out among other candidates due to their unusual rhetoric or some unusual aspects of their campaigns.

The statement analysis has shown that independent candidates Damir Nikšić, Fuad Kasumović and Konstantin Savić did not talk about local topics, but exclusively about national topics, as if they were candidates in national elections. Accordingly, all three candidates used conceptual metaphor **state as person** in the local elections, but they did not refer to their relationships with the neighbouring countries, Croatia and Serbia.

The research examined to what extent is the national identity displayed through the use of the chosen metaphor. Damir Nikšić, the independent candidate for the Head of the Centar Municipality, Sarajevo, considers depoliticization of the state necessary, and he claims that the local elections were absurd because they were run as national elections. For candidate Nikšić, Bosnia was robbed and impoverished. Despite the national election rhetoric, Nikšić did not anticipate the future of the state. His engagement in the local elections was seen as a general rehearsal for the national elections. He advocates decentralization and suggests the establishment of a confederation of independent municipalities.

Fuad Kasumović, an independent candidate for Mayor of Zenica, who won the elections and became Mayor, claims the state is inefficient and the biggest influence is wielded by several families who have completely privatized the Party of Demo-

cratic Action (SDA). He warned about the islamisation of certain SDA organizations, and he mentioned the SDA organization in Zenica as an indicative example of the process. Kasumović thinks that big parties homogenize the public, or their body of voters, by referring to wars and divisions so as to stay in power. His outlook on the country's future is not optimistic.

For Konstantin Savić, the independent candidate for the Head of the Teslić Municipality, the state is a corrupt entity with an administration of politically suitable and incompetent civil servants. He advocates layoffs of all civil servants and says their employment should solely be based on competence and ability. He especially criticizes the judiciary as being corrupt. Savić anticipates a more optimistic future for Bosnia. He claims: "We are Bosnia and Herzegovina, this is our country, the process of globalization has to go further". This candidate sees the country's future globally and included in the EU integration processes.

The overall rhetoric of all analysed candidates shows that they see the source of the problems in the party model of a state which encourages corruption, nepotism, party-centred human resourcing, incompetence and divisions. They see Bosnia and Herzegovina as a highly centralized state, where a few individuals or families privatized the largest parties and the most important functions. The candidates' statement analysis shows they all agreed that the state is excessively centralized, that decentralization is needed to enhance the subsidiarity of decision making. They propose a confederation of independent municipalities and wider regions as a method of strengthening cities and municipalities. Finally, they refer to the MOST of Independent Lists, as evident in the Croatian example. The candidates referred to war rhetoric as the main reason why their visions of state have been a bit pessimistic. It is interesting that only one candidate mentioned the integration processes and a united Bosnia and Herzegovina as a possible future situation.

The analysis of the political statements made
in Pressing *and aired on N1 Serbia*

The *Pressing* web pages offer ten (10) available shows aired during the campaign for the local, regional and national elections held on 24 April 2016. The campaign lasted from March 4 until April 22. During that period the guests on the show were the following: journalist Brankica Stanković, political analyst Dejan Vuk Stanković, sociologist Jovo Bakić, Tomislav Žigmanov, President of the Democratic Alliance of Croats in Vojvodina, Bálint Pásztor, Chairman and Chief Deputy of the Alliance of Vojvodina Hungarians in the Serbian Parliament, Borislav Stefanović, President of the political party Levica Srbije, Vojislav Šešelj, President of the Serbian Radical Party, Saša Radulović, President of "Enough is Enough" movement, Sanda Rašković

Ivić, President of the Democratic Party of Serbia; Boris Tadić, President of the Social Democratic Party and the former President of Serbia, Bojan Pajtić, President of Serbia's Democratic Party, Jadranka Joksimović, Minister without portfolio in charge of European integration in the Government of the Republic of Serbia and International Secretary of the Serbian Progressive Party.

Since the local, regional and national elections in Serbia were held at the same time, the guests in *Pressing* were predominantly focused on the national, rather than the local or regional elections. The selection procedure consisted of the elimination of the following shows: (1) shows not hosting politicians and shows not focused on the elections; (2) the show hosting Boris Tadić because he is the former President of Serbia; (3) the show hosting the former and current minister Jadranka Joksimović; (4) the show hosting Borislav Stefanović, President of the left party Levica Srbije, the only party that has not reached a parliamentary status, as opposed to the other guests' parties. The analysis covered the shows with Saša Radulović, President of the "Enough is Enough" movement, which won 6,02% on parliamentary elections, Bojan Pajtić, President of the Democratic Party, which also won 6,02% on parliamentary elections and Sanda Rašković Ivić, President of the Democratic Party of Serbia, which won 5,04% of votes on parliamentary elections. All shows were hosted by Jugoslav Ćosić, they started at 8 p.m., and they were 56,07 min (Saša Radulović), 55 min (Sanda Rašković Ivić) and 54,02 min (Bojan Pajtić) in length.

All of the three analysed Serbian politicians used the conceptual metaphor **state as person**. From the example statements we could see that Radulović identifies Serbia as exceptionally party-cratic, a banana state where the rules are not equal for everyone, as a state which needs order, justice, independence and change. In all the analysed statements, with the identified source domain **person**, Radulović predominantly evokes negative associations connected to the state and, therefore, indirectly passes on a pessimistic view. He stresses national values and feelings, pointing to negativity and shortcomings. The examples of Radulović's statements are the following (Pressing, 4 April 2016): "Srbiju ubija partitokracija." (Partytocracy is killing Serbia), "Situacija u kojoj se Srbija nalazi je sve gora." (The situation in Serbia is getting worse), "Mi smo najgora od svih banana država na svijetu." (We are the worst banana state of all the banana states in the world), "Srbija (je) podnijela žrtve u sukobu na ovom prostoru." (Serbia suffered losses in the regional conflict), "Srbija nema kapacitete za suradnju s Rusijom." (Serbia has no capacity for cooperation with Russia), "Srbiji ne treba vođa, ja nisam vođa. Srbiji je potreban sistem. (...) Kad bi Njemačka imala ovakav sistem ličila bi na Srbiju." (Serbia doesn't need a leader, I am not a leader. Serbia needs a system. (…) If Germany had a system like this, it would look like Serbia), "… država mora da se povuče iz privrede, ali da ima jaku regulatornu ulogu" (…. the state has to retreat from the

economy, but it must have a strong regulatory role), "Srbija treba da se okrene vlastitim snagama, da Srbija bude u centru svega." (Serbia has to turn to its own strength, so as to be in the center of everything), "Cilj Srbije je da napravi uređenu zemlju." (Serbia's aim is to create an orderly state).

Linguistic metaphors which refer to the metaphor **state as person** were identified in the statements made by Sanda Rašković Ivić, President of the Democratic Party of Serbia, and they also point to negative evaluation potential. The examples of Rašković Ivić's statements are the following (Pressing, 5 April 2016): "Za Srbiju nije dobro priključenje u EU." (Accession to the EU is not good for Serbia), "Srbija ima ulogu posrednika između Istoka i Zapada, da ostane vojno i politički neutralna. Prije je tu ulogu igrala Jugoslavija i Finska." (Serbia has a role of a mediator between the East and the West, to remain militarily and politically neutral. Yugoslavia and Finland used to have that role), "Na Kosovu i Metohiji imali smo srpske općine… tu je bila prisutna Srbija (...)." (We had Serbian municipalities in Kosovo and Metohija…. Serbia was present there …). Rašković Ivić emphasizes the international context in which Serbia is described as a kind of an indecisive bride who is unable to choose between the East and the West, and due to that policy, it lost Kosovo. The use of metaphors here indicates a pessimistic stance.

For Bojan Pajtić, President of the Democratic Party, Serbia as a person is a looser in the transition processes, and not due to the shiftlessness in its foreign policy, but rather due to the corruption and autocracy in its domestic affairs. The examples of Pajtić's statements are the following (Pressing, 19 April 2016): "Srbija je, nažalost, napravila velike korake unatrag u protekle četiri godine." (Serbia has unfortunately made large steps backwards in the last four years), "Srbija danas sliči na Sjevernu Koreju. (Serbia today resembles North Korea), "Mi se bavimo s režimom koji je ponizio građane Srbije." (We are dealing with the regime that humiliated the citizens of Serbia), "Važno je što će se događati sa Srbijom, a ne pojedinačne sudbine političara." (It is important what will happen with Serbia, and not individual politicians' destinies).

The previously cited statements clearly show that: (1) all three candidates are focused on the national level in the elections; (2) all are challengers, the opposition; (3) they all consider Serbia to be the victim of the bad, incompetent and autocratic regime of Prime Minister Vučić.

The argumentative analysis of political statements indicate that Radulović does not refer to Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina in his statements, and according to him, the "main problem of Serbia () Vučić and his satellites… essence of the party-tocratic system with the prime minister in its centre." He thinks that "it is not acceptable to have parties that hire politically, that turn into employment offices" and that this "Government has been marked by erosion of institutions, media control and

irreverent deception of its citizens." Radulović believes that the forthcoming elections would be an announcement of the beginning of the end for Vučić and SNS. The reason for that is that "SNS is an interest group that would disintegrate from within (…). The only thing that keeps them together is the perception of Aleksandar Vučić's popularity and a possibility to share the profits". Furthermore, he criticizes the EU integration process. While speaking about the program and actions of his movement, he stresses that its members are mostly competent and successful people, who had not been present in politics until now. Finally, the analysis of his statements shows a focus on domestic, foreign, economic and party-related topics.

Unlike Radulović, Rašković Ivić intensively referred not only to the neighbouring states, but also to a wider international context, i.e. the integration processes (EU, NATO, Russian Federation). She explains that her party was a Europhile until 2005 but the community of Serbia and Montenegro did not hold on to it, and while the EU became an active builder of Kosovan independence, the DSS became not an "anti-European, but a Eurosceptic party." She does not believe in a credible European policy. She has a much bigger aversion to the NATO because "the 2005 agreement is significantly different to the 2015 and 2016 agreements, which caused a real NATOization of the society." Her words clearly reveal an affection for Russia. She also averts xenophobic biases by saying that "we have nothing against foreigners, but we do not want them to get preferential treatment, not even Russians." She was very emotional when speaking about the Serbian national minority in Kosovo and Croatia, which is clear from her statements "Kosovo's north is ruined", or that Serbia should take care "of its people in Croatia too". Rašković Ivić advocates for a free and sovereign Serbia that belongs neither to the EU nor to the Euro-Asian alliance. She stressed that under her leadership DSS enhanced its economic program, which is called "Economic patriotism".

Pajtić describes the situation in Serbia as catastrophic and stresses that the DS is "the only dam against the rule of one man, a guarantee of democracy, the only organization that can successfully fight this regime with its program and infrastructure and the only one with a potential to put a stop to this regime, for this country to become decent and just, to be a lawful state which is not dominated by primitives, amateurs, the people who bought or counterfeited their university degrees." According to him, it is more honourable to be in the opposition all his life than to spend one minute in power with Vučić, because "people in Serbia are scared". He presents the Government as economically extremely unsuccessful. Pajtić expresses doubt in the election regularity due to the 300,000 additional voters in the Voters Registry, while the media was silenced and the citizens and the opposition intimidated. In contrast to this view of Serbia, he said that as a long-term leader in Vojvodina, he is very proud of the improvements in the Vojvodina healthcare system, that 50% of the EU

funds come from Vojvodina, and that they are a dependable and serious government. He gave examples, such as actions against domestic violence, investment in fruit agriculture and 2,000 new employees in the IT sector. Pajtić referred to Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina indirectly, in the context of hiring the Croatian communication expert Krešimir Macan for their campaign. He also talked about the Government's relationship with the EU: "The Government tells the EU story only because it enables them to stay in power". Pajtić considers Vučić's fall as a "to be or not to be" moment for Serbia and emphasises that it is "time for this pest-like regime to go away."

The vision the analysed politicians have of Serbia points to several common elements: (1) joint local, regional and national elections held in April 2016 were presented as a kind of a beginning of the end for the SNS and Aleksandar Vučić's rule; (2) Serbia needs changes that would make it a sovereign and economically independent state, and not a hostage to the SNS, which is considered a predatory interest group; (3) the EU integration process is contaminated due to European tolerance of Vučić's clientelism and autocracy. Of all the analysed politicians, only Rašković Ivić builds Serbian identity on the "We – They" opposition. For her, "We" are Serbia and Russia, and "They" are EU, NATO, Croatia and the government in Priština. The other two analysed politicians build a political dichotomy "We – They" on the relationship between "Our Serbia" (meaning successful, just and honest) and "Their Serbia" (meaning unsuccessful, unjust and corrupt). It is important to emphasise that "Their" (Vučić's) country is not the real Serbia, but a deceitful, sick Serbia which they could amend and cure. In other words, in their rhetoric, Serbia is a victim of a partytocratic, corrupt or nationally unaware regime.

The analysis of the political statements made
in Pressing and aired on N1 Croatia

The Pressing web pages offer eight (8) available shows aired in the period before the local elections held on 21 May 2017. The campaign lasted from 20 April 2017 until 20 May 2017. The guests were the following: Hrvoje Burić, an independent candidate for Mayor of Rijeka, Ivan Čehok, an independent candidate for Mayor of Varaždin and a bearer candidate for the City Council voters – the GLAS list, Miro Bulj, MOST's candidate for the Prefect of the Split-Dalmatia County, Ivan Rimac, professor at the Faculty of Law, University of Zagreb, and political analyst, Željko Lacković, an independent candidate for Prefect of Koprivnica-Križevci County, Miroslav Šimić, MOST's candidate for Mayor of Osijek, Drago Prgomet, HDZ's candidate for Mayor of Zagreb, Ivan Sinčić, Živi zid candidate for Mayor of Karlovac.

To have an equal sample in scope, independent from the broadcasting country, it was decided that the analysis would entail three shows from N1 Croatia. Although there were two major crises that dominated the Croatian public discourse during the local elections in 2017, the Agrokor Holding situation and the parliamentary crisis, the candidates in the local elections were also hosted in the shows, with the exception of professor Ivan Rimac. This kind of content enabled additional objectivity in the selection process. Therefore, the intentional sample includes shows with mayoral candidates, where the criteria are on the city level. Thus, the analysis includes the shows hosting the mayoral candidates of Osijek, Rijeka and Zagreb.

All analysed shows were hosted by Petar Štefanić, they started at 8 p.m. and their running time was 56,51 min (Hrvoje Burić) and 57 min (Miroslav Šimić and Drago Prgomet). The focus of the analysis was primarily on the use of political metaphor **state as person**, but also on the use of **person** source domain with other target domains. An argumentative analysis was used to answer the questions about how politicians see the state and which are the basic guidelines in their political statements.

All the analysed interviews showed a minimal use of **state as person** metaphor. The linguistic metaphors that lead to the metaphor **state as person** were identified in the statement made by Miroslav Šimić and Drago Prgomet. The example of Šimić' statement is the following (Pressing, 10 May 2017): "Ne mogu reći ni da je Hrvatska bolja ni da je lošija, ali mislim da su neke stvari što se tiče hrvatske politike jasnije, zbog toga je bolja" (I cannot say that Croatia is either better or worse, but I think that some things related to Croatian politics are clearer, which makes it better.) Drago Prgomet's statement (Pressing, May 17, 2017) is as follows: "To ne znači da me ne interesira Hrvatska, ali u ovom trenutku ne razgovaramo o Hrvatskoj, nacionalna kampanja nam je jela kampanju." ("That doesn't mean that I am not interested in Croatia, but at this moment we are not talking about Croatia; the national campaign has been eating into our campaign.")

The interviewed politicians did not speak about local problems or problems on the state level, based on the use of the chosen metaphor. Since parliamentary politics is more dominant in the Croatian public discourse, talking about politics through **state/nation** metaphors is more common during campaigns before the parliamentary and presidential elections. According to Kasapović (2004: 63-64), local elections in centralized states such as Croatia are considered less attractive to voters and thus such elections have a lower turnout. The popularity of certain parties was appraised on local elections, while parties could experiment with the effects of coalitions or different election strategies (Raos, 2013:25).

The analysis of the Croatian politicians' statements shows further that the discussion was narrowed down to the party level and local level, and it only implicitly

suggested particularities of the state. Accordingly, their statements included many linguistic metaphors, such as **party as person** and **city as person**, as shown in the following statements made by Hrvoje Burić (Pressing, 24 April 2017): "Rijeka ne da je stagnirala, nego je nazadovala" (Not only has Rijeka been stagnating, it has regressed.), "Grad je istjerao sve investitore" ("The city has chased out all the investors"), Miroslav Šimić (Pressing, 10 May 2017): "SDP i HDZ su vrlo slični." (SDP and HDZ are very similar.) and Drago Prgomet (Pressing, 17 May 2017): "HDZ je bio tu potpuno jasan." (HDZ has been very clear about this.). In all the mentioned examples, the rhetorical power of political metaphors of personification was used to negatively evaluate the present situation in local communities and dominant parties.

The success or failure of local politicians was seen through the perspective of future ratios on the national level, which was confirmed by the choice of topics and the ways of argumentation in the analysed sample. The analysis of the interview with Hrvoje Burić, an independent mayoral candidate for Rijeka, shows dominance regarding local themes. Burić begins the conversation with Oliver Frljić's theatrical activities, which he deems negative. Hrvoje Burić was a member of HDZ for 25 years and he entered these elections as an independent candidate, so one of the conversation aims was to confirm his credibility. He does this by mentioning bad political practices in the region, and, to support his argumentation, he points out that other people changed parties too. In order to emphasize his authenticity, Burić predominantly focuses on municipal problems and his vision about how to resolve them.

The analysis of the interview with Miroslav Šimić, the MOST candidate for Mayor of Osijek, shows that he used his interview in *Pressing* to positively position his party and to point to challenges underway. This is understandable, since the cause of the parliamentary crisis in April and May of 2017 was the laying off of four MOST ministers because they failed to support the Government's decision concerning the confidence vote for the Minister of Finance, Zdravko Marić. Šimić also referred to the relationship between the media and the parties, saying they portray his party negatively. While criticizing the Government, due to the mentioned event and his reason for leaving it, Šimić also talks about another current crisis, the Agrokor situation. He uses that topic to stress the importance of his party for the country's future. Thereby, he sends the message of responsibility and an air of correctness in his own policy. At the same time, the power concept is attributed to MOST through anchoring the sense of strength in the recipients' perception. A part of the conversation was dedicated to local topics, such as his vision concerning the future of the city. Šimić based his program on arguments that lead to the present situation in the city of Osijek, which encounters large-scale emigration, he comments on the nega-

tive selection in employment and stresses that his vision is based on combating political clientelism.

In compliance with the parliamentary crisis regarding the campaign schedule for the local elections, Drago Prgomet's argumentation was directed to positively emphasizing the image of his own party and affirming his program and his credibility in the upcoming elections. The conversation topics were the break-up with MOST, the possibility of snap parliamentary elections, the credibility of candidates such as Bruna Esih and Sandra Švaljek, the work of the incumbent mayor, Milan Bandić, and some crucial topics and projects from his own campaign.

Finally, we could say that the analysis did not show the dominance of topics connected to state identity, but rather party identity, which corresponded with the expectations from discourse of the politicians who run for local offices.

Conclusion

The subject of this paper was the use of metaphors in political media discourse during local elections. Political public appearance aims to present political content with the intention to inform the public about them and to convince voters that they are right. The insight into the construction of political statements enables an insight into the dominant public discourse. At the same time, local elections tend to check the popularity of parties and politicians among voters, especially if that popularity is transferred to the national level.

The analysis of political discourse was conducted on the statements made in the political show *Pressing*, broadcast on N1 television, with the same format being used in Croatia, Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Having in mind the fact that the local elections in these countries are considered as mid-term elections, the aim of this paper has been to examine which topics were dominant in political statements in the period of official campaigns, whether these topics moved to national identity, or the local context was in the centre. The available *Pressing* shows broadcast in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the mentioned period showed that only three guests took part in the local elections. Therefore, the decision was made to limit the analysis to three politicians from each country because analysing more politicians from Croatia and Serbia would undermine the approach uniformity. The analysed politicians from Serbia were not candidates in the local but in the national elections, and they were taken into consideration since the 2016 elections were held at the same time for all three levels of their government. In selecting Serbian politicians, the criterion was their success on the national level, and in Croatia it was whether the politicians were candidates in big cities.

According to the scholars who study political metaphors, in some narratives they contribute to the evaluation potential of a statement. The research was therefore focused on the use of the metaphor **state as person**. The analysis of the use of the chosen metaphor can indicate the connection between the political image and the scenario of the nationhood behind the rhetoric. Attention was therefore on whether politicians build their credibility when speaking about their own or the neighbouring countries.

The analysis included a total of nine politicians in the selected show. A parallel analysis of the rhetoric of nine politicians showed that the metaphors with the source domain **person**, such as **state as person**, are mostly present in the Serbian political discourse, which could be explained with the coinciding local and parliamentary elections. It is important to mention that the research results are symptomatic for the analysed interviews only. The analysed Serbian politicians' discourse shows a domination of party-related topics that are directly connected with bad economic and political situation in the country. Argumentation is predominantly directed towards a negative evaluation of the existing situation, as well as a negative outlook on the future, if no changes occur. Local themes were entirely neglected. The discourse of the selected Bosnian and Herzegovinian politicians also included metaphorical expressions that point to a chosen conceptual metaphor, but to a much more limited extent. Argumentation was focused on the problem of centralization in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the importance of strengthening the cities and municipalities. Just like the politicians' discourse in Serbia, the analysis here has shown that politicians use argumentation to emphasize the negative aspects of the current challenges. The Croatian sample analysis showed a dominance of the metaphorical expressions leading to the **party as person** and **city as person**, while the metaphor **state as person** was entirely neglected. In using argumentation, the politicians build party credibility as much as their own. In the Croatian part, argumentation was also mostly used for negative evaluation, so we can conclude that this research shows that politicians, with lack their own solutions or proof of improvement, use their argumentation, and thereby their public discourse, for the negative evaluation of the current affairs and their political opponents.

REFERENCES

Borčić, N. (2017) *Međuodnos argumentacije, konceptualnih metafora i neverbalne komunikacije u javnim nastupima njemačkih i hrvatskih političara. Unpublished doctoral thesis*. Osijek: Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku, Doktorska škola društveno-humanističkih znanosti.

Charteris-Black, J. (2005) *Politicians and Rhetoric*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Charteris-Black, J. (2014) *Analysing Political Speeches*. *Rhetoris*, Discourse and Metaphor. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chilton, P. and G. Lakoff (1995) "Foreign policy by metaphor", pp. 37-55. In: C. Schäffner and A. Wenden: *Language and Peace*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Dedaić, M. N. (2006). „Political Speeches and Persuasive Argumentation", pp. 700-707. In: K. Brown (edt.): *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Volume 10. Oxford: Elsevier

Freeden, M. (1996), *Ideologies and Political Theory*: A Conceptual Approach, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Girnth, H. (2002) *Sprache und Sprachverwendung in der Politik. Eine Einführung in die linguistische Analyse öffentlich-politischer Kommunikation.* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Goatly, A. (2007) *Washing the Brain: Metaphor and Hidden Ideology*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Golding, P., G. Murdock (2015) „Ideologija in množični mediji: k vprašanju določenosti", *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo*, 259 (1/4), 97-115.

Grünert, H. (1984), „Deutsche Sprachgeschichte und politische Geschichte in ihrer Verflechtung", pp. 29-37. In: W. Besch, *Sprachgeschichte. Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und ihrer Erforschung*. 1. Halbband, Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Hall, S. (1997) *Representation. Cultural Representation and Signifying Practices*. London: SAGE.

Jarren, O. and P. Donges (2011). „Politička komunikacija u medijskom društvu kao predmet istraživanja", pp. 43-56. In: A. Zerfass, M. Radojković: *Menadžment političke komunikacije. Osnove i koncepti*, Beograd: Konrad Adenauer Stiftung.

Kopperschmidt, J. (1986), *Allgemeine Rhetorik: Einführung in die Theorie der Persuasiven Kommunikation*, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Koprić, Ivan (2007) „Independent Local Lists in Croatia: In Search for a Composite Theoretical Frame" *Hrvatska javna uprava*, br. 2., 335–375

Kövecses, Z. (2002) *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson (1980) Metaphors We Live By, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Lakoff, G. (1991) "The Metaphor System Used to Justify War in the Gulf.*" Journal of Urban and Cultural Studies* 2(1), 59-72.

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

Lakoff, G. (2002) *Moral Politics. How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. (2004) *Don't think of an elephant: know your values and frame the debate: the essential guide for progressives*. White River Junction: Chelsea Green Publishing Company.

Lakoff, G. (2008) *The Political Mind: Why You Cant Understand 21st-Century American Politics with an 18th-Century Brain*. New York: Penguin Group.

Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson (2015) *Metafore koje život znače*. Zagreb: Disput.

Morley, D. and K.-H. Chen (1996), *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. Lonodon and New York: Routledge

Musolff, A. (2016) *Political Metaphors Analysis. Discourse and Scenarios*. London, New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Niehr, T. (2014) *Einführung in die Politolinguistik*. Göttingen: UTB.

Perelman, Ch. and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation.* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Raos, V. (2017) „Lokalni izbori kao međuizbori?" *Političke analize*, vol 7. No. 30. pp. 29-35

Schakel, A. H. (2015) How to analyze second-order election effects? A refined second-order election model. *Comparative European Politics* 13 (6): 636-655.

Schakel, A. H. and R. Dandoy (2014) Electoral cycles and turnout in multilevel electoral systems. *West European Politics*. 37 (3): 605-623.

Stanojević, M.-M. (2013*) Konceptualna metafora. Temeljni pojmovi, teorijski pristupi i metode*, Zagreb: srednja europa.

Šarić, LJ. (2015) "Metaphors in the discourse of the national" *Družboslovne razprave,* XXXI, No. 80, 47-65

Van Dijk, T. (2002). „Political discourse and ideology", pp. 15-34. In: C. U. Lorda, M. Ribas (edt.) *Anàlisi del discurs polític*. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra. 15-34.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). „Politics, Ideology and Discourse", pp. 728-40. In: K. Brown (edt.) *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Elsevier

Analiza uporabe političkih metafora u političkoj retorici na lokalnim izborima

Nikolina Borčić
Mirela Holy
Ivona Čulo

SAŽETAK

Politički diskurs uvijek je više ili manje ideološki budući da je ideologija neod-vojiva od diskursa i politike. Koncepti nacije i nacionalnog dio su svake ideolo-gije. Članak istražuje sinergiju između političke komunikacije o naciji i nacio-nalnom te strukture diskursa putem korištenja konceptualnih metafora i argu-mentacije u izgradnji političkih identiteta u izjavama odabranih političara tije-kom lokalnih izbora 2016. i 2017. u Srbiji, Bosni i Hercegovini i Hrvatskoj. U radu se analizira argumentacija i korištenje metaforičkih okvira u retorici odabranih političara u Hrvatskoj, Srbiji i Bosni i Hercegovini. Istraživanje je bilo usmjereno na proučavanje metafora s izvornom domenom osoba, kao što je država je osoba u argumentaciji odabranih političara u televizijskoj emisiji "Pressing". Ta se emisija u istom formatu emitira na N1 televiziji u sve tri drža-ve. Cilj je bio opisati međupovezanost jezičnih realizacija načina razmišljanja i namjere naglašavanja specifičnih političkih poruka pozivanjem na nacionalni identitet. Usporedna analiza je pokazala da su metafore personifikacije naj-zastupljenije u političkom diskursu analiziranih srpskih političara. Nacionalna argumentacija pretežito je usmjerena na negativnu evaluaciju trenutne političke situacije, ali i buduće situacije ukoliko ne dođe do političkih promjena. Retorika odabranih bosanskohercegovačkih političara također se oslanja na izraze koji vode do metafore država je osoba, ali u manjoj mjeri. Slično retorici srpskih političara, analiza retorike bosanskih političara također je pokazala korištenje negativnih argumenata prilikom isticanja trenutnih izazova. Hrvatski uzorak upućuje na dominantno korištenje izraza koji ukazuju na metaforu stranka je osoba i grad je osoba, dok je metafora država je osoba zanemarena. Slijedom toga, može se zaključiti kako narativ nacionalnog identiteta nije uobičajen za retoriku političara na hrvatskim lokalnim izborima.

Ključne riječi: konceptualne metafore, argumentacija, diskurs na nacionalnim i lokalnim izborima, nacionalni identitet