

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Metaphors had been known as a matter of literature. For many years metaphor was only seen as a figure of speech that is restricted to poetry, prose, or rhetoric before it considered as a cognitive phenomenon. Since the time of Aristotle, many scholars from many disciplines have struggled to define metaphor and understand its functions in language, thought, and culture. But, the revolutionary idea of George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980) has changed the perspective of metaphor that does not merely a matter of language but it is a matter of thought. Since *Metaphor We Live By* was published in 1980, there was an explosion study of metaphor, especially within cognitive science, where linguists, philosophers, and psychologists have offered a variety of proposals on study metaphors.

The explosion studies of metaphor contributed to the multidisciplinary study of metaphor. Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1999) found that metaphor as a cognitive phenomenon that allows human to understand one thing in terms of the other which created the new advances in cognitive science and neural computation which found the relation between brain and body. Glucksberg, Gildea, and Bookin (1982: 96-97) found that people use the same mechanism in processing both literal and metaphorical language. Coulson and Okley (2005: 1535-1536) found that the

dichotomy between literal and figurative are not really clear and the literal-nonliteral distinction is the prevalence of the conventionality of the metaphors. Glucksberg (2008: 81-83) found that metaphors are understood by both the categorization and comparison process. Furthermore, Stringaris, Medford, Brammer, and David (2007) conduct a research using MRI scanner to see whether metaphor or nonliteral meaning was processed in the same area of brain and found that there is no significant difference between literal and metaphorical language and concluded that metaphors are involved construction of an attribute category, a concept that resembles object activation in the semantic system. These multi-discipline researches create the evidence of that metaphor was not merely matter of one discipline.

Although metaphor is considered as a cognitive phenomenon yet most of metaphors theorists study metaphor through language, linguistic expression. However in *bahasa*, the study of metaphor are dominated by literary studies such as poetry (Supriyadi, 2013; Ulya, Eko, & Mujiyanto, 2016), newspapers (Nirmala, 2011, 2012; Sukarno, 2017), religious lectures (Hartanto, 2018), songs (Ranabumi, 2018) and it is difficult to find a study of metaphors in political discourse. In addition, there is a little study the function of metaphors, especially in politic. Supriyadi (2013) studied symbols in the human perception that form metaphorical meanings, while Ulya, Eko, W., and Mujiyanto (2016) and Ranabumi (2018) only study types of metaphor. Nirmala (2011, 2012) and Sukarno (2017) studied the functions of the metaphor in the newspaper.

Some research in metaphors had mistaken about the theoretical concept of metaphors. Metaphors should be understood as a human conceptual system which the product of them mostly linguistic expressions. In the linguistic expressions of metaphor “our relationship *meet a dead end*, there is a conceptual metaphor *love is journey (from now on the conceptual metaphor would be marked by *) that governed our view of love in terms of a journey. Yet the difference between metaphors as linguistic expressions and metaphor as a conceptual system is not easy for some people. Sukarno (2017) failed in understanding the differences between metaphor as a conceptual system (conceptual metaphor) and metaphor as a linguistic expression. He made an example of linguistic expression of metaphor “*argument adalah perang*” (Sukarno, 2017: 17) that was taken from Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980: 1) conceptual metaphor of *argument is war. Sukarno was translated this conceptual metaphor and used it as an example, yet he was failed in understanding that the metaphor was actually occurred in a conceptual system and did not occur as a linguistic expression. Lakoff and Johnson always capitalized his example of metaphors in a conceptual system and used italics for making different with the metaphor as a linguistic expression. Furthermore, Supriyadi (2013) failed in explaining the metaphorical expressions that occur in the poem because he was failed in understanding Halley (1980) theory of metaphor. Supriyadi (2013:317) found that in a poem “*maka mereka pandangi saja semua senja, semua warna yang beringsut menuju malam*” contains metaphorical meaning because the lexicon “*malam*” was a metaphorical symbol for “stupidity”. It is hardly to interpret “*malam*” as a symbol of

stupidity by just looking a poem without interpreting the context. Supriyadi should provide more explanation in order to make the readers understand and certain that “*malam*” has connotation meaning for a stupidity.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 1) explained that metaphor play a central role in defining our everyday realities. It means metaphor is used in various domains of our life. One of the domain that many linguistic expressions of metaphor occur is in political discourse. Politic and metaphors are two things that cannot be separated. Politicians use metaphor to state and to express their ideas because as Charteris-Black (2004: 7, 2011: 29-30) explained that a metaphorical expression has a persuasive power as rhetorical tools for politicians to use when addressing the public which can be used to “heightening the emotional impact of speech by sounding right” (Charteris-Black, 2011: 313). Thus, metaphors can be used to manipulate thought in democractic society. Lakoff (2014: 94) explained when George. H. W. Bush propaganda speech about Iraq invasion toward Kuwait, he said that *the ‘rape’ of Kuwait was a barbaric and an inhuman act*. The metaphorical expression *rape* was a conceptualization of a nation as a person. Bush sold Kuwait as a person that needed to be saved from being raped to send their army to save them from *a barbaric and inhuman act of raping*.

Before the propaganda speech of *the ‘rape’ of Kuwait* occurred, George. H. W. Bush has actually performed another propaganda speech but it did not work. He was failed in persuading American people when using a self-defense story by saying

that Saddam was *threatening our lifeline*. Yet, the American just did not believe in him. Then, he used his winning story by creating a rescue story. He used a conceptual metaphor *nation is a person, which created an image of how Iraq *was raping* Kuwait and American as the moral leader has the responsibility to rescue Kuwait (Lakoff, 2014: 94). American people who were implanted by fictional superhero culture in comic, movie, and story between good and evil in human life believed in that story. Metaphor and frame are contributed in many of Iraq civilians were killed by American bomb because American people supporting Bush policy.

Since metaphors can influence thought and perception the democratic society which the leaders are chosen by general election, politicians rely on their rhetorical and metaphorical skills to persuade their follower (Charteris-Black, 2004: 7). Beer and de Landtsheer (in Cammaerts, 2013: 230) explained that politicians used metaphor as persuasive tools in communication which can bridge gaps between two people who do not know each other and to create a frame of the issue. As Lakoff (2014: 11) explained that frames are mental structures that shape the perspective of human thought in seeing the world. People can understand frame through language. All the words they heard are defined relative to the conceptual frame that is activated in our brain.

Most of the political issues are complicated and abstract whereas the majority of people have a little knowledge about them. Thus, it is valuable for politicians to present these abstract issues are explained by the metaphorical expressions that make

them more intelligible for their target audiences (Charteris-Black, 2011: 31-32). It could be the reason that there are many metaphors occurs in political discourse. The failing in understanding metaphor could be a problem because the audience would not understand that metaphors somehow have hidden messages. This hidden message carries speaker intention of using a metaphor which should be analyzed using a pragmatic approach because semantics only provide the meaning but does not concern for what is hidden beyond the meaning.

Metaphors could activate the frame which can be used to persuade people, even it is clearly against their interest. A clear example is explained by Lakoff (2014: 16), he explained how George W. Bush using the phrase *tax relief* to state his policies almost every day. He explained Bush policy *tax relief* contains a frame and a metaphor. When the word *tax* adds to *relief*, it means that there is conceptual metaphor *taxation is an affliction. If there is a relief there must be an affliction, which made Bush became a hero who removes an affliction and the people who are trying to stop him are villains because they are trying to prevent relief. It created a frame that Bush was a hero who removed the affliction, and anyone who tries to stop him is the bad guy. Many of American society were happily and welcome to a Bush policy of *tax relief*. The framing metaphor worked because no one actually likes to pay taxes. Although there are no many people who could have the advantages of *tax relief*, there 65% of American society.

In political discourses, the metaphor has different function and different characteristics with the metaphor that occur in another domain such as in literature. In literature metaphor is easy to identify because the structure of metaphors usually formulated by A is B. Like in the famous Shakespeare's fictional work, *Romeo and Juliet*, which occur the famous metaphor "*Juliet is sun*". Metaphors in literature are innovative linguistic expression. Metaphors in literature are infrequent and people fully aware of their metaphoricity. On contrary, conventional metaphors have entered the lexicon of ordinary speech and people often failed to see those as metaphors, for example, the expression "*we are in different way*" that is used as an expression at the end of a relationship. In this expression, the topic and the vehicle of the metaphor are not stated explicitly which make it does not consider as a metaphor but the context shows that this expression is a metaphor because it was used at the end of the relationship. The topic of the metaphor is love while the vehicle is a journey. The love relationship understood in term of Journey which produces linguistic expression "*we are in different way*".

Metaphors have no frozen meaning which makes them difficult to comprehend. The different context could create a different interpretation of metaphor. The different culture also contributes to a different metaphor that uses by speaker because the metaphor is cultural product even different person could use a different metaphor. Furthermore, metaphors in political discourses occur all over the world including in Indonesian politic. In the 2017 Jakarta Governor Election also has many

metaphorical expressions that were used by candidate of Governor and Vice Governor. Yet, the topic of the metaphors somehow hidden which make them were not considered as metaphors. Furthermore, each candidate has his own way in expressing their idea including using a metaphor. Every culture has its own metaphor and every person also has its own metaphor. By studying of metaphor in politic, the pattern of thought in candidates' mind can be seen from the language they employ, which can be used to reveal the hidden ideology and the speaker intention of using a metaphor. Moreover, in the 2017 Jakarta Governor Election, there was a collision of ideologies between two different social groups. Those social groups have different interest but the same purpose, in ruling Jakarta. Many political observers believe whoever rule Jakarta will be the third most powerful person in Indonesia politic. Indonesia politic had been divided into two opposed political power. They had been fought since 2014 in President Election. These two political powers were represented by Basuki Tjahja Purnama, who represented the government or ruling group and Anies Baswedan who represented the opposition stronghold. Basuki was the incumbent governor who has a very different character with Anies. Basuki was described as strong and strict characteristic and Anies who has the delicate and homely characteristic. Both of them has a different rhetorical style and lexical choices in expressing their ideas. Those all contributed to creating different metaphorical expressions that are interesting to investigate. By those reasons, the researcher is interested in conduct study of the use of metaphor in 2017 Jakarta Governor Election.

B. Problem Identification

According to the background, there are some problems that are identified in this research:

1. The research of metaphors in *bahasa* is still dominated by literary studies which mostly focus on describing the types of metaphors.
2. Metaphors are a cultural product but it is difficult to find researches that study the comparison of the metaphorical expression in Indonesian language and other languages.
3. Metaphors in political discourse are difficult to identify because the topic and the vehicle are not stated explicitly.
4. Metaphors are difficult to interpret because metaphor requires context in interpreting them.
5. Metaphors are the matter of speaker choices, thus in understand what is speaker intention is difficult.
6. Metaphors have a different function in different domain and there is no research about the function of metaphor in the political discourse in 2017 Jakarta Governor Election.
7. There are some scholars who failed in understanding conceptual theory of metaphor.
8. Metaphors have a hidden ideology which promotes the use of metaphor in discourse.

C. The Limitations of Problem

In order to make this study more focus and deeper, this study will not do research on every problem that is identified. The more significant problem will be focused on find out the topics and the vehicles of metaphors, the ideology of the speakers which hidden in the metaphorical expressions, and the functions of metaphor that occurred in the 2017 Jakarta Governor Election.

D. Formulation of Problem

Based on the elaboration of the background above the researcher found that the importance of this research. The formulation of problems in this study is formulated which several questions below.

1. What are the topics and the vehicle of metaphors that occur in the 2017 Jakarta Governor Election?
2. What are the ideologies of speakers which bears in metaphorical expressions in the 2017 Jakarta Governor Election?
3. What are the functions of metaphors in the 2017 Jakarta Governor Election?

E. The Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study are formulated as bellow:

1. Identifying the topics and vehicles of metaphors that occur in the 2017 Jakarta Governor Election.
2. Explaining the ideologies of speakers which bears in metaphorical expressions in the 2017 Jakarta Governor Election.
3. Explaining the functions of metaphor in the 2017 Jakarta Governor Election.

F. The Significance of the Study

The result of this research is expected will be practically helpful to enrich readers' knowledge about metaphor. People still thought a metaphor is matter of literature or just merely language. More than just language, metaphor in cognitive perspective is a structure of thinking that allows human to understand one domain of experience to describe the term of another domain. This research is also practically helpful in raising the awareness of how metaphors are used in politic and give explanations of what is in speakers' mind when they state their argument, how they construct meaning, and what are beyond those metaphors. Furthermore, this research will provide a new methodology which integrates the cognitive linguistic, pragmatic and critical discourse for analyzing of metaphor in political discourse. However, the

result of the research theoretically can be the references for the later research in the field linguistics, cognitive linguistics, pragmatics, and discourse analysis.