RELIGIOUS NARRATIVES: A SEMIOTIC STUDY OF METAPHORS IN POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

Dr. Nabeela Falak[1], Dr. HM Azhar Usama[2]

[1]Assistant Professor HOD, Department of Islamic Studies, the University of Lahore,

Sargodha Campus

[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Islamic Studies, the University of Lahore, Lahore,

Pakistan

Corresponding Author Email:[2]muhammad.azhar@ais.uol.edu.pk

Email: [1]nabeela.falak@ais.uol.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

Political discourse serves as a dynamic arena where communication transcends mere exchange of information, often relying on metaphorical expressions to convey complex ideas and shape public perceptions. This abstract explores the multifaceted role of conceptual, linguistic, religious, and social metaphors within the realm of political communication.Conceptual metaphors provide a cognitive framework for understanding abstract political concepts by mapping them onto more concrete, familiar domains. These metaphors not only facilitate comprehension but also shape the way individuals perceive and engage with political issues. Linguistic metaphors, on the other hand, play a pivotal role in crafting persuasive narratives and framing political debates. The strategic use of metaphors allows political actors to influence public opinion, reinforcing particular ideologies or stances.Religious metaphors often permeate political discourse, drawing on deep-seated cultural and spiritual associations to convey moral values, legitimacy, and righteousness. Politicians frequently deploy religious metaphors to establish a connection with their audience, tapping into shared belief systems to garner support or justify policy decisions.Social metaphors further enrich political communication by tapping into shared societal experiences, norms, and values. Analogies drawn from everyday life help bridge the gap between complex policy issues and the public's understanding, fostering a sense of

relatability and resonance.The study examines how these various metaphorical devices are strategically employed by political actors to achieve specific rhetorical objectives. It also delves into the potential implications of metaphorical framing on public opinion, highlighting how the choice of metaphors can sway perceptions, build alliances, or galvanize opposition.

INTRODUCTION:

Political discourse, as a mode of communication, is inherently laden with the complexities of conveying abstract ideas, shaping perceptions, and influencing public opinion. In this context, the utilization of metaphors emerges as a powerful linguistic tool, encompassing conceptual, linguistic, religious, and social dimensions. The amalgamation of these metaphorical devices within political communication serves as a dynamic means to bridge the gap between the intricacies of policy issues and the public's understanding.Conceptual metaphors play a pivotal role in translating abstract political concepts into more tangible and relatable terms. By mapping complex ideas onto familiar domains, political actors employ conceptual metaphors to provide a cognitive framework that aids comprehension and shapes the audience's perception. These metaphors not only facilitate understanding but also serve as persuasive devices, influencing the way individuals interpret and engage with political narratives.Linguistic metaphors, another integral facet of political discourse, contribute to the construction of persuasive narratives and the framing of political debates. The careful selection of metaphorical language allows politicians to evoke specific emotions, aligning the discourse with particular ideologies, and framing issues in ways that resonate with their audience. The nuances embedded in linguistic metaphors contribute significantly to the shaping of public opinion and the crafting of political identities.

Religious metaphors, deeply rooted in cultural and spiritual traditions, offer politicians a rich source of symbolic language. Drawing on religious narratives and archetypes, political actors use these metaphors to infuse their discourse with moral values, legitimacy, and a sense of righteousness. Such usage creates a connection with the audience through shared belief systems, establishing a moral grounding for political actions and policies.Social metaphors, derived from everyday experiences, norms, and values, further enhance the communicative power of political discourse. By employing analogies rooted in societal contexts, politicians make complex issues more accessible, fostering a sense of relatability and resonance among the public. Social metaphors serve as a bridge, connecting political rhetoric with the lived experiences of individuals and communities.This exploration aims to delve into the intricate interplay of conceptual, linguistic, religious, and social metaphors within political discourse. By understanding how these metaphorical devices are strategically employed, we can unravel the layers of meaning embedded in political communication, shedding light on the subtle ways in which language shapes political narratives, influences public attitudes, and contributes to the dynamic nature of contemporary politics.

Critical discourse Analysis is an approach that is used to study text and talk becoming apparent from critical linguistics and commonly from socio-politically conscious and oppositional way of language, discourse and communication investigation (Van Dijk, 1995). Fairclough (1993) explains

critical discourse analysis as a systematic approach to find out the opaque relationships of determination and causality between discursive practices, events and text and on the contrary, wider range of cultural and social structures. It also explores how these practices are ideologically shaped by the relationship of power and struggles over power to control the mind of the people and maintain hegemony. For the purpose to control the mind, there are certain linguistic devices that play an important role to communicate the required meaning. Use of metaphor in political speeches is also one of them   .

Communication is the essential activity in politics due to the reason that in political communication it is the lifeblood of politics that links togather the various parts of society and permits them to work as an integrated whole" (Graber, 1993, p. 305). As Edelman (1964, 1971, 1977, 1988) argues that it is the ability of the politician to make use of metaphor and symbols at the core of political communication that awakes latent tendencies among the masses. An oft-quoted view among the researchers of cognitive psychology of metaphor is Paivio's (1979) contention i.e. "metaphor is a solar eclipse. It hides the object of study and at the same time reveals some of its most salient and interesting characteristics when viewed through the right telescope" (p. 150). This hiding, as it reveals metaphor quality, was anticipated long before in the political field by Edelman .(197)

Metaphor, therefore, defines the pattern of perception to which people respond. To speak of deterrence and strike capacity is to perceive war as a game; to speak of legalized murder is to perceive war as a slaughter of human beings; to speak of a struggle for democracy is to perceive war as a vaguely defined instrument for achieving an intensely sought objective. Each metaphor intensifies selected perceptions and ignores others, thereby helping one to concentrate upon the 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 .

Metaphor theory started with George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's book, Metaphors We Live By (2008). The theory goes back a long way and builds on centuries of scholarship that takes metaphor not simply as an ornamental device in language but as a conceptual tool for structuring, restructuring and even creating reality. Notable philosophers in this history include, for instance, Friedrich Nietzsche and, and more recently, Max Black. A recent overview of theories of metaphor can be found in Gibbs and Cameron (2008) and that of conceptual metaphor theory (CMT) in Kövecses (2010). Since the publication of Lakoff and Johnson's (2008) work, a large amount of research has been conducted that has confirmed, added to and also modified their original ideas. Often, the sources of the new ideas were Lakoff and Johnson themselves. Given this situation, it is obvious that what we know as conceptual metaphor theory today is not equivalent to the theory of metaphor proposed in Metaphors We Live By. Many of the critics of CMT assume, incorrectly, that CMT equals Metaphors We Live By. For this reason, I will not deal with this kind of criticism in this introduction.There is a great deal of research that has

already been conducted in the world on the use of metaphor that the political elite uses in speeches. Some of the theorists have suggested that metaphor can easily be understood while the other like Mio (1997) has concluded that the meaning of the most of them are uncertain. But it has not been discussed that if a listener or audience of the speaker knows the social, political, conceptual and historical background of the metaphor used, what would be the result. This study, therefore, will try to find out how the meaning of a metaphor can be understood. How conceptual framework of a person works and makes the meaning of a metaphor clear for the listeners. It will also try to find out the level of uncertainty of the meaning of a metaphor even if a person has religious, social, political, conceptual and historical background of the metaphor used .

There are different types of political parties in every country. Some of them are right wing while the others are left wing. Some are progressive while the others are conservative. The use of language by every political leader is according to the political narrative and similarly they use metaphoric language according to the narrative. In Pakistan, there are three major political parties . Among them are Pakistan Tehrik.i.Insaf (PTI), Pakistan Muslim League Nawaz (PMLN) and Pakistan Peoples Party (PPP). In this study, the researchers have taken one speech of each of the heads of these parties and found out the metaphor used by these political leaders and its political, conceptual, social and historical impact on the minds of the people. Due to the shortage of time and data collection problems, the study is limited to only three major parties of the country and not all the parties and only one speech of every political leader. Therefore, the results of the study cannot be generalized. This study will prove very significant i.e. it will contribute to find out the meaning of the metaphor used by the different political leaders in historical, religious, social and political context and and to know that how it influences on the minds of the public. It will also bring out the difference of the meaning of a metaphor in Pakistani context with that of the other countries of the world having Pakistani background and how a metaphor can be meant differently in a different country due to its particular social, conceptual and historical background. For this purpose, the metaphor selected from the text will be analyzed and discussed in context in which it is used according to the social perspective that shows the conceptual understanding of the people due to its cultural and historical background. In this way, this study aims to :

🔸   Explore linguistic use of metaphor in everyday life .
🔸   Find out the social and conceptual meaning of these metaphors .
🔸   Find out how these metaphors influence the common man psychologically .

LITERATURE REVIEW
According to Lakoff and Johnson (2008) a metaphor is, for most people, a device of the poetic imagination and the rhetorical flourish i.e. a matter of extraordinary rather than ordinary language. Moreover, metaphor is typically viewed as characteristic of language alone, a matter of words rather than thought or action. For this reason, people think they can get along perfectly well without using a metaphor. It has been found, on the contrary, that

metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature. The concepts that govern our thoughts are not just matters of the intellect. They also govern our everyday functioning, down to the most mundane details. Our concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people. Our conceptual system thus plays a central role in defining our everyday realities. If we are right in suggesting that our conceptual system is largely metaphorical, then the way we think, what we experience, and what we do every day is very much a matter of the metaphor. But our conceptual system is not something we are normally aware of. In most of the little things that we do every day, we simply think and act more or less automatically along certain lines. Just what these lines are is by no means obvious. One way to find out is by looking at language. Since communication is based on the same conceptual system that we use in thinking and acting, language is an important source of evidence for what that system is like. The conceptual metaphors, thus, means understanding one domain of experience (that is typically abstract) in terms of another (that is typically concrete). This definition captures conceptual metaphors both as a process and a product. The cognitive process of understanding a domain is the process aspect of a metaphor, while the resulting conceptual pattern is the product aspect .

Importance of Political Communication

The most cited writer on the importance of political communication is Lippmann (1922). He is the first to propose that politics is too complex and abstract to be directly experienced. Thus, our political world is one of such creations as are created by public communication. This creation helps reduce the political world into simpler models that are easier to manage and manipulate. Although Lippmann's intention was to describe the fact of politics being essentially abstract and intangible, an unspoken theme was that politics could be manipulated for political gains and other sinister motives. This theme has been directly addressed in different writings (e.g., Blankenship & Kang, 1991; Edelman, 1964, 1971, 1977, 1988; Graber, 1993; Miller, 1979; Stone, 1988). These writings have focused upon how the national media, particularly television, has emerged as an important tool of such manipulation .

Importance of Metaphors as Information-Processing Tools

It is this notion of limited information processing abilities and the need for simplification that leads us to conclude that a metaphor and other forms of symbolic representation can be most useful in the political arena. A metaphor seems uniquely designed to address the information processing capacity problems discussed by the political cognition theory advocates. This discussion is reminiscent of Ortony's (1978) compactness thesis that discusses how metaphors are important in conveying a great deal of information in a concise manner .

Cognitive psychologists have had a hand in contributing to this new information processing perspective (e.g. Fiske & Kinder, 1981; Kinder &

Sears, 1985; Ottati&Wyer, 1990; Sears, Lau, Tyler & Allen, 1980). This general model has long been used as the basis of cognitive processes (Ashcraft, 1994). Because we are limited in our ability to process information, selection must be made to attend to only information that we are interested in, are drawn to, understand already, and so forth. We have certain pre existing notions, called schema, that serve as filters through which information enters our minds. For example, if we were to have a schema for the understanding of the world events from a liberal perspective, this perspective or schema would serve to filter in those ideas that are consistent with liberal bias while screening out those ideas consistent with a conservative bias. This could also work at a more microscopic level as well for example; a person might have a specific schema to understand environmentally relevant information. This schema might render him to be more attuned to pleas for environmental conservation as opposed to complaints from industries regarding regulations designed to protect the environment. This works both for selecting events from any number of potential events as well as for interpreting ambiguous events in a manner more consistent with preexisting beliefs (Ottati&Wyer, 1990). This occurs at the time of initial encoding of theinformation, not at the time of recall .

Iyengar (1990) and Iyengar and Kinder (1987) seized upon this information processing model and developed themes around cognitive heuristics such as those proposed by Kahneman and Tversky (1982). Heuristics are "rules of thumb" that mimic logical processing but are much simpler and do not take into account all pieces of information. Decisions based upon heuristics are mostly consistent with decisions based upon careful consideration of all information, but such decisions often vary from maximally logical decisions. Because heuristics mimic logic, people can make choices or evaluations that are wrong or even opposite to what information is available while still operating under the impression that they are being logical. Iyengar (1990) and Iyengar and Kinder (1987) particularly focused upon the framing heuristics, in which decisions differ based upon how a particular issue is framed. They were especially critical of the media, particularly television, for not providing proper frames within which people can make logically important decisions. Such presentation of the news maximally invites people to use simplistic heuristics for decision-making purposes. Brady and Sniderman (1985) focused their attention on the likability of heuristics. This heuristics suggests that people decide if they like a politician or not and make broader decisions based upon this likability index. This is particularly true regarding their selfevaluation of their own conservative-liberal dimension. Brady and Sniderman (1985) suggest that abstract notions of conservatism and liberalism are not very well understood by the general public .

Therefore, people assess which politician they like, and then they identify themselves with his conservative-liberal dimension. Turning more specifically to a metaphor, as an information processing tool, Edelman (1971) suggests, "metaphor and myths are devices for simplifying and giving meaning to complex and bewildering sets of observations that evoke concern" (p. 65). He further suggests that what makes s metaphor effective is that it evokes a part-to-whole relation. This can come in two forms. A certain metaphor can

become symbolic of a broader issue, and solving a metaphor at the more local level addresses the issue at this broader level. This means that political metaphors can justify courses of action. Certainly, Franklin D. Roosevelt did this during the Great Depression with his New Deal metaphor. The country, in the throes of the Depression, felt that all direction was lost. When certain specific programs, such as specific public works programs, were put in place, these became metaphors for the larger issue of the direction of the country. Confidence in the country grew, and the United States was pulled out of the Depression. According to Edelman (1971), metaphors justifying courses of action are especially effective during the times of heightened public anxiety, when the public needs to be reassured that there is some sense or organization to the problem at hand and that government is addressing it. This is perhaps the reason why the Cold War was so successful as a metaphor for the general security of the country, and issues such as defense spending were accepted, by and large, by the public. A second implication of metaphors' generating a part-to-whole relation is that simple metaphors that render complex issues understandable make the issues relevant to the general population. These make the public feel a part of the political process and supportive of decisions by the political elite (Thompson, 1998). Edelman (1964) suggests that the goal of a political discourse is not to find novel metaphors that mobilize public opinion but to use simple metaphors that are repeated continuously. Politicians often use metaphors that resonate with latent opinions and become symbolic or coded speech. Repetition of such metaphors results in dulling the critical faculties rather than awakening them. Chronic repetition of clichés and stale phrases that serve simply to evoke a conditioned, uncritical response is a time-honored habit among politicians and a mentally restful one for their audiences . The only information conveyed by a speaker who tells an audience of business people that taxes are too high and that public spending is waste is that he is trying to prevent both himself and his audience from thinking and to make all the people, present there, to join in a favoured liturgy consisting of the ritualistic denunciation of the symbols spending (Edelman, 1964, pp. 124-1 25). Finally, Stone (1988) made a connection between political problems and stories. Stories have a beginning, middle, and an ending, with some sort of change or transformation. They also have heroes, villains, and victims, with good battling evil. Therefore, Stone (1988) says that "metaphors are important devices for strategic representation in policy analysis. On the surface, they simply draw a comparison between one thing and another, but in a more subtle way, they usually imply a whole narrative story and a prescription for action (p. 118). These notions of the metaphor, as a part-to-whole or as a story prescribing action, lead us into a metaphor used in persuasion. Research on metaphor and politics (see Mio, 1997) concludes that it is proved through the empirical evidence that persuasive use of the device of metaphor as an effective persuasive device is uncertain more than the theorists make us believe. It is strongly objected that the metaphor used by the political leader though may have uncertain meaning for the people belongs to other social background but it is fully meaningful for the workers of that political leader .

Rationale of the Study

The study aims to provide a deeper understanding of various aspects of the use of a metaphor in the speeches of political leaders. Sometimes, a common man

does not know the meaning of the metaphor used by the political leaders. This study will possibly provide additional insights in better identifying a metaphor used in political speeches and in taking a better linguistic, historical and conceptual perspective about the metaphor used. This study will provide a base for the future research in this field .

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

• Which linguistic, social, religious and conceptual metaphors are being used in political speeches ?

• How metaphors are exploited to construct the opinion of the common people ?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The methodology adopted for this research is qualitative. For the purpose to analyse political speeches of both Imran Khan and Bilawal Bhutto Zardari, metaphor identification procedure (MIP) model, presented by Pragglejaz Group in 2007, was followed which i.e. (1) Read the entire text–discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning; (2) Determine the lexical units in the text–discourse; (3) (a) For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, i.e. how it applies to an entity, relation, or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (contextual meaning). Take into account what comes before and after the lexical unit, and (b) For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. For our purposes, basic meanings tend to be; (i) more concrete i.e. what they evoke is easier to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell, and taste, (ii) related to bodily action, (iii) ore precise (as opposed to vague), and (iv) historically older, and (v) basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit ;

(c) If the lexical unit has a more basic current–contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it .

DATA COLLECTION

Two speeches of Imran Khan and Bilawal Bhutto (one each) were taken from the Youtube. Imran Khan's speech was translated into English from Urdu while more than 90% of Bilwal's speech was in English, therefore it was written as it was while the remaining few sentences were translated and cross checked by language expert to avoid any mistake .

DATA ANALYSIS

After the collection of data, it was analysed by the researchers according to the rules set by experts. Group (2007) was a group of scholars from a variety of disciplines who prepared a comprehensive method of the identification of metaphors and called metaphor identification procedure (MIP). In this identification procedure, they set a criteria to check metaphors on the basis of rules. For example, first of all a metaphor should be checked on the basis of context in which it is used. Then what is the contemporary significance of this

metaphor and also what is its historical perspective. For explaination of these terms.

Contextual Meaning

The context or surroundings in which a metaphor is used or discourse occurs and the meaning of that particular metaphor or word is understood according to that particular environment, situation or context in which it is spoken. Similarly, in writing the text in which a word or metaphor appears and affects its meaning. Therefore, the words and social setting, that surrounds a spoken or written word, is called context. Context can be used to understand words which the people do not know the meaning of. This helps the reader to understand the piece in question while in speech, the social setting as well as the language helps the listener understand what is said. For example, there were words "sheeps and goats'' used by Bilwal Bhutto Zardari in his first speech in the parliment in august, 2018. If we read these words out of context, it will convey different meanings that is the name of some animals and have no specific conotative meanings. While if we see these words in context, in which they are used, they have different meanings that refer to that particular speech by Imran Khan in which he calls the people of Sindh province as goats and sheeps to denote that they have no sense to differentiate between right and wrong and do what is directed to them by their faudal lords and political leaders. Imran Khan used 5 metaphors that have contextual meanings while Bilawal used 17 contextual metaphors. In this way, the frequency of the use of the metaphor in Bilawal's speech is higher than Imran Khan .

Historical Meaning

By historical meaning is meant that there are some metaphors of or concerning history or past events that have some historical perspectives. It is usually used to make the audience uderstand the whole story or event that is happening at present by giving the example of the past. It awakes some concepts, ideas or opinion and activates our schema related to that metaphor used. Usually, in political speeches, it is used to exploit the opinion of the people. For example, when Imran Khan uses the metaphor in his speech that I will make Pakistan a 'Madina State', it denotes to the holy city of Madina that has historical and religious significance and reverance for the Muslims and especially for the Pakistanis. Imran Khan used 2 historical metaphors in his speech while Bilawal used only 1 historical metaphor in his speech. Thus, the frequecny of the use of historical metaphor is higher in the speech of Imran Khan as compared to Bilawal Bhutto Zardari. Contemporary Meaning

The type of metaphors that are used to denote some particular meaning to masses and are easier to imagine, feel or think due to its present denotation is the metaphors that have contemporary meaning. A contemporary metaphor may also be historical and contextual at the same time. For example, the metaphor used by Bilawal Bhutto Zardari ''The Prime Minister Selected" in his speech has contemporary meaning. This shows that he believes that Imran Khan, who has won the current elections, is not actually elected by the people but he is selected by the establishment and as result of this selection won the

election by rigging with the help of establishment. Bilwal Bhutto Zardari used these contemporary metaphors for 21 times as compared to Imran Khan who used this metaphor 13 times (see table 1). In this way, the frequency of the use of contemporary metaphor by Bilawal Bhutto Zardari is higher than that of Imran Khan's .

Religious Meaning

Religious meanngs are used to convey some particular religious meaning and evoke some religious perspective. Pakistan is a declared religious state as its complete name is Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The people of Pakistan like to hear religious type of metaphors in the political speeches and they consider that politician a better Muslim to be followed as a leader. Imran Khan usually uses religious metaphors in his speeches. He aspired for Pakistan to make it "Riasat e Madina" in his first speech as the prime minister of Pakistan and he used this metaphor to denote that one day Pakistan will become a welfare state like the State of Madina. Similarly, he used an Arabic verse from the Holy Qur'an which meant 'I worship You (God) and I pray to You (God)'. This versed is used to implicate that as a leader of a Muslim country, he always worships and prays to God and it influences the opinion of the poeple to convince them that their leader is a true Muslim. While Bilawal usually does not use religious metphors in his speech therefore, he has not used any religious metaphor in his speech .

Exchange of ideas

Language has always been a vehicle of communication. When we want to express our feeling, ideas and thinking, we use language. While using language, sometimes we cannot express some ideas or concepts directly. For this purpose, we have to use metaphors to conveyed the meaning to the audience without awkwardness and without being sever in communication. The selection of the metaphor may vary from person to person because every person has different educational background and nurture. For example, there is a use of standard and refined language by the educated people while uneducated people, most of the times, will use slang language. But all of the people try to choose the metaphor to make their conversation safe. An oft-quoted perspective among cognitive psychology researchers of the metaphor is Paivio's (1979) contention i.e. "metaphor is a solar eclipse. It hides the object of study and at the same time reveals some of its most salient and interesting characteristics when viewed through the right telescope" (p. 150). Plitical speeches are full of such metaphors because political leaders need to use metaphors more than anybody else. They always try to portray positive self representation and negative others representation as Van Dijk (1995) opines. Both Imran Khan and Bilawal Bhutto Zardari are educated politicians therefore their use of language is usually different from other politicians like Usman Buzdar and Sheikh Rasheed. The metaphors used in their language are refined one. For example, Madina State, tonga party, Sadiq and Ameen metaphors used by Imran Khan and prime minister selected, folk, goats and sheeps as used by Bilawal .

Religion has always been a tool in the hand of politicians to manipulate the opinion of the masses. They use this to make the common and less educated poeple to think that their leader will run the country according to the teachings of Islam and also will make and implemnt the rules of the country according to the will of God. These metaphors are also used to portray positive self representation and negative others representation as Van Dijk (1995) opines. Therefore, metaphors like Sadiq and Ameen, Riasat-e-Madina are used for this purpose. Both Nawaz Sharif and Imran Khan use religious metaphors in their speeches for the most of the times. But Bilawal and other member of Bhutoo family never use religious metaphors in their speeches .

Another aim of the study is to find out the social background of the metaphors. Man is a social animal as Aristotle has said. He can not live without other human beings who have same linguistic and social background because they live in the same society, they share some common ideology and as a result they have same thinking about various things (Van Dijk, 1995). Similar is the case with the langauge because language affects society and society affects language. There may be some words that may mean differently in one society while at the same time may mean differently in another society. For example, shopper means a person who shops but in Pakistan it is usally taken as a shopping bag. Similarly, a metaphor that has some social background can be understood in local society in a better way. Every society has its own norms or values and takes metaphors according to that particular background. Most of the politicians use metaphors that can be understood by the local audience. They try to convey meaning to the society for a better picture as Van Dijk (1995) opines that hey always try to portray positive self representation and negative others representation as. For example, when Bilawal used the metaphor of a 'donkey' there is particular social background that he had in his mind. In Pakistan, donkey is taken to be an animal that is silly socially and if someone calls somebody a donkey, it means that he is insulting him. The use of this particular word at a particular time shows that he is trying to get the sympathy of those to whom Iman Khan once calls donkies. Similary, Imran Khan uses the metaphor 'tonga party' that has particular social meaning according to which most of the people understand that a political party that doesnot have more than one or two seats is called a tonga party. There may be some metaphors that have more than one meaning and denote to two different meanings in a same society as Kövecses (2005) points out that variation in a metaphor can also be found within the same language or culture   .

Conceptual background of the metaphor has an important domain in the use of political discourse. Leckoff and Johnson (2008) define the conceptual metaphor as a systematic set of correspondences between two domains of experience. This is what "understanding one domain in terms of another" means. Therefore, when the politicians use metaphors in their speeches, they hit the conceptual domain of the listeners. Thus, the use of language in political discourse, based on social background, has some conceptual background also. It activates our schema because we have some conceptual understanding on the basis of which we decide what is wrong and what is right. For example, the word 'sadiq and ameen' simply refers to a quality regarding the speaking of truth and honesty. But whenever, the word 'sadiq

and ameen' will be used in conversation after the decision of the Supereme Court of Pakistan against the ex prime minister of Pakistan Muhammad Nawaz Sharif, there will be a special conceptual link between Muhammad Nawaz Sharif and sadiq and ameen and the term would be used in a certain context and will not be taken literal but in a certain context for a person as Kövecses (2005) suggests that contextual factors can actually create novel metaphors that can be referred to as "context-induced" ones. Therefore, whenever Imran Khan will use these words even without mentioning the name of Muhammad Nawaz Sharif, it will refer to Muhammad Nawaz Sharif as it is context-induced. Similarly, the use of the words 'we weaponised 62 and 63', refers to the conceptual metaphor by which the common people understands how thei courts have used the articles 62 and 63 as a weapon to deseat the ex primeminster of Pakistan. That is the reason why metaphors have association with the conceptual frame work of human beings .

Another aim of this study is to find out how these metaphor influence the common public and how they are exploited to alter the opinion of the mases. The first thing is that metaphors are important in conveying a great deal of information in a concise manner as Ortony (1978) has said. The main purpose of political communication is to convey their message not only to the followers but also to the opponents. Political leaders always use the langauge that is publically acceptable. Most of them have mastery over discourse and use such language as may construct or alter the opinion of the people. Usually, they choose metaphors to convey the meaning. For example, when Bilawal Bhutto Zardari used the word prime minister 'select', actually he tried to construct the opinion of the people that Imran Khan (who is an elected prime minister of Pakistan by the votes of the people of Pakistan), was actually, not the elected prime minister of Pakistan but he was selected by the establishment first and then there was some planning on the basis of which he was declared as the winner of the elections. Thus, he tried to give the opinion that actually Imran khan was not the true representative of the people of Pakistan. And it is the common practice of the politicians that they use metaphors again and again to make it true because the more you propogate, the more it will seem to be true. A voter usually has sympathy for one or for the other parties and they feels disillusioned sometimes due to the corruption of a party or due to the failure in delivering. He wants to change his support for that political party and desires to give a chance to some new party but when he listens a particular narrative as mentione above i.e. he is confused. Therefore, political leaders build such narrative by using metaphors of different kinds e.g. historical, religious, and contextual. By using these kinds of metaphor they not only stop their forllowers to change their view or soft corner for them but also win sympathy that their leader is deprived of his right of ruling the people by will and vote of the people, rather someone is installed on them by the establishment .

CONCLUSIONS:

To conclude, it can be said that metaphorical use of language enables someone not only to convery his message in compact words since metaphors are important in conveying a great deal of information in a concise manner, but also create a novelity in the converstation of a politician. As politicians are the

representative of their areas and similarly, leaders represent a whole society and they know the structure of their society and social norms, values and taboos, they use such linguistic metaphors as are socially acceptable and are widely liked by the people living in that society. This social background that is based on a certain conceptual support makes one leader samart use of them. It is focused that people should be treated according to their concepts and conceptual framework. Therefore, keeping in mind this conceptual framework, politicians use such metaphors as convey not just one meaning but rather several meaing to get their hidden objectives because variation in metaphor can also be found within the same language or culture. In this way, they exploit the language for their own purpose to build a certain narrative. Thus, this exploitation of language enables them to influence their supporters psychologically. As a result they succeed to get their support without letting them to think about the reality that may be something else and the opinion of the voters is constructed on the basis of this narrative that is built by their leaders .

REFERENCES:

Ashcraft, R. (1994). 9 Locke's political philosophy. In V. C. Chappell (ed.), TheCambridge Companion to Locke (pp. 226-251). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press .

Blankenship, J. ,& Kang, J. G. (1991). The 1984 presidential and vice presidential debates: The printed press and "construction" by metaphor. Presidential Studies Quarterly, 21(2), 307319 .

Brady, H. E., &Sniderman, P. M. (1985). Attitude attribution: A group basis for political

reasoning. American Political   Science   Review,   79(4), .1061-1078   doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/1956248 .

Edelman, M. (1964). The symbolic uses of politics. Urbana: University of Illinois Press .

Edelman, M. (1971). Politics as symbolic action: Mass arousal and quiescence. Chicago: Markham .

Edelman, M. (1977). Political language: Words that succeed and policies that fail. New York: Academic .

Edelman, M. (1988). Constructing the political spectacle. Chicago: University of Chicago Press .

Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. Discourse & Society, 4(2), 133-168. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002002 .

Fiske, S. T., & Kinder, D. R. (2017). Involvement, expertise, and schema use: Evidence from political cognition. In S. T. Fiske & D. R. Kinder (Eds.), Personality, Cognition and Social Interaction (pp. 171-190). Taylor and Francis. doi: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315528816-17 .

Gibbs Jr, R. W., & Cameron, L. (2008). The social-cognitive dynamics of metaphor

performance. Cognitive   Systems   Research, 9(1-2),   .64-75 doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogsys.2007.06.008 .

Graber, D. (1993). Political communication: Scope, progress, promise. In A. W. Finifter (Ed.), Political Science: The State of the Discipline (pp. 305-332). Washington, DC: American Political Science Association .

Iyengar, S. (1990). Shortcuts to political knowledge: The role of selective attention and accessibility. In J. A. Ferejohn& J. H. Kuklinski (Eds.), Information and Democratic Processes (pp. 160-185). Urbana: University of Illinois Press .

Iyengar, S., & Kinder, D. R. (1987). News that matters: Television and American opinion. C hicago: University of Chicago Press .

Kahneman, D., &Tversky, A. (1982). The psychology of preferences. Scientific American, 246(1), 160-173 .

Kinder, D. R., & Sears, D. O. (1985). Public opinion and political action. In G. Lindzey& E .

Aronson (Eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology (pp. 659-741). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley .

Kövecses, Z. (2005). Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press .

Kovecses, Z. (2010). Metaphor: A practical introduction. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press .

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2008). Metaphors we live by. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press .

Lippmann, W. (1922). The world outside and the pictures in our heads. In W. Lippmann (Ed.), Public Opinion (pp. 3-32). New York, NY, US: MacMillan Co .

Miller, D. (1979). Social justice. Oxford: Oxford University Press .

Mio, J. S. (1997). Metaphor and politics. Metaphor and Symbol, 12(2), 113-133. doi :

https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms1202_2 .

Ortony, A. (1978). Remembering, understanding, and representation. Cognitive Science, 2(1), 53-69. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0364-0213(78)80061-5 .

Ottati, V. C., &Wyer, R. S. (1990). The cognitive mediators of political choice: Toward a comprehensive model of political information processing. In J. A. Ferejohn& J. H. Kuklinski (Eds.), Information and Democratic Processes (pp. 186-216). Urbana :

University of Illinois Press .

Paivio, A. (1979). Psychological processes in the comprehension of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), Metaphor and Thought (pp. 150-171). London: Oxford University Press .

Group, P. (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in

discourse. Metaphor and Symbol, 22(1), .1-39 doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10926480709336752 .

Sears, D. O., Lau, R. R., Tyler, T. R., & Allen, H. M. (1980). Self-interest vs. symbolic politics in policy attitudes and presidential voting. American Political Science Review, 74(3), 670684. doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/1958149 .

Stone Deborah, A. (1988). Policy paradox and political reason. Glenview: Scott Foresman& Co .

Thompson, B. (1998). In praise of brilliance: Where that praise really belongs. American Psychologist, 53(7), 799-800. doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.53.7.799 .

Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Discourse semantics and ideology. Discourse & Society, 6(2), 243-289 .

doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926595006002006 .

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M-ckm2RJtkk