



RHETORICAL STRUCTURE OF ELECTION SPEECHES

Zeynep Cihan KOCA HELVACI*

Abstract

During the election campaigns, politicians spend great effort to gain votes by means of trying to legitimate themselves, delegitimize their rivals and arouse strong emotions in the audience via metaphors and rhetorical strategies. The database of this study was comprised of the selected 2011 Election Campaign speeches of the Justice and Development Party (henceforth JDP) in order to find out the metaphors and rhetorical modes of proof. The analysis showed that the consistent electoral success of the JDP depends on the perfectly constructed political discourse of its leader. It was seen that high-valued notions such as altruism, sincerity, empathy and piety were constantly used to describe the mission.

Keywords: Election Speeches, Metaphor, Rhetorical Modes of Proof.

1. INTRODUCTION

Both language and politics are based on symbolic consensus and in today's democratic order; language is the lifeblood of politics. As Mey (2001, 115-116) pointed out: 'In all such institutions and bodies, certain human agreements and customs have been legalized, and this legalization has found its symbolic representation in language'. As all political actions are systematized and institutionalized, it is inevitable for politics to have a discourse of its own. Discourse, which is language in use, frames the perception, signification and communication with a specific grid. Hall (2001) argued that although physical entities and actions exist autonomously, they can only gain meaning and become objects of knowledge within discourse. In other words, knowledge about the real world is generated and exchanged discursively. Ideological standing and identity markers such as class, race and gender shape the encoding and decoding of discourse. Political discourse is quite different from the discourse of journalism or law since it employs particular lexico-grammatical structures and discursive strategies to gain approval via persuasion.

The Russian linguist Bakhtine (1994, 83) argued that as language use becomes conventionalized, speech genres, which can be defined as fixed language patterns in particular contexts, become predictable and relatively stable. In no other discourse type, the Self/Other dichotomy is as prominent as it is in political discourse. This binary opposition is obviously the building block of political communication as positioning oneself by drawing the group boundaries is essential for political identity formation. According to Bloor and Bloor (2007, 86), 'boundaries of any kind keep some people 'in' and 'others' out and support the view of SELF and OTHER'. This duality, which is constructed through language, requires mutual dependence of the Self and the Other on each other for their own existence. By comparing itself with the other group, each group will create a network of opinions, values and attitudes. van Dijk noted (1995, 156) that 'the most fundamental way of establishing a distinction between THEM and US is not only to describe ourselves in benevolent terms and them in negative terms, but to emphasize the Others violate the very norms and values we hold dear'. For example, the immigrants in racist discourse or Muslims in Islamophobic discourse are all portrayed as destructors that ruin the Western civilization and its values (Richardson, 2007; Riggins, 1997). Wodak (1989, 137) indicated that:

Political groups need their own language and portray themselves via this language; they define their territory by means of their language; they signal their ideology through certain slogans and stereotypes; their ideological structure is joined together in a certain way and so is their argumentation.

Regardless of the political views of the Speaker, the speeches in election rallies are expected to be full of linguistic structures that glorify and justify the Self while demonizing and scapegoating the opponents. Representing the Other in negative terms also contribute to the Positive image of the Self. The election speeches are based upon discursive formulas that aim at substantiating the moral and logical rightness of US

* Dr. Dokuz Eylul University, zeynep.koca@deu.edu.tr



while refuting the credibility of THEM. This paper addressed the following questions: 1. What kind of rhetorical modes of proof were used to persuade the audience? 2. Which metaphors were employed to create a specific mental imagery? This paper is comprised of four sections. Following this introduction, power, ideology and persuasion which are the main constituents of political discourse were explained in the second section. In the Analysis part, excerpts from the election speeches were analysed to find out rhetorical modes of proof and metaphors. In the Conclusion, the findings of the study were discussed.

2. POLITICAL DISCOURSE

In the field of politics, a particular text is planned and organized for a specified audience to achieve a definite objective. Politicians may try to get the support of the Parliament for a military act or shirk responsibility of a failure. No matter what their objective is, the main target remains unchanged. The pivotal point of political discourse is power; politicians try to gain, maintain or reinforce power. van Dijk (2008, 65) defined social power 'in terms of the control exercised by one group or organization (or its 'members') over the actions and/or the minds of (the members of) another group, thus limiting the freedom of action of the others, or influencing their knowledge, attitudes or ideologies'. Social organization presupposes power structures in which subordinate or superordinate positions and roles are assigned to individuals. This asymmetrical relation is naturalized by the political and social system and the roles are generally internalized without much resistance. Foucault (1980) explained power as a force that accesses every segment of the social body. Power and power plays are existent in every field of social life from courts to educational settings. For Bourdieu (1991, 236), struggle in social and political domains is a "struggle over the power of preserving or transforming the social world by preserving or transforming the categories of perception of that world". In order to obtain power, an individual or a group must present a particular discourse about physical reality in such a way that serves their interests perfectly. Power holders construct and maintain social order by means of fabricating discourses, shaping opinions and enforcing discipline and submission. While the concept of power invents new hierarchies and roles, social and political changes introduce new ways of exerting power. Unlike tyrannies, in today's rather modern and democratic societies elected politicians cannot impose power explicitly but have to exercise it tacitly through mind control (van Dijk, 2008, 29). In the political domain, power refers to the rulers' ability to make the majority accept their policies via manufacturing consent. Since their status give them the advantage of accessing and controlling public discourse, politicians can shape the public opinion easily with well-planned positive Self and negative Other representations.

Ideology as a socially shared cognitive framework refers to the beliefs, attitudes and opinions of a specific group (van Dijk, 1998, 8). Ideologies as mental schematas are inherent in the collective consciousness of a group and they stimulate shared understanding and attitude in specific circumstances. Ideology is ubiquitous and immanent in every aspect of the social life and it contributes to the identity formation of the group by communicating what is appropriate or inappropriate (Goatly, 2007). It defines the principles and rules of 'We' ness and strengthen group solidarity. The attitudes and opinions of the group members about immigration or same sex marriages are in compliance with the prescriptions of the group ideology. Ideology like power is omnipresent and it becomes verbalized in discourse. Eggins (2004, 11) explained that no discursive production can be purified of ideology and underlined that 'to use language means to use it to encode particular positions and values'. As members of social groups, individuals are encircled by the insurmountable walls of discourse, power and ideology. Various ideologies clash in the field of discourse so as to domineer. Every one of them incites different perceptions and reactions by forming a peculiar in-group discourse. Since the ontology of discourse embraces all communicative actions, politicians must seek ways of making their ideologies frame the prevalent discourse. van Dijk (2008, 36) defined access to public discourse as one of the most significant social resources of contemporary power. Only a few people who have the privilege of controlling the flow of public discourse are thus called 'the power elites'. Being consistent with the ideological foundations of their parties, political leaders select from the general culture depository of social norms and values which will serve their interests perfectly. The intentionally selected notions which are ingrained in the social cognition of that society will construct the building blocks of that political group. van Dijk (2008, 34) stated that the dominant group has the tendency to hide their ideology and real interests while trying to make their ideology accepted as a natural system of rules, values and norms.

Another striking characteristic of political discourse is its persuasive nature. Persuasion can be defined as A's use of language skillfully and deliberately to cause a desirable change in B's attitude or opinion (Burke, 1969). Apparently persuasion is a goal-directed activity and the Speaker plays with language



to realize his/her veiled purpose. Hague et al. (1998, 3-4) stated ' Politics involves reconciling differences through discussion and persuasion'. While this is true for political debates and parliamentary talks, election speeches which are the focal point of this study are unidirectional and persuasive as politicians rarely discuss their policies with the public in rallies. Persuasion which is defined as the change of belief by Walton (2007, 48-49) is the main objective of political discourse. Persuasion is synonymous with rhetoric which has gained a pejorative meaning throughout time (Kuypers, 2009). Yet, in this paper they were used interchangeably.

Fiske (1994) stated ' Our words are never neutral. Our words are politicized, even if we're unaware of it, because they carry the power that reflects the interests of those who speak'. Every political message is intended and purposeful. However, politicians have to convey the messages in such a masterly manner that their latent intentions remain tacit but on target. The deliberate choice of lexis and syntactical structures provides the communication of the message in the interest of the politicians. The careful selection and organization of linguistic units also reveals the ideological standing of the speaker. Politicians manufacture and manipulate consent only by means of persuasive discursive tactics. van Dijk (2002, 254) acknowledged that a modern and more influential way of holding power is probable via shaping and diverting public cognition. Mind control or manipulation is possible only by means of effective production and transfer of discourse. Besides giving information, every kind of political communication is based on the principles of persuasion. They can gain or maintain support as long as the audience believe that they are efficient and working for public benefit. Politicians are well aware of the fact that influencing people's minds means controlling their actions (van Dijk, 2001). It's obvious that the power in the hands of politicians is not enough to change the nature of reality but language is at the disposal of politicians to shape the portrayal of truth. Rhetorical modes of proof, metaphors and various rhetorical devices are exploited by politicians to make the audience believe that they are the right choice.

2.1 RHETORICAL MODES OF PROOF

Campbell (1963) described 'rhetoric' as the art of adapting discourse to its end. He also pointed out that every speech has four functions which are to enlighten the understanding, please the imagination, move the emotions and influence the will. A politician's persuasive success is based on his/her use of three modes of proof which are ethos, pathos and logos (Halmari and Virtanen, 2005). These three modes indicate the reciprocal bond among the audience, rhetor and argument. Instead of basing their arguments on one of them, rhetors prefer using a blend of these three modes. Ethos is about the moral credibility of the speaker. For the mode of ethos, identification has a very important role. The arguer must present himself/herself as certain kind of person and the audience must believe that this certain type of person is in their group boundaries. The speaker's physical appearance, voice, body language, clothes, social status, selection of words all contribute to the audience's perception of the message. All these features will help the formation of the speaker's image as a sincere, trustworthy and wise person. Pathos is about the psychological mood of the audience (Halmari and Virtanen, 2005, 5). Pathos is concerned with politicians' effort to arouse certain emotions to gain approval. Undoubtedly, negative emotions such as anger, fear, hatred and shame are aimed to be evoked for the perception of the Other while positive emotions like pride, hope, courage are intended to be awakened for the perception of the Self. Negative emotions will cause avoidance behaviours from the Other while positive emotions will promote intimacy with the Self. Moreover, negative emotions associated with the Other will also make the audience more closer to the Self. While forming their speeches, the audience profile and political goals are taken into consideration by the politicians. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969, 43) defined the audience, 'as the ensemble of those whom the speaker wishes to influence by his argumentation'. The emotional state of the audience will affect the perception of the message. The rhetor aims at stimulating a specific sentimental atmosphere to make the audience more responsive and open to the message. As Aristotle (1984, 25) stated : '.persuasion may come through the hearers, when the speech stirs their emotions. Our judgments when we are pleased and friendly are not the same as when we are pained and hostile'. A large scale of emotions from rage to mercy can be aroused by emotive vocabulary and accompanying images. Finally, logos is about the logical configuration and rationality of the argumentation. The audience can be persuaded by proof and steps of reasoning. A politician can use inductive or deductive reasoning to support his standpoint or refute the Other's standpoint. The Self and Other representation of a politician should satisfy the emotional, logical and moral needs of the audience. Persuasion in election campaigns aims at influencing the voting behaviour of the audience. Compliance is manufactured by making the audience believe that the Speaker is the most desirable one.

2.2 METAPHOR



Charteris-Black (2011) argued that in politics one of the most influential weapons of persuasion is metaphor as it both addresses the cognitive schemas and sentiments of the audience stealthily. According to Cognitive Linguistics, metaphors enable understanding an abstract and unfamiliar conceptual domain in terms of a concrete and familiar conceptual domain (Kövecses, 2010, 7). The most commonly used delineated physical concepts generally originate from bodily and neural experiences of space, movement and containment (Johnson, 1987). The POLITICS IS WAR metaphor provides a mental representation that the various aspects of political experience to be understood and expressed through embodied experience of war such as attack, defense, enemy and battlefield. A politician may also base his/her speech on other political metaphors such as POLITICS IS A JOURNEY, POLITICS IS BUSINESS or POLITICS IS A FOOTBALL GAME. Each of these metaphors will entail different mental frames with roles, relations and scenarios (Lakoff, 2009). The 'POLITICS IS BUSINESS' metaphor automatically evokes a mental imagery in which states are companies, politicians are business people and political relations are trade relations. As Goatly (2007, 5) stated 'metaphor' doesn't simply reflect the existing reality but it constructs the reality. Thus, a politician is free to ground his discourse on any political metaphor that will best serve his/her purpose in reality construction. Hart (2010, 127) defined metaphor as an important part of ideology. The cognitive framework presented by a preferred metaphor is subjective and 'privileged one understanding of reality over others' (Chilton, 1996, 74). The mental mapping between the abstract 'target' domain and concrete 'source' domain not only facilitates signification but also introduce pre-determined insights by the Speaker. Edelman (1971, 68) noted that:

Metaphor, therefore, defines the pattern of perception to which people respond.... Each metaphor intensifies selected perceptions and ignores others, thereby helping one to concentrate on desired consequences of favoured public policies and helping one to ignore their unwanted, unthinkable, or irrelevant premises and aftermaths. Each metaphor can be a subtle way of highlighting what one wants to believe and avoiding what one does not wish to face.

Metaphors are valuable resources in political persuasion for two reasons. First of all, these cognitive frames with uncomplicated imagery canalize the audience to perceive issues in the way the speaker intends to. Secondly, metaphors as colourful mental schemas evoke emotional responses in the audience. In terms of Musolff (2004, 173), 'The analogical relationship of source and target concepts involves not only the transfer of semantic structures but also of emotive and evaluative aspects as integral parts of seemingly self-evident conclusions'. For instance, the STATE IS A NURTURANT PARENT metaphor not only makes the audience visualize a well-acquainted bond between these two conceptual domains but also arouses certain emotions like love, protection and sincerity. Charteris- Black (2011, 50) emphasized the persuasive nature of metaphor due to its stimulation of 'both conscious and unconscious resources to influence our rational, moral and emotional responses, both directly -through describing and analyzing political issues- and indirectly by influencing how we feel about things'. Besides cognitive and emotive functions and effects, metaphors are also loaded with perlocutionary effects. They force people to think, feel and act in accordance with a network of attitudes, feelings and values (Gregg, 2004). Metaphors used in election speeches affect the voting behaviour of the audience as they offer new insights with specific cognitive and emotive structures.

In this paper, the rhetorical modes of proof and metaphors in the 2011 General Election speeches were examined. The election speeches made by the party leader and Prime Minister Erdogan in four different cities (Diyarbakır, İzmir, Konya and Trabzon) were chosen. The speeches can be found at the website of the Justice and Development Party (<http://www.akparti.org.tr/english>).

3. ANALYSIS

3.1 2011 GENERAL ELECTIONS

Elections are great symbolic occasions for democratic societies in which citizens determine their representatives with their freewill. Every politician employs expertly designed speeches fitting a specific audience for getting votes. They have to prove that they possess the required leadership features such as credibility, dynamism and vision. A comparison between the competent Self and incompetent Other constructs the locus of election speeches. The advantages of the Self and disadvantages of the Other are explained in a pragmatic and sensational way. All of the positive attributes are made to the Self whereas the political opponents are depicted as evil-intentioned, incapable creatures. In the run up to the 2011 General Elections, the party leader made election speeches all over the country. He not only aimed at being re-elected for the third time but also wanted to increase his votes. As they're manufactured and voiced by the same person, no matter where he spoke his speeches included identical patterns and content. He started with



saluting the residents of the city, made allusions to the historical or religious figures of that city, recalled the investments and progress in economy, health, and foreign affairs since his rise to the power in 2002. He criticized his rivals by depicting the era before him as miserable and humiliating for the Turkish people. While he was foregrounding the positive actions taken by him and his party, he preferred not to mention any of their mistakes. Unsurprisingly, he also made promises about future projects and he frequently used 'Target 2023' as one of the slogans of the election rally. On finishing, he guided the crowd to sing the party song, greeted the city and thanked God. Simply by changing the things peculiar to the city he's addressing, he used one well-written text over and over again in every city.

3.3 THE RHETORICAL MODES OF PROOF:

The leader of the JDP based his persuasion on a perfect blend of the three modes of proof. As aforementioned, ethos is about the identity and personal characteristics of the speaker. The speaker tries to give the image of a sincere, trustworthy and wise person. According to Aristotle (1984), ethos can be quite distinctive when the arguments of both parties are equally forceful. Under these circumstances, the listener has to decide in favour of the person who appears wise, virtuous and full of goodwill (Fortenbaugh, 1996). Identification has a great influence on this decision. The arguer must present himself/herself as a certain kind of person and the audience must believe that this person is in their group boundaries. The quotation below exemplifies the way the speaker positioned himself in his relation with the voters.

My dear siblings, there isn't the politician Tayyip Erdogan in front of you, there isn't the Prime Minister Tayyip Erdogan in front of you, there isn't the head of the JDP in front of you. In front of you, there is someone like you. Here is your brother, your fellow of destiny, your travel companion, the friend of the friendless, the voice of the voiceless (Diyarbakır Speech, 01.06.2011).

The Prime Minister preferred addressing the crowd directly with 'my dear siblings' vocative which aimed at alerting the audience. Via this vocative, he stimulated the positive connotations of kinship between him and the audience. Family is the center of life in collectivist Turkish society and people have a high trust of family members (Kabasakal and Bodur, 2008). Calling the audience 'my siblings' was an audience engaging strategy which intended to make them feel inside the group boundaries. The concepts of identity and identification are central to accomplishing the persuasive aspect of political discourse during an election campaign. Candidates present themselves as being able to identify with the needs, wants and interests of the electorate and try to convince voters it is in their interest to identify with particular candidates (Hahn, 2003). The use of 'my dear siblings' underlined that there was no distance between him and the voters and they were as close as family members. The first sentence includes three clauses that started with the same structure 'There isn't.....'. This rhetorical device is called anaphora which aims at underlining the consistence and persistence of the Speaker. Repetition made the line more memorable and rhythmic. He not only gave the image of a humble politician but also he reminded the crowd of the superiority of his position with a detailed list of assignments. The repeated negation made the audience mentally ready for a forthcoming sequence of positive attributes to him. In the following sentences, he kept representing himself as a sincere and credible leader coming from the heart of the public. Burke (1969) used the term 'identification' synonymously with consubstantiality. Something shared between A and B make these two entities 'consubstantial'. Burke (ibid.) equated persuasion with consubstantiality and identification. By labelling himself as brother, fellow and advocate of the public, he orientated the crowd for identification. This kind of Self representation with words of proximity is certainly influential in a society where collectivity is highly appreciated. Kabasakal and Bodur (2008) noted that besides strong family bonds, Turkish people also have a strong commitment to their relationships in a network of close interdependent relationships. The sharedness of kinship, destiny, and journey all contributed to the consubstantiality between the speaker and the audience. With the alliterative phrases '*...the friend of the friendless, the voice of the voiceless*', he fortified his image as a leader who could sympathise with the problems of his folk.

As Wodak (1986 cited in Menz, 1989) stated, ideological language is characterised with the emotionalization of facts. The rhetorical mode of proof 'pathos' is concerned with the Speaker's ability to persuade by arousing certain emotions about the Self and the Other. The bottom line of the 2011 Election Rally was to underline the importance of unity and togetherness for the future of Turkey as the country had been struggling with the problem of terror since the 1980s. The quotation below shows how the public sensitivity about this issue was addressed:

What did we say after? We said one flag. Our flag's colour is the colour of our martyrs. The crescent is the expression of our independence. The star is the symbol of our martyrs. So, what



is the poet saying: 'What makes a flag a flag is the blood on it; the land is motherland if someone dies for it.' So, what did we say? After one flag, we said a united country. A united country of 780.000 km² (Trabzon Speech, 31.05.2011).

The quotation above started with a rhetorical question which didn't aim at eliciting a reply from the audience. Although no answer was expected, this question created the image of an ongoing dialogue between the audience and the speaker. In this way, the audience was psychologically and mentally engaged in this unidirectional communication. Apart from making the audience think, rhetorical questions also emphasize the argumentator's point (Halmari, 2005). With this rhetorical question in the Simple Past Tense, he referred to the time they established the JDP. He underlined that the flag and motherland had been the hub of their party discourse since the foundation. A well known rhetorical device 'anadiplosis' with repeating the last word of a clause at the beginning of a new clause: '*..After one flag, we said a united country. A united country of 780.000 km².*' The repetition of the words not only created rhythm and vocal harmony but also emphasized the notion. Moreover, anadiplosis also prepared the audience for a climax. The paragraph above was full of culturally-valued words such as flag, motherland, independence, martyrs and crescent/star. These emotive words both have significance in the nationalist and Islamist mental schemata. In particular, the use of 'martyrdom' and 'crescent/star' highlights the merge of patriotism with Islamic tradition. He directly spoke to the national sentiments and pride of the public by means of making a semiotic analysis of the Turkish flag. By quoting lines from a well-known nationalistic poem by Mithat Cemal Kunday, he not only aroused strong emotions in the audience but also increased the credibility of his argumentation. According to Barrett et al. (2002, 291), 'emotions are just as cognitive as any other kind of perceptual image we experience, and play a much larger role in decision-making than we realise'. This nationalistic narrative which has exceeded the time span and space for Turkish society certainly stirred the emotions of the audience witnessing terrorist threat to the national integrity. Menz (1989, 237) put forth that 'Through emotionalization, common-sense and rational argument are more or less eliminated; independent thinking becomes superfluous. Frames are offered; prefabricated patterns come into play and assume an independent existence'. The sentiments of the audience were addressed through the reiteration of nationalistic frames and prefabricated sentimental patterns such as the holiness of dying for national independence. The repeated phrases 'one flag, a united country' underlined the leader's image as a national hero who would demolish any threat against his nation.

Finally, the logical mode of proof 'logos' was also used. The PM Erdogan benefited from inductive reasoning to attack his opponents and praise his own policies. He employed inductive reasoning in which two specific cases are drawn upon to support a general conclusion about his opponents. His inductive argument took the form of comparison or analogy as he preferred pointing out the similarity between two rival parties:

I am asking you what is the difference between the mentality of prohibiting the headscarf and the mentality of throwing molotof bombs into the dorms of the Cizre Religious High School and burning the faces of the children? Aren't both of them civil fascism? (Diyarbakır Speech, 1.06.2011)

Two subsequent rhetorical questions about the negative actions of two rival parties were posed. He framed the reasoning of the audience with a question and answer session. Walton (1989, 256) stated: 'Arguments from analogy are often extremely powerful forms of persuasion to a particular audience because they compare a (particular) issue to something the audience is very familiar with or has very positive (or negative) feelings about it'. A parallelism was drawn between the policies of the left wing People's Republican Party (PRP) and the Peace and Democracy Party (PDP). The PRP defending secularism banned headscarves from educational settings and state owned institutions. On the other hand, the Kurdish political party PDP which is known to be in close contact with the terrorists throwing bombs at the students of religious high schools was defined as sadistic destructors. There was appeal to the reason of the audience as every sensible audience member would perceive restriction of freedom and giving damage to someone as inhumane behaviors. The audience were guided to perceive these two parties as enemies of the public. Religious sensitivity is certainly the binding element of the inner-group against this enemy imagery.

3.4 ANALYSIS OF METAPHORS

1. LOVE METAPHOR:



1. We are in love with you, we fall in love with you, we fall in love with this country. We are the sufferers of this country. Because of this, we got crazy on these roads like Ferhat, like Majnun. We'll run a lot (Izmir Speech, 4.06.2011).

2. And we did the difficult parts, we pierced the mountains. We've opened 12 tunnels in the mountains. Oh, if only the mountains could talk. We are Ferhat and you are Şirin. Nation is Şirin and we are Ferhat. As I have said, we are in love with you (Trabzon Speech, 31.05.2011).

With some minor changes, 'love' metaphor is repeatedly used in the election rally. In these quotations, two metaphors 'COUNTRY IS A PERSON' and 'LOVE IS MADNESS' were intertwined. First of all, the country is personified and attributed human characteristics. According to Lakoff and Johnson (2003, 33), personification 'allows us to comprehend a wide variety of experiences with nonhuman entities in terms of human motivations, characteristics and activities'. In the quotation above, 'country' and 'public' became the objects of love. The power of this love is strengthened with a simile by referring to two Orientalist folk stories in which two lovers 'Ferhat' and 'Majnun' spent supernatural effort to unite with their lovers. Ferhat pierced mountains to be able to marry Şirin while Majnun walked without direction in the Arabic deserts in the search of Layla. All their efforts proved futile as evil-intended people didn't want their unification.

Perelman (1982) noted that metaphor and analogy are means of bringing an idea before an audience-making it 'present' and evoke a strong emotional response. Daring to lose one's mind because of love is the climax in a love relationship and not everybody runs the risk of it. When this metaphor was used, he meant that he wouldn't hesitate to sacrifice himself for his country and people. He underlined the parallelism between Ferhat's piercing the mountain to bring water to Şirin's village and his opening tunnels in the steep mountains of the Black Sea Region. In this way, he strengthened the value of his services and increased his chances of being elected again. According to Hofstede (1980) Turkish culture is identified with collectivism. Turkey with its close-knit social structure denounces individualism while collectivism and working for the group benefit are high-valued notions. The Ferhat and Majnun analogy indicated the supremacy of his love for Turkey and its people. In this way, the PM achieved self-glorification and gave the image of an ideal leader with altruistic attitudes. Chilton (2004, 64) claimed that presuppositions can be seen as a way of strategically packaged information which is employed by politicians to include or exclude certain groups and audiences. Love metaphor was used intentionally as it is known that all of the listeners would understand the presupposed meanings of the Majnun and Ferhat mental schemata easily. Moreover, benefiting from the cultural repertoire of the audience by mentioning well-known folk story characters, he clearly stated that he is in -the- group.

2. JOURNEY METAPHOR:

1. Dear people of Konya, my precious travel companions, my dear siblings, today I greet you with longing and affection once again (Konya Speech, 3.06.2011).

2. Jaladdin Rumi says 'What's inside the cup will leak out', 'If you think of a rose, you'll be a rose garden, if you think of a thorn, you'll be a thorny place. See, these grand people illuminate our path. These mighty personages', these men of heart's advice show us the path. We have not come to be the master but we have aimed to be the servant, this is our difference (Konya Speech, 3.06.2011).

3. Don't stop, keep moving! (The Election Campaign Slogan)

POLITICS IS A JOURNEY metaphor and its entailments were employed as well. According to Charteris-Black (2011, 88), journey metaphors indicate an intentional activity to achieve a certain goal. Lakoff and Johnson (1999, 179) explained that journey metaphors with 'motion- in- space' mapping entails the concepts of obstacles, travel companions, guides and destination. Everyone is familiar with the source domain 'journey', physical movement in direction is a universal human experience. Although journey metaphors are defined as motion-in-space (Charteris-Black, 2011, 88), in these speeches 'journey' conceptualizes 'motion in time to a specified destination'. The 2011 Election Rally of the JDP was based on a temporal target. The PM aimed to be in the office until 2023 which is the 100th anniversary of the foundation of the Turkish Republic so he demanded support for his leadership and political action with a journey metaphor.

The cognitive frame of 'POLITICS IS A JOURNEY' metaphor entails several new conceptualizations as it can be seen in the quotations above. While he positioned himself as the leader on the way, he used the 'SUPPORTERS ARE TRAVEL COMPANIONS' metaphor to define in-group boundaries as can be seen in (1). As Lakoff and Johnson (2003) stated social and political relationships were lexicalised and conceptualised by the PM in terms of space metaphors. Travel companions and the leader are all in the same



group boundaries. The leader emphasized the shared destiny of the group marching towards the same destination. It is expected for travel companions to support one another and the speaker implied that the electoral support of the audience was crucial for forward movement. The second entailment is 'SPIRITUAL LEADERS ARE OUR GUIDES' conceptualization. Making allusions to an important Islamist figure that is known and appreciated by the majority, the speaker substantiated the rightness of this journey. Quoting credible sources is one of the well known persuasive devices. Sornig (1989) stated that 'Quotational language not only carries conviction, or at least feigns credibility by exploring the prestige of the person by whom a quotation was originated'. According to Bakhtine (1984) when all words and phrases used before are utilised in new contexts, their previous uses will be entailed. In this predominantly Muslim society, the influence of justifying the correctitude of him with references to religious figures is indisputable. On journeys, travelers are awaited to face with obstacles on the road. The only obstacle on the progress to the destination 2023 is stoppage. This standstill could happen if another party became victorious in the elections. In this 'STOPPING ON THE WAY IS DANGEROUS' conceptualization, he benefited from the topos of threat/danger. Fear is induced by implying that another ruling party meant regression for Turkish society.

3. HEALTH METAPHOR:

'After one flag, we have said a united country. A united country of 780.000 kilometres. We won't let anyone perform a surgery (Trabzon Speech, 31.05.2011).

In this quotation, the 'COUNTRY IS A HUMAN BODY' metaphor was employed. The human body serves as a highly productive source domain in the perception and conceptualization of socio-political reality (Musolff, 2010). Generally, surgical operations are carried out in case of health problems. This metaphor implied that the country was under the risk of a disease which would result in several surgical operations. Chilton (1996, 197) stated that 'Diseases are typically imagined as invading the body from outside, a notion which rests both on the CONTAINER schema and the warfare script'. The topos of danger/threat as argumentative strategy was at work again, as one of the deep seated fears in the society was addressed. This sickness metaphor constructs cognitive associations between the victory of another political party and threat connoting cues. Threat to the nation's integrity could come from the Others while only the PM as a healer could destroy the supposed agent of the disease. As Charteris- Black (2011, 13) explained 'voicing semi-conscious anxieties was a highly persuasive way of sounding right and contributed further to the arousal of such anxieties'. This mental mapping also had roots in history. The partitioning of the Ottoman Empire, which was labeled as 'the sick man of Europe', is still a trauma inscribed into the collective consciousness of the society. Altheide (2003, 39) defined 'the politics of fear as 'decision-makers promotion and use of audience beliefs and assumptions about danger, risk and fear in order to achieve certain goals'. With this metaphor, the audience was asked to think that he was a healer who could prevent the division. A warning was issued by means of a very emotional and strongly opinionated mental model. He hinted at the threat of an inescapable operation on the Turkish territory in case of his electoral failure.

4. CONCLUSION

As Hughes et al. (2009) explained leadership is a complex phenomenon involving the leader, the followers and the situation. A leader is expected to influence the attitudes of the followers by exploiting the situation. First of all, the analysis of the rhetorical modes of proof and metaphors indicated that the image of the leader was based on high-valued notions such as altruism, sincerity, empathy and piety. He not only represented himself as a leader who could sacrifice himself for the goodness of his people but also underlined that he could understand his folk easily because he was in -the- group. According to Nimmo (1978,103), propaganda unifies the audience creating 'the impression that leader and led are joined in a cooperative effort to the mutual benefit of both'. The sharedness of goals and destiny in various ways such as being travel companions, siblings and believers of the same faith. Secondly, his oratory was composed of emotive content and memorable linguistic structures. The speeches were adorned with emotive vocabulary to grasp the hearts of the listeners, simple syntax to be understood easily, parallel structures to sound rhetorically poetic, rhetorical questions and vocatives to make the audience feel included and repetitions to engrave his words in the minds of the audience. As he addressed people from different background, he knew that only emotionally striking parts from his speeches would be memorable and persuasive. In terms of Sornig (1989, 109), 'persuasive use of language does not so much appeal to reason, but to the recipient's expectations and emotions. As its purpose is not so much to inform as to make people believe, and in the end to act upon their beliefs, he/ she who sounds like one of us is the one we most easily trust'. He also aimed at creating sympathy for himself while inciting anger and fright for his opponents. The fear inducing rhetoric which was framed by the threat of 'territorial division' and 'attacks to religion' intended to increase



his votes. As the most powerful cohesive forces anger and fear were exploited in a sensational way in his election discourse. Finally, like any other politician he inscribed his ideological perspective in his election discourse. He was well aware of the fact that 'language is an instrument of control as well as communication' (Hodge and Kress, 1993, 6). Moreover, long years of political experience enabled him to make observations of the mental schemata of the Turkish society. The crux of his election discourse is nationalism and Islam. According to Armstrong (2012, 138), 'Nationalism and religion have been two primary energizing forces in Turkish society for almost a hundred years, even if one has always dictated to other. The current Turkish government's rhetoric manages to appeal to both impulses, and that is why it is such a powerful brew'. His election discourse satisfies both nationalist and religious sentiments which are the most valued notions of Turkish society. The leader's words resonated so profoundly with so many people because he exemplified a perfect blend of two constructing narratives of Turkish society. Gül (2001) stated that Islam has been the cement of Turkish society which comes from diversified ethnic backgrounds. In order to gain votes, he addressed the majority with sharedness of faith besides supra-national Turkish identity. The in-depth analysis of his Self representation via rhetorical modes of proof and metaphors demonstrated that the PM's emotive discourse is in tune with the collective symbols, myths, fears and feelings of large sections of the society.

REFERENCES

- Altheide, D.L. (2003). Notes towards a politics of fear. *Journal for Crime, Conflict and the Media*, 1, 37-54.
- Aristotle (1984). *Rhetoric*. W. R. Roberts (trans.). In *The Rhetoric and the Poetics of Aristotle*, 1-218. New York: The Modern Library.
- Armstrong, W. (2012). Turkish Nationalism and Turkish Islam: A New Balance. *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, Vol. 10 Number: 4.
- Bakhtine, M. (1984). *The Problems of Dostoyevsky's Poetics*. C. Emerson (ed.) and (trans.) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtine, M. (1994). *Speech Genres*. In P.Morris (ed.) *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Voloshinov*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Barrett, L., Dunbar, R. and Lycett, J. (2002). *Human evolutionary psychology*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Bloor, M. and Bloor, T. (2007). *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. J. B Thompson (ed.), G. Raymond and M. Adamson (trans.). Cambridge UK: Polity Press.
- Burke, K. (1969). *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Campbell, G. (1776). *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. L. Bitzer (ed.) Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1963.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2007). *The Communication of Leadership: The Design of Leadership Style*. London: Routledge.
- Chilton, P. A. (1996). *Security Metaphors: Cold War Discourse From Containment To Common House*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Edelman, M. (1971). *Politics as Symbolic Action: Mass Arousal and Quiescence*. Chicago: Markham.
- Eggs, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Continuum 2nd Edition
- Fiske, J. (1994). *Media Matters: Everyday Culture and Political Change*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fortenbaugh, W.W. (1996). Aristotle's Accounts of Persuasion Through Character. In C.L. Johnstone (ed.) *Theory, Text, Context. Issues in Greek Rhetoric and Oratory*, New York: Suny Press. pp. 147-168.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archeology of Knowledge and The Discourse On Language*. (trans. S. Smith), New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge*. Brighton, UK: Harvester.
- Goatly, A. (2007). *Washing The Brain: Metaphor and Hidden Ideology*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Gregg, R. B. (2004). Embodied meaning in American public discourse during the cold war. In F. A. Beer and C. De Landtsheer (eds.), *Metaphorical World Politics*, East Lansing: Michigan State University Press. pp. 59-74.
- Gül, A. (2001). *Turkey: Key Policy Challenges*. paper presented at the Wilton Park Conference, February 2001.
- Hague, R., Harrop, M. and Breslin, S. (1998). *Comparative Government and Politics: An Introduction*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 4th Edition.
- Hahn, D.F. (2003). *Political Communication: Rhetoric, Government and Citizens*. New York: Strata Publishing.
- Hall, S (1996). The Question of Cultural Identity. In S.Hall, D. Held, D. Huert and K. Thompson (eds.), *Modernity: An Introduction to Modern Societies*. Cambridge: Mass and Oxford, pp.595-634.
- Hall, S. (2001). Foucault: Power, knowledge and discourse. In *Discourse Theory and Practice*, M. Wetherell, S. Taylor and S.J. Yates (eds.), 72-81. London: Sage.
- Halmari, H (2005). In search of "successful" political persuasion: A comparison of the styles of Bill Clinton and Ronald Reagan. In H. Halmari and T. Virtanen (eds.), *Persuasion Across Genres: A Linguistic Approach*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing. pp. 105- 34.
- Halmari, H. and Virtanen, T. (2005) (eds.) *Persuasion Across Genres: A Linguistic Approach*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Hart, C. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Science: New Perspectives on Immigration Discourse*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hodge, R. and G. Kress. (1993). *Language As Ideology*, 2nd ed., London: Routledge.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences In Work- Related Values*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hughes, R.L., R.C. Ginnett and G.J. Curphy (2009). *Leadership: Enhancing The Lessons of Experience*. New York: McGraw- Hill International Edition.
- Kabasakal, H. and Bodur, M. (2008). Leadership and Culture in Turkey: A Multifaceted Phenomenon. In J. S. Chhokar, F. C. Brodbeck, R. J. House (eds.), *Culture and Leadership Across The World: The GLOBE Book of In-depth Studies*, New York: Routledge. pp. 835-74
- Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kuypers, J.A. (2009). *Rhetorical Criticism: Perspectives in Action*. Plymouth: Lexington Books.
- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson. (1980, 2003). *Metaphors We Live By*. London: The University of Chicago Press.



- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh: the Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lakoff, G. (2009). *The Political Mind: A Cognitive Scientist's Guide To Your Brain and Its Politics*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Johnson, M. (1987). *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mandaville, P. (2002). *Transnational Muslim Politics: Reimagining the Umma*. Routledge: New York.
- Menz, F. (1989). Manipulation Strategies in Newspapers: A Program For Critical Linguistics. In R. Wodak (ed.), *Language, Power and Ideology Studies In Political Discourse*, Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Mey, J.L. (2001). *Pragmatics An Introduction*. Cornwall: Blackwell Publishers.
- Musolff, A. (2004). *Metaphor and Political Discourse: Analogical Reasoning in Debates About Europe*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Musolff, A. (2010). Political Metaphor and Bodies Politic. In U. Okulska and P. Cap (eds.), *Perspectives in Politics and Discourse*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Nimmo, D. (1978). *Political Communication and Public Opinion in America*. Santa Monica, California: Goodyear.
- Perelman, C. and Olbrechts- Tyteca, L. (1969). *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. (trans.) J. Wilkinson and P. Weaver. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Perelman, C. (1982). *The Realm of Rhetoric*. (trans. W. Kluback), Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Richardson , J.(2007). *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach From Critical Discourse Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Riggins, S.H. (1997). *The Language and Politics of Exclusion: Others in Discourse*. London: Sage Publications
- Sornig, K. (1989). Some Remarks on Linguistic Strategies of Persuasion. In R. Wodak (ed.), *Language, Power and Ideology Studies In Political Discourse* . Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. pp. 95- 113
- van Dijk, T.A (1995). Ideological Discourse Analysis. In E. Ventola and A. Solin (eds.), *Special issue Interdisciplinary approaches to Discourse Analysis 4*. New Courant (English Dept, University of Helsinki), pp. 135-161.
- van Dijk, T.A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis. In D.Schiffrin, D.Tannen and H. E. Hamilton (eds), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publishing New York. pp. 352-67.
- van Dijk, T.A (2002). Political Discourse and Political Cognition. In 'Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse, (eds) Paul A. Chilton and Christina Schaffner, John Benjamins Publishing.
- van Dijk, T.A (2008). *Discourse and Power*. China: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Walton, D.N.(1989). *Informal Logic: A Handbook for Critical Argumentation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walton, D.N. (2007). *Media Argumentation: Dialectic, Persuasion and Rhetoric*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wodak ,R. (1986) cited in Florian Menz (1989). Manipulation Strategies in Newspapers: A Program for Critical Linguistics. In R. Wodak (ed.), *Language, Power and Ideology: Studies in Political Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Wodak, R (ed.) (1989). *Language, Power and Ideology: Studies in Political Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Wodak, R, R. de Cillia , M. Reisigl, K. Liebhart. (2009). *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. (trans. A. Hrisch, R. Mitten and J.W. Unger), Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.