



Universidad de Valladolid

Facultad de Filosofía y Letras

Grado en Estudios Ingleses

**"Taking the Arrow out of the Heart":
a multi-level contextual metaphor analysis
of Walker's speech**

Marina Moyano San José

Tutora: Raquel Fernández Fuertes

Departamento de Filología Inglesa

Curso 2022-2023

ABSTRACT

This dissertation is framed within Critical Discourse Analysis and applies Conceptual Metaphor Theory to analyze Alice Walker's speech "Taking the Arrow out of the Heart" on the suffering undergone by people because of racism. Three main levels of analysis have been considered (i.e., stylistic realizations, thematic classifications, and conceptual domains), and they are examined in isolation and combined. The analysis shows that Walker's discourse is articulated into three main ideas which perfectly match the three conclusions that have been obtained with the analysis of conceptual metaphors: the main topic of the speech (i.e., suffering), the purpose of the speech (i.e., the description of suffering), and the participants in this ordeal (i.e., people that have undergone suffering). Thus, the speech is articulated in such a way that it perfectly describes the suffering of people who fight against racism, in short, people that try to "take the arrow out of the heart".

KEYWORDS: Conceptual Metaphor Theory, stylistic realizations, thematic classifications, conceptual domains, suffering, racism.

RESUMEN

Este trabajo se enmarca en el Análisis Crítico del Discurso y aplica la Teoría de la Metáfora Conceptual para analizar el discurso de Alice Walker "Sacar la Flecha del Corazón" que trata sobre el sufrimiento de las personas debido al racismo. Se han considerado tres niveles de análisis (realizaciones estilísticas, clasificaciones temáticas y dominios conceptuales) que se han estudiado aisladamente y combinados. El estudio demuestra que el discurso está formulado en torno a tres ideas principales que encajan perfectamente con las tres conclusiones obtenidas tras el análisis de las metáforas conceptuales: el tema central del discurso (sufrimiento), el propósito del discurso (la descripción del sufrimiento) y los participantes de esta tragedia (personas que han experimentado el sufrimiento). Así, el discurso se ha formulado de tal manera que describe perfectamente el sufrimiento de las personas que luchan contra el racismo, es decir, las que intentan "sacar la flecha del corazón".

PALABRAS CLAVE: Teoría de la Metáfora Conceptual, realizaciones estilísticas, clasificaciones temáticas, dominios conceptuales, sufrimiento, racismo.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Theoretical framework	3
2.1. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)	3
2.2. Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT)	4
3. Methodology	9
3.1. Contextual analysis within CDA	9
3.2. Procedure and criteria to carry out the analysis on conceptual metaphors	10
3.2.1. Stylistic realization(s)	12
3.2.2. Thematic classifications	16
3.2.3. Conceptual domains	17
4. Critical Discourse Analysis of conceptual metaphors in Walker's speech	18
4.1. Contextual analysis within CDA	18
4.2. Conceptual Metaphor Theory analysis	21
4.2.1. Analysis of each level in isolation	21
4.2.1.1. Level 1. The analysis of stylistic realizations	21
4.2.1.2. Level 2. The analysis of thematic classifications	24
4.2.1.3. Level 3. The analysis of conceptual domains	25
4.2.2. Analyses across levels	27
4.2.2.1. Stylistic realizations per thematic classifications	27
4.2.2.2. Conceptual domains per thematic classifications	30
4.2.2.3. Stylistic realizations per conceptual domains	32
5. Conclusion	35
6. Bibliography	37
7. Annex	40

1. Introduction

In recent years, Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth, CDA) has been widely used as a framework of analysis given its interdisciplinary approach to the study of discourse. Not only has it been applied to offer greater insights into political, cultural, or social discourses, but also into audiovisual contents, something that is in line with the height of these hybrid contexts nowadays.

Alice Walker (1944-present) is an African American writer of novels, poems, and short stories, who is vastly known for her novel *The Color Purple* (1982). Her literary works have been extensively analyzed from a literary perspective, mostly within feminist literary theories, as the focus of her stories is placed on African American women. She is also considered the pioneer of “womanism”, a movement that can be perceived as black feminism and that advocates for black women as being doubly oppressed: for being women and for being black (Yuldashbayevna, 2021). Thus, it can be affirmed that Walker is more than a literary author, as she can be considered a feminist and anti-racist activist as well. It is in this context where her speech “Taking the Arrow out of the Heart” given in 2017 within the Stanford Storytelling Project and as part of the project “Contemplation by Design Summit” can be framed.

By concentrating on the first twenty minutes of Walker’s speech “Taking the Arrow out of the Heart” and using CDA as a framework, this undergraduate dissertation focuses on the analysis of conceptual metaphors (henceforth, CMs) under Conceptual Metaphor Theory (henceforth, CMT). Therefore, this dissertation attempts to uncover how CMT applies in Walker’s speech. Even more, by investigating CMs the analysis delves in the very configuration of Walker’s speech.

The selection of this speech as the main concern of this undergraduate dissertation lies on the fact that Walker has been predominantly regarded as a literary figure and, as such, it has been the subject of many studies. However, this is not the case when it comes to her role as an activist, something that also deserves attention as the linguistic analysis provided here will show.

This dissertation is divided into seven different sections, the first one being the introduction. Section two deals with the theoretical framework (i.e., CDA and CMT), which serves as the basis for the posterior analysis. Section three includes the methodology that has been applied to analyze Walker's speech. Section four contains both the contextual analysis of the speech and the CMT analysis. The latter is subdivided into the analysis of the three levels that are considered (i.e., stylistic realizations, thematic classifications, and conceptual domains) and that are discussed both in isolation and in combination. Section five includes the conclusions reached. Section six compiles all the bibliographical references. And finally, the annex in section seven contains the link to the YouTube video from where the speech has been extracted, together with the database that has been designed to carry out this investigation.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth, CDA) was developed during the 1980s in European Discourse Studies by several linguists such as Fairclough, Wodak, and van Dijk, among others (Blommaert and Bulcaen, 2000). According to Huckin (1997), CDA is a “highly context-sensitive, democratic approach which takes an ethical stance on social issues with the aim of improving society” (78). The fact that it is described as “context-sensitive” means that discourses, which are defined as “language use in speech and writing” (Wodak and Meyer, 2009, 5) or, more specifically, the “semiotic ways of construing aspects of the world” (Fairclough, 1995, 11), are subject to relevant contextual factors such as “cultural, political, social” ones (Huckin, 1997, 79).

According to Fairclough and Wodak (1997), CDA aims to analyze linguistic or pseudo-linguistic instances of social interaction. Thus, different aspects of society (e.g., power relations, ideologies, institutions, social identities) are some of the main focuses of CDA (Fairclough, 1995). Considering these statements, CDA approaches discourse as a “social practice” (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997, 258). As these authors state, discourse influences society and could lead to the creation of unequal social relationships (e.g., social classes, men/women relationships, majority/minority ethnic inequalities...). Thus, CDA approaches the oppressors and the oppressed sides, in the same way as other social science theories. However, the main distinctive feature between CDA and other kinds of social science theories is that CDA acts in favor of the oppressed side to claim its emancipation (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997). As Huckin (1997) states, CDA is both analytical and evaluative. In this way, it could be affirmed that CDA offers different methods to show how oppressive society is, but without focusing [CDA] on one analytical approach (Huckin, 1997). The evaluative perspective of CDA is a justification to describe this kind of discourse analysis as ‘critical’ by inspiring the marginal groups of society to rebel against the oppression they suffer (Huckin, 1997).

This can be related to the three ways in which semiosis is connected to social practices: “as a facet of action; in the construal (representation) of aspects of the world; and in the constitution of identities” (Fairclough, 1995, 11). In this way, this is directly tied to the previously discussed concept of discourse and the aims of CDA.

CDA interprets social reality as “conceptually mediated”, which means that every single social act or event has its respective representation, construal, or conceptualization (Fairclough, 1995, 9). A ‘construal’ could be defined as the “different ways of viewing a particular situation” by relating it to Cognitive Linguistics (Verhagen, 2007, 48). According to Fairclough (1995), it is necessary to explain how the world has been constructed in order to be able to change it for the better. This influenced-Marxist theory could be related to the ‘construal’ theory in the sense that being aware of the construal of the social problem under analysis is necessary in order to apply CDA to “enhance well-being and reduce suffering” (Fairclough, 1995, 10).

The construal of different social factors can sometimes be interrelated. This phenomenon is called ‘intersectionality’, which is defined as “a coming together of social issues to create a moment of social experience” (Bannerji, 2005, 114). The most frequent social issues which become interrelated are race, gender, and class, which will be the main issues to be discussed according to the Conceptual Metaphor Theory application in this dissertation.

2.2. Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT)

According to Stockwell (2019), a ‘metaphor’ is a phenomenon by which humans talk about something regarding something else. Although it has been traditionally associated with the literary field, it is now a trend in Cognitive Linguistics as well to analyze how influential metaphors are in everyday language and speaking.

In relation to socio-cognitive CDA, “Cognitive Linguistics (...) explores the relation between language, cognition, and culture. Furthermore, Cognitive Linguistics provides insights into the pervasiveness and persuasiveness of metaphor” (Hart, 2008, 3). In this way, metaphors contribute to the frame of reality and are powerful in terms of giving the

necessary argumentative tools for the speaker in order to make the audience create their perspective on the subject matter. This implies that the speaker should be an expert user of metaphors to discuss polemical topics without the danger of being legally or socially responsible (Musolff, 2012).

Relatedly, the connections between CDA and CMT are based on both being dependent on the context. However, CMT explains this idea in depth by affirming that our cognitive activities should also be considered (Kövecses, 2017). Although metaphorical reasoning in CMT is portrayed as an inevitable cognitive process, this does not mean that it is neutral or innocent (Goatly, 2007).

Furthermore, there are two theories that deal with the metaphor concept in CDA, within Cognitive Linguistics: CMT (Lakoff, 1993) and the more recent conceptual blending theory (Fauconnier and Turner, 2002). Although they are very similar in terms of how they approach the study of linguistic phenomena, the main difference between them is that CMT makes use of a unidirectional viewpoint (e.g., “the metaphorical process typically goes from the more concrete to the more abstract but not the other way around” (Kövecses, 2002, 6)), whereas blending theory allows the comparison of more than two pairs of mental constructions (Hart, 2008). On behalf of a straightforward analysis, only CMT will be taken into account in this dissertation.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980a, as cited in Kövecses, 2002, 8) affirmed that:

Metaphor is a property of concepts, and not of words; the function of metaphor is to better understand certain concepts, and not just some artistic or esthetic purpose; metaphor is often not based on similarity; metaphor is used effortlessly in everyday life by ordinary people, not just by special talented people; and metaphor, far from being a superfluous though pleasing linguistic ornament, is an inevitable process of human thought and reasoning.

Following these authors' ideas, Cognitive Linguistics would define a ‘metaphor’ as the understanding [of] one conceptual domain (A: that is typically abstract) in terms of another conceptual domain (B: that is typically concrete) (Kövecses, 2002). The standardized formula to express this relationship is “CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN (A) IS CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN (B)” (Kövecses, 2002, 4). As per Kövecses (2017, 4), CMT

distinguishes “linguistic metaphors (i.e., linguistic expressions used metaphorically), from conceptual metaphors, (i.e., certain conceptual patterns we rely on in our daily living, to think about aspects of the world)”. In view of this, the distinction between conceptual metaphors and metaphorical linguistic expressions needs to be clarified in that the latter is to be defined as all the linguistic expressions that belong to the terminological language of a concrete conceptual domain (Kövecses, 2002).

In addition, a conceptual domain is “any coherent organization of experience” (Kövecses, 2002, 4). Therefore, a coherent understanding of life is what allows us to organize our knowledge to establish correspondences between two different meaning fields. These correspondences are often known in Cognitive Linguistics as ‘mappings’ (Kövecses, 2002). Nevertheless, not everything can “be mapped from one domain to another” (Kövecses, 2017, 3).

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980b), these correspondences and the stated formula are formed by non-metaphorical and metaphorical concepts. A non-metaphorical concept comes directly from our experience, and it is defined by itself, whereas a metaphorical concept is based on the understanding of other concepts, which are usually non-metaphorical ones. On the one hand, some examples of non-metaphorical concepts in CMT are orientational (e.g., MORE IS UP (“My income rose last year”) (196)), ontological (e.g., THE MIND IS A CONTAINER (“His brain is packed with ideas”) (196)) and structural (e.g., UNDERSTANDING IS SEEING (“I see what you mean”) (197)) conceptual domains. On the other hand, the most common conceptual domains regarding metaphorical concepts are related to abstract concepts such as time and ideas (e.g., TIME IS MONEY (“How do you spend your time these days?”) (198)).

On another note, two different types of conceptual metaphors according to the grade of literary meaning involved in them can be distinguished: visible metaphors and invisible metaphors. The former can be almost understood as literary, whereas the latter demand the reader to be creative and tend to be ambiguous (Stockwell, 2019). Thus, a classification from the most visible to the most invisible stylistic realizations of conceptual metaphors can be provided, as in Table 1:

STYLISTIC REALIZATION	KEYWORDS/STRATEGIES
1. Similes and analogies	Use of “like”, “as”
2. Copula constructions	Use of the verb “to be”
3. Appositions and other parallelisms	Use of punctuation
4. Partitive and genitive structures	Use of “of” and saxon genitive
5. Premodification	Use of adjectives and adverbs
6. Compounds and lexical blends	Use of compound words
7. Grammatical metaphor	Use of personifications
8. Negation	Use of “not” and “no”

Table 1: Stylistic realization of metaphors and strategies (Stockwell, 2019, 107)

The classification in Table 1 gives way to a series of linguistic strategies which will be the ones to be followed in the present dissertation in order to provide an analysis of Walker’s speech at Stanford University “Taking the Arrow out of the Heart”. The analysis will be twofold: on the one hand, the metaphoric stylistic realizations will be analyzed according to CMT; and, on the other, a thematic classification of conceptual metaphors will also be considered.

In the case of thematic classifications and in the spirit of Walker’s speech, the following two categories will be considered: ‘suffering’ and ‘joys’. The thematic category ‘suffering’ will be analyzed as a CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN (A) connected to its correspondent CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN (B) in each metaphorical example of analysis. At the same time, this category will be subdivided into ‘suffering by racism’ and ‘suffering by male chauvinism’, which are the two main topics of the speech that could be potentially conceptualized. The second thematic category includes the conceptual metaphors related to ‘joys’ as CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN (A), which is the remaining crucial topic of the speech. Therefore, this dissertation will provide a three-way classification of conceptual metaphors: a stylistically typological one (see Table 1) and a thematic one (suffering (racism and male chauvinism) and joys) within different conceptual domains.

This three-way classification regarding CMT grounds its justification in the theoretical aspects of CDA and the already mentioned concept of ‘stance’, which could be defined

as “the lexical and grammatical expression of attitudes, feelings, judgments, or commitments concerning the propositional content of a message” (Biber and Finegan, 1989, 92). This definition can be applied to the speech under consideration in this dissertation in the sense that Alice Walker offers her point of view and judgment on how the American society and government make black, indigenous people, and women suffer. This can be extrapolated to the social presence of racism and male chauvinism. Besides, the metaphoric stylistic classification (see Table 1) provides the necessary strategies to find different metaphoric realizations. Therefore, the combination of both analyses will be rooted in CMT and CDA’s principles.

3. Methodology

The present dissertation deals with the analysis of Alice Walker's speech at the Memorial Church organized by the Stanford Storytelling Project of Stanford University as part of the project called "Contemplation by Design" in 2017 and entitled "Taking the Arrow out of the Heart". The methodological approach that precedes the analysis *per se* comprises two approaches that are presented in the subsequent sections: Firstly, a contextual analysis of the speech within CDA; and secondly, the procedure and criteria to carry out the analysis of conceptual metaphors within CMT. The former section is considered necessary in order to understand and be able to conduct the study of CM instances in the given context.

3.1.Contextual analysis within CDA

According to Fairclough (1989), and as part of the principles of CDA, there is a contextual level in discourse, which is based on the potential answers to four different questions that are useful for analytical purposes:

1. '*What's going on?*' This question is related to the content of the discourse, which can be divided into "activity, topic, purposes" (Fairclough, 1989, 147).
2. '*Who's involved?*' This question is related to the participants involved in the utterance of discourse, Walker's speech in this case.
3. '*In what relations?*' This question is related to the relationship between the participants of the speech.
4. '*What's the role of language?*' Within this question, this dissertation would be focused on the CMT analysis that has been carried out for analytical purposes.

3.2. Procedure and criteria to carry out the analysis on conceptual metaphors

Relatedly, this dissertation includes a third-way analysis of the first 20 minutes of Walker's speech with a focus on CMs. All instances of CMs were output and then codified using three different ways of classification: stylistic realization(s), thematic classifications, and conceptual metaphor domains.

Stylistic realizations are reflected in italics (i.e., *copula constructions*), whereas thematic classifications and conceptual domains are presented in small caps (i.e., RACISM, PEOPLE). This differentiation relies on stylistic realizations being a key and structural category within this analysis.

The classification was carried out in an Excel database and, together with the three-way classification, information relative to the minute (time) of the speech in which each CM instance appeared as well as the CM instance itself were included. The three-way classification rendered eight different stylistic realization(s) (Table 1 above, and Table 2 below, too), two thematic classification levels (the first one divided into SUFFERING and JOYS; and the second one, subdividing SUFFERING), and the five conceptual metaphor domains of each CM instance. This classification as well as an example of how a CM instance is classified appears in Table 2. The Excel database can be accessed at the following link: [Excel Database](#).

Category	Subcategory	CM instance
Minute	Minute: second	01:23
Example	N/A	Martin Luther King's children
Stylistic realization(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Similes and analogies</i> - <i>Copula constructions</i> - <i>Appositions and other parallelisms</i> - <i>Partitive and genitive structures</i> - <i>Premodification</i> - <i>Compounds and lexical blends</i> - <i>Grammatical metaphors</i> - <i>Negation</i> 	<i>Partitive and genitive structures</i>
Thematic classification (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SUFFERING - JOYS 	SUFFERING
Thematic classification (2) (only SUFFERING cases)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -NON-SPECIFIC (BLANK) -RACISM -MALE CHAUVINISM 	RACISM
Conceptual metaphor domains	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PEOPLE -OBJECTS -NATURE -JOURNEY -COUNTRY 	PEOPLE

Table 2: Classification sample as it appears in the Excel database

A column named 'other' was also included in case there was a need to specify some information related to the CM instance in question. Furthermore, some examples needed to be classified by omitting some oral information such as repetitions or filler words. Its graphic representation in the database corresponds to (...). Moreover, some CM instances were related to previous ones and the use of pronouns difficulted the comprehension of the CM instance. As such, a clarification between brackets ([...]) was included in the specific example under analysis.

A description of each of the categories of analysis as summarized in Table 2 above appears in the subsections below.

3.2.1. Stylistic realization(s)

First, the various conceptual stylistic realization(s) were searched according to the principles established in Table 1 (Stockwell, 2019, 107). Therefore, the eight different stylistic realization(s) that were considered were: *similes and analogies* (example 1), *copula constructions* (example 2), *appositions and other parallelisms* (example 3), *partitive and genitive structures* (example 4), *premodification* (example 5), *compounds and lexical blends* (example 6), *grammatical metaphors* (example 7), and *negation* (example 8):

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------------|
| (1) | as far away from Donald Trump as you get | (minute 4:59) |
| (2) | you are foreign to his roots | (minute 17:11) |
| (3) | maybe we have avoided it /
maybe we have escaped it | (minute 0:53) |
| (4) | Martin Luther King's children | (minute 1:23) |
| (5) | the one that more closely followed her father | (minute 1:31) |
| (6) | somebody gives him a shoebox full of the letters | (minute 7:24) |
| (7) | [Blanket] It's going to reach over there
and cover you | (minute 4:07) |
| (8) | if we don't learn to take out that arrow | (minute 6:03) |

Moreover, the different combinations that appeared throughout the speech between the eight different stylistic realizations were also taken into account for analytical purposes. In this way, the stylistic realization(s) were organized in the order they appeared in each example, as it was stated before. Thus, the stylistic realization(s)' analysis was classified from one single realization up to five different ones combined in the same CM instance.

An instance of this appears in example 9, which incorporates the following: *copula, negation, simile and analogy, premodification and compound word*:

(9) my suffering is not quite as bad as so-and-so suffering (minute 1:01)

Table 1 summarizes the criteria for the research of the different CM instances. However, an in-depth analytical methodology needs to be provided regarding the speech in question. Initially, *similes and analogies* were found by searching for “as” and “like” throughout the speech. Nonetheless, it had to be proven that there were indeed a simile and/or analogy, and a metaphorical realization in each example to include it in the database with the aim of collecting suitable data. An instance can be found in example 10 where the use of “as” establishes a correlation between life and learning:

(10) as we go along (minute 5:06)

Copula constructions were also searched throughout the speech considering all the forms of the verb ‘to be’ (present tense “am”, “are”, “is”, and its contracted forms “’m”, “’re”, “’s”; past tense “was” and “were”; infinitive “be”, past participle “been”; and continuous form “being”). Only the examples in which the verb ‘to be’ functioned as a copula were included in the data collection. An example appears in (11) with the copulative verb “to be” in its second-person singular simple present form “are”:

(11) you hardly are a tree (minute 17:21)

In the case of *appositions and other parallelisms*, as an oral utterance is being analyzed, the examples that were taken into account were those which depicted significant speech pauses (/) and allowed parallelisms to take place. These kinds of examples were the only ones that were written together with pauses marks (/) in the database, as it was considered

significant for the analysis. For instance, example 12 shows an *apposition* in which the phrase “arrow in the heart” specifies what the speaker means with the first sentence within a CM instance. The original video was helpful in finding these *appositions and parallelisms*:

- (12) They beat him every time he tried to speak
his own language /**arrow in the heart** (minute 7:03)

In addition, *partitive and genitive* structures were researched, without establishing a distinction between them, by “’s” (Saxon genitive) and “of” performances. An example of Saxon genitive within a CM instance can be found in (13):

- (13) Jayco Vera’s children (minute 1:52)

In the case of *premodification*, the tool Sketch Engine was used, which allowed to find the different adverbs and adjectives in the speech. Each of them was analyzed in context in order to find the ones that were indeed premodifiers of nouns (i.e., adjectives), premodifiers of adjectives (i.e., adverbs) and premodifiers of adverbs (i.e., other adverbs). These three premodifier forms were included in the database. A CM instance of the first case, *premodification* of a noun by an adjective, can be seen in (14):

- (14) [Military] to be peopled by our **poor** children (minute 3:10)

Sketch Engine was also useful when looking for *compound words*. The different nouns in the speech were searched and, from this output, a selection of those *compounds* used in CM was carried out involving *compounds* written together, written separately and hyphenated ones. Example 15 shows a *compound* that was used in a CM instance:

(15) suffering / people making you get off the **sidewalk** (minute 7:24)

Additionally, *grammatical metaphors* were embodied into personifications throughout the speech, which was the only category to be considered in this specific case. As it appears in (16), a personification was found by attributing the human act of “murdering” to a [-human] noun, “land”:

(16) the **land** has been **murdered along with the people** (minute 18:53)

Lastly, verbal *negation* was researched by the use of “not” attached to a verb, as well as its contracted form “n’t”. Nominal *negation*, that is the form “no” attached to nouns, was also considered. Example 17 offers a CM instance of the contracted form of verbal *negation*:

(17) you **don’t** need the blanket (minute 4:07)

When different realizations combine in a single CM instance, the combination of the different realizations was also considered and captured in the database. As a result, some CM instances were found to include up to 5 different stylistic realizations.

(18) my suffering **is not** quite **as** bad as so-and-so suffering (minute 1:01)

Example 9 repeated above as example 18 includes the copulative realization stated in the verb form “is”, *negation* manifested in the negative adverb “not”, *similes and analogies* formed by the “as...as” comparison structure, and *premodification* and *compound words* expressed together in the “so-and-so” hyphenated *compound*, which is premodifying “suffering” at the same time.

3.2.2. Thematic classifications

Once the stylistic classification is completed for each of the CM instances, the thematic classification is conducted. First, each CM instance is classified according to its relationship either to the thematic category of SUFFERING (19) or to that of JOYS (20):

- | | | |
|------|---|----------------|
| (19) | fertilizer/ that's terrible | (minute 18:58) |
| (20) | [Dennis] full of life /and full of hope/ for people | (minute 16:12) |

Whereas example 19 provides a CM based on “fertilizer” being one of the causes of suffering in the world, example 20 expresses metaphorically how Dennis Banks’ cheerful personality was.

Moreover, a secondary thematic classification is specified in the case of SUFFERING. Three different options are regarded: NON-SPECIFIC thematic area (blank space in the database, example 21), RACISM (example 22) and MALE CHAUVINISM (example 23):

- | | | |
|------|---|----------------|
| (21) | I think that suffering is the great equalizer | (minute 0:38) |
| (22) | Malcolm X's widow | (minute 3:16) |
| (23) | some of the women were not so happy | (minute 14:32) |

Example 21 is considered a NON-SPECIFIC CM instance because the speaker, at the beginning of the speech, deals with suffering in general terms without referring to any specific kind of SUFFERING. As seen in context, example 22 metaphorically conceptualizes the suffering provoked by racism through the widow of Malcolm X. In turn, example 23 expresses the uncomfortable attitude of the indigenous women when Dennis tried to repopulate his society by having children with them. This comment is made from a feminist perspective and emphasizes the suffering provoked by male chauvinism.

3.2.3. Conceptual domains

Five conceptual domains are considered in order to group the different CM instances. These domains are the following: PEOPLE (example 24), OBJECTS (example 25), NATURE (example 26), JOURNEY (example 27) and COUNTRY (example 28):

(24)	to wipe them off the face of the earth	(minute 15:00)
(25)	I'm wearing this squash-blossom necklace	(minute 6:33)
(26)	the land is mute	(minute 18:53)
(27)	I don't know what suffering is / passed me by	(minute 0:21)
(28)	this country to be such a sad place	(minute 4:21)

The specific context in which these five examples appear needs to be analyzed in order to comprehend why their metaphorical meanings are attached to each category. Regarding (24), the speaker conceptualizes the idea of suffering from racism with the representation of non-white society as sufferers of the racism of the white society that wants to destroy them. In addition, the “squash-blossom necklace” in example 25 conveys a representation of an object in a CM instance because she wears it in mourning for Dennis Banks' death. Therefore, the object can be considered the representative of a metaphor conceptualized by an object and related to suffering. Example 26 illustrates the conceptualization of a part of nature, “land”. In this example, the speaker is expressing metaphorically that the land has been made mute out of racist attitudes throughout history. On another note, example 27 provides the audience with the conceptualization of “suffering” as a journey that “passes” the speaker. Lastly, example 28 shows a CM instance that conceptualizes SUFFERING with the representation of the US becoming a very “sad” country out of racism.

The five different domain groups (PEOPLE, OBJECTS, NATURE, JOURNEY and COUNTRY) were established and shaped while the analysis was carried out with the aim of naming domains as broad as possible to include most of the CM instances in the corresponding group.

4. Critical Discourse Analysis of conceptual metaphors in Walker's speech

As it has already been stated, the analysis of the data in the present dissertation would be divided into two different sections: contextual analysis and CM analysis. The former is considered necessary to provide an accurate analysis of CM within Walker's speech in order to show the context in which CMT is presented.

4.1.Contextual analysis within CDA

The contextual analysis of Walker's speech can be summarized by answering the following four questions as per Fairclough's (1989) proposal:

1. *'What's going on?'*

In this case, the activity corresponds to a speech given by Alice Walker on 8th November 2017 at Memorial Church, Stanford University (USA). This speech is framed within Stanford University's Stanford Storytelling Project and is part of the project called "Contemplation by Design Summit".

The main purpose of the Stanford Storytelling Project is to highlight the significance of storytelling in humans' lives and how stories affect us (Themes, n.d.-b). Walker's speech at this event was called "Taking the Arrow out of the Heart". The main topics of this speech are related to how to overcome suffering provoked by different factors and how to interpret the joys of life through storytelling. Consequently, the purpose of this speech revolves around the relief of the speaker while reflecting on these topics.

2. *'Who's involved?'*

The communication under consideration involves two main participants: the speaker, Alice Walker, and the audience at Stanford Memorial Church. Although the video presents just the figure of Walker, it can be interpreted that there is an audience present due to the different sounds produced and some responses offered during the speech. Nevertheless, it cannot be assessed how many people are in the audience or their background. However, some instances occurring during the speech and some elements

within the contextual analysis can lead to some conclusions about the audience's positions and nature, as it would be developed in question 3.

As the given activity corresponds to a conference speech, Walker acts as the lecturer/speaker and the audience as the addressees. Thus, this dimension of classification derives from the type of activity under consideration. Moreover, according to Fairclough (1989, 148), "the institution ascribes social identities to the subjects who function within it". Hence, the "institution" in this case corresponds to Stanford University assigning the social identity of lecturer to the reputed literary author, Alice Walker, and of audience to the members of the Stanford community present.

3. *'In what relations?'*

According to Fairclough (1989, 148), this question must be answered in terms of "relationships of power, [and] social distance". Thus, by analyzing the speech, it can be affirmed that the audience is younger than 73-year-old Alice Walker, at that moment. Although the Stanford University community may involve a wide range of different age groups, the addressed audience seems to mainly correspond to university students. This can be supported by some of the speaker's expressions, as illustrated in (29):

(29) some of you don't know who I'm talking about because
this was before you were huh / but you know there is the Internet
/ so basically there's no excuse for not knowing your history

(minute 2:16)

As it can be interpreted from (29), most of the audience is younger than the speaker, possibly corresponding to students at Stanford University. In this way, age and experience provide Walker with the power to direct this type of statements towards the audience.

On another note, it can also be inferred from the speech that the audience involves a wide majority of white listeners. This can be interpreted from utterances such as the one presented in (30):

(30) I don't know how much you know
about reservations/ but you know/ you should know
everything about them /they're your creation

(minute 8:34)

In this utterance, Alice Walker, a black woman who is dealing with racism, explains that reservations for Native Americans were created by “the audience” itself. As a consequence, it could be affirmed that the addresses could be part of the white society that has historically made non-white society suffer from racism.

Going back to the idea of “social distance” (Fairclough, 1989, 148), it could be stated that Walker has the power and the right to raise her voice about suffering due to her life experiences, which is one of the main topics of the speech and the principle aim of the Stanford Storytelling Project. However, the audience limits itself to listening passively to what Alice Walker has to say. Therefore, and in this respect, there is a relation of power that is established during the speech.

4. *What's the role of language?*

The role and importance of language is crucial in this speech, and it resides in Walker. According to Fairclough (1989), the role of language determines both the genre (i.e., speech) and the form of utterance (i.e., oral). To go further on this question, the following CM analysis section provides an analysis of the speech in terms of how CMT is applied by Walker and the conclusions that can be reached from this analysis.

4.2. Conceptual Metaphor Theory analysis

The analysis of CMT in Walker's speech is presented in this section and it is organized as follows. First, an analysis of the three different category levels in isolation is provided: stylistic realizations, thematic classifications, and conceptual domains. Then, an analysis of CM instances across levels follows: the connections between the stylistic realizations and the two thematic classifications; the analysis of the distribution between the conceptual domains and the two thematic classifications; and the findings related to how conceptual domains and stylistic realizations are intertwined.

As in the previous sections of this undergraduate dissertation, stylistic realizations are presented in italics (i.e., *copula constructions*), whereas thematic classifications and conceptual domains appear in small caps (i.e., RACISM, PEOPLE). This distinction is based on the fact that stylistic realizations are an overarching category in the CM analysis followed here.

4.2.1. Analysis of each level in isolation

4.2.1.1. Level 1. The analysis of stylistic realizations

The analysis of stylistic realizations appears in Tables 3 to 6. Table 3 shows the total number of CM instances that constitute the corpus under study and how they are distributed across the eight stylistic realizations.

STYLISTIC REALIZATION	CM INSTANCES
Copula constructions	28 (22.22%)
Premodification	22 (17.46%)
Partitive and genitive structures	17 (13.49%)
Appositions and other parallelisms	16 (12.7%)
Similes and analogies	12 (9.52%)
Negation	12 (9.52%)
Compounds and lexical blends	10 (7.94%)
Grammatical metaphors	9 (7.14%)
Total	126 (100%)

Table 3: CM instances per stylistic realization

On the one hand, *copulas* (22.22%) are the most common realizations within the speech. They are grammatically responsible for the formation of descriptive structures, rather than action-patient narrative patterns which are rather favored by transitive verbs. Hence, this can be linked to the speech's objective which is already reflected in the very title "Taking the Arrow out of the Heart": Walker's attention is placed on the description of suffering and how to manage it rather than on narrating a story.

On the other hand, *grammatical metaphors* (7.14%) are the least common realizations, as the speech is focused on dealing with people's suffering in the most straightforward way possible. Furthermore, objects, which are the ones subject to personification, are placed in the background, people being in the spotlight, as will be discussed later in Table 10.

The 126 instances reflected in Table 3 are not equally distributed across Walker's speech. That is, there are cases in which there is one stylistic realization per sentence, but other cases in which there is more than one in the same sentence. This is what Table 4 captures. It distinguishes between CM instances that include one stylistic realization and CM instances that integrate more than one. As such, this deals with the degree of complexity underlying CMs in Walker's speech in that more than half of the cases correspond to CM instances in which different stylistic realizations are simultaneously used.

NUMBER OF STYLISTIC REALIZATIONS PER INSTANCE	CM INSTANCES	CM COMBINED INSTANCES
1	30 (43.48%)	--
2	26 (37.68%)	26 (66.67%)
3	9 (13.04%)	9 (23.08%)
4	3 (4.35%)	3 (7.69%)
5	1 (1.45%)	1 (2.56%)
Total	69 (100%)	39 (100%)

Table 4: Number of stylistic realizations per CM instance: combined versus non-combined

In fact, regarding the CM instances column, the total amount of non-combined CM instances (43.48%) proves to be lower compared to that of combined ones (56.52%). Therefore, combinations of stylistic realizations are favored over stylistic realizations present in isolation in CM instances. Consequently, the prominence of combinations is an indicator of the high degree of complexity of the argumentation in the speech.

In the case of stylistic realizations which are combined in the same CM instance, the highest percentage corresponds to two-combined CM instances (66.67%), whereas the rest of the possible combinations (three, four, and five) amount to one-third of the total (33.33%).

On another note, Table 5 below shows the breakdown of the data in terms of the stylistic realizations used in combined (96) and non-combined (30) CM instances.

STYLISTIC REALIZATION	COMBINED	NON-COMBINED
Copula constructions	24 (25%)	4 (13.33%)
Premodification	17 (17.71%)	5 (16.67%)
Partitive and genitive structures	11 (11.46%)	6 (20%)
Similes and analogies	10 (10.42%)	2 (6.67%)
Negation	10 (10.42%)	2 (6.67%)
Appositions and other parallelisms	9 (9.38%)	7 (23.33%)
Compounds and lexical blends	8 (8.33%)	2 (6.67%)
Grammatical metaphors	7 (7.29%)	2 (6.67%)
Total	96 (100%)	30 (100%)

Table 5: CM combined and non-combined instances per stylistic realization

Whereas combined CM instances favor *copula constructions* (25%), non-combined CM instances favor *appositions and other parallelisms* (23.33%). Therefore, combined CM instances are the ones responsible for the overall pattern seen in Table 3 above.

As it can be inferred from Table 5, *copulas* are prone to be combined as well as *premodification* (see also Table 3), something that could be linked to their being common grammatical structures in general speech, as well as to their mainly descriptive role.

In the case of non-combined instances, the lowest rate is equally given to *similes and analogies, compounds and lexical blends, grammatical metaphors, and negation* (6.67%). In addition, combined ones' lowest values coincide in belonging to *compounds and lexical blends* (8.33%), *grammatical metaphors* (7.29%), and *negation* (10.42%).

As stated above, *appositions and other parallelisms* are the most common stylistic realization in non-combined instances (23.33%). Nevertheless, they receive one of the lowest values in combined ones (9.38%). Therefore, they tend to be used in isolation rather than combined with other stylistic realizations. This could be attributed to the complexity that *appositions and other parallelisms* already involve, as in (31):

- (31) You're supposed to have all kinds of things (...)
bellowing/ and mooing /and lowing /and crashing about
(minute 17:45)

In (31) the succession of four *-ing* verbal forms creates a clear *parallelism* that makes the sentence length increase considerably. Moreover, due to intonation, rhythm and pauses, this structure creates an *apposition*. The effect is already strong enough and, therefore, no other stylistic realization is used in this sentence.

4.2.1.2. Level 2. The analysis of thematic classifications

Thematic classifications have been analyzed under Table 6. In this case, the unit of analysis has been the sentence. Therefore, as opposed to the stylistic realization analysis where the total number of occurrences was 126 (including both combined and non-

combined CM instances), the total number of CM instances, in this case, is 69. This coincides with the total number of CM instances already seen in Table 4.

THEMATIC CLASSIFICATIONS		SUBTOTALS		TOTALS	
Suffering	Racism	46	(79.31%)	58	(100%)
	Non-specific	11	(18.97%)		
	Male chauvinism	1	(1.72%)		
Joy		11	(15.94%)	--	11 (15.94%)
Total		--			69 (100%)

Table 6: CM instances per thematic classifications

Regarding CMT and as seen in Table 6, SUFFERING instances (84.06%) are far more common than JOY instances (15.94%). Relatedly, the main topic of the speech has proven to be SUFFERING. This can be linked to the title of Walker’s speech (i.e., “Taking the Arrow out of the Heart”) which points directly to a SUFFERING situation.

Within SUFFERING, RACISM (79.31%) is favored over the two other categories. Hence, it can be argued that RACISM is Walker’s main concern regarding SUFFERING and CMs reflect this in the speech. Although Walker is known for being a feminist activist, apart from being against racism as a literary author, not so much importance is given to MALE CHAUVINISM in this case (1.72%).

4.2.1.3. Level 3. The analysis of conceptual domains

Table 7 shows the five different conceptual domains that have been considered under the CMT analysis. Related to thematic classifications, the same unit of analysis is used: the sentence. Thus, 69 is the total of number of instances that have been found (see also Tables 4 and 6).

CONCEPTUAL DOMAINS	CM INSTANCES
People	22 (31.88%)
Objects	17 (24.64%)
Nature	16 (23.19%)
Journey	9 (13.04%)
Country	5 (7.25%)
Total	69 (100%)

Table 7: CM instances per conceptual domains

Given that the focus in the speech is set on suffering (see Table 6), it is not surprising that PEOPLE is the most common conceptual domain found in the speech. Together with PEOPLE, OBJECTS, and NATURE are the conceptual domains that receive more attention in terms of CMs within the speech, the three amounting to almost 80% of the data (79.71%). As for the conceptualization of PEOPLE (31.88%), it could be argued that the center is placed on them as either the cause of suffering or as receivers of suffering (32), whereas OBJECTS (24.64%; example 33) and NATURE (23.19%; example 34) help conceptualize that suffering.

- (32) What happens to these children / their fathers / their mothers (minute 2:05)
- (33) It's like (...) just this blanket (minute 3:51)
- (34) This landscape (...) is not supposed to be this quiet (minute 17:38)

In (32), the focus is placed on the fact that, when people suffer from racism, suffering is also passed on their relatives. Moreover, (33) conceptualizes a “blanket” as an emblematic object regarding the need for advocating suffering. The example in (34) shows how nature, reflected on “the landscape”, has become lifeless due to suffering.

4.2.2. Analyses across levels

Within this section, the three levels that have been presented in isolation above are going to be regarded by analyzing all the possible combinations and interrelations between them. Therefore, in Tables 8 to 12, stylistic realizations, thematic classifications, and conceptual domains have been analytically combined.

4.2.2.1. Stylistic realizations per thematic classifications

The first analysis comparing across levels affects stylistic realizations (Table 3 above) and thematic classifications (Table 6 above). The distribution of stylistic realizations across the two thematic classifications appears in Table 8 below:

STYLISTIC REALIZATION	SUFFERING	JOY
Copula constructions	24 (22.43%)	4 (21.05%)
Premodification	17 (15.89%)	5 (26.32%)
Partitive and genitive structures	15 (14.02%)	2 (10.53%)
Appositions and other parallelisms	14 (13.08%)	2 (10.53%)
Negation	11 (10.28%)	1 (5.26%)
Similes and analogies	10 (9.35%)	2 (10.53%)
Compounds and lexical blends	9 (8.41%)	1 (5.26%)
Grammatical metaphors	7 (6.54%)	2 (10.53%)
Total	107 (100%)	19 (100%)

Table 8: Thematic classifications per stylistic realization

As it was seen in Tables 3 and 5, *copula constructions* and *premodification* are the two most common realizations in Walker's speech, mostly in combined instances.

In relation to this, Table 8 shows that the distribution of stylistic realizations in the case of SUFFERING could be subdivided into three different categories. First, *copula constructions* are the most common realization (22.43%). Then, *premodification*

(15.89%), *partitive and genitive structures* (14.02%), and *appositions and other parallelisms* (13.08%) stand on a second level of commonality. Thirdly, *negation* (10.28%), *smiles and analogies* (9.35%), *compounds and lexical blends* (8.41%), and *grammatical metaphors* (6.54%) are the least common realizations. Therefore, the overall pattern seen in Tables 3 and 5 is kept in the case of SUFFERING.

The same distribution of stylistic realizations appears in the case of JOY, with *premodification* (26.32%) and *copulas* (21.05%) being the most used ones, placing *partitive and genitive*, *appositions and other parallelisms*, *similes and analogies* and *grammatical metaphors* (10.53% each) on a second level, and *negation* and *compounds* being the least used ones (5.26% each). Therefore, the overall pattern seen in Tables 3 and 5 is also kept in the case of JOY.

It is interesting to comment on the case of *negation*, which is far more prominent in SUFFERING than in JOY. *Negation* matches the main topic being addressed (i.e., suffering). Therefore, *negation* is used as a stylistic realization twice as much when suffering, a negative feeling, is being targeted.

The second analysis comparing across levels affects stylistic realizations (Table 3 above) and the three thematic domains comprised in SUFFERING (Table 6 above). The distribution of stylistic realizations across the three thematic subclassifications appears in Table 9 below:

STYLISTIC REALIZATION	SUFFERING					
	RACISM		NON-SPECIFIC		MALE CHAUVINISM	
Copula constructions	14	(18.67%)	9	(32.14%)	1	(25%)
Partitive and genitive structures	13	(17.33%)	1	(3.57%)	1	(25%)
Premodification	12	(16%)	4	(14.29%)	1	(25%)
Appositions and other parallelisms	11	(14.67%)	3	(10.71%)	0	(0%)
Similes and analogies	8	(10.67%)	2	(7.14%)	0	(0%)
Negation	7	(9.33%)	3	(10.71%)	1	(25%)
Compounds and lexical blends	6	(8%)	3	(10.71%)	0	(0%)
Grammatical metaphors	4	(5.33%)	3	(10.71%)	0	(0%)
Total	75	(100%)	28	(100%)	4	(100%)

Table 9: Suffering Thematic Classification per stylistic realization

Copula constructions are the most common structures within the categories RACISM and NON-SPECIFIC, the ones which provide more CM instances. Thus, this coincides with the general pattern found, both in the case of SUFFERING (Table 8) and when considering all the CM instances (Table 5). Moreover, *premodification* is also prominent in the discourse, for the three SUFFERING subthemes.

Regarding RACISM, apart from *copula constructions* (18.67%) and *premodification* (16%) being two of the most common realizations, *partitive and genitive structures* (17.33%) together with *appositions and other parallelisms* (14.67%) are also common categories (as seen in Table 3, too).

Thus, *copulas* offer a describing pattern that allows the speaker to express the suffering undergone by non-white people, as seen in (35). Besides, *premodification* helps to make the speech more informative and to make it acquire a deeper meaning regarding RACISM (36). In addition, *partitive and genitive structures* help to weave the net of people suffering from RACISM who are both non-white people and their relatives, as seen in (37). *Appositions* (38) are also related to the oral dimension of the speech as it helps build rapport with the audience, too.

- | | | |
|------|--|---------------|
| (35) | Whether you're white / black / brown whatever | (minute 7:55) |
| (36) | [Military] To be peopled by our poor children | (minute 7:48) |
| (37) | Malcolm X's widow | (minute 3:16) |
| (38) | What happens to these children / their fathers / their mothers | (minute 2:05) |

On another note, the NON-SPECIFIC category counts with *copulas* (32.14%) and *premodification* (14.29%) as the most prominent stylistic realizations, following the descriptive and narrative pattern. However, *partitive and genitive structures* (3.57%) receive the lowest value in this case, contrary to RACISM.

In the case of MALE CHAUVINISM, no actual pattern can be detected given the low number of occurrences in this case. The only instance of this category also favors *copula* and *premodification* (25% each). The same number of instances are found within *partitive*

and genitive structures together with negation, (25%). These data lead us to affirm that the four instances belong to the most common stylistic realizations in SUFFERING, as it was shown in Table 9, except for *negation*.

4.2.2.2. Conceptual domains per thematic classifications

Under this subsection, the first analysis would be focused on comparing conceptual domains (Table 7 above) and thematic classifications (Table 6 above). The distribution of conceptual domains across the two thematic classifications appears in Table 10 below:

CONCEPTUAL DOMAINS	SUFFERING	JOY
People	19 (32.76%)	3 (27.27%)
Objects	15 (25.86%)	2 (18.18%)
Nature	10 (17.24%)	6 (54.55%)
Journey	9 (15.52%)	0 (0%)
Country	5 (8.62%)	0 (0%)
Total	58 (100%)	11 (100%)

Table 10: Thematic classifications per conceptual domains

Table 10 shows how in the expression of SUFFERING there is a preference towards the conceptual domains of PEOPLE (39) and OBJECTS (40). Both comprise 58.62% of the data and, therefore, amount to more than half of SUFFERING instances. Whereas (39) provides a CM instance in relation to the suffering undergone by the relatives of non-white people assassinated due to racist reasons, (40) presents an “arrow” as a conceptualized object for the expression of suffering.

- (39) We don't pay more attention to the children
of those who have been assassinated (minute 1:58)

(40) Every time he tried to speak his own language //arrow in the heart

(minute 7:08)

Again, JOURNEY (15.52%) and COUNTRY (8.62%) receive a less prominent percentage, as also seen in the overall approach (Table 7). What is more, JOURNEY and COUNTRY are two domains that are not present in JOY.

JOY favors NATURE over the other categories (54.55%). So, it could be said that JOY is associated with NATURE in some parts of the speech. However, given the scarcity of data on this theme, no actual pattern can be determined.

The second analysis comparing across levels comprises conceptual domains (Table 7 above) and the three thematic subclassifications within SUFFERING (Table 6 above). The distribution of conceptual domains across the three thematic classifications appears in Table 11 below:

CONCEPTUAL DOMAINS	SUFFERING					
	RACISM		NON-SPECIFIC		MALE CHAUVINISM	
People	16	(34.78%)	2	(18.18%)	1	(100%)
Objects	13	(28.26%)	2	(18.18%)	0	(0%)
Nature	6	(13.04%)	4	(36.36%)	0	(0%)
Journey	6	(13.04%)	3	(27.27%)	0	(0%)
Country	5	(10.87%)	0	(0%)	0	(0%)
Total	46	(100%)	11	(100%)	1	(100%)

Table 11: Suffering Thematic classification per conceptual domains

When it comes to RACISM, PEOPLE (34.78%) and OBJECTS (28.26%) are the most favored domains, amounting to more than half of the CM instances (63.04%). The reason why this might happen could be that RACISM is directly related to people as the ones who suffer from it. Moreover, NATURE and JOURNEY are equally represented within RACISM (13.04%

each). COUNTRY is related only to RACISM, but not to the other two SUFFERING categories. It is the least prominent (10.87%), in fact.

The NON-SPECIFIC SUFFERING domain favors NATURE (27.27%), as it also happens in the case of JOY in Table 10. In RACISM, NATURE is favored, so it can be affirmed that there is an established pattern here. PEOPLE and OBJECTS in this case are least prominent (18.18% each), similar to JOURNEY.

Regarding MALE CHAUVINISM, its sole instance is related to PEOPLE (100%), as people are the ones who suffer from it. This, however, is not the target theme in Walker’s speech.

4.2.2.3. Stylistic realizations per conceptual domains

This section contains the analysis and comparison of conceptual domains (Table 7 above) and stylistic realizations (Table 3 above). The distribution of the eight different stylistic realizations across conceptual domains appears in Table 12 below. In this case, the categories receiving the highest rates have been highlighted and will be commented on next.

STYLISTIC REALIZATION	PEOPLE	NATURE	OBJECTS	JOURNEY	COUNTRY
Premodification	8 (19.05%)	4 (12.9%)	6 (23.08%)	2 (13.33%)	2 (16.67%)
Partitive and genitive structures	8 (19.05%)	3 (9.68%)	2 (7.69%)	3 (20%)	1 (8.33%)
Similes and analogies	8 (19.05%)	1 (3.23%)	1 (3.85%)	1 (6.67%)	1 (8.33%)
Copula constructions	6 (14.29%)	11 (35.48%)	5 (19.23%)	1 (6.67%)	5 (41.67%)
Negation	5 (11.9%)	1 (3.23%)	3 (11.54%)	2 (13.33%)	1 (8.33%)
Appositions and other parallelisms	4 (9.52%)	1 (3.23%)	5 (19.23%)	5 (33.33%)	1 (8.33%)
Compounds and lexical blends	3 (7.14%)	3 (9.68%)	3 (11.54%)	1 (6.67%)	0 (0%)
Grammatical metaphors	0 (0%)	7 (22.58%)	1 (3.85%)	0 (0%)	1 (8.33%)
Total	42 (100%)	31 (100%)	26 (100%)	15 (100%)	12 (100%)

Table 12: Conceptual domains per stylistic realizations

- (45) They never even bothered to give to him/arrow in the heart (minute 7:30)
- (46) Suffering/ people making you get off the sidewalk (minute 5:15)

Additionally, *similes and analogies* favor the domain PEOPLE, whereas *grammatical metaphors* favor the domain NATURE. In this last case, this could be linked to the use of personifications. These two stylistic realizations seem to be the least common and, in fact, they are only preferred in one conceptual domain, NATURE.

5. Conclusion

The main purpose of this undergraduate dissertation has been to provide an analysis of stylistic realizations, thematic classifications, and conceptual domains based on CMT in Walker's speech. The speech is entitled "Taking the Arrow out of the Heart" and it was given within Stanford Storytelling Project and as part of the "Contemplation by Design Summit". To achieve this aim, CMT has been previously and necessarily regarded as pair Fairclough's (1989) contextual analysis within CDA.

The theoretical framework of CMT served as the basis for the selection of stylistic realizations under Stockwell's (2019) theory. Thematic classifications and conceptual domains have been extracted while carrying out the linguistic analysis per se by grouping CM instances into the different categories. Although it was not the main concern of the analysis, visual elements in the official video have also been useful to provide a complete review of the speech regarding CMT. Therefore, and once the contextual analysis has been carried out, the focus of the CM analysis has been concerned with the findings of different patterns when the three levels (i.e., stylistic realizations, thematic classifications, and conceptual domains) were considered both in isolation and in combination.

Walker's discourse has been articulated into three main ideas which perfectly match the three main conclusions that have been obtained with the CM analysis. The first is concerned with the main topic of the discourse: suffering. The second refers to the purpose of the discourse on suffering: the description of this feeling. And the third refers to the participants that are being focused: people that have undergone suffering.

With respect to the topic of Walker's discourse (i.e., suffering), the CM analysis and, in particular, the analysis of thematic classifications has demonstrated that indeed SUFFERING (84.06%) is favored over JOY (15.94%). More specifically, when it comes to the different categories within SUFFERING, the speaker has clearly set the spotlight on RACISM (79.31%) rather than on NON-SPECIFIC (18.97%) or on MALE CHAUVINISM (1.72%).

With respect to the purpose of Walker's discourse (i.e., description of suffering), the CM analysis has shown a preference for a descriptive pattern rather than for an action-patient pattern. This is seen in the analysis of stylistic realizations in the prominence of *copula constructions* (22.22%) and *premodification* (17.46%) which are main resources to provide a description, that is, to provide details on the main topic of the discourse, the other six realizations ranging from 13.49% to 7.14%. When stylistic realizations are analyzed in combination with thematic classifications, the use of *copula constructions* (22.43%) and *premodification* (15.89%) is favored in SUFFERING, the other six realizations ranging from 14.02% to 6.54%. This, in fact, reflects that Walker's main aim is to describe suffering.

When it comes to the participants that are being focused on Walker's discourse (i.e., the people that have undergone suffering), the CM analysis has, in fact, pointed to PEOPLE (31.88%) as the most common conceptual domain, the other four domains ranging from 24.64% to 7.25%. When conceptual domains are analyzed in combination with other levels (i.e., thematic classifications and stylistic realizations), the overall pattern of Walker's discourse emerges: the description of people's suffering, especially suffering due to racism. This affirmation can be directly linked to the different levels considered in the combined CM analysis: the speech reflects and describes (i.e., *copula constructions*) how painful (i.e., SUFFERING) racism (i.e., RACISM) can result for those who suffer from it (i.e., PEOPLE).

To conclude, it can be assumed that there is a clear concern in Walker's speech: to describe how people suffer from racism and the consequences that this suffering brings to them. In this way, CM analysis as performed within CDA has been used to investigate how these topics are intertwined in the speech and how, in fact, the speech has been constructed to fit the purpose for which it was created: "taking the arrow out of the heart". This has been proven to be so given the CM analysis provided here where a consistent pattern emerges both when analyzing levels in isolation and when comparing across them.

6. Bibliography

- Bannerji, H. (2005). Building from Marx: Reflections on Class and Race. *Social Justice*, 32(4 (102)), 144–160. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29768341>
- Biber, D., and Finegan, E. (1989). Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. *Text-interdisciplinary journal for the study of discourse*, 9(1), 93-124.
- Blommaert, J., and Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical Discourse Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 29, 447–466. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/223428>
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical Discourse Analysis. In Gee, J. P., and Handford, M. (Eds.). *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis* (p. 9-20). Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. and Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In T.A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction* (1st ed., Vol.2, pp. 258–284). Sage.
- Fauconnier, G. and Turner, M. (2002). *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. Basic Books.
- Goatly, A. (2007). *Washing the Brain- Metaphor and Hidden Ideology*. (Vol.23). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Hart, C. (2008). Critical discourse analysis and metaphor: toward a theoretical framework. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 5(2), 91-106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405900801990058>
- Huckin, T. N. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. Miller (Ed.), *Functional approaches to written text: Classroom applications* (417 422 ed., pp. 78-92). United States Information Agency. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED417422.pdf#page=87>

Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Z. (2017). Conceptual metaphor theory. In E. Semino and Z. Demjén (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Metaphor*. Routledge.

Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.). *Metaphor and thought (2nd edition)* (p. 202-251). Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980a). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., and Johnson, M. (1980b). The metaphorical structure of the human conceptual system. *Cognitive science*, 4 (2), 195-208.

Musolff, A. (2012). The study of metaphor as part of critical discourse analysis. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 9 (3), 301-310. DOI: [10.1080/17405904.2012.688300](https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2012.688300)

Stockwell, P. (2019). *Cognitive poetics: An introduction*. Routledge.

Themes, W. (s. f.). *Alice Walker | Search Results | Stanford Storytelling Project*. <https://storytelling.stanford.edu/?s=Alice+Walker>

Themes, W. (n.d.-b). *Stanford Storytelling Project*. <https://storytelling.stanford.edu/>

Verhagen, A. (2007). Construal and perspectivisation. In C. H. Geeraerts D. (Ed.), *Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 48-81). Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/14063>

Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (2009). *Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory, and Methodology 1*. Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.

Yuldashbayevna, N. J. (2021). Alice walker's biography and creative work in American literature. *European Scholar Journal (ESJ)*, 2 (4), 315-317.

7. Annex

Link to the YouTube video of Walker's speech

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qMQie82m204>

Link to Excel Database

[TFG Excel Database Marina Moyano](#)