I. Why Conceptual Metaphors?

1.1 Metaphor and Rhetoric

Since Aristotle’s era, the persuasive roles of metaphors have been given a great deal of attention in rhetoric studies. Aristotle stated in *Poetics*, “Metaphor is the application of an alien name by transference either from genus to species, or from species to genus, or from species to species, or by analogy, that is, proportion” (350 B.C.A/2008: p. 41). In *Rhetoric*, he said, “The metaphor is lucid, pleasing, and strange, and has all these qualities to a high degree; moreover, one cannot learn its use from anyone else” (Aristotle, 350 B.C.B/1989: p. 70). The former argues the similarity or proximity that underlies the metonymical linguistic expressions. The latter discusses the quality of metaphors, or the depth of deliberation.

The similarity mentioned in the former of Aristotle’s definitions of metaphor deals with the analogical match in a mental space. According to the definition, if “A is B” (or “A is like B”), the factual literal relationship between A & B should either be: (1) A includes B, (2) A is included in B, (3) A relates to B, or (4) A correlates to B. This interpretation recalls the current common terms for figurative expressions, such as ‘metaphor,’ ‘simile,’ ‘metonymy’ and ‘synecdoche.’ This represents a long-lasting tradition in the use of metaphors, especially those applied in ‘creative’ literal works.

Conceptual metaphor theory proposed by Lakoff & Johnson (1980), organized and raised an idea, called “conceptual metaphors.” They stated, “The essence of metaphor is understanding
one kind of thing in terms of another” (p. 5). Their important contribution to the field was the clear declaration that linguistic expressions are representations of conceptual ideas in the mind. According to the conceptual metaphor theory, a metaphorical expression is an instance of an underlying concept that represents the speaker’s way of perceiving the world. This presents an assumption that metaphorical expressions may disclose a clue to the speaker’s invisible mind through the medium of speech, an audible text. Analyzing metaphorical expressions can be called the process of investigating the “cross-domain mapping in the conceptual system” (Lakoff, 1993: p. 203), because “the locus of metaphor is not in language at all, but in the way we conceptualize one mental domain in terms of another” (p. 203).

1.2 Researching Conceptual Metaphors

Researching metaphors does not necessarily mean investigating so-called “creative” metaphorical expressions or inspiring uses of figurative language, such as those widely studied in the criticism of literary works. This type of ‘common’ definition of metaphor may be rooted in the words of Aristotle’s in his *Rhetoric*. He says there, “The metaphor is lucid, pleasing, and strange, and has all these qualities to a high degree” (Aristotle, 350 B.C./1989: p. 70).

The study of conceptual metaphors, however, is rather to investigate the underlying concept through the mental representations that appear on the surface level of language as linguistic expressions. “Surface realizations” (Rakova, 2003: p. 22) of cross-domain mappings are required in the process.

A MONEY\(^1\) metaphor is a typical example of this. It is a well-known conceptual metaphor, which may easily upset those who believe that metaphors must be something more creative. Here are several quotations of sample metaphorical expressions from *Metaphors We Live By* (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(1-1a)] You’re *wasting* my time.
  \item[(1-1b)] This gadget will *save* you hours.
  \item[(1-1c)] How do you *spend* your time these days?
  \item[(1-1d)] That flat tire *cost* me an hour.
  \item[(1-1e)] I’ve *invested* a lot of time in her.
\end{itemize}

(Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: pp. 7-8)

Some people may claim that some—or possibly all—of them are not metaphors at all because these sentences all sound so conventional, or even idiomatic. Nevertheless, according to Lakoff & Johnson (1980), these sentences are clearly regarded and categorized as metaphorical linguistic expressions. In Conceptual Metaphor Theory, the examples (1-1a) to (1-1e) are considered instances of a single conceptual metaphor, TIME IS MONEY.

The conceptual metaphor TIME IS MONEY, for example, is grounded in our common conceptual understanding that ‘money’ is an important limited resource in our society. So is ‘time.’

\(^1\) In this article, in order to distinguish the conceptual metaphor and its linguistic metaphorical expression, metaphoric concepts are represented graphically by SMALL CAPITALS.
Therefore, when we describe time, the conceptual metaphor TIME IS MONEY is reflected in the outcome linguistic expression, such as “You’re wasting my time.” Since the verbs waste, save, spend, cost and invest in the quotations are generally those regarding money, we should recognize that these linguistic expressions are instances of the underlying conceptual metaphor: TIME IS MONEY.

Why do many people tenaciously insist that these metaphorical linguistic expressions are not ‘metaphorical?’ There appears to be two major reasons. One is that “our conceptual system is not something we are normally aware of. In most of the little things we do everyday, we simply think and act more or less automatically along certain lines” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: p. 3). Therefore, we do not often sense any “semantic tension” (Charteris-Black, 2004: p. 21) in the linguistic expressions that should be considered ‘metaphorical’ according to the conceptual metaphor theory. The other reason is partly related to Aristotle’s definition. The metaphorical linguistic expressions, which do reflect certain underlying conceptual metaphors, are not always lucid, pleasing, strange, and of the high qualities that Aristotle (350 B.C./1989: p. 70) stated. As already mentioned, a metaphorical expression, which reflects the underlying conceptual metaphor, is something we do not often recognize.

Nonetheless, in allowing us to focus on one aspect of a concept, a metaphorical concept can keep us from focusing on other aspects of the concept that are inconsistent with that metaphor (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: p. 10). This idea yields one hypothesis. By investigating underlying conceptual metaphors in the metaphorical expressions, we can unveil the conceptual views toward the topic being discussed by the speaker. Conversely, by becoming more aware of the roles of conceptual metaphors, or the intentional choice of conceptual metaphors when we describe something, the oral communication will be facilitated in terms of the conceptual understanding on the audience’s side. It is an attempt to make something understood, by paralleling the conceptual metaphors which are uttered on the speaker’s side, and heard and understood on the audience’s side.

This paper, therefore, focuses on the roles of conceptual metaphors which underlie the metaphorical linguistic expressions uttered by the speaker, especially in business communication situations. Through the actual linguistic expressions, an attempt will be made to discover the rhetorical constructions that the speaker, consciously or unconsciously, applied in his metaphorical business communication.

II. Born to Be a Weapon

2.1 Conceptual Metaphors in Business Presentations
This section discusses how conceptual metaphors actually work in business situations. The Apple Worldwide Developers Conference2, commonly known as “WWDC,” is referred to as an example. WWDC is an annual event, hosted by Apple Inc., one of the leading companies in the computer industry. The attendees are mostly those in the field of computer science and marketing.

2) Details are available at http://developer.apple.com/wwdc/
2.1.1 Scene 1: Redmond, Start Your Photocopiers.
In 2004, the Apple Worldwide Developers Conference (WWDC 2004) was held. Presentations about the latest “Mac OS X, Tiger” took place. What people saw in the hall were huge propaganda banners with an advertisement copy that said, “Redmond, start your photocopiers.” Two years later, the senior vice president of Apple, Bertrand Serlet, came up on the stage of WWDC 2006. He began his presentation by recalling the campaign conducted in 2004, reintroducing the copy on the banners, “Redmond, start your photocopiers.” “It was just a joke,” he explained, and said, “But they actually took it seriously.” Right at the moment, the audience burst into laughter.

Why did they laugh? The answer is in the rhetoric of metaphor. The key element is the undesirable fact that the rival company, in his implication, seems to have started ‘copying’ their original product. Behind the scenes, there are some complex roles of metaphors, which successfully created the laughing impact. We may explicate it by analyzing the metaphors applied in the communication. Here are the statements.

(2–1a) Redmond, start your photocopiers. (Apple Inc., 2004)
(2–1b) But they actually took it seriously. (Serlet, 2006)

The first word in the sentence (2–1a), “Redmond,” is an instance of THE PLACE FOR THE INSTITUTION metonymy (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980: p. 38). It makes people refer to the specific computer giant, a rival company of Apple’s, headquartered in Redmond, Washington. As the advertisement was exclusively for the people in the IT industry, it gained an instant effect of pinpointing the specific rival company in the context, without explicitly announcing its real name.

“Photocopiers” is a reflection of the MACHINE metaphor, or to be exact, AN UNSKILLED WORKER IS A MACHINE metaphor. Photocopiers do not think. They mechanically duplicate the product simply by copying the original without adding anything creative. The metaphorical expression, “Start your photocopiers,” highlighted the implied message that the rival company is non-creative and is a poor performer.

The complete literal expression for the sentence (2–1a) would be, “[So-and-so] Company, get ready to start copying our product.” Most people at the conference must have understood this ironic metaphorical expression immediately, because Apple had often complained about the close resemblance found between Apple’s products and those of the rival company’s. In addition, just a year before the conference, Steve Jobs, the CEO at Apple, clearly claimed, “Windows just copied the Mac” (Jobs, 2005). This message may have emphasized the ironic metaphor, making it more powerful and persuasive to many Apple fans present at the conference.

What about the other sentence (2–1b)? Is it metaphorical, or literal? It should be considered metaphorical, if we believe that the pronoun “it” refers to the “vehicle” (Richards, 1965: p. 96), meaning: ‘starting the photocopiers.’ It is because the rival company is neither actually —and literally— ‘starting’ nor ‘turning on’ their photocopiers in the office. On the other hand, it could also be considered literal, when “it” refers to the “tenor” (Richards, 1965: p. 96), meaning: ‘start copying the original.’ As long as the implied metaphorical meaning of the first
sentence (2-1a) has already been understood (or if the audience has completely digested the metaphorical irony) at the moment of utterance, the next sentence (2-1b) will sound completely literal to the audience.

Regardless of the discussion, from a critical perspective, it should also be noted that the expression, “took it,” is an instance of IDEAS ARE OBJECTS metaphor (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: p. 10). It metaphorically describes the physical action to “take” the object. In general, wording illustrates the innate mental process of understanding and visualizing the fact. Here in (2-1b), the idea is an object that they can metaphorically ‘grab’ and figure out seriously.

2.1.2 Scene 2: This is our new baby.

WWDC 2010 caught the audience’s attention because the new iPhone 4, a 4G (fourth generation) smartphone, was to be announced. At the conference, the keynote address was delivered by Steve Jobs, the CEO, to the audience of more than 5,200 attendees. Having unveiled the new iPhone 4, Jobs announced the concluding message as follows.

(2-2a) This is our new baby. (Jobs, 2010)
(2-2b) I hope you will love it as much as we do. (Jobs, 2010)

We find a HUMAN metaphor that conceptualizes the utterance. The word “baby” is an instance of PRODUCT IS A FAMILY metaphor, which implies the amount of care that has been given so that the product could be ‘born.’ “Baby” is a persuasive word that emphasizes the product’s infinite potential for future growth. Not only to Jobs, but also to all the associated staff at Apple, the product must be more than a handy gadget. It is a part of their living family, and the one they really love, and also the one, they hope, everyone loves. The HUMAN metaphor, found in the rhetoric of personification in the message, let the audience draw a lively visual image of their own colorful daily life with the product.

The FAMILY or HUMAN metaphor is also reflected in (2-2b). The keyword, “love,” is important. Is it also an instance of a conceptual metaphor? The answer is yes, as long as this sentence is in this context. “Love” is such a common word. It is so conventional that most people would not even recognize the presence of an underlying conceptual metaphor, PRODUCT IS A FAMILY. It relies on the audience’s “consciousness of metaphoricity” (Müller, 2008: pp.188). Since Jobs had mentioned in the preceding sentence that the product was a “baby,” the verb “love” was automatically selected to best describe his wishes for the users’ deepest affection toward a newly-born baby, a living entity. Conceptual metaphors affect his/her diction, while “creating a tension in our nervous system” (Eastman, 1931: p. 205). They create and maintain a certain “semantic tension” (Charteris-Black, 2004: p. 21) when ‘decoding’ the metaphorical meanings on the audience’s side.

As the linguistic expression “to love something” sounds very common to our ears, it indeed appears to be almost metaphorically ‘dead.’ Nevertheless, let us have a look in the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (LDOCE 5th edition), which lists each meaning of a headword in the descending order of frequency in use, based on corpus studies. The dictionary says that the most conventional—or ‘literal’—meaning of the verb “love” is still “to love somebody.”
To love something, like (2-2b) in the speech, is listed in the third place of the headword in the list. The Pragglejaz Group (2007) also supports the idea of referring to the listing order for a single headword in the dictionary. It is an affirmative way to judge an expression as metaphorical, when the contextual meaning of the word is not the first listed meaning of the headword (Pragglejaz Group, 2007). Yet, it would be premature to conduct the metaphor identification procedure simply by checking the first meaning of a headword in dictionaries. It is one of several methods that may help justify the case.

2.1.3 Scene 3: We cannot give up the weapon.
About a month before WWDC 2010, another groundbreaking product of Apple was launched: the iPad. It is a new tablet computer designed as a mobile wireless networking device. It had been announced by Apple in January of 2010 that iPad would be released SIM (Subscriber Identity Module) free worldwide. It meant that all iPad users would be able to choose their favorite wireless 3G networking career. To the contrary, in May, it turned out that all iPads to be sold in Japan were SIM locked to Softbank Mobile Corp. They would work only on the 3G network of Softbank Mobile. It was said that the decision was to monopolize the 3G connections of iPads in Japan to beat the huge market share occupied by the Japanese mobile telecommunication giant, NTT Docomo Inc.

The CEO at Softbank Mobile, Masayoshi Son, went live on Ustream, an internet video streaming service provider, and explained the background of the issue. In response to the question from an attendee, Son began his remark by extending his respects to Ryoma Sakamoto, a great revolutionary in Japanese history. And he continued the following story.

(2-3) In the middle of combat with the shogunate [the ruling government of the Edo period], did Ryoma give up his own foreign weapons, which he had stocked, to the opposing shogunate? I believe we are still only halfway to revolution. . . . From my point of view, we are still only halfway through the war. While being halfway through the war, providing the weapons for the combat to his opponent in the combat—is that what Ryoma really did? While organizing the Satcho Alliance and battling against the shogunate, did Ryoma give the guns and ammunition, which he had received from America or Britain, to the shogunate side? Thus we are hoping that you would understand we are still only halfway through the war.
Son (2010)

In this speech, we clearly find the dominance of WAR metaphors: BUSINESS IS WAR. He began by asking a rhetorical question, which remains rather literal. This leads to new metaphorical stories that follow.

(2-4a) . . . we are still only halfway to revolution. Son (2010)
(2-4b) . . . we are still only halfway through the war. Son (2010)

The sentences (2-4a) and (2-4b) work as facilitators for the transition of the speaker’s view-

3) The English script of Son (2010) quoted in this paper is translated by the author.
point from being literal to metaphorical. The first sentence in the quotation (2-3), a rhetorical question, illustrates Ryoma’s policy toward the use of weapons. While this standpoint is echoing in the audience’s mind, he consecutively mentioned (2-4a) and (2-5b) in sequence.

The sentence (2-4a) has an underlying conceptual metaphor, BUSINESS IS A JOURNEY. This conceptualizes the image of traveling halfway to the goal: actualizing the revolution in the industry. This sentence (2-4a) appears to play a significant role like ‘a landing step’ that pushes the metaphorical scheme up to the next level. The next sentence (2-4b) attempts his final figurative approach, employing the WAR metaphor. The speaker finally reveals that his conceptual image of business: BUSINESS IS WAR. In other words, the main rhetorical aim of this metaphor application is to vividly visualize the highly competitive aspect of the mobile telecommunication market. This competitive image illustrates the unfair and disadvantageous state of Softbank Mobile. This rhetorical approach does penetrate Son’s message from the beginning through the end of the story.

2.2 Transitional Use of Conceptual Metaphors—A Persuasive Rhetorical Scheme

From a critical point of view, the rhetorical scheme that Son employed in the first three sentences of his message (2-3) can be illustrated as Figure 2-2-1.

![Fig. 2-2-1 Metaphorical transition toward the target scheme](image)

He starts with the literal observation of Japanese history. In the story, Ryoma was aiming to conquer the shogunate without giving up his own foreign weapons. At this point, his words sound quite literal. The reason why he mentions the Ryoma story is that he tries to show the story overlapping with his own policy toward the SIM-locked iPad. In this regard, he is targeting the final metaphorical scheme, BUSINESS IS WAR, right from the start (Figure 2-2-1). The BUSINESS IS JOURNEY metaphor in the middle is not necessarily required, but this JOURNEY metaphor successfully justifies the undesired situation (SIM-locking) that the audience should undergo. The significant effect of this rhetoric is; the series of war-like actions that Softbank takes (or will take) shall be justified for the sake of “revolution” (Son, 2010) in the JOURNEY.

This type of rhetorical approach that justifies negative conditions can also be found in the “war on terror” metaphors (Charteris-Black 2004, p. 39; 2005: p. 172). They are often found in the political speeches. For example, it is interesting to observe the resemblance of
metaphorical structures between the speech by Son at Softbank and the so-called “Declaration of war on terrorism” speech by George W. Bush. Bush (2001) addressed to the joint session of Congress on September 20. Here are some quotations from the speech (Bush, 2001). The sentences (2–5a; b; c) are consecutive sentences in series, so are (2–6a; b).

(2–5a) On September the 11th, enemies of freedom committed an act of war against our country.
(2–5b) Americans have known wars—but for the past 136 years, they have been wars on foreign soil, except for one Sunday in 1941. Americans have known the casualties of war—but not at the center of a great city on a peaceful morning. Americans have known surprise attacks—but never before on thousands of civilians.
(2–5c) All of this was brought upon us in a single day—and night fell on a different world, a world where freedom itself is under attack.

Bush (2001)

(2–6a) The course of this conflict is not known, yet its outcome is certain.
(2–6b) Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty, have always been at war, and we know that God is not neutral between them.

Bush (2001)

The sentence (2–5a) is a clear reflection of WAR metaphor, explicitly stating Bush’s conceptual standpoint by saying, “enemies of freedom.” In contrast to (2–5a), the following sentences in (2–5b) are rather literal, which talk about the historical facts or the reviews of American history of wars. Still, it is obvious that Bush tries to overlap the past wars with the terror attack in Manhattan. The sentence (2–5c) puts all the information together, and sets the viewpoint back to the original WAR metaphor, where “freedom itself is under attack.” This rhetorical approach is similar to the one that Son applied in his speech. Son first quoted the literal facts about Ryoma in Japanese history. In both speeches by Son (2010) and Bush (2001), literal facts are recited to justify elements that support the WAR metaphor. This conceptual metaphor governs the whole conceptual image of the body in each of their speeches.

The sentences (2–6a) and (2–6b) are another example that illustrates the similarity found between the two speeches. (2–6a) is an instance of JOURNEY metaphor, which presents the final goals: “freedom and justice for America” for Bush, while “revolution for the industry” for Son. Each goal of the JOURNEY is a forward-looking, sound argument. In other words, the goals should be ‘fair enough’ so that the speaker can defend himself from being accused of creating the painful situations—sometimes undesirable actions for somebody—that are projected by the conceptual metaphors of WAR: BUSINESS IS WAR (Son, 2010), and DEFENDING FREEDOM IS WAR (Bush, 2001).

The relationship between the WAR metaphor and the JOURNEY metaphor, found in the speeches, are illustrated in Figure 2–2–2a & 2–2–2b. The three aspects that can be inferred from the figures are as follows.

(1) Both Son (2010) and Bush (2001) point out their ‘ideal goals’ in the future, describing the DESTINATION through JOURNEY metaphors.
(2) The dominant underlying conceptual metaphor for each speech is WAR: BUSINESS IS
They attempt to justify their ‘wars’ by illustrating that they we cannot do away with anticipated WARS to complete the JOURNEY we are on.

The rhetorical transition from JOURNEY to WAR found in their speeches is necessary for persuasion. It is based on the common assumption that nobody would want war in their own daily lives. Since we do not want war, we need a good reason to justify it and commit to war-like actions in business or on terror. The rhetorical success found in the speeches of Son (2010) and Bush (2001) can be explained by the statement that “metaphor has a very important persuasive role in evoking strong emotional responses that may prioritise one interpretation of a text over another. It is this persuasive role that constitutes the ideological and rhetorical basis of metaphors” (Charteris-Black, 2004: p. 41).

Actually, in the quotation (Son, 2010), we can find the continuous, strong dominance of the underlying BUSINESS IS WAR metaphor after the sentence (2–4a) that is an instance of JOURNEY metaphor. Similarly, the concepts of WAR, found in the series of sentences in Bush (2001), are justified through the JOURNEY metaphors that emphasize the presence of an ideal and reasonable DESTINATION: the freedom and justice for all. This approach is just like the rhetorical scheme, which Son (2010) applied. Son quoted the historical and real story of Ryoma in Japan’s Edo period, while burning the successful image of industrial revolution—the DESTINATION of JOURNEY—into the audience’s consciousness. Son utilized the persuasive power of metaphors to justify his decision of SIM-locking, as if he had been Ryoma who bravely struggled against the shogunate for the Meiji Restoration.

The methods, which Son and Bush applied in their speeches of WAR, can be identified as ‘the masquerading power of metaphors.’ In other words, it can also be the cunning or crafty power of metaphors that skillfully manipulate the audience’s minds without letting the audience recognize them. This explains why Musolff (2004) claims, “Metaphor and rhetoric in general can acquire a dangerous power if they are used to entice the hearers to develop attitudinal preferences that translate into rash and violent actions, which are not in their own best interest” (p. 168). It appears to be historically and empirically true that the masquerading power of metaphors sometimes highlight a certain aspect of the issue, while downplaying another. Either in business or in politics, these rhetorical schemata in speeches can be made explicit by analyzing underlying conceptual metaphors.
2.3 When Is the ‘Weapon’ Born?

Now, let us look back at the words at WWDC 2010. Jobs (2010) employed the HUMAN metaphor (PRODUCT IS A FAMILY) when introducing the new iPhone. He said, “This is our new baby.” On the other hand, as we have seen in the previous section, Son (2010) employed the WAR metaphor (BUSINESS IS WAR) to introduce the new iPad. He figuratively mentioned that he could never give up his own weapon to the enemy in combat. The iPhone and the iPad are both high-tech gadgets newly-released from Apple in spring of 2010. Since iPhone was released as “a new baby” (Jobs, 2010), the same could also be said of the iPad. However, once it had been stocked at the retailing Softbank Mobile, it became a “weapon” (Son, 2010). It was, practically, ‘born to be a weapon.’

At what moment does the baby transform itself into a weapon? Literally speaking, neither the iPhone nor the iPad are living babies or firing weapons. They are just electronic gadgets sold at the same Softbank stores. What has changed in the process of transformation is the people’s sense of values toward the product. This sense is affected by the speaker’s words of metaphors, which changed from HUMAN to WAR, because metaphors “can be clues to how another is feeling, to what he or she views as important” (McCaskey, 1979: p. 136).

The transformation of the sense of value of the product is illustrated in Figure 2–3–1.

At the Literal Value level, the product is nothing more than a plain gadget of a default specification. When it is described by a metaphorical linguistic expression (a reflection of a certain conceptual metaphor), the concept becomes a new descriptive value for the product at the Metaphorical Value level. The product and the new value will overlap each other, and are projected into one figure at the Value-Added Projection level (Figure 2–3–1).

If the product is a phone together with a PRODUCT IS A FAMILY metaphor, the value-added product will be like the phone which is naturally and inevitably around with the owner all the time. We become happy when we play with it, or worried when we lose sight of it, or shocked when it breaks. It is ironic that this metaphorical approach has just been applied to the
advertising campaign of NTT Docomo, the biggest rival of Softbank Mobile. The campaign in spring of 2010 is entitled, “Walk With You” (NTT Docomo Inc., 2010), which is exactly a linguistic projection of the HUMAN metaphor. In TV commercials, a famous actor is playing the role of a cell-phone, literally walking beside the owner all around town.

Conversely, if the product is a phone with a WAR metaphor, especially with a PHONE IS A WEAPON metaphor, the value-added product will be the phone which is a powerful tool for an owner to complete something. We use it to win in real-time online investments, or to gain important knowledge to beat a rival, or to send and receive prompt messages to conquer a woman.

Especially in business situations, which and how many conceptual metaphors are applied at the Metaphorical Value level (Figure 2-3-1) is a most important factor. For retailers, it must be the first concern, the power that a product possesses to penetrate the market. This concern highlights the competitive aspect of the product, so the presenter should apply conceptual metaphors such as WAR, SPORTS or ADVENTURE. But as for the end-users, they do not care about wars in business. Their concern is not so much about competition. Their concern is about user-friendly utility because they use the products everyday, everywhere. Therefore, the conceptual metaphors applied in presentations and advertisements for consumers should be related to HUMAN, GAME or ART. Business speakers should be fully aware of the persuasive power of conceptual metaphors and the choice of metaphorical linguistic expressions, in order to firmly grab the consumers’ interests. It is like tuning the speaker’s conceptual metaphors to those acceptable to the audience, so that the audience may follow the conceptual path that the speaker intends.

Research about the utility of conceptual metaphors will require deeper investigations into the Added Concepts presented at the Metaphorical Value level (Figure 2-3-1), from both qualitative and quantitative approaches. In the research, a chronological quantitative approach to metaphors will also help find new discoveries to depict the roles of conceptual metaphors. The ‘Mental Distance’ analysis (Shimizu, 2010) is one methodology which enables the visualization of the roles of conceptual metaphors, applied in business presentations.

III. Summary

Conceptual metaphor is a hidden power that directs the audience’s conceptual understanding. It is sometimes difficult to recognize. It is also sometimes impossible for the audience to completely avoid the persuasive power of metaphors. They are powerful because our minds and our conceptual understanding are unconsciously manipulated and directed to a certain direction that the speaker intends. The rhetorical tricks are not always easy to uncover because to be metaphorical, or not to be metaphorical, depends on the context. Metaphorical expressions with conventional ‘dead’ metaphors could even become alive and colorful again, according to the context. This makes the metaphor identification procedure even more complex.

Several examples of the roles of metaphors were discussed in Section II. Following the previous section, the importance of context was examined to explore the roles of underlying conceptual metaphors that carry irony, humor, and other additional values. The contrastive criticism of HUMAN and WAR metaphors helped to demonstrate the structural similarities of the roles of conceptual metaphors observed in different speeches. In addition, it was revealed that
the roles of WAR and JOURNEY metaphors, applied in Son (2010) and Bush (2001), also have similar metaphorical constructions in common. Their metaphorical constructions successfully ‘masquerade’ the undesired situation for the audience, while highlighting the brilliant vision of future by employing the JOURNEY metaphors strategically.

Further research interests will be focused on how these individual conceptual metaphors actually work and collaborate together to draw desirable conceptual images in the audience’s mind. The Value-Added Projection model (Figure 2–3–1) will help illustrate the persuasive metaphorical structures in business presentations, if conducted with the ‘Mental Distance’ analysis (Shimizu, 2010). This attempt will uncover the directive roles of conceptual metaphors. Practical qualitative and quantitative approaches show us when and how a ‘baby’ grows to be a ‘weapon’ in business contexts.
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