

Lingue e Linguaggi
Lingue Linguaggi 11 (2014), 77-92
ISSN 2239-0367, e-ISSN 2239-0359
DOI 10.1285/i22390359v11p77
<http://siba-ese.unisalento.it>, © 2014 Università del Salento

A ROADMAP TO PEACE

Journey metaphors in political speeches on the Middle East peace process

ASSUNTA CARUSO
UNIVERSITY OF CALABRIA

Abstract – This paper investigates the metaphorical conceptualization of peace by former leaders George W. Bush, Ariel Sharon, and Mahmoud Abbas. Specifically, it examines how peace/the peace process is conceptualized via metaphors through the notion of JOURNEY and MOVEMENT. The corpus in this study comprises twenty speeches given by the three politicians over a four-year period (2002-2005). The corpus data is analyzed using a combination of different methods. The tools are mainly Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson 1980), the MIPVU procedure (Steen et al. 2010), and Critical Metaphor Analysis (Charteris-Black 2004). Findings reveal that JOURNEY metaphors are a vital and common part of the three politicians' political discourse. Overall, there are very few metaphors for peace unique to the individual politicians. The main differences observed lie not in which metaphors are used, but in what aspects of peace or the peace process they are used to highlight.

Keywords: metaphor identification, conceptual metaphor, Critical Metaphor Analysis, political discourse, peace.

1. Introduction

The importance of metaphors in political discourse has been largely investigated, and a number of these studies have analyzed the metaphors used to talk about war or terrorism (e.g. Voss et al. 1992; Pancake 1993; Rohrer 1995; Sandikcioglu 2000; Lakoff 2001; Steuter and Willis 2008). Yet, very little has been published on the metaphors used to describe peace. This study explores how the three main actors in the Roadmap peace process conceptualize peace/the peace process through metaphorical expressions related to JOURNEY.

Semino (2008: 117) posits that JOURNEY metaphors are globally systematic in English, and also discursively systematic in politics, especially in relation to plans and policies. In the period following the 2002 peace initiative, a specific ROAD MAP metaphor became systematic within international discourse on the Middle East. Indeed, the analysis of the speeches given by the three main political leaders in the peace process reveal that the notion of JOURNEY is predominantly used to refer to peace and aspects of it.

The data of this study consist of metaphors extracted from a corpus of 20 political speeches given in the timeframe 2002-2005 by Bush, Sharon and Abbas, all regarding the peace process and which are often referred to as 'peace speeches'. The linguistic metaphors are identified using the MIPVU procedure (Steen et al. 2010) and the conceptual metaphors analyzed by exploiting a combination of theoretical approaches including Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson 1980), and Critical Metaphor Analysis (Charteris-Black 2004).

In the following section, a brief background about the political context of the Roadmap peace process is provided to better understand the context in which the metaphors are employed.

2. Political background: the Roadmap peace process

This section briefly outlines the political context in which the metaphors analyzed in this study are employed. It is important to examine the basic context of the events and to discuss the political ideology of the politicians, in order to get a clearer understanding of the context and the interpretation of metaphors from their political discourses.

As the Israeli-Palestinian conflict intensified in a spiral of violence during the early months of 2002, pressure mounted on the Bush administration to do something. Therefore, on April 4, 2002 the president delivered a strong statement urging Palestinians to stop terror and calling on Israelis to halt their incursions and stop settlements. Subsequently, on June 24, 2002 in a major speech in the White House Rose Garden, President Bush presented his vision of an Israeli-Palestinian peace, calling for an end to terrorism, new Palestinian leadership, and support for Palestinian statehood. Bush, in fact, was asking the Palestinian people to abandon Arafat's leadership, embrace a new leadership, and institute significant reforms (Quandt 2005; Miller 2008). In short, if the Palestinians reformed, then a Palestinian state would be possible. Unlike most speeches or statements on the Arab-Israeli issue during the past twenty years, this one was a true departure in American policy. It was not "some passing statement that the administration intended to walk away from" (Miller 2008: 348).

In response, Ariel Sharon adopted a new approach, resting on the Bush vision as a reasonable program to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian confrontation. The "new Sharon" was marketed intensively by the Israeli media. He was portrayed as moderate and ready to reach a political settlement with the Palestinians under their new leadership (Meital 2006: 159). He and his aides carefully formulated the address he gave on December 4, 2002 at the Herzliya conference, which became his professed political platform. Choosing his words with care, Sharon formulated a shrewd political statement about the Palestinian state and its characteristics. "A slow but sure change marked the rhetoric of Israel's hawkish prime minister" (Meital 2006: 159).

On March 14, 2003 President Bush gave a statement in which he announced that once the Palestinian Authority had created the new position of Prime Minister, then he would be ready to launch the Roadmap. Following this statement, April 29, 2003 saw the formation of Prime Minister Mahmoud Abbas's government. In his inaugural speech, Abbas promised to fight corruption and violence, paving the way for publication of the Middle East peace Roadmap which was officially presented to both the Israelis and Palestinians on April 30 (Kurtzer and Lasensky 2008).

In the wake of what appeared to be at the time a successful outcome in Iraq, and giving in to expectations from the Europeans and Arabs, President Bush met with Abbas and Sharon in Aqaba in June. Israel however, continued with the notion of "no partner" and Prime Minister Sharon resolved to promote a plan of unilateral disengagement that was to bring about a dramatic change in the confrontation with the Palestinians (Meital 2006: 175). On December 18, 2003 Sharon presented his Unilateral Disengagement Plan of Gaza at the Herzliya Conference.

In April 2004, President Bush and Israeli Prime Minister Sharon exchanged letters regarding expectations as to the outcome of the final status negotiations. Bush offered

support for Sharon's disengagement plan and declared that Israel would neither have to return to the 1967 lines nor have to take back Palestinian refugees (Kurtzer and Lasensky 2008). In the meeting between them at the White House, as in the letter, Bush showered praise on Sharon's bold leadership.

On January 9, 2005, Mahmoud Abbas won the Palestinian elections and became Palestinian Authority president. This event was followed by a summit meeting on February 8, 2005 where the leaders of Israel, Egypt, Jordan and the Palestinian Authority met in Sharm el-Sheikh and at which they declared their continuing support for the Roadmap. On May 26, 2005 President Bush held a joint press conference with Palestinian leader Mahmoud Abbas in the Rose Garden in which Bush asserted that "changes to the 1949 armistice lines must be mutually agreed to" (Kurtzer and Lasensky 2008).

From 17 to 23 August 2005 Israel unilaterally withdrew from all Gaza settlements and four small West Bank settlements however, on August 29 Sharon announced no further unilateral or coordinated disengagements. All future steps would now fall under the rubric of the Roadmap (Kurtzer and Lasensky 2008) as stated in his address to the United Nations General Assembly on September 15, 2005.

Never persuaded that the Israeli-Palestinian issue was a top priority or worth any real political investment, the US administration could not even follow up seriously on its own initiatives. The roadmap quietly expired and the president's two-state vision became a talking point (Miller 2008: 354).

3. Metaphor, politics and peace

Metaphors have been studied in political discourse from different perspectives. Some studies (Musolff 2000, 2003) have examined how the same metaphor has changed over time according to the goal of the speaker in specific discourse contexts. Musolff has investigated in detail the role of metaphor in the reporting of political issues in the British and the German press. In one of his studies, Musolff (2003) identifies how the same metaphor of a two-speed Europe can be positively evaluated by the German press while negatively evaluated in the British press.

Other studies have examined the use of metaphors in various types of political discourse. This includes political speeches (Chew 2000), press reports (Pancake 1993; Thornborrow 1993; Musolff 1998; Santa Ana 1999; Zinken 2003), and studies which include data from a number of types of political discourse. For example, Chilton and Ilyin (1993) use data from European political discourse. Their study of Russian, German and French public statements of political leaders focuses on how the metaphor of 'the common European house' changes when it passes between linguistic and political cultures. Strahle et al. (1999) carry out an analysis on data that comes from political speeches and presidency conclusions in the European Union.

Further studies have concentrated on the use of metaphors within a political party. Charteris-Black (2004) studies the metaphors used in the 1997 manifesto by the British New Labour Party along with New Labour speeches and identifies metaphors drawing on the source domain of RELIGION, constituting what he refers to as a new "ethical" political discourse.

Studies which have followed a similar line have analyzed the metaphorical language used by a particular political leader. Semino and Masci's (1996) analysis shows how Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi developed a populist rhetoric in which extensive use is made of metaphors drawn from the source domain of FOOTBALL. Other studies include Aponte-Moreno (2008) who examines Hugo Chavez's choice of metaphors

in trying to construct and legitimize his Bolivian Revolution, focusing on metaphors drawn from the target domains of NATION, REVOLUTION, and OPPOSITION. Hellin Garcia (2009) investigates the metaphorical conceptualization of terrorism by President José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero. Hellin examines in particular, how terrorism is conceptualized via FIGHT metaphors. Berho (2005) examines Peron's use of the metaphor POLITICS IS RELIGION in his political discourse.

An important contribution to the studies in this field has been Charteris-Black's 2005 study in which he examines the role of metaphor in the rhetoric of major British and American political leaders such as Winston Churchill, Martin Luther King, Margaret Thatcher, Bill Clinton, Tony Blair, and George W. Bush. He explores the use of metaphor in developing persuasive political arguments, and its relation to ideology and myth. An important finding is that metaphor is especially effective when combined with the semantic relation of contrast, or when combined with other metaphors which draw on two or more source domains (Charteris-Black 2005: 197).

Other studies have analyzed the metaphors used to conceptualize a particular situation. For example, Rohrer (1995) analyzes metaphors by President Bush to conceptualize the Persian Gulf War in the pre-war period of August 1990 to January 1991. Rohrer (1995) analyzes the analogical reasoning behind the metaphors used by Bush to refer to the Iraqi invasion. Bush mainly used the conceptual metaphor NATION IS A PERSON to describe the Gulf Crisis. Rohrer mentions that President Bush's metaphors were widely accepted by the American public and this was a decisive factor in gathering support for the 1991 Persian Gulf War. Thus, Bush argued for the Iraq invasion with metaphors that were chosen specifically to gain acceptance and support from the general public.

It can be said that metaphors are related to the event and adjusted to the purpose and area in which the speech is delivered. Therefore, it is relevant to know the context as well as the purpose and beliefs of the speaker to be able to locate and interpret the metaphors. On the other hand, the speaker makes an active choice of words and a decision whether to use metaphors or not in order to make a point more vivid or persuasive (Charteris-Black 2004: 17). Metaphors can be used to make abstract political issues more accessible to the potential receiver of the political message by emphasizing or softening certain aspects. They can be used to convey the problem as well as to imply a solution in the same metaphor. The interpretation of the message can be influenced by the speaker's values but its interpretation by the receiver is also subject to the different way people categorize, understand and receive certain issues (Lakoff and Johnson 2003: 163).

Despite the value accorded to peace in political rhetoric, it has not proven to be a particularly well studied subject among researchers with very little being published on the language of peace (Bridgeman 2000). Wenden (Schäffner and Wenden 1995) argues that part of this neglect is conceptual; the notion of 'peace' has still not been adequately conceptualized. Wenden offers a review of attempts to define peace since the early 1940s, noting that "peace researchers ...have found it easier to define peace in terms of what it is not rather than what it is" (1995: 3). The traditional concept that dominated Western political and media discourses for centuries was, and still is, that peace is the absence of war. In fact, most chapters in the well-known book entitled *Language and Peace* discuss war and conflict situations (Schäffner and Wenden 1995). Bridgeman (2000: 4) argues that even in the field of diplomacy, where language is recognized as a crucial feature of interaction almost no research exists on the discourse of peace, particularly as regards metaphors for peace. The need to examine the key role of peace discourse and its lexicon is crucial when peace has not been achieved and peace negotiations have repeatedly failed

(Wenden 2003: 171).

Compared to the vast amount of literature pertaining to war in the Middle East, the subject of peace has achieved a relatively narrow niche, which has gradually broadened in the last three decades (Reznik 2002 cited in Gavriely Nuri 2010). However, discursive and linguistic analysis of the concept of peace remains relatively marginal within the literature. According to Gavriely Nuri (2010), the majority of current studies focus on Middle East peace from three perspectives. The first concerns research on peace narratives (e.g. Biton and Salomon 2006; Hermann 200). The second perspective refers to research on peace and media frames (e.g. Shinar 2000). The third perspective, which is where this paper fits in, deals with peace metaphors (Bridgeman 2000; Gavriely-Nuri 2010).

Therefore, while work is being done on the language of peace, there have not been many systematic studies of the contemporary metaphors for peace. Nor, as Bridgeman (2000: 50) argues, is there a systematic study available of the language used in promoting or covering the peace process. It is for this reason that this paper aims at examining how Bush, Sharon, and Abbas conceptualized peace via JOURNEY metaphors in their speeches regarding, (and promoting?), the Roadmap peace process.

4. Corpus and methodological framework

The corpus under investigation here is a specialized corpus of political speeches dealing with the Middle East Roadmap peace process. In order to construct this corpus, speeches and statements given by American President George W. Bush, Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon and Palestinian Authority Prime Minister Mahmoud Abbas were collected during the first four years of the Middle East Roadmap peace process (2002-2005). This includes approximately 30,000 words comprising twenty speeches related to peace/the peace process. A detailed description of the corpus as a whole can be found in Table 1 below, which shows the date range of the speeches, the number of speeches, and the number of words per politician.

Sources	Date range	Number of speeches / % of corpus	Number of words / %
George W. Bush	2002- 2005	7 (35%)	9,669 (32%)
Ariel Sharon	2002- 2005	8 (40%)	9,873 (33%)
Mahmoud Abbas	2003- 2005	5 (25%)	10,535 (35%)
Total		20 (100%)	30,077 (100%)

Table 1
Data on the corpus.

Since this research focuses on how peace/the peace process is conceptualized by Bush, Sharon, and Abbas, only the parts of the political speeches that mention aspects related to peace/the peace process were selected from the corpus. The extracted portions were identified manually. Once the parts related to peace/the peace process were selected, the metaphorical instances in these portions were identified following the MIPVU procedure (Steen et al. 2010) and then analyzed following Charteris-Black's (2004) metaphor explanation and metaphor interpretation steps.

The first part of the method of analysis in this study follows the MIPVU procedure, i.e., metaphor identification. The main tool used for making decisions about lexical units,

contextual meanings, basic meanings, and distinctness of contextual and basic meanings (Steen et al. 2010:185) was the *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners*. The reasons for using this type of dictionary, and Macmillan in particular, are that it is recent and corpus-based (Pragglejaz Group 2007). As described in the instructions for the procedure (Steen et al. 2010), a second dictionary was also used in order to have a second opinion about specific types of problems. This was the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*.

In the identification step, it is important to identify what counts as a metaphor related word and what does not. The issue here is identifying the literal or metaphorical meaning in the lexical units. This is done by looking at the contextual meaning and a more basic meaning of the lexical unit. An example is provided with the following expression: *We then drafted the road map as the route to get there*. Considering the lexical unit *road map*, the contextual meaning is ‘a plan or set of instructions that makes it easier for someone to do something’; while a more basic meaning is ‘a map that shows all the main roads and motorways in a region or a country’. By comparing and contrasting the two meanings, *road map* can be classified as a metaphor related word. The same can be said for the lexical unit *route*. The contextual meaning is ‘a way of doing something that produces a particular result’. A more basic meaning is ‘a way that buses, trains, ships, or planes travel regularly’. The contextual meaning can be understood through the more concrete, visible basic meaning.

In this first step, it is necessary to identify both the metaphorical instances in the corpus and the metaphor keyword(s) of each one. In the previous example, *We then drafted the road map as the route to get there*, the following metaphorical instances can be identified: 1. *We then drafted the road map*; 2. *the road map as the route to get there*

The above example presents the two nouns *road map* and *route*, which have been identified as the metaphorical keywords. The metaphor keyword will help to provide the source domain that the metaphor belongs to. In categorizing metaphors, one must also consider the fact that some metaphors may belong to more than one source domain. The different source domains found in the corpus help to interpret and explain why Bush, Sharon, and Abbas choose these metaphors, and not others, to conceptualize peace in this way and its effect. As mentioned previously, this paper will however, only focus on JOURNEY metaphors.

It is also important to mention that some metaphor keywords belong to two different word classes, like *progress* and *to progress*. They will be counted as two different metaphor keywords because a distinction should be drawn between word classes in the qualitative analysis. It is also essential in the identification stage when deciding on contextual and basic meanings to compare the same part of speech (Steen et al. 2010). However, when a verb is mentioned in different verbal tenses, it will still be considered as the same metaphor keyword.

The next step consists of interpreting the identified metaphors by finding conceptual metaphors that underlie them. This stage involves analyzing metaphors by source domains. Once all the metaphorical instances have been identified (Step 1), and the metaphor keyword highlighted, the source domain is listed for each reference. For example, in the case of the metaphorical instance *We then drafted the road map as the route to get there*, *road map* and *route* are listed as the metaphor keywords, the source domain listed as JOURNEY and the conceptual metaphor as THE PEACE PROCESS IS A JOURNEY. The contextual meaning allows the reader to interpret the meanings of *road map* and *route* in reference to peace, and establish a connection between the literal meaning of *road map* and *route* and the contextual meaning in which they occur. In this

case, Bush compares the peace process with a road map that indicates the route Israelis and Palestinians must following if they intend to reach the final, desired destination, that is, peace. The reference to peace is implicit, through the use of the word *there*, which refers back to one of Bush's previous statements stating that *the policy of the United States is to help bring peace to the Middle East*. Charteris-Black (2004: 37) suggests that interpretation involves a relationship between metaphors and cognitive and pragmatic factors. Therefore, interpretation will also include the social, historical, and geopolitical context in which the metaphor occurs.

The last step consists of explaining the findings. This is carried out by taking into consideration the political contexts of the texts being analyzed. The purpose here is to determine the relationship between the findings and the contexts in an attempt to uncover the ideological motivations behind the choice of metaphors. It will be important here to examine which aspects of the source domain are highlighted and, consequently, hidden. The investigation of the three politicians' ideology will be crucial for this step since an explanation of the metaphor would be impossible without taking into account the political ideological context.

5. Analysis and results

This section attempts to demonstrate that the notion of JOURNEY is predominantly used in all three leaders' discourse on peace/the peace process. In order to do so, it presents overall findings in relation to the metaphorical elements (metaphorical expressions, metaphor keywords and conceptual metaphors) that conceptualize peace and aspects related to it. Moreover, it examines how the elements mentioned previously contribute to creating the leaders' political agenda.

5.1. Metaphor keywords

This section illustrates the metaphor keywords found in the data. Metaphor keywords are essential in order to analyze metaphorical expressions. Following Charteris-Black's (2004) definition of metaphor keyword: those metaphorical expressions that the researcher finds to be interesting and frequent in a manual analysis of a particular set of data, the analysis of the corpus shows that the lexical domain of JOURNEY was the most frequent in all three sub-corpora. The metaphor keywords used by Bush, Sharon, and Abbas are illustrated in the following sub-sections.

5.1.1. Metaphor keywords in Bush

After a close reading and analysis of the speeches, 139 metaphor keywords in the domain of JOURNEY were identified in Bush's discourse. The counting procedure employed includes the actual instances (tokens) of metaphor. Since Bush (as do Sharon and Abbas) re-uses evocative metaphors such as *way*, *step*, *roadmap*, etc., the number of metaphor types would be less than this. Thus, the metaphor keywords include 68 nouns: *avenue* (2), *destination* (1), *journey* (2), *obstacle* (1), *partner* (4), *path* (4), *progress* (11), *road* (1), *roadmap* (19), *route* (2), *step* (15), *way* (6); 38 verbs: *to accelerate* (1), *to advance* (1), *to bring* (4), *to build* (1), *to come* (4), *to lead* (4), *to mark* (1), *to move* (6), *to reach* (3), *to return* (1), *to search* (1), *to set forth* (2), *to set out* (1), *to step* (2), *to step up* (2), *to stop* (1), *to start* (2), *to tilt* (1); 22 prepositions: *beyond* (2), *on* (1), *toward* (19); 10 adverbs: *ahead* (1), *back* (2), *forward* (4), *quickly* (3); and 1 adjective: *stuck* (1).

5.1.2. Metaphor keywords in Sharon

A total of 122 JOURNEY metaphor keywords were identified in Sharon's political discourse, which is slightly less frequent than in the Bush sub-corpus. The metaphor keywords identified in Sharon's speeches include 57 nouns: *acceleration* (1), *avenue* (1), *direction* (1), *footsteps* (1), *obstacle* (2), *partner* (5), *path* (10), *progress* (11), *starting point* (1), *step* (11), *step by step* (1), *roadmap* (11), *way* (1), 48 verbs: *to abandon* (1), *to advance* (8), *to anchor* (1), *to bring* (1), *to bring (about)* (1), *to break off* (1), *to build* (2), *to derail* (1), *to drag (your) feet* (1), *to embark* (1), *to guide* (1), *to go* (1), *to lead astray* (1), *to lead to* (6), *to move* (4), *to pave* (1), *to proceed* (1), *to pursue* (1), *to reach* (3), *to return (to)* (1), *to set forth* (1), *to start on* (1), *to take* (8); 12 prepositions: *toward* (12); 6 adverbs: *forward* (5), *speedily* (1).

5.1.3. Metaphor keywords in Abbas

A close analysis of the Abbas sub-corpus revealed a total of 77 JOURNEY metaphor keywords including 43 nouns: *acceleration* (1), *partner* (3), *labyrinth* (1), *maze* (1), *momentum* (1), *obstacle* (3), *path* (7), *progress* (3), *quest* (1), *road* (1), *roadmap* (15), *step* (4), *track* (1), *way* (1); 20 verbs: *to accelerate* (1), *to advance* (2), *to build* (2), *to continue on* (2), *to delay* (1), *to derail* (1), *to get* (1), *to go* (1), *to move* (4), *to reach* (4), *to turn* (1); 7 prepositions: *to* (3), *towards* (4); 5 adverbs: *ahead* (1), *back* (1), *forward* (3); and 2 adjectives: *forward* (1), *stuck* (1).

It should be noted that some of the metaphor keywords seem to be more central to the idea of JOURNEY than others. In this respect, it could be possible to classify them as JOURNEY/MOVEMENT, for instance.

The following section moves from a linguistic metaphor analysis to a conceptual metaphor analysis and attempts at extrapolating the relevant conceptual metaphors.

5.2. JOURNEY metaphors in the corpus

JOURNEY metaphors were originally documented in cognitive linguistics by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). Lakoff (1993) proposed PURPOSEFUL ACTIVITY IS TRAVELLING ALONG A PATH TOWARDS A DESTINATION. JOURNEY metaphors can be traced back to the PATH image schema, which is based on our physical experience of motion in space (Semino 2008: 92). This image schema provides a way of metaphorically constructing goals as destinations, ways of reaching goals as movement forwards, problems as obstacles to movement, and success or failure as reaching, or failing to reach, a destination. Charteris-Black (2004) and Semino (2008) suggest that social purposes can be viewed as destinations, so that actions aimed at the achievement of goals are constructed in terms of travel or movement forward. Moreover, Semino (2008: 109) points out that "political negotiations, in particular, are one of the many types of purposeful activities that are conventionally constructed as journeys."

As previously mentioned, JOURNEY/MOVEMENT was the most common source domain for metaphor in the corpus. This is not surprising since the peace process is a scheduled event and involves work towards a goal.

The data show that the conceptualization of peace focuses mainly on four aspects: peace in itself, those who seek it, those who oppose it, and how to achieve it. The

following statement by George W. Bush includes most of these aspects.

(1) There can be no peace for either side in the Middle East unless there is freedom for both. *Reaching* that *destination* will not be easy, but we can see the *way forward*. Now the parties must *take* that *way, step by step*, and America will be the active *partner* of every party that *seeks* true peace. (Bush June 2002)

Bush refers to peace as a destination to be reached. The journey (the peace process) will not be a simple one, however he can see the way forward (by following his policy, i.e. roadmap). Those who seek peace are the travelers who must follow the right path towards the destination. Moreover, America will be the travelling partner to those who truly seek peace. This statement reaffirms Bush's "with us or against us" view of the world, which he had previously outlined in his State of the Union address at the end of January 2002.

Peace is usually referred to as the aspired destination, which people *search for, try to reach, to get to, to go to, to move toward* and even *to lead to*. It is also at times the vehicle used to arrive at the destination. Below Sharon refers to terrorist groups as those wanting to derail the vehicle 'peace'. What is interesting is that he does not refer specifically to peace, but to a 'possibility', which brings to the surface the doubts he has in the peace process.

(2) There are still many who seek to *derail* any possibility of peace and tranquility. (Sharon July 2003)

Abbas also uses the metaphor keyword *derail*. In his case however, he is referring to the Palestinians as being on the journey towards peace, and to the Israelis as those trying to derail the train that the Palestinians are on. It is interesting to note that *derail* is not followed by the keyword *track*, but by *path*. A reason for this could be that *path* is a highly conventional metaphor in political discourse. In fact, *path* is one of the most frequently used metaphor keywords by all three politicians.

(3) It is our duty, whether in the Authority, opposition, or civil society not to allow the occupation to *derail* us from this *path*, or internal chaos to sabotage this process. (Abbas Jan. 2005)

There are very few references to a specific vehicle in the JOURNEY/MOVEMENT metaphor in this corpus. In Bridgeman's (2002) analysis of the US press coverage of the Oslo peace accords, the most common reference to a specific vehicle is a reference to a train, and the most common reference to a specific path is to a track. In the corpus under analysis here, there are only three references to a train (*getting back on track* and the above two instances of *being derailed*). There are, however, many references to *roads, avenues, paths, routes, and people taking steps towards peace*. One could argue that this is an extended metaphor of the main metaphorical concept in this corpus: *roadmap*.

In the references identified in the corpus, the peace process is mainly a vehicle or journey, highlighting the way to achieve peace.

(4) Mr. President, you have made a new *start* on a difficult *journey* requiring courage and leadership each day, and we will *take* that *journey* together. (Bush May 2005)

At times, the vehicle will stop working and it is up to the traveler to find another solution. In the following reference, Bush refers to Sharon, explaining the reasons for his disengagement plan.

(5) There was a process that *got stuck* and the prime minister *steps up* and *leads*. (Bush April 2004)

The vehicle (the peace process) has been stalled, therefore Prime Minister Sharon has decided to follow another path (the disengagement plan), and he is not only a traveler, but the guide.

The participants in the peace process are the travelers, while the opponents are the impediments to travel. There are frequent impediments to travel and the journey ahead is long and difficult, however, there seems to be no other choice.

(6) Prime Minister Abbas recognizes that terrorist crimes are a dangerous *obstacle* to the independent state his people *seek*. (Bush June 2003)

(7) The *journey* we are taking is difficult, but there is no other choice. (Bush June 2003)

(8) It is true that this is not a shining *path* which will *lead us to* instant, magical solutions, but I am certain that only by *going forward* in this *direction, step by step*, will we be able to achieve security for the Israeli people, and *reach* the peace we all yearn for. (Sharon Dec. 2002)

(9) The *road ahead* is long, but it is a *road* that we will *take* and a challenge that we will accept. (Abbas Jan. 2005)

Whatever the difficulties, and even when it has been decided to take another way towards the destination, the parties/travelers should try to return to the roadmap which points the way back to the right path.

(10) Secretary Rice will consult with Israelis and Palestinians on the disengagement, their shared commitments, and the *way back* on the *roadmap*. (Bush May 2005)

(11) As we work to make the disengagement succeed, we must not lose sight of the *path ahead*. (Bush May 2005)

As suggested by Charteris-Black (2004: 95), BUILDING metaphors make an interesting comparison with JOURNEY metaphors since they are conceptually related. Both building and travelling involve progression towards a predetermined goal. Charteris-Black notes that they both involve covering a surface: journeys go along a horizontal path while buildings follow a vertical one. As regards motion in this corpus, it is represented through horizontal movement, *forward* and *back*. Forward movement goes *toward*, *beyond*, and *ahead*. It moves *quickly* and *speedily*, however at times *acceleration* is necessary, as there are *delays* and vehicles *get stuck*. Both JOURNEY and BUILDING metaphors can also be used in the same metaphorical expression as the one that follows:

(12) The Disengagement Plan can *pave* the *way* to implementation of the Roadmap ... (Sharon Feb. 2005)

What is being built here is the road that will lead the way to peace. ‘Nested metaphor’ is the term used by Charteris-Black (2005: 53) to describe the rhetorical practice of placing a metaphor from one source domain within a metaphor from another source domain.

When looking for similarities and differences among the three leaders, results show that Bush and Sharon use many of the same keywords (it has been thought that the two politicians often spoke with one voice), whereas some of Abbas' metaphor keywords are unique to his discourse:

(13) You must ensure that we do not *re-enter* the *labyrinth* of preconditions that preclude *progress* in implementation. You must ensure that we do not *get stuck* in the *maze* of long-term partial or interim solutions designed to *delay reaching* a just and comprehensive solution. (Abbas Jan. 2005)

Progress does not solely depend on the Palestinians, as Bush has emphasized many times. Indeed, it is Bush and the Quartet who have laid out the roadmap, and it is up to them to ensure that no mazes or labyrinths are put in the way of progress towards the destination of a peaceful solution, and indeed, create the avenue towards peace, mentioned by both Bush and Sharon. The implications of the keywords are better understood by looking back at the original linguistic metaphor identification process, in which the more basic meaning helps in providing an interpretation and explanation for their use. The more basic meaning of *avenue* is 'a wide straight road, especially one with trees on each side'. Whereas the basic meaning of *labyrinth* is 'a place where there are lots of paths or passages and you can easily become lost', and *maze*: 'an arrangement of closely connected paths separated by tall bushes or trees. The paths often do not lead anywhere, and you have to use your memory and skill to get through'.

An analysis of the source domain helps to provide a perspective of peace/the peace process and aspects related to it. In this regard, conceptual metaphors show how source domains help to construe and frame the issue from different concepts (Hellin Garcia 2008: 246). In this respect, the domain of JOURNEY/MOVEMENT reveals that PEACE/THE PEACE PROCESS IS A JOURNEY, THE USA, ISRAEL AND PALESTINE ARE TRAVELLING COMPANIONS, and that by following the roadmap, IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PEACE PROCESS IS MOVEMENT FORWARD, however by not following the roadmap, THE REJECTION OF PEACE PROCESS IS MOVEMENT BACKWARDS/LACK OF MOVEMENT. PEACE/THE PEACE PROCESS IS AN AVENUE/ROAD/PATH, however, it is also possible that THE PEACE PROCESS IS A MAZE/LABYRINTH. PEACE/THE PEACE PROCESS IS A VEHICLE, the vehicle used to arrive at the destination. PEACE IS A DESTINATION, and while trying to reach that destination, VIOLENCE/DIFFICULTIES ARE IMPEDIMENTS TO TRAVEL. The conceptual metaphors frame and evaluate the different elements of peace/the peace process through the source domain to construe a conceptualization of peace.

6. Conclusions

This paper has illustrated how linguistic metaphor expressions can be linked to conceptual metaphors, and how these reflect specific aspects of peace. Using Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Critical Metaphor Analysis to identify underlying conceptual metaphors and the way they are represented in a text linguistically can provide an organizational framework and shed light on the choice of lexical items that at first glance may seem almost random. An understanding, for example, of how many linguistic metaphors can arise out of the conceptual metaphor PEACE IS A JOURNEY can perform at least three functions. Firstly, it allows one to see the underlying connections between the various linguistic expressions employed, thus helping provide a deeper understanding of the text and adding the perception of coherence. Secondly, it facilitates an insight into the

underlying ideology and less overt aspects of the text. Thirdly, it can give cross-cultural insights into the conceptual metaphors shared by people of a different culture or society. The analysis of these so-called ‘peace speeches’ has shown that the notion of journey is predominantly used in the discourse of Bush, Sharon and Abbas. Results show that during a four-year period the three leaders consistently referred to aspects of peace/the peace process invoking the concept of journey. Overall, there are very few metaphors for peace unique to the three politicians. The only differences observed lie not in which metaphors are used, but in what aspects of peace or the peace process they are used to highlight. What seems to emerge from the discourse is that the road to peace is often strewn with obstacles, placed there by the other party or parties. Many of the metaphors analyzed in the discourse, and not only in the domain of JOURNEY, emphasize the perceived asymmetry between the opponents (‘us’ and ‘them’). Whether depicting themselves as the friendly neighbor who has no partner, or the victim of an endless conflict whose opponent stubbornly refuses to make peace, the concept ‘peace’ has been emptied of content and has become illusory, something that neither the user nor the listener believes is possible to achieve and used for purposes of prestige (Gavriely-Nuri 2010).

References

- Aponte Moreno M. 2008, *Metaphors in Hugo Chavez's Political Discourse: Conceptualizing Nation, Revolution, and Opposition*. Unpublished dissertation. City University of New York.
- Berhó D. 2005, *Argentina is deity and Juan Domingo Perón its high priest: The POLITICS IS RELIGION metaphor in Perón's political discourse*, in "Journal of Christianity and Foreign Languages" [6], pp. 48-64.
- Biton Y. and Salomon G. 2006, *Peace in the Eyes of Israeli and Palestinian Youths: Effect of Collective Narratives and Peace Education Program*, in "Journal of Peace Research" 43 [2], pp. 167-80.
- Bridgeman C. 2000, *What kind of peace is this? Metaphor in the US press coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian negotiations*, Unpublished PhD thesis. University of South Carolina.
- Bridgeman C. 2002, *Playing at Peace: Game Metaphors in Discussions of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*, in "British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies" 29 [2], pp.165-167.
- Charteris-Black J. 2004, *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*, Houndmills, Hampshire, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black J. 2005, *Politicians and Rhetoric. The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*, Basingstoke-New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chew P.G. 2000, *Islands and national identity: the metaphors of Singapore*, in "International Journal of Sociology of Language", 142, pp. 121-37.
- Chilton P. and Ilyin . 1993, *Metaphor in Political Discourse: the Case of the "Common European House*, in "Discourse and Society" 4 [1], pp.7-31.
- Gavriely-Nuri D. 2010, *If both opponents 'extend hands in peace' – Why don't they meet? Mythic metaphors and cultural codes in the Israeli peace discourse*, in "Journal of Language and Politics", 9 [30], pp. 449-68.
- Gavriely-Nuri D. 2010, *The idiosyncratic language of Israeli peace: a cultural approach to critical discourse analysis*, in "Discourse & Society", 21[5], pp. 565-85.
- Hellin Garcia M.J. 2008, *Framing Terrorism via Metaphors: José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero (2004-2007)*. Unpublished dissertation. University of Minnesota.
- Hermann T. S. 2001, *Contending Narratives: The Israeli Peace Movement's Role in the Oslo Process*, in A. Ben-Zvi and A. Kleiman (eds) *Global Politics*, London: Frank Cass, pp. 237-64.
- Kurtzer D.C. and Lasensky S.B. 2008, *Negotiating Arab-Israeli Peace*. Washington D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Lakoff G. 1993, *The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor*. In A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.202-257.
- Lakoff G. 2001, *Metaphors of Terror*. In G. Lakoff (ed.), *Don't think of an elephant*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff G. and Johnson, M., 1980/2003, *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago, Chicago University Press.
- Meital Y. 2006, *Peace in Tatters. Israel, Palestine, and the Middle East*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Miller A.D. 2008, *The Much Too Promised Land*. New York: Bantam.
- Musolff A. 1998, *Metaphors and Trains of thought: spotting journey imagery in British and German political discourse*, in S. Wright, L. Hanrais and J. Howorth (eds), *Language, Politics and Society*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp.100-109.
- Musolff A. 2000, *Political Imagery of Europe: a House Without Exit Doors?*, in "Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development", 21 [3], pp. 216-29.
- Musolff A. and Charteris-Black J. 2003, *'Battered hero' or 'innocent victim'? A comparative study of metaphors for euro trading*, in "English for Special Purposes" 22, pp. 153-176.
- Pancake A.S. 1993, *Taken by storm: the exploitation of metaphor in the Persian Gulf War*, in "Metaphor and Symbolic Activity" 8, pp. 281-95.
- Pragglejaz Group 2007, *MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse*, in "Metaphor and Symbol", 22 [1], pp. 1-39.
- Quandt W.B. 2005, *Peace Process. American Diplomacy and the Arab-Israeli Conflict since 1967*. California: University of California Press.
- Rohrer T. 1995, *The metaphorical logic of (political) rape: The new wor(l)d order*, in "Metaphor and Symbolic Activity" 10: 115-37.
- Sandikcioglu E. 2000, *More metaphorical warfare in the Gulf: Orientalist frames in news coverage*, Barcelona, A. (ed.), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 299-320.
- Santa Ana O. 1999, *Like an animal I was treated: anti-immigrant metaphor in US public discourse*, in "Discourse and Society" 10 [2], pp. 191-224.

- Schäffner C. and Wenden A.L. (eds.), 1995, *Language and Peace*. Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing Company.
- Semino E. 2008, *Metaphor in Discourse*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Semino E. and Masci M. 1996, *Politics is Football: metaphor in the discourse of Silvio Berlusconi in Italy*, in "Discourse and Society", 7 [2], pp. 243-69.
- Shinar D. 2000, *Media Diplomacy and 'Peace Talk'*, *Gazette* 62 [2], pp. 83-97.
- Steen G. J., Dorst A., Herrmann J.B., Kaal A., Kremmmayr, T. and Pasma, T. 2010 *A method for linguistic metaphor identification*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Steuter E. and Willis D. 2008, *At War with Metaphor: Media, Propaganda and Racism in the War on Terror*, Lanham MD, Lexington Books.
- Straehle C, Weiss G., Wodak R., Muntigl P and Sedlak M. 1999. *Struggle as Metaphor in European Union Discourse on Unemployment*, in "Discourse and Society", 10 [1], pp. 67-99.
- Thornborrow J. 1993. *Metaphor of Security: a Comparison of Representation in Defense Discourse in Post Cold War France and Britain*, in "Discourse and Society" 4 [1], pp. 99-119.
- Voss J., Kennet J., Wiley J., and Schooler T. 1992, *Experts at debate: The use of metaphor in the US senate debate on the Gulf crisis*, in "Metaphor and Symbolic Activity" 7, pp. 197-214.
- Wenden A. L. 2003, *Achieving a Comprehensive Peace: The Linguistic Factor*, in "Peace & Change", 28, pp. 169-201.
- Zinken J. 2003, *Ideological imagination: intertextual and correlational metaphors in political discourse*, in "Discourse & Society", 14 [4], pp. 507-523.