

العنوان:	Lexical Analysis of Obama's and Hillary Clinton's Political Speeches About the Arab Spring
المصدر:	مجلة كلية الآداب
الناشر:	جامعة الفيوم - كلية الآداب
المؤلف الرئيسي:	Sayed, Mai Ashraf Hussein
المجلد/العدد:	ع12
محكمة:	نعم
التاريخ الميلادي:	2015
الشهر:	يونيو
الصفحات:	324 - 354
رقم MD:	1020711
نوع المحتوى:	بحوث ومقالات
اللغة:	English
قواعد المعلومات:	HumanIndex
مواضيع:	تحليل المفردات، الخطاب السياسي، أوباما، كلينتون
رابط:	http://search.mandumah.com/Record/1020711

Lexical Analysis of Obama's and Hillary Clinton's Political Speeches about the Arab Spring

By

Mai Ashraf Hussein Sayed

A researcher, Faculty of Arts, Fayoum University

Abstract

This study aims at highlighting the major role played by lexical analysis in conveying certain ideological messages in the political speeches of Obama and Hillary Clinton about the Arab Spring. The sample consists of five political speeches, three belong to Obama and two belong to Clinton. The speeches were collected from the period (February-November, 2011). Relying on Van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach which gives particular significance to lexical analysis, the study is to look into the use of metaphor and metonymy in the selected speeches. The findings of this study revealed that both Obama and Hillary Clinton have used the two selected linguistic devices in order to achieve their ideological goals and convince the listeners of their thoughts. The most important ideas which they try to stress, through the use of these devices, are that America is the hero who has made a great effort and has cooperated with other partners to secure the Arab citizens from the atrocities of their leaders and that the Arab leaders are dictators. Also, they want to confirm that America is the leader and hence all the Arab countries should follow it.

الخلاصة

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى إظهار الدور البليغ الذي يلعبه تحليل المفردات في توصيل رسائل أيولوجية معينة في خطابات أوباما وهيلاري كلينتون السياسية عن الربيع العربي. حيث تتكون العينة من خمسة خطابات سياسية، ثلاثة ألقاها أوباما، واثنين ألقتهما كلينتون. وقد جمعت هذه الخطابات في الفترة من فبراير 2011 إلى نوفمبر 2011، وبالاعتماد على المذهب الاجتماعي المعرفي لفان دايك الذي يهتم

اهتماما كبيرا بتحليل المفردات تفحص هذه الدراسة استخدام الاستعارة والكناية في الخطابات المحددة . وقد كشفت نتائج هذه الدراسة أن كل من أوباما وكلينتون استخدمتا هاتين الوسيلتين اللغويتين كي يحققا أهدافهما الأيدولوجية و يقنعا المستمعين بأفكارهما. وتتمثل أهم الأفكار التي يريدان التأكيد عليها من خلال استخدام هاتين الوسيلتين أن أمريكا هي البطلة التي بذلت مجهودا فائقا وتعاونت مع شركاء آخرين لكي تنقذ المواطنين العرب من بشاعات قادتهم، وأن القادة العرب ديكتاتوريون. ويريدان أيضا أن يؤكدوا أن أمريكا هي البلد القائدة لذا يجب علي كل البلاد العربية أن تتبعها.

Introduction

This paper starts by theoretically introducing lexical analysis; its definition, its importance, and the names of some rhetorical devices which this analysis can be applied through. Then, it highlights the two devices that have been chosen for the analysis. Each device is accompanied by a theoretical overview which presents the definition, the significance, and general examples. This overview is followed by some examples from Obama and Hillary Clinton's political speeches. After the examples, there is a quantitative account of the purposes of the selected rhetorical devices. Finally, there is a conclusion of the two linguistic devices chosen for the analysis.

Lexical analysis can be defined, according to Patrick Hanks (2013), as a wide examination of word use and meaning in a text. Hanks (2013) argues that words have "meaning potentials" (p.73), and "these potentials are activated when the words are used" (p.73). He adds that the meaning of a word is determined by its context. As for the importance of lexical analysis, Hanks (2013) suggests that lexical analysis helps people "better understand how words go together in collocational constructions to make meanings" (p.7). Thus, lexical analysis plays a central role in distinguishing one text from the other one. In addition, according

to Sayed (2009), what makes the study of lexical items quiet essential is the fact that it is through words that a speaker is able to convey his own messages which are the aim of a given discourse. Thus, the researcher found it essential to handle this linguistic phenomenon.

There are some figures of speech which are most relevant to the lexical analysis of a text. These figures are metaphor, simile, hyperbole, irony and metonymy (Hanks, 2013). Metaphor and metonymy have been chosen for the analysis.

Metaphor: A Theoretical Overview

Metaphor can be defined as figure of speech which involves making an implicit comparison between two unrelated things but they share some common characteristics (Ferraro & Briody, 2017). Developing a comparison in a metaphor does not include using 'like' or 'as' (Corbett, 2013). For example, 'Ahmed is a lion'. The word 'lion' which is applied to an animal is here attributed to a person. What is meant here is that the characteristics of the lion which include strength, bravery and control are attributed to Ahmed. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980) define metaphor in a simpler way and point out that "the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another." (p.5). Thompson (2004) gives a clear example of metaphor in which the words 'crippled' and 'burden' are used metaphorically: "The north is crippled with the burden of the industrial revolution to an extent that the south hardly begins to understand." (p.220). The literal meaning of the word 'crippled' is 'disabled' like, for example, ' a crippled child' whereas 'burden' literally means 'something heavy'. Therefore, the interpretation of the sentence above into a metaphorical language might be: " The north is in a difficult situation because of the effects of the

industrial revolution." (p. 221). Consequently, metaphor involves two meanings: literal and figurative. The literal meaning is imperfect, but the figurative one creates a beautiful image and provides us with the intended meaning and the effect which the speaker desires. Livingstone and Harrison (1981) see that metaphors "serve the dual purpose of remedying some temporary imperfection of literal language and providing imaginative and entertaining verbal puzzles" (p.95)

Lesz (2011) views that metaphor is inevitable when we speak about our emotions, experiences, and beliefs. Moreover, Lakoff & Johnson (1980) assert that metaphor pervades everyday language. This means that it is present in most texts like newspapers, conversations and political speeches. They contend that:

Metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action ... Our concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people (p.3).

Using metaphor in political speeches is of a great importance for the political speaker. Charteris-Black (2004) argues that "metaphors are chosen by speakers to achieve particular communication goals within particular contexts rather than being predetermined by bodily experience" (p.247). In other words, political speakers use metaphor in political speeches to legitimate their policies and agendas in front of their listeners. In his works written in 1991 and 2003, Lakoff wants to stress the idea that political figures use metaphors to justify what they say in order to win the public consensus. This idea accounts for the use of metaphor in Obama's and Clinton's speeches where they try to justify their policies in front of the Arab citizens in order to influence the citizens' opinions and thoughts.

Lakoff (1991) states some metaphor systems which are used to understand international politics. The first system is called 'The State-as-Person System' in which a state is conceptualized as a human being "engaging in social relations within a world community ... It lives in a neighborhood, and has neighbors, friends and enemies ... Well-being is wealth ... Strength for a state is military strength" (p.3). This system was introduced by Lakoff during the first Gulf war to analyze the role of metaphor in political discourse. He indicates that the idea of personifying the State-as-Person has the advantage of linking the ordinary citizen's well-being and economic state with those of the State. This connection makes the citizen need to strengthen his ties with the State in order to preserve his needs.

It is worthy of note that the researcher started with this system and found that it was able to convey all the important messages in the speeches of Obama and Clinton, so there is no need to study other systems of metaphor.

Examples of the Use of The State-as-Person System of Metaphor from Obama's Political Speeches:

Obama makes use of the State-as-Person system in order to personify America to stir the emotions of his listeners. To reassure the listeners that America respects the Tunisian citizens and supports the transition to democracy in Tunisia, the President personifies America in his remarks on the Middle East and North Africa on 19th May, 2011:

We have the chance to show that America values the dignity of the street vendor in Tunisia more than the raw power of the dictator. There must be no doubt that the United States of America welcomes change

that advances self-determination and opportunity (the second speech of Obama, para.20).

In the above quotation, Obama represents America as a person who has the ability to value the dignity of the people and who welcomes change in Tunisia. This personification conveys the intended message of this quotation which is praising America's democratic regime. Personifying America in this way has a profound psychological effect on the Tunisian listeners as they find themselves love America, appreciate it and accept whatever it does. In addition, the Tunisian people feel that they have supporters represented in America and that America encourages the Tunisian revolution. That metaphor also means that American people have sympathy for Tunisian people as if they are one entity.

In the same speech, he personifies America as a person who is interested in solving the Arab world's problems represented in stopping terrorism and securing the Arab citizens from violence to show America's leading role. This metaphor aims at showing the key role of America:

For decades, the United States has pursued a set of core interests in the region: countering terrorism... and safe-guarding the security of the region... We will continue to do these things, with the firm belief that America's interests are not hostile to people's hopes; they're essential to them (the second speech of Obama, para.16).

In addition, the President makes use of metaphor, in the same speech, by depicting America as a person who respects the rights of the Arab citizens in order to praise America's democratic regime. This is the main aim of this quotation and it also shows

America's preference for getting rights and its respect to people who seek to get their rights in a peaceful way:

Let me be clear, America respects the right of all peaceful and law-abiding voices to be heard, even if we disagree with them (the second speech of Obama, para.40).

Obama again confirms America's support for democracy in the Arab countries in the same speech by personifying America as a person who supports democracy and wants to achieve it in the Arab region so as to show America's central role. This is the purpose of this quotation and it shows indirectly to what extent America is a democratic country:

America's support for democracy will therefore be based on ensuring financial stability, promoting reform, and integrating competitive markets with each other and the global economy. And we're going to start with Tunisia and Egypt (the second speech of Obama, para.47).

In addition, he stresses the idea of supporting nations that seek democracy by using the same metaphor in the same speech to assert America's fundamental role:

Moreover, the United States will continue to support those nations that transition to democracy — with greater trade and investment — so that freedom is followed by opportunity (the third speech of Obama, para.28).

Another example out of the various examples of metaphor in which Obama personifies The United States of America is in his address to the United Nations General Assembly on 21st September, 2011. In the next quotation, the President embodies America as a person who is pleased with the freedom of Libya from the tyranny

of Gaddafi. Thus, America is reopening its embassy in Tripoli. This metaphor illustrates that America supports political relationships between itself and Libya. The main purpose of this metaphor is to show America's significant role:

From Tripoli to Misurata to Benghazi — today, Libya is free. Yesterday, the leaders of a new Libya took their rightful place beside us, and this week, the United States is reopening our embassy in Tripoli (the third speech of Obama, para.19).

Moreover, in the subsequent quotation, the President depicts The United States of America as a person who has the ability to impose sanctions on Syria's leaders and has some allies to cooperate with in the hard effort. In addition, it supports the Syrian people. Personifying America in this way has a deep psychological effect on the Syrian people as they find themselves trust America and its effort to rescue them from Bashar Al-Asad. This quotation aims at encouraging people to continue the revolution in addition to showing America's role. The message here is that America does its best for the sake of Syria and that it has the ability as well as the authority to impose sanctions on Syria's leaders. Therefore, America has a unique ability and it is the leader of all countries. Furthermore, the United Nations Security Council is personified as a person who can sanction the Syrian regime and support the Syrian people:

Already, the United States has imposed strong sanctions on Syria's leaders. We supported a transfer of power that is responsive to the Syrian people. And many of our allies have joined in this effort. But for the sake of Syria — and the peace and security of the world — we must speak with one voice. There's no excuse for inaction. Now is the time for the United

Nations Security Council to sanction the Syrian regime, and to stand with the Syrian people (the third speech of Obama, para.24).

Also, Obama asserts the idea that America has some allies and partners to cooperate with in his speech about Libya on 28th March, 2011. This metaphor shows that America has strong relationships with the other countries and it plays an essential role:

In this effort, the United States has not acted alone. Instead, we have been joined by a strong and growing coalition. This includes our closest allies - nations like the United Kingdom, France, Canada, Denmark, Norway, Italy, Spain, Greece, and Turkey - all of whom have fought by our side for decades (the first speech of Obama, para.14).

In the same speech, the President shows America's social relationships in addition to its role:

To summarize, then: in just one month, the United States has worked with our international partners to mobilize a broad coalition, secure an international mandate to protect civilians, stop an advancing army, prevent a massacre, and establish a No Fly Zone with our allies and partners (the first speech of Obama, para.15).

In the subsequent quotation, Obama uses the system of the State-as-Person to personify America to stir the emotions of his listeners. The main purpose of this quotation is to encourage people to work or to continue the revolutions in addition to showing America's positive role:

Throughout the region, we will have to respond to the calls for change. In Yemen, men, women and children gather by the thousands in towns and city squares every day with the hope that their determination and spilled blood will prevail over a

corrupt system. America supports those aspirations. We must work with Yemen's neighbors and our partners around the world to seek a path that allows for a peaceful transition of power from President Saleh, and a movement to free and fair elections as soon as possible (the third speech of Obama, para.25).

In the above quotation, Obama reassures the listeners that America will respond to the call of the Arab citizens for defending them and protecting them from violence and cruelty of their leaders. This shows that America is a democratic country which supports the weak citizens and it is against unjust leaders. In addition, Obama confirms America's support to the Yemen people's aspirations by personifying America as a person who has partners to work with for achieving the Yemen people's dreams represented in getting rid of corruption, President Saleh, and a movement to free and fair elections.

Furthermore, Obama, in the subsequent quotation, embodies America as a person who has friends among whom is Bahrain. He describes America as a devoted friend who helps her friends in their difficult situations and behaves for the sake of those friends. This personification has a deep effect on Bahrainis as it persuades them that America stands with them in their revolution. This metaphor also illustrates the idea that America seeks peace, not war, and likes making friendships. The main purpose of this quotation is to show America's strong relationships in addition to its role:

America is a close friend of Bahrain, and we will continue to call on the government and the main opposition bloc — the Wifaq — to pursue a meaningful dialogue that brings peaceful change that

is responsive to the people (the third speech of Obama, para.26).

The President again depicts the United States of America as a friend to nations who seek freedom in his speech about Libya on 28 March, 2011. The following metaphor also shows that America allows its citizens to have freedom. The main purpose of this quotation is to praise America's democratic regime:

Because wherever people long to be free, they will find a friend in the United States. Ultimately, it is that faith - those ideals - that are the true measure of American leadership (the first speech of Obama, para.41).

In addition, he represents America as a leader who has responsibility towards nations that suffer from the atrocities of their leaders. This metaphor shows that America is the leader and the Arab countries are the ones that follow her. It also shows America's crucial role:

To brush aside America's responsibility as a leader and - more profoundly - our responsibilities to our fellow human beings under such circumstances would have been a betrayal of who we are (the first speech of Obama, para.25).

Examples of the Use of The State-as-Person System of Metaphor from Clinton's Political Speeches:

It is notable that Hillary Clinton goes on the same line taken by Obama where she tries to make use of the system of the State-as-Person. She personifies America by attributing such human description like having friends and partners, having interests, helping the others and so on. Therefore, in her *Keynote Address at the National Democratic Institute's 2011 Democracy Awards Dinner* on 7th November, 2011, she

embodies America as a person who helps the Syrian people to get their rights. The main purpose of this quotation is to praise the American citizens represented in the ambassador in order to show how far they suffered for the sake of the Syrian people:

When our Ambassador to Syria was mobbed, assaulted, and threatened, just for meeting with peaceful protestors, he put his personal safety on the line to let the Syrian people know that America stands with them (the second speech of Clinton, para.6).

Also, in the following quotation, she describes America as a person that people call for help to solve their problems and a person who has a role to play. Personifying America in this way means that it is a wise and trusted country to the extent that it has the ability to solve people's problems. This personification also means that America is an indispensable country in the days of the Arab revolutions as it is the one that can help the Arab citizens solve their problems. The main purpose of this quotation is to praise America:

I've heard people asking America to solve all their problems and others wondering whether we have any role to play at all (the second speech of Clinton, para.7).

Furthermore, in the subsequent quotation, the Secretary of State personifies America so as to stir the emotions of the listeners and show America's leading role:

Now, America did push for reform, but often not hard enough or publicly enough. And today, we recognize that the real choice is between reform and unrest (the second speech of Clinton, para.12).

In the above quotation, Clinton represents America as a person who works for and supports reform in the Arab countries and

hence refuses instability. Thus, America is the country of reform and it seeks reform by action not just saying.

Moreover, in the next quotation, she describes America as a person who has complex interests and has a friend. This metaphor shows America's friendly relationships in addition to its role:

As a country with many complex interests, we'll always have to walk and chew gum at the same time. That is our challenge in a country like Bahrain, which has been America's close friend and partner for decades (the second speech of Clinton, para.21).

Furthermore, using the adjective 'complex' as well as the phrase 'walk and chew gum' in the above quotation, means that America has a great task to do. Furthermore, by using metaphor to personify America as a person who has a friend, Clinton repeats Obama's metaphor which is mentioned before.

Also, she confirms the idea that America has partners whom it motivates to achieve reform in the Arab region. Furthermore, the Secretary of State indicates that the past leaders were better than the present ones and hence she dispraises indirectly the present leaders of the Arab countries. This metaphor aims at encouraging partners to reform in addition to showing America's role:

Fundamentally, there is a right side of history. And we want to be on it. And—without exception—we want our partners in the region to reform so that they are on it as well (the second speech of Clinton, para.23).

Moreover, she uses the same metaphor that was used by Obama in which she personifies America as a person who respects the rights of the others and prefers democracy as well

as freedom, so it works for achieving them. In addition, she indicates the idea that America likes good and hates evil. This personification makes the Tunisian listeners respect America. Thus, metaphor is employed by politicians to achieve their ideological goals. This quotation shows America's friendly relationships with Tunisia in addition to America's vital role:

In Tunisia, an Islamist party has just won a plurality of the votes in an open, competitive election. Its leaders have promised to embrace freedom of religion and full rights for women. To write a constitution and govern, they will have to persuade secular parties to work with them.

And as they do, America will work with them, too, because we share the desire to see a Tunisian democracy emerge that delivers for its citizens and because America respects the right of the Tunisian people to choose their own leaders (the second speech of Clinton, para.28).

In addition, Clinton uses metaphor, in her remarks about *Internet Rights and Wrongs: Choices & Challenges in a Networked World* on 15th February, 2011, to personify America as a person who motivates other nations to exercise the freedom of connecting. Personifying America in this way aims at representing America in a favorable picture as it is the country which supports freedom and wants other nations to enjoy it. Moreover, she confirms the idea that America keeps up with modern technology represented in the internet and calls for using it throughout the Arab region. The main purpose of this quotation is to show America's role:

Together, the freedoms of expression, assembly, and association online comprise what I've called the freedom to connect. The United States supports this freedom for people

everywhere, and we have called on other nations to do the same (the first speech of Clinton, para.13).

Moreover, in the same speech, she uses metaphor to personify America as a brave, strong person who has the ability to deter criminals and terrorists online. This personification also represents America in a remarkable picture and illustrates that it refuses terrorism and it plays a major role to stop it online. Consequently, the purpose of this quotation is to show America's key role:

The United States is aggressively tracking and deterring criminals and terrorists online (the first speech of Clinton, para.21).

To stress the positive image of America, Clinton embodies it as a person who helps other nations to apply laws in order to be stable so as to show America's leading role. By using this metaphor, the secretary of State confirms Obama's idea that America is superior to the Arab countries and the whole world and it does them a favor:

The United States Government invests in helping other nations build their own law enforcement capacity (the first speech of Clinton, para.21).

She also adds that America intends to get rid of all criminal activities online and offline and it respects laws and values. The main purpose of this quotation is to show America's role:

The United States is determined to stop terrorism and criminal activity online and offline, and in both spheres we are committed to pursuing these goals in accordance with our laws and values (the first speech of Clinton, para.22).

A Quantitative Account of the purposes of using metaphor in the selected speeches

Table 1

The purposes of using metaphor	Obama's Speeches		Clinton's Speeches	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1-showing America's vital role	5	38.4	5	50
2-showing America's strong relationships in addition to its role	3	23.1	2	20
3-encouraging people to continue the revolutions and emphasizing America's role	2	15.4	1	10
4-praising America's democratic regime or the American citizens	3	23.1	2	20

From table 1, it is obvious that the total number of the examples of metaphor taken from Obama's speeches are thirteen, five out of them are used to show America's important role and three examples are used to show America's good relationships in addition to its role while two examples are used to encourage people to continue the revolutions. Finally, only three examples are used to praise America's democratic regime.

On the other hand, the total number of examples of metaphor taken from Clinton's speeches are ten, five out of them are used to show America's vital role while two examples are used to show America's social relationships in addition to its role, one example is used to encourage people to continue the revolutions, but two examples are used to praise America or the American citizens.

Thus, it can be concluded that both Obama and Clinton used metaphor for the purpose of showing America's key role for the sake of the Arab citizens during the days of the Arab Spring more than the other purposes. The purpose of showing

America's crucial role had the first rank with 38.4% and 50% while the purposes of showing America's good relations in addition to its role and praising America's democratic regime had the second rank with 23.1% and 20%. The purpose of encouraging people to work had the third rank with 15.4% and 10%.

To conclude, both Obama and Clinton want to confirm that America is the leader of the Arab countries and the whole world. It is the one who has the authority to impose sanctions and the one who can help the other countries. Moreover, it is a strong country which did the Arab countries a favor during the revolutions. Also, it is a democratic country and it has strong relationships with the other countries, so it is a good example which should be followed.

2- Metonymy: A Theoretical Overview

Metonymy can be defined, according to Hanks (2013), as "a figure of speech in which, instead of using a word, a speaker uses a word that denotes something associated with the thing meant" (p.226). It is obvious from this definition that the basic concepts of metonymy are 'substitution' and 'association'. For Gunter Radden & Klaus-Uwe Panther (1999), metonymy includes "the substitution of the name of one thing for that of another thing" (p.17). In other words, we use metonymy when an idea or a concept is replaced by a single word or feature that is connected to it. Lakoff & Johnson (1980) see that metonymy, like metaphor, is an important part of our everyday life as it is present in our thoughts and actions. They give an example of metonymy which is "She's just a pretty face" (p.18). In this

sentence, we derive the basic information about a girl or a woman from her face. According to Panther& Radden (1999), this sentence is "assumed to mean 'she is just a pretty woman', but this sentence does not mean that she is pretty 'all over'. It suggests that, most importantly, she has a pretty face" (p. 18). They argue that "metonymy does not simply substitute one entity for another entity, but interrelates them to form a new meaning" (p.19).

Actually, in our culture, we get the basic information about what the person is like when we look at his/her face. Lakoff& Johnson(1980) stress this point and suggest that when we look at a person's picture, the most important part in the picture is the person's face. This is because through the face we can see what he looks like. However, when we see the picture of the body without the face, this sounds strange. Thus, metonymy is an essential way of thinking about people.

As for the importance of metonymy in political discourse, Van Dijk (1997) contends that metonymy and metaphor are used in political language in order to "follow the overall goals of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation" (p.36). This strategy is based on the idea that our people and actions are described in positive associations whereas our political opponents are described in negative ones. The example which Van Dijk gives concerning this strategy is the characterization of our soldiers or politicians as good animals such as lions or tigers while representing the others as dirty animals like rats or dogs.

It is worthy of note that the metonymic strategy which the researcher has used is what Panther& Radden (1999) called

"salient characteristic for person" (P. 215). The idea of this strategy is that we refer to the person by mentioning some of his qualities to draw the audience attention to them. This strategy is suitable in this study as Obama and Clinton refer to the Arab leaders through some noun phrases that refer to their characteristics.

Examples of the Use of Metonymy from Obama's Political Speeches

Obamamakes use of the rhetorical strategy of metonymy to present other people in a negative image. He tries to blacken the Arab leaders and their regime by attributing an ugly picture to them. He uses the linguistic device of metonymy, in his remarks to the United Nations General Assembly on 21st September, 2011, to reinforce the picture of the Arab leaders as 'dictators' who used violence against their people and suppressed their people' hopes. He describes the leaders of the Arab countries and their regime by using the words 'corruption', 'tyranny', dictators', and 'dictatorship' to reveal their atrocities. These words served as metonymies for the bad rule of the Arab leaders and to what extent the Arab citizens suffered from injustice and violence of their leaders. They also refer to Obama's refusal of the Arab leaders' atrocities. The main purpose of the subsequent quotation is to blacken the Arab leaders' reputation and expose their drawbacks:

The humiliating grip of corruption and tyranny is being pried open. Dictators are on notice. Technology is putting power into the hands of the people. The youth are delivering a powerful rebuke to dictatorship, and rejecting the lie that

some races, some peoples, some religions, some ethnicities do not desire democracy (the third speech of Obama, para.21).

Obama also refers to the president of Tunisia in the same speech by using the phrase 'the rule of an iron fist' to refer to injustice and suppression. Also, this quotation aims at showing America's sympathy with the Arab citizens:

One year ago, the hopes of the people of Tunisia were suppressed. But they chose the dignity of peaceful protest over the rule of an iron fist (the third speech of Obama, para. 16).

In the same speech, he makes use of the metonymies 'dictator' and 'tyranny' instead of the President's name to refer to the President of Libya as well as its dictatorship. So, the main purpose of this quotation is to blacken the Arab leaders' reputation and reveal their inhumanity:

One year ago, the people of Libya were ruled by the world's longest-serving dictator (the third speech of Obama, para.18).

Obama praises the Libyan people's determination to fulfill their revolution and get rid of their president in the same speech:

In the months that followed, the will of the coalition proved unbreakable, and the will of the Libyan people could not be denied. Forty-two years of tyranny was ended in six months (the third speech of Obama, para.19).

He makes use of metonymy to attribute such inhuman description like 'The humiliating grip of corruption and tyranny/ dictators/ dictatorship/ the rule of an iron fist/ the world's longest-serving dictator/Forty-two years of tyranny' to the Arab leaders.

Furthermore, in his speech about Libya on 28th March, 2011, the President refers to Moammar Gaddafi by using the noun 'dictator'. However, the main purpose of this quotation is to show America's essential role and its effective turn:

Because while our military mission is narrowly focused on saving lives, we continue to pursue the broader goal of a Libya that belongs not to a dictator, but to its people (the first speech of Obama, para.21).

Also, in the same speech about Libya, Obama mentions one Libyan's reference to Gaddafi by using the metonymy 'nightmare'. It is a metonymy for social, economic and political injustice and suppression. Therefore, the main purpose of this quotation is to blacken the Libyan President's reputation and reveal his brutality:

As one Libyan said, "For the first time we finally have hope that our nightmare of 40 years will soon be over." (the first speech of Obama, para.6)

Moreover, in his remarks on the Middle East and North Africa on 19th May, 2011, Obama makes use of the metonymy 'dictator' to refer to the President of Tunisia. The main purpose of this quotation is to praise the Arab citizens' determination:

Hundreds of protesters took to the streets, then thousands. And in the face of batons and sometimes bullets, they refused to go home -- day after day, week after week -- until a dictator of more than two decades finally left power (the second speech of Obama, para.8).

Again, he refers to the Tunisian president in the next quotation. However, its main purpose is to show America's central role:

We have the chance to show that America values the dignity of the street vendor in Tunisia more than the raw power of the dictator (the second speech of Obama, para.20).

In the same speech, he uses the noun 'tyranny' to refer to the Arab leaders as well as their atrocities and hence blacken their reputation and expose their atrocities:

It's the same kind of humiliation that takes place every day in many parts of the world — the relentless tyranny of governments that deny their citizens dignity (the second speech of Obama, para.7).

Furthermore, the president in the same speech makes use of metonymy to refer to the Arab leaders and their brutality. Also, he wants to show America's feeling sympathy for the Arab citizens:

Across the region, those rights that we take for granted are being claimed with joy by those who are prying loose the grip of an iron fist (the second speech of Obama, para.67).

Examples of the Use of Metonymy from Clinton's Political Speeches

Clinton utilizes the same device of metonymy that is employed by Obama in order to blacken the Arab leaders and their regime by attributing an inhuman description to them. Therefore, in her *Keynote Address at the National Democratic Institute's 2011 Democracy Awards Dinner* on 7th November, she reinforces the picture of the Arab Presidents as 'dictators' and 'autocrats' who oblige their citizens to accept their rule. Thus, this quotation aims at exposing the Arab leaders' atrocities:

We begin by rejecting the false choice between progress and stability. For years, dictators told their people they had to accept the autocrats they knew to avoid the extremists they feared (the second speech of Clinton, para.12).

In addition, in the following quotation, she refers to the Arab citizens by the phrase 'the demand for change' and also to the Arab leaders by the phrase 'the refusal to change'. She wants to assert the idea that the reason for the revolutions in the region is the Arab leaders themselves and their cruel regime and also that the Arab citizens just demand their rights. Using the noun phrase 'the demand' is a metonymy for the legitimacy of the Arab revolutions as the Arab citizens just demand their legitimate rights. However, using the noun 'the refusal' is a metonymy for the Arab leaders' stubbornness. So, this quotation aims at defending the Arab citizens:

The truth is that the greatest single source of instability in today's Middle East is not the demand for change. It is the refusal to change (the second speech of Clinton, para.14).

In the same speech, she shows America's sympathy with the Arab citizens:

Free, fair, and meaningful elections are essential—but they are not enough if they bring new autocrats to power or disenfranchise minorities (the second speech of Clinton, para. 18).

In the above quotation, Clinton refers to the Arab leaders by the noun 'autocrats', but she refers to the Arab citizens by using the noun phrase 'disenfranchise minorities'. Using these metonymies summarizes the conditions in the Arab world, that is, the Arab leaders are unjust and tyrant, but the citizens of the Arab countries are helpless in front of the tyranny of their leaders.

Again, she refers to the Arab leaders and their crackdown by using the noun 'autocrats'. Using this noun summarizes all the Arab Presidents' atrocities. In addition, using that noun is a metonymy for injustice and Clinton's hate of the Arab leaders' regime. Therefore, this quotation aims at exposing the Arab leaders' inhumanity:

But in part, the pushback comes from autocrats around the world wondering if the next Tahrir Square will be their capital square, and some are cracking down when they should be opening up (the second speech of Clinton, para.35). She also blackens the Arab leaders' reputation in the next quotation:

When autocrats tell us the transition to democracy will take time, we answer, "Well, then let's get started." (the second speech of Clinton, para. 39).

Furthermore, the Secretary of States refers to the Arab revolutions by using the noun 'journey'. He also personifies America as a person who helps make these revolutions successful ones to show America's vital role and stress the idea that thanks to America, these revolutions succeeded. Using the metonymy 'journey' indicates that the revolutions took much time and they inevitably were full of a lot of hardships and suffering:

And on this journey that they have begun, the United States will be their partner. And of the many tools at our disposal – the National Endowment and NDI and all of the family of organizations that were created three decades ago to help people make this journey successfully – will be right there (the second speech of Clinton, para.48).

Also, in her remarks about *Internet Rights and Wrongs: Choices & Challenges in a Networked World* on 15th February, 2011, Clinton refers to the Arab leaders by using the noun 'dictator' in order to blacken their reputation':

We believe that governments who have erected barriers to internet freedom... will eventually find themselves boxed in. They will face a dictator's dilemma and will have to choose between letting the walls fall or paying the price to keep them standing (the first speech of Clinton, para.46).

A Quantitative Account of the purposes of using metonymy in the selected speeches

Table 2

The purposes of using metonymy	Obama's Speeches		Clinton's Speeches	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1-blacken the Arab leaders and expose their atrocities	4	40	4	57.1
2-show America's sympathy with the Arab citizens	2	20	1	14.3
3- defend the Arab citizens or praise their determination	2	20	1	14.3
4-show America's crucial role	2	20	1	14.3

From table 2, it is notable that the total number of the examples of metonymy taken from Obama's speeches are ten, four out of them are used to blacken the Arab leaders and expose their atrocities while two of them are used to show America's sympathy with the Arab citizens. Two examples are used to defend the Arab countries and two examples are used to show America's significant role.

On the other hand, the total number of metonymies taken from Clinton's speeches are seven, four out of them are used to blacken the Arab leaders as well as exposing their atrocities while one example is used to show America's sympathy with the Arab citizens, one example is used to defend the Arab countries and also one example is used to show America's central role.

Therefore, it can be concluded that both Obama and Clinton used metonymy for the purpose of blackening the Arab leaders and exposing their atrocities more than the other purposes. That purpose had the first rank with 40% and 57.1% while all the other purposes had the second rank with 20% and 14.3%.

To sum up, both Obama and Clinton want to stress the idea that American leaders are always strong, brave and able to achieve democracy in their country and so there are not any revolutions in America. On the other hand, the Arab leaders are weak and dictators. So, they have failed to achieve freedom as well as democracy in their countries. Consequently, there were revolutions against their regime. In addition, they indicate that they share the sorrow of the Arab citizens in their difficult situation and they are against the Arab leaders' injustice and suppression.

Conclusion

After analyzing the use of metaphor and metonymy in the political speeches of Obama and Clinton, it can be concluded that both of them have used the two linguistic devices for achieving almost the same goals. For instance, there are two purposes which have been repeated in the selected devices. The first one is showing America's key role.

The second one is praising the Arab citizens' determination or courage so as to encourage them to continue their revolutions. However, there are two purposes which have been mentioned in just metaphor. They are showing America's strong relationships with the other countries and praising America's democratic regime. Also, there are two purposes that have been mentioned in just metonymy. They are blackening the Arab leaders' reputation as well as exposing their atrocities and showing America's sympathy with the Arab citizens.

To conclude, both Obama and Clinton used the two rhetorical devices in order to confirm some ideas. First, America put a great deal of effort and has cooperated with some allies and partners to defend the Arab people and secure them from the tyranny of their leaders. Second, America is a devoted country which feels pity for the Arab citizens and supports them in their difficult situation. Third, America is a democratic country which calls for peace and freedom. Fourth, the Arab leaders are unjust. Therefore, using the rhetorical devices of metaphor and metonymy were essential.

References

- Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Clinton, H.R. (2011, February, 16th). *Internet Rights and Wrongs: Choices & Challenges in a Networked World*. Attached as the first speech of Clinton. Retrieved from <https://www.indexoncensorship.org/2011/02/internet-rights-and-wrongs-choices-challenges-in-a-networked-world/>

- (2011, November 9th). *Keynote Address at the National Democratic Institute's 2011 Democracy Awards Dinner*. Attached as the second speech of Clinton. Retrieved from <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/WO1111/S00205/keynote-address-at-the-national-democratic-institute.htm>
- Corbett, P. (2001). *How to Teach Fiction Writing at Key Stage 2*. Britain: David Fulton.
- Ferraro, G.P., & Briody, E.K. (2016). *The cultural dimension of Global Business* (8th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Hanks, P. (2013). *Lexical analysis: Norms and exploitations*. Cambridge Mass: The MIT Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1991). Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System Used to Justify War in the Gulf. In: *Viet Nam Generation Journal & Newsletter*, 3(3).
- (2003). *Metaphor and war, again*. Retrieved February 20, 2008 from <http://www.alternet.org/story/15414>.
- & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lesz, B. (2011). *To Shape the World for the Better: An Analysis of Metaphors in the Speeches of Barack Obama* (Master's thesis, Tromsø University). Retrieved from <https://munin.uit.no/bitstream/handle/10037/3540/thesis.pdf?sequence=1>
- Livingstone, D. N. & Harrison, R.T. (1981). Meaning through Metaphor: analogy as Epistemology. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 71(1), 95-107.

Obama, B.H. (2011, March 28th). *Remarks by the President in Address to the Nation on Libya*. Attached as the first speech of Obama. Retrieved from

<https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/03/28/remarks-president-address-nation-libya>

----- (2011, May 19th). *Remarks by the President on the Middle East and North Africa*. Attached as the second speech of Obama. Retrieved

from <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/05/19/remarks-president-middle-east-and-north-africa>

----- (2011, September, 21st). *Remarks by the President in Address to the United Nations General Assembly*. Attached as the third speech of Obama. Retrieved

from <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/09/21/remarks-president-obama-address-united-nations-general-assembly>

Panther, K.U. & Radden, G. (1999). *Metonymy in language and thought*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sayed, Y. H. (2009). *George W. Bush Versus Saddam Hussein: A Critical Discourse Analysis* (UnPublished Master's thesis). Ain Shams University, Cairo.

Thompson, G. (2004). *Introducing Functional Grammar*. London: Oxford University Press.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is Political Discourse Analysis? In J. Blommaert & C. Bulcean (Eds.), *Political Linguistics* (pp. 11-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.