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ABSTRACT

The present study explores the metaphorical representations of the Khilafah (Caliphate) as conceptualized by the U.K. Muslim Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir (Liberation Party) in their collectively authored book "The Method to Re-establish the Khilafah and Resume the Islamic Way of Life" (2000), which targets an audience of Muslims in Britain and the Western world as a whole. The study follows Charteris-Black's (2004) theoretical framework of Critical Metaphor Analysis. The framework methodologically combines Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) and the critical explanatory strand drawn from Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA); it operates at two complementary stages of analysis: (1) at the micro-analysis stage, the metaphorical linguistic expressions associated with the search term "Khilafah" in the data have been identified, then the conceptual metaphors underlying these linguistic expressions have been interpreted; (2) at the macro-analysis stage, the broad socio-historical context of the Khilafah conceptual metaphors, drawn upon by the discourse participants at stake, has been explained. Besides offering some implications, the study has reached the following main finding: The discourse participants of Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir have metaphorically conceptualized the target domain THE KHLFAFAH in terms of the following concrete source domains: STRATEGIC PLANNING, BUILDING, RELIC, INTERRUPTED ACTIVITY, and WAR TARGET. These source domains were demonstrated to highlight and hide certain conceptual mappings of the target, THE KHLFAFAH, in a way that has ideologically shaped the discourse participants' worldview of the prospective Khilafah State in the Western World.
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1. Introduction

Aristotle's conceptualization of metaphor (cited in Ross, 1952, p. 1457b) as the mere process of "giving the thing a name that belongs to something else" is known as the comparison view of metaphor. Such an Aristotelian view of metaphor has been criticized for being "the rather superficial one [view] of enhancing stylistic elegance though linguistic ornamentation" (Charteris-Black, 2004, p. 25). Obviously, then, Aristotle's metaphor seems to operate strictly at a word, rather than concept, level in a way that is focused on word-for-word replacement in discourse. It was I. A. Richards' (1936) seminal work The Philosophy of Rhetoric that laid the conceptual foundations of metaphor with the proclamation that the metaphorical expression in language could best be described as "modes of interaction between co-present thoughts" (Richards, 1936, p. 90).
The Guided by Richards’ ideas, the academic study of metaphor began to take an insightfully cognitive turn with the two consecutive publications of Ortony (1979/1993) and Lakoff and Johnson (1980), especially with the latter introducing the notion of conceptual metaphor.

Unlike Aristotle’s lexically oriented view of metaphor, Conceptual Metaphor Theory (henceforth CMT) postulates that metaphor is essentially cognitive: “The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 5, italics in original). This, according to Lakoff and Johnson, should distinguish “conceptual metaphors,” as cognitively based in the mind of speakers and writers, from “metaphorical expressions,” as linguistically instantiated out of these conceptual metaphors. The two authors (1980, p. 4) have given a classic example that illustrates such a distinction, where the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR is reflected in everyday language use through the expressions “Your claims are indefensible,” “He attacked every weak point in my argument,” “His criticisms were right on target,” and so forth.

CMT is based on the experientialist philosophy that meaning is essentially construed via “embodiment”; that is, “in terms of our collective biological capacities and our physical and social experiences as beings functioning in our environment” (Lakoff, 1987, p. 267). This experiential basis can be demonstrated in the CMT approach towards metaphorical meanings as being potentially captured in the so-called conceptual domains of human experience. The notion of a domain has been meticulously elaborated in cognitive grammar: “A context for the characterization of a semantic unit is referred to as a domain. Domains are necessarily cognitive entities: mental experiences, representational spaces, concepts, or conceptual complexes” (Langacker, 1987, p. 147).

Crucially, Langacker (1987) continues to differentiate between “basic” and “abstract” domains by way of illustration, where “the basic domain of three-dimensional space gives rise to the shape specification of [BODY], which then constitutes an abstract domain for the characterization of [ARM] (and [ARM] for [HAND], [HAND] for [FINGER], and so forth.)” (p. 150). This illustration may take us back to the earlier ARGUMENT IS WAR conceptual metaphor introduced by Lakoff and Johnson (1980, p. 59, italics in original), whose analysis is based on the typical conceptualization of “the nonphysical [in this example, the domain of ARGUMENT] in terms of the physical [the domain of WAR] – that is, we conceptualize the less clearly delineated in terms of the more clearly delineated.” As such, conceptual metaphors would typically involve two domains of experience: one is abstract in nature, and is technically labelled “target domain” (e.g., ARGUMENT); the other is the less abstract “source domain” (e.g., WAR). Subtly holding between the two conceptual domains is a set of conceptual correspondences, technically termed “mappings” (Lakoff, 1987, 1993, 1994), whereby metaphorical meanings can be established.

Although, as is shortly surveyed, there has been a growing body of literature on the application of CMT to various types of discourse, the model of conceptual metaphor has not yet been applied to discourses of the conceptually complex nature, i.e., those discourses that cut across different domains. Here, I use the term “domain” as derived from Bloor and Bloor (2007): “a socially recognized context within which the discourse takes place. If we talk of scientific discourse, ‘science’ is the domain” (p. 8). In the present context of research, the theoretical model of conceptual metaphor – albeit augmented with the complementary aspect of context-based explanation – is applied to a special type of discourse; that is, the discourse of the Khilafah (Calipheathe), which falls into the two distinct domains of religion (specifically Islam) and politics. Thus, it can be said that in the Khilafah discourse, both domains of religion and politics are expected to overlap in many complex ways (for a full critical metaphor analysis of the Khilafah concept, see Section 5).

At this point, it is worth mentioning that the Arabic-transliteration term of the Khilafah, which has the standard English translation “caliphate,” is typically Islamic; it has such a long socio-political history over the centuries, starting from the death of the Muslims’ Prophet Muhammad (632 AD) and the appointment of Abu Bakr as the first of the so-called “four rightly-guided” caliphs (632-634 AD) till the end of the Khilafah rule with the Ottoman decline which “continued from the seventeenth to the early twentieth century and culminated in the abolition of the caliphate in 1924” (Adam, Ab Rahman, & Ali, 2014, p. 1256).

The present context of research targets the key term of the Islamic Khilafah as being discursively conceptualized by a particular institutional agency; that is, the U.K. Liberation Party (Hizb ut-Tahrir), whose members ideologically advocate the return of the Khilafah, not just as a concept in the Islamic public mind but as actual Practice in the political reality lived through by world Muslims (for more contextual information on Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir, see Subsection 5.2). This politico-religious vision has been comprehensively defined and stoutly defended in their collectively authored book The Method to Re-establish the Khilafah and Resume the Islamic Way of Life (2000). Here, I claim, this book can be a rich source for metaphorical analysis in case one attempts to uncover the religious and political conceptual systems of Hizb ut-Tahrir Members. However, since the concept of the Khilafah itself is enmeshed in a highly complex web of histories and societies over the centuries, there needs to be a macro-contextual form of analysis, alongside the micro-textual analysis of metaphor, of the research data. This explains why a critical perspective towards the conceptual-metaphor analysis of the Khilafah discourse may be warranted in the present context of research. An extremely useful model that offers such a critical dimension to discourse analysis, in general, is Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA).
As Kress (1990) argues, CDA has “the larger political aim of putting the forms of texts, the processes of production of texts, and the process of reading, together with the structures of power that have given rise to them, into crisis” (Kress, 1990, p. 85). This may be even clearer in the research agenda of CDA, among whose basic tenets are the following: (1) “Discourse does ideological work”; (2) “Discourse is historical”; (3) “Discourse analysis is interpretive and explanatory” (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, pp. 275-279). Here, it should be noted that I am being selective of these three tenets as they are relevant to the Khilafah discourse, which is highly ideological and historical. Hence, it necessitates a systematically interpretive and explanatory analysis. Thus, a critical explanatory perspective can readily contribute to the metaphorical analysis of the concept of the Khilafah in a way that explains the wide socio-historical context of the concept itself (see Section 5).

It follows, then, that the present study seeks to answer the following research question: What is the metaphorical representation of the concept of the Khilafah in the text of Hizb ut-Tahrir Members? Being complex in nature, the foregoing question can be divided into a set of related sub-questions: (a) What is/are the dominant conceptual metaphor(s) underlying the concept of the Khilafah in the textual production of Hizb ut-Tahrir Members? (b) What kinds of conceptual mapping are involved in the metaphorical representations of the Khilafah? (c) How can such metaphorical representations be explained in the socio-historical context of the Islamic Khilafah?

In what follows, I outline the overall structure of the present paper. Section 2 recounts some of the significant studies that have utilized the CMT in analyzing different types of discourse. Section 3 presents the model of Critical Metaphor Analysis that is used as a theoretical framework in the present study. Section 4 offers the research methodology, and it has two subsections: Subsection 4.1 describes the data used for analysis; Subsection 4.2 sets out the two-stage procedure followed in the data analysis. Thereafter comes the data analysis in Section 5; it has two further subsections (5.1 and 5.2) that, respectively, demonstrate the micro stage of identifying, describing and interpreting the Khilafah conceptual metaphors as well as the macro stage of explaining the socio-historical context surrounding these metaphors. The last section (Section 6) is a conclusion that presents the final findings and implications coming out of the critical metaphor analysis of the Khilafah in the text produced by Hizb ut-Tahrir Members.

2. Literature Review

The research done on conceptual metaphor in different types of discourse abounds. Lakoff (1991) launched a pioneering study on how the metaphor system has been used in justifying the war in the Gulf; for instance, the “State-as-Person system” has transformed states into persons with certain dispositions; that is, being “peaceful,” “aggressive,” “responsible irresponsible,” etc. Chilton and Ilyin (1993, p. 27) examined the role of the metaphor of “the common European house” in the discourse of the Russian, German, and French utterances publicly made by political leaders; the authors demonstrated how metaphors were “processed in accordance with local languages, local discourse formations and local political interests.” Chilton and Lakoff (1995) applied the theory of conceptual metaphor to the area of foreign policy; more specifically, they investigated the role of metaphors in understanding the nature of politics and making foreign policies. Further, Chilton (1996) critically tackled security metaphors in Cold-War discourse and their role in the conduct of international relations in this time period: “This is especially the case for the conceptualization of abstract, unfamiliar, or complex domains. Such domains would include, for instance, social and political institutions, international relations, and strategic doctrines” (p. 48). Rohrer (1995) investigated the metaphors employed by George Bush Senior in relation to the politics of the pre-war period (August-January 1991) in the Persian Gulf. For example, analyzing politically contrasting metaphors (e.g., THE PERSIAN GULF CRISIS IS WWII vs THE PERSIAN GULF CRISIS IS ANOTHER VIETNAM), he demonstrated that adopting one “metaphor system” could trigger so “stark a difference in the engendered inferences” (p. 118). More investigations of conceptual metaphors could be traced in Semino and Masci (1996) and Strath, Weiss, Wodak, Muntigl, and Sdlak (1999), where the latter paid attention to the concept of struggle as a metaphor in the European Union discourse on unemployment. A similar trend in research was followed by Musolff (2004), with a special focus on the metaphorical representation of Europe as a BODY POLITIC.

Additionally, conceptual metaphors have been theoretically employed in analyzing discourses of (de-)legitimization, which are based on positive self-presentation versus negative other-presentation (Sandikciąglu, 2000; Musolff, 2003). Also, using a critically oriented approach known as Critical Metaphor Analysis, Charteris-Black (2004) examined metaphors in political discourses and religious discourses: the former including discourses of New Labour British-Party manifestos and inaugural addresses of American presidents; the latter appertaining to the two religious texts of the Bible (New and Old Testaments) and the Qur’an (“Koran,” in Charteris-Black’s terms). Further, extending his approach of metaphor analysis, Charteris-Black (2005) exhaustively covered the ideological and mythical representations in the discourse of leadership, offering some models of political leaders such as Churchill, Martine Luther King, Margaret Thatcher, Bill Clinton, Tony Blair, George Bush Senior, and George Bush Junior. (Still, however, it can be said that Charteris-Black’s model has not yet been extended in analytic scope towards the investigation of a discourse type that is politico-religious in nature.) On similar political grounds, in Musolff (2010),
Hitler's "body-illness-parasite" metaphors have been demonstrated to be at the heart of his racist ideology, which is argued to be part and parcel of the Nazi ideology that presented the genocide as "a therapy for the German national body" (p. 7).

The idea of metaphorical patterns in discourse has been studied by Cameron and Deignan (2003) in a way that underscored the synergy of discourse-analysis research and the linguistic expressions motivated by conceptual metaphors. They empirically showed how the lexical and grammatical patterns in discourse might linguistically cue the presence of metaphorical meanings at a co-textual level of language use; for instance, this co-textual metaphoricity could occur when speakers or writers use phrases such as "metaphorically speaking," "sort of," "literally," etc. Further, in a similar fashion, Cameron and Deignan (2006) tackled what they called "metaphoremes," which emerged from interaction in discourse in the form of idiomatically preferred forms; for example, the authors combined "analyses and data types of tracking the use of <walk away from> as a metaphoreme, showing its patterns of formal, semantic, affective, and pragmatic characteristics" (p. 671). Similarly, following Steen's (1999) five-step procedure from linguistic to conceptual metaphor, Semino, Heywood, and Short (2004) explored some methodological problems in the study of metaphorical patterns in an electronic corpus of conversations about cancer.

In Carver and Pikalo (2008), a number of studies presented new methodological and theoretical approaches to the use of metaphor in political science which involved the different discourse domains of science, social institutions, sexuality, and politics and policy. Likewise, Semino (2008) applied the conceptual-metaphor framework to a wide range of discourses that fall within different domains of literature, politics, science, and education. Also, further to the discourse-domain variations in metaphor studies, Musolff (2012, p. 305) reported numerous empirical metaphor studies that have observed the variation of source-domain content, which increased with the consideration of what he described as "cross-linguistic and -cultural data" (Kővecses, 2005, 2006, 2009; Musolff, 2010; Steen, 2007; Yu, 2008a, 2008b).

Interestingly, too, Porto and Romano (2019) proved the research hypothesis that a given metaphor could conceivably "migrate" from one mode to another or synergy of modes; the two authors termed this phenomenon "transmodal metaphors." Also, Forceville (2019) has reported a number of significant studies that investigated multimodal metaphors that are confined to the visual and the written-verbal modes of communication (e.g., Maalej, 2015; Forceville, 2017; Poppi & Kravanja, 2019). Very recently, adopting the framework of CMT, Lan and Yin (2020) undertook an exhaustive analysis of the metaphorical expressions used in the first collection of poems in Chinese history dating from the 11th to the 6th century B.C. It has been found that, by means of analyzing 476 metaphorical expressions, most of the metaphors identified belonged to the Great Chain of Being. Further, the study revealed the presence of a conceptual metaphor pattern of the Zhou Dynasty as being anthropocentric and anthropomorphic.

Now, moving on to the research employing a synergy of metaphor analysis and CDA, it should be mentioned that a number of scholars, most prominently O'Halloran (2007) and Hart (2008, 2010), have challenged "the appropriation of Conceptual Metaphor Theory in CDA" on the grounds that the theory is "discordant with interpretation-stage analysis" (Hart, 2010, p. 113). However, this should not take away the fact that CMT can gain some insight from CDA, especially from the latter's critical explanation of the socio-political context of the discourse participants who draw on certain conceptual metaphors in the production of their textual practices. Koller (2004) stressed the fact that "metaphor research still has much to gain from incorporating a CDA perspective and thus focusing more on sociocultural and ideological functions of metaphors" (p. 8). Some studies have methodologically combined metaphor analysis with CDA in a way that has enriched both research paradigms (Charteris-Black, 2004; Maalej, 2007; Musolff, 2008, 2012). Taking the example of Charteris-Black (2004), the Critical Metaphor Analysis approach has been adopted towards metaphor analysis with the aim of revealing "the covert (and possibly unconscious) intentions of language users" (p. 34). This approach is similar in many respects to the CDA approach developed by Fairclough (1989/2001) – which is outlined in the next section – as it goes through a three-stage procedure of analysis: metaphor identification, metaphor interpretation, and metaphor explanation.

Obviously, then, even though conceptual metaphors have been extensively investigated in a whole breadth of discourses, none of these discourses seems to have cut across different social domains in a way that exposes the riches of CMT, especially when it methodologically combines with the critical dimension of CDA. This combination is argued to have enriched the latter with "the explanatory power of cognitive metaphor analysis" (Musolff, 2012, p. 302). As I argued earlier, the current research data on the Islamic concept of the Khila'fah falls into the two domains of religion and politics, which may serve as a good ground for conducting Critical Metaphor Analysis based on the methodological combination of CMT and the critical explanatory strand associated with CDA.


The present study follows the well-established theoretical framework of CMT and attempts to augment its explanatory power by drawing the context-based analytic tool from the field of CDA. This yields what Charteris-Black (2004) has methodologically established as Critical Metaphor Analysis. It is a synergetic method of analyzing
metaphors in different discourse types. The present context of research could be viewed as one such new discourse type – the Khilafah discourse (see Section 1). But, prior to presenting the synergetic discourse-analytic toolkit of Critical Metaphor Analysis, I would rather sketch out the basic tenets of CMT.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1999) set out their argument for CMT with the claim that concepts are essentially metaphorical and that linguistic metaphors are strictly expressions of underlying conceptual metaphors. To illustrate this CMT claim, Lakoff and Johnson (1999) afford the following extract:

Look how far we’ve come. It’s been a long, bumpy road. We can’t turn back now. We’re at a crossroads. We’re heading in different directions. We may have to go our separate ways. The relationship is not going anywhere. We’re spinning our wheels. The marriage is out of gas. Our relationship is off track. The marriage is on the rocks. We’re trying to keep the relationship afloat. We may have to bail out of this relationship. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1999, pp. 63-64)

Here, according to Lakoff and Johnson (1999), the extract above includes metaphorical linguistic expressions that are underlain by the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY, where the abstract target domain LOVE is metaphorically represented by the concrete source domain JOURNEY. Notably, in this metaphor, the target domain LOVE is conceptualized (or understood) through the source domain JOURNEY, which would, in turn, motivate the "conventional expressions" in the extract above.

Indeed, CMT pays considerable attention to the systematic correspondences which potentially hold between the source domain and the target domain; such correspondences are technically labelled "mappings" (Lakoff, 1993), and they experientially function in a way that crystallizes the LOVE IS A JOURNEY conceptual metaphor. Based on Lakoff’s (1993) analysis, Kövecses (2010, p. 9) has offered a detailed profile of the mappings related to this conceptual metaphor as shown in Figure 1 below:

![Figure 1. The mappings of the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY(Source: Kövecses, 2010, p. 9)](image)

As can be observed in Figure 1 above, the mappings go from the source JOURNEY to the target LOVE, with the constituent elements of the source domain concretely structuring those elements of the abstract domain.

However, it should be made clear that one target domain is by no means confined to one source domain. For example, as Lakoff and Johnson (1980, p. 85) argue, the target domain LOVE can be metaphorically structured by source domains other than the source JOURNEY. This can be noticed in conceptual metaphors like "LOVE IS A PATIENT, LOVE IS A PHYSICAL FORCE, LOVE IS MADNESS, LOVE IS WAR, etc." It follows then that different source domains would entail different mappings and would therefore structure the target domain (LOVE) in a different way. Indeed, the human conceptualizer, alongside the socio-physical contextual factors, determines what source domain(s) to be drawn upon in the process of metaphorizing certain target concepts or expressions in a given type of discourse.

In their attempt to classify conceptual metaphors according to their cognitive functions, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) differentiate three kinds of metaphor: structural, ontological, and orientational. I shall briefly introduce their arguments about the first two kinds as they are the dominant ones in the data analysis of current research on the Khilafah. Structural metaphors are cases where “one concept is metaphorically structured in terms of another” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 14). The LOVE IS A JOURNEY conceptual metaphor discussed earlier in this section is a typical case in point. The crucial element in this type of metaphor is the rich mappings systematically holding between the source domain and the target domain, and those mappings bear an enabling cognitive function; that is, they enable discourse participants to “understand target A by means of the structure of source B” (Kövecses, 2010, p. 37).

As regards ontological metaphors, they are presented by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) as "[discursive] ways of viewing events, activities, emotions, ideas, etc., as entities and substances" (p. 25). Lakoff and Johnson chart the various purposes served by ontological metaphors as follows: (1) "Referring" as in "My fear of insects is driving my wife crazy"; (2) "Quantifying" in "It will take a lot of patience to finish this book"; (3) "Identifying Aspects" in "The ugly
side of his personality comes out under pressure”; (4) “Identifying Causes” in “The pressure of his responsibilities caused his breakdown”; (5) “Setting Goals and Motivating Actions” in “He went to New York to seek fame and fortune” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, pp. 26-27, italics in original). With these five purposes, it seems as though the main cognitive function of ontological metaphors is to provide abstract target concepts with a new existential status through “entities” and “substances” that are experientially familiar to discourse participants.

Given its cognitive-linguistic nature, conceptual metaphor has been integrated into the wider framework of discourse analysis, which goes beyond the myopic vision of traditional text linguistics with its strict focus on describing the local meanings in a text. By contrast, as Fairclough (1995) convincingly argues, a critically oriented analysis of discourse offers an eclectic approach that targets both the local description of the text and the global explanation of the discourse effects that “go beyond the immediate situation” (p. 43). Teun van Dijk (2011) has articulated a similar view: “Whereas earlier research typically focused on the structural details of just one level of text and talked […], we have come to realize that such structures are often dependent on structures or constraints at other levels or dimensions of discourse, such as those of context, social interaction and cognition” (Van Dijk, 2011, p. 5). Obviously, then, this view takes into consideration text description as well as discourse interpretation and explanation.

Here, I argue that CMT can methodologically operate at the first two levels of text description and discourse interpretation as it offers a systematic shift from the metaphorical linguistic expressions in the text towards their conceptual meanings in the minds of discourse participants; such conceptual meanings can be so conventional, and perhaps naturalized, that they constitute what Fairclough (2001) refers to as “common-sense assumptions,” which would “give textual features their values” (p. 117). This process is described by Fairclough as the stage of “discourse interpretation.” At this point, it can be said that investigating the cognitive mappings and entailments associated with conceptual metaphors in discourse may well offer a sufficient procedure for the stage of interpreting discourse. This is being so because those mappings and entailments can access the common-sense assumptions held by discourse participants, whose conceptual metaphors can reflect their ways of thinking.

The mappings holding between the target domain and source domain, which underlie conceptual metaphors, have been discussed above in this section. Still, it may be significant to revisit the term “mapping” itself in a way that accentuates its technical significance in CMT:

More technically, the metaphor can be understood as a mapping in the mathematical sense from a source domain (in this case, journeys) to a target domain (in this case, love). The mapping is tightly structured. There are ontological correspondences, according to which entities in the domain of love (e.g., the lovers, their common goals, their difficulties, the love relationship, etc.) correspond systematically to entities in the domain of a journey (the travellers, the vehicle, destinations, etc.). (Lakoff, 1993, pp. 206-207)

The mappings underlying the LOVE IS A JOURNEY conceptual metaphor have been already presented earlier above in Kövecses’ (2010) schematic form. As can be inferred from Lakoff’s above argument, mapping has an experiential basis, which is established in the more experientially palpable source domain: the constituent elements (“the travellers, the vehicle, destinations, etc.”) of the source domain need to be recurrent in our human conceptual system.

Now, coming to metaphorical entailments as the second cognitive component of discourse interpretation, Lakoff (1987, p. 384) emphasizes the role of this cognitive resource in rendering conceptual metaphors productive. He casually refers to metaphorical entailments as “carryovers”; that is, they carry over the details of the extensive knowledge (experientially possessed by human conceptualizers) from the source domain to the target domain; and, as such, they “constitute elaborations of conceptual metaphors.” Lakoff illustrates the cognitive resource of metaphorical entailments by means of the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS HEAT OF FLUID IN A CONTAINER: “one thing we know about hot fluids is that, when they start to boil, the fluid goes up forward.” According to him, this piece of common knowledge gives rise to the metaphorical entailment below:

“When the intensity of anger increases, the fluid rises.”
- His pent-up anger welled up inside him.
- She could feel her gorge rising.
- We got a rise out of him.
- My anger kept building up inside me.
- Pretty soon, I was in a towering rage. (Lakoff, 1987, p. 384, italics in original)

The above entailment should draw our attention to Lakoff’s (1980, 1987, 1993) insistence on the productive nature of conceptual metaphors, which are based on basic domains of experience. As Lakoff (1980, p. 117) explains, basic domains of experience are “experiential gestalts” that characterize “structured wholes within recurrent human experiences”; and they are natural in three significant senses: (1) “our bodies (perceptual and motor apparatus, mental capacities, emotional makeup, etc.); (2) “our interactions with our physical environment (moving, manipulating objects, eating, etc.); (3) “our interactions with other people within our culture (in terms of social,
political, economic, and religious institutions)." These meaning dimensions are calling for interpretations as they tell a great deal about the gestalt domains selected by discourse participants.

Proceeding with Fairclough's (2001) discourse-analytic procedure, there is yet another stage that immediately follows discourse interpretation; that is, discourse explanation as a shift towards the macro-level analysis of the wider socio-historical context of discourse. According to Fairclough (2001, p. 136), explanation has two dimensions: First, seeing discourses as "parts of social struggles," and contextualizing those discourses in terms of such broader social struggles; second, showing "what power relationships determine discourses," bearing in mind that "these relationships are themselves the outcome of struggles, and are established (and, ideally, naturalized) by those with power." As such, being an essential part of the overall meaning of discourse, conceptual metaphors can readily be explained in terms of the broader social struggles and power relations that comprise the socio-historical context of discourse.

All in all, then, Critical Metaphor Analysis basically relies on CMT but gainfully draws the wider contextual analysis of discourse explanation from CDA. As is shortly detailed in the next section, the approach begins with the identification of the metaphorical linguistic expressions of the target research term in the text. Then the text-based description of the semantic shift associated with these metaphorical expressions follows. Thereafter, the two discourse processes of interpreting and explaining the conceptual metaphors underlying the metaphorical expressions are operationalized.

4. Methodology
4.1 Data

The present research data is a book under the title *The Method to Re-establish the Khilafah and Resume the Islamic Way of Life*. It was published in 2000 by Muslim Members of *Hizb ut-Tahrir* (Islamic Liberation Party), established in Britain. The book counts 132 pages that tackle the politico-religious topic of the *Khilafah*, which can be defined in English as the Islamic Caliphate. The book includes six parts: Part One entitled "The Khilafah is the Vital Issue"; Part Two "The Khilafah is an Obligation"; Part Three "The Need for *Ijtihad*"; Part Four "The Invalid Methods"; Part Five "The Method"; Part Six "The Return of the Khilafah." The language of the book is originally English, and it directly addresses Muslims in Britain and the Western World in an attempt to elucidate the complex Islamic concept of the *Khilafah* and put right the so-called misconceptions about the concept.

4.2 Procedure

The present study follows a methodological procedure that rests on two stages of critical metaphor analysis of the data: the first stage is the micro analysis of conceptual metaphors associated with the search term of the *Khilafah*; the second is the macro analysis of the socio-historical context that explains the use of such *Khilafah*-based metaphors.

4.2.1 Micro analysis: Metaphor identification, description, and interpretation

The stage of micro analysis involved three steps. First, the keyword *Khilafah* was identified in its metaphorical contexts in the data based on "the presence of incongruity or semantic tension" that arises from "a shift in domain use" (Charteris-Black, 2004, p. 35); this means that all the literal meanings of the keyword *Khilafah* were avoided. Second, the shift in domain use was described in a way that offered a comprehensive profile of the potential source domains through which the target domain *THE KHILAFAH* was conceptualized. Third, the authorial choices of the source domains were interpreted in terms of the metaphorical mappings and/or entailments that represented the target domain itself.

4.2.2 Macro analysis: Metaphor explanation

The second stage of the present methodological procedure is oriented towards the macro analysis of explaining the broader socio-historical context of the conceptual metaphors associated with the *Khilafah* in the text produced by Muslim Members of *Hizb ut-Tahrir*. More specifically, this stage of analysis focused on two contextual facets: first, the social agency that produced the metaphors of the *Khilafah* in terms of its institutional framework and the religious, political and social values that underlie such a framework; second, the historical meanings invested in the concept of the *Khilafah* itself. Together, the two facets reveal the factors that motivated the authors to conceptualize the *Khilafah* in this metaphorical way.

5. Analysis

The data analysis in this study conforms to the methodological procedure outlined above in the previous section. The first subsection of the analysis is concerned with the immediate context of the term *Khilafah* as metaphorically realized in the text; this is where the three steps of identifying, describing and interpreting the
Khilafah metaphors simultaneously operate towards the fulfilment of the micro analysis of the research data. The second subsection moves to explain the wider socio-historical context of the Khilafah metaphors, and it offers some more space for explaining the textual message collectively transmitted by Hizb ut-Tahrir Members.

5.1 The metaphorical conceptualization of the Khilafah

The title of the book under analysis reads "The Method to Re-establish the Khilafah and Resume the Islamic Way of Life." One striking observation about this title is that it has three metaphorical linguistic expressions which seem to be cognitively motivated by three corresponding conceptual metaphors, as shown in Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Metaphors</th>
<th>Conceptual Metaphors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Method to Re-establish the Khilafah</td>
<td>RE-ESTABLISHING THE KHILAFAH IS STRATEGIC PLANNING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-establish the Khilafah</td>
<td>THE KHILAFAH IS A RELIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume the Islamic Way of Life</td>
<td>THE ISLAMIC WAY OF LIFE IS AN INTERRUPTED ACTIVITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the target domain, THE ISLAMIC WAY OF LIFE, in the third conceptual metaphor in Table 1, is replaced with the domain THE KHILAFAH through the different parts of the book. This may be ascribed to the fact that the authors equate the Khilafah with the typically Islamic way of life. As such, as is discussed later in the analysis, the conceptual metaphor THE KHILAFAH IS AN INTERRUPTED ACTIVITY dominates all through the book by means of the linguistic metaphorical expression of "resume/resuming the Khilafah."

Now, as a point of departure, the analysis begins with the first linguistic expression, "The Method to Re-establish the Khilafah", and its corresponding conceptual metaphor RE-ESTABLISHING THE KHILAFAH IS STRATEGIC PLANNING in Table 1. As a whole, aside from the verb re-establish, the expression evokes such a conceptual metaphor with the linguistic realization of the prestigious term method – with its positive connotations of orderliness, advance preparation, purposiveness, etc. – which may signify a very special message about the book itself: the book is intended to offer readership an orderly, purposive and pre-arranged way of reviving the concept of the Khilafah. This might conceptually suggest a guided plan with well-defined strategies towards the fulfilment of some demanding undertaking; that is, a conceptual space for the domain <strategic planning>. Thus, in the book title, using the word Method as a linguistic cue for the source domain STRATEGIC PLANNING significantly uncovers the authors’ conceptualization of the re-establishment of the Khilafah as a carefully goal-oriented enterprise that entails following a "method," and not just a cavalier (or, perhaps, random) "way" of doing an ordinary routine thing: the latter linguistic cues would have evoked an alternative (everyday) source domain such as RECIPE.

Indeed, the term "method" has its own structural meanings. In Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Synonyms (1984, 537-538), the lexical item method is differentiated from other semantically related items – such as mode, manner, way, fashion, and system – on the grounds that it has special connotations: "the term [method] connotes regularity or formality in procedure" (1984, p. 537). Of course, orderly structures of all types have the common Practice of following one particular Method or another. Thus, the mappings between the source domain STRATEGIC PLANNING and the target domain RE-ESTABLISHING THE KHILAFAH can ideally be presented in Figure 2 as such:

![Source: STRATEGIC PLANNING Target: RE-ESTABLISHING THE KHILAFAH](image)

Figure 2 Mappings of RE-ESTABLISHING THE KHILAFAH IS STRATEGIC PLANNING
The metaphorical mappings in Figure 2 above illustrate how novel the conceptual metaphor RE-ESTABLISHING THE KHIHLAFAH IS STRATEGIC PLANNING may be. The metaphor elevates the activity of re-establishing the Khilafah to the highly sophisticated process of making strategic plans, which would receive all the prestige associated with long-term thinking and orderly acting. Further, the metaphor ennobles the role played by the Khilafah seekers and the goal of reviving the Khilafah as it conceptually presents such constituent elements of the target domain as being serious, legitimate, and worthy enough.

The same source domain STRATEGIC PLANNING has four linguistic realizations through the book structure:

1. "... the detailed Prophetic method for re-establishing the Khilafah" (Introduction, p. 3).
2. "... including the methodology of establishing the Khilafah" (pt. 3, p. 53).
3. "Hence it becomes necessary to understand the Islamic methodology for establishing the Khilafah" (pt. 4, p. 78).
4. "The example of the Messenger (saw) demonstrates the only methodology of resuming the Khilafah" (pt. 5, p. 82).

As the examples above show, by using the linguistic cues of "method" and "methodology," the authors offer the readers some mental access to the abstract target domains of RE-ESTABLISHING THE KHIHLAFAH, ESTABLISHING THE KHIHLAFAH, and RESUMING THE KHIHLAFAH, respectively, through the concrete target domain STRATEGIC PLANNING. However, with these examples, certain mappings become more specific than those in the title (see Figure 2 above):

Source: STRATEGIC PLANNING Target: RE-/ESTABLISHING/RESUMING THE KHIHLAFAH

| the planners | the Khilafah Muslim seekers |
| the pre-planning events | the Islamic History of the Khilafah |
| the obstacles to planning | the problems encountered by Muslims in the Khilafah revival |
| the strategy for planning | the Prophet’s tradition that facilitates the Khilafah revival |

**Figure 3. Specific mappings associated with the source domain STRATEGIC PLANNING**

Thus, as exhibited in Figure 3 above, with the textual references made to Islam and the Muslims' Prophet (Muhammad), the conceptual space of the source domain STRATEGIC PLANNING gets narrower in a way that renders the mappings from the source more specific in relation to the constituents of the target domains RE-/ESTABLISHING THE KHIHLAFAH and RESUMING THE KHIHLAFAH. Therefore, at this point, it can be said that the authors’ highlighting of certain elements of the target domain (THE KHIHLAFAH) is discursively at its zenith: Following the well-informed tradition of their Prophet, Sunni Muslims can be rightly guided and admirably systematic in their pursuit of the Khilafah. Also, significantly, with these novel metaphorical representations, the authors have utilized the corresponding elements of the source domain (STRATEGIC PLANNING) in a way that elevates the Islamic discourse of the Khilafah, basically by virtue of conceptualizing the Muslim seekers of the Khilafah as (strategic) planners and the Prophet's Islamic tradition as the strategy for planning. Thus, two discourses seem to be intersecting here: Islamic discourse and logistic discourse. To an audience that belongs to the Western culture, it would be remarkably easier to understand the former, which is more abstract and perhaps most misrepresented, in terms of the latter. Obviously, the two domains of religion and logistics meet at this point of metaphorical representation.

The other important metaphorical linguistic expression in the title of the book under analysis is “Reestablish the Khilafah,” which is strongly motivated by the conceptual metaphor THE KHIHLAFAH IS A RELIC. Again, as is shortly demonstrated, this conceptual metaphor has several linguistic realizations all through the book. These linguistic realizations compare aptly with another set of realizations that underlie yet another related conceptual metaphor: THE KHIHLAFAH IS A BUILDING. The metaphorical linguistic expressions underlying both conceptual metaphors are exhibited in Table 2 below:
Table 2. Linguistic realizations of the two conceptual metaphors THE KHALIFAH IS A RELIC & THE KHALIFAH IS A BUILDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Metaphors</th>
<th>THE KHALIFAH IS A RELIC</th>
<th>THE KHALIFAH IS A BUILDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metaphorical Linguistic Expressions</td>
<td>1) “The Muslim Ummah has become aware that the re-establishment of the Khalifah is the most vital issue facing them today” (Introduction, p. 1).</td>
<td>1) “Hence, the issue facing the Muslims today is the establishment of the Khalifah as a ruling system” (pt. 1, p. 19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) “What must be realised is that the responsibilities of the work to re-establish the Khalifah that rest on the shoulders of the Muslims of Britain and the Western World” (Introduction, pp. 1-2).</td>
<td>2) “Establishing the Khalifah is conclusively a vital issue” (pt. 1, p. 19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) “the calls for democracy and participation in government are added obstacles in the path to re-establish the Khalifah” (Introduction, p. 2).</td>
<td>3) “we call upon every single Muslim … to work towards establishing the Khalifah” (pt. 1, p. 23).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) “We ask Allah … to assist us in our endeavour to re-establish the Khalifah with His help and His strength” (Introduction, p. 3).</td>
<td>4) “Establishing Islam in actuality means the establishment of the Khalifah” (pt. 1, p. 28).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5) “We ask Him also to honour them [Muslims] with the re-establishment of the Khalifah” (Introduction, p. 3).</td>
<td>5) “the resumption of the Islamic way of life by establishing the Khalifah is the vital issue that faces the Ummah” (pt. 3, p. 54).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6) “In order to establish the Khalifah rather they should wait for its promised return” (pt. 4, p. 70).</td>
<td>6) “in order to establish the Khalifah rather they should wait for its promised return” (pt. 4, p. 70).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fundamental difference between the two metaphors in Table 2 is a matter of derivational morphology: the textual appearance of the prefix re- denotes the meaning “to establish again”, and the textual absence of the same prefix denotes the meaning of mere “establishment.” Crucially, then, the semantics of the derivation in re-establish and re-establishment reveals the ontology or existence of a historical object (the Khalifah). This meaning should raise a particular metaphorical entailment: To re-establish some object is to re-build this object. Upon such a metaphorical entailment, the historical-object meaning emerges, and thus the idea of having a relic (from the past) may plausibly ensue. But, even more interestingly, the metaphor THE KHALIFAH IS A RELIC may be considered an ontological metaphor, which conceptually adds some historical substance to the Khalifah. This may explain why this metaphor is predominant in the authors’ introduction to the book under investigation: the metaphor encapsulates a great deal of background information to the topic of establishing the Khalifah that comes next.

The second conceptual metaphor in Table 2 is THE KHALIFAH IS A BUILDING, whose linguistic realizations in the table evince the absence of the foregoing derivational semantics of the prefix re- in re-establish and re-establishment. Thus, the present conceptual metaphor is devoid of the historical meaning of the Khalifah as a relic; instead, the metaphor evokes the conceptualization of the Khalifah as being potentially in the making. Notably, this conceptual metaphor dominates Part I in the book, especially when the authors refer to the Khalifah as being a “vital issue” (see the linguistic expressions in Table 2). Indeed, unlike the linguistic realizations of the ontological metaphor, THE KHALIFAH IS A RELIC, the metaphorical linguistic expressions in Table 2 reveal that the metaphor THE KHALIFAH IS A BUILDING is a structural conceptual metaphor that provides a rich set of mappings between the source domain BUILDING and the abstract target domain THE KHALIFAH as shown in Figure 4.

Source: BUILDING

- the building structure
- the builders
- the strong foundations of the building

Target: THE KHALIFAH

- the Khalifah ruling system
- the world Muslims of today
- the good faith of Muslims

Figure 4. Mappings of THE KHALIFAH IS A BUILDING

The mappings presented above in Figure 4 show that there are certain constituent elements in the source BUILDING that have been consciously utilized with a view to partially highlighting certain constituents in the metaphorical representation of the target THE KHALIFAH: First, the ruling system of the Khalifah is construed as the structure of a building; second, present-day world Muslims are represented as the actual builders of such a ruling system of the Khalifah; third, the good faith of those Muslims – the actual builders – is constructed as being the
strong foundations upon which the whole structure of the Khilafah can be erected or re-erected. Thus, it can be inferred that what matters to the authors relying on such a conceptual metaphor is the Khilafah as a legal system as well as those who are eligible enough to sustain such a legal system and their unwavering belief in the cause of “establishing the Khilafah.”

Also, in addition to the book title, the conceptual metaphor THE KHILAFAH IS AN INTERRUPTED ACTIVITY has several linguistic realizations in different chapters. Table 3 presents these linguistic realizations of the conceptual metaphor. Obviously, as tabulated, the linguistic cues “resumption,” “resume,” and “resuming” indicate almost the same conceptual metaphor in the authors’ minds: THE KHILAFAH IS AN INTERRUPTED ACTIVITY. Here, the cognitive-linguistic element is outweighed by the pragmatic element of the authors’ knowledge about the history and the current status of the Khilafah; such a pragmatic element is being invested in making textual references to the moral obligation on the part of today’s world Muslims to continue with the activity of the Khilafah State. Indeed, the present conceptual metaphor highlights the target element of the current state of non-Khilafah, which is being utilized through the source element of “resumption.” This may render this conceptual metaphor ontological in cognitive function: the domain INTERRUPTED ACTIVITY imparts a particular status to the Khilafah as being precluded by some force from continuing to exist. It is a point that strikes some intratextual coherence with the coming conceptual metaphor, THE KHILAFAH IS A WAR TARGET, where the Khilafah is metaphorically represented as being attacked by an enemy in a war. With this intratextual coherence in mind, it can be assumed that there is a kind of illocutionary meaning with the metaphor THE KHILAFAH IS AN INTERRUPTED ACTIVITY: The Sunni Muslims of today have the moral obligation of changing the current status of non-Khilafah, and thereby rendering it uninterrupted.

| Table 3. Linguistic metaphors realizing THE KHILAFAH IS AN INTERRUPTED ACTIVITY |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Linguistic Metaphors | Conceptual Metaphor |
| “The removal of kufur depends upon the resumption of the Khilafah” (pt. 2, p. 28). | THE KHILAFAH IS AN INTERRUPTED ACTIVITY |
| “This is an extremely dangerous concept that in actuality would serve as an obstacle in the resumption of the Khilafah” (pt. 4, p. 78). | |
| “It would need to take all the necessary steps in order to resume the Khilafah” (pt. 5, p. 81). | |
| “the details of the ruling, economic, social and educational systems and policies that Islam has laid down for without them it would be incapable of resuming the Khilafah” (pt. 5, p. 81). | |
| “After this is clear it must be applied to our situation in determining the way to resume the Khilafah” (pt. 5, p. 82). | |
| “Allah has blessed us with guiding us upon how to resume the Khilafah” (pt. 6, p. 120). | |

In many parts of the book under analysis, the expression the Khilafah is used as an object of destruction, or more metaphorically, a target of destruction:

“Unfortunately, after the destruction of the Khilafah, Islam became absent from the realm of life” (Introduction, p. 1).

1) “Hence, the Khilafah was destroyed, the system of Islam was abolished” (pt. 1, p. 7).
2) “It came as no surprise when Mustafa Kemal destroyed the Khilafah and all the rules of Islam” (pt. 1, p. 16).
3) “So Mustafa Kemal went ahead with his action, destroyed the Khilafah and wiped out Islam from the political map” (pt. 1, p. 17).
4) “Therefore, the Kuffar’s destruction of the Khilafah and their removal of the system of Islam from existence” (pt. 1, p. 17).
5) “Since the destruction of the Khilafah and the decline of the Muslims” (pt. 3, p. 49).

The above examples include linguistic metaphors that can be taken to be representative of THE KHILAFAH IS A WAR TARGET. In all these linguistic metaphors, the elements of “destruction” and “destroyed” are utilized in the source domain WAR TARGET in a way that highlights historical belligerence and animosity towards the Khilafah system. The immediate contexts of the linguistic metaphors in examples 1 to 6 reveal three-constituent mappings between the source WAR TARGET and the target THE KILAFAH, as exhibited in Figure 5. Significant about these mappings is the authors’ employment of the three elements of the attackers, the destructive effect, and the defeat in the source WAR TARGET in such a way that ideologically highlights the three corresponding elements of the
Kuffars (non-Muslim infidels) and Mustafa Kemal, dismantling the Shari’ah (Islamic law), and ending the Khilafah State. The cognitive process of highlighting these three elements serves as a picture of the dire consequences that followed the demise of the Khilafah in the Sunni Islamic World and also cast light on the violent image of warring against Islam in general. This aspect is sufficiently covered in the coming subsection, which deals with the socio-historical explanation of the metaphor (see Subsection 5.2).

**Source: WAR TARGET**

- the attackers
- the destructive effect
- the defeat

**Target: THE KHILAFAH**

- the Kuffars (non-Muslim infidels) & Mustafa Kemal
- dismantling the Shari’ah (Islamic law)
- ending the Khilafah State

*Figure 5. Mappings of THE KHILAFAH IS A WAR TARGET*

By the same token, in the present conceptual metaphor (THE KHILAFAH IS A WAR TARGET), one highly conventional constituent has been hidden from the target THE KHILAFAH, namely, the supporters of the Khilafah, which could have been utilized in the source WAR TARGET through the mapping constituent of the "defenders" (versus the "attackers"). The process of hiding such an aspect in the target, THE KHILAFAH, critically raises the question of why, during the Caliphate State, Muslims failed to defend the Khilafah system and stand against the attackers of its ruling system – the Shari’ah. Further, unutilized in the source WAR TARGET is the conventional mapping constituent of the victors (who are metaphorically represented as the destroyers of the Khilafah in the book) in the war launched against the Khilafah State. At this point, it seems that the authors are unwilling to be explicit about the victorious warring side of the non-Muslim Kuffars and Mustafa Kemal. They historically managed to end the Khilafah State. Rather, the authors opt to conceptualize this warring side in the negative frame of destruction and not victory. Indeed, more in this regard is discussed in the coming subsection on contextualizing the Khilafah conceptual metaphors.

5.2 Contextualizing the Khilafah conceptual metaphors

In order to explain the whys and wherefores of the Khilafah conceptual metaphors identified, described, and interpreted in the preceding subsection, there needs to be a socio-historical context analysis of the discourse whose participants have consciously drawn upon these particular metaphors. The present socio-historical analysis is based on two strands that together comprise a critical context-based approach to the research data: first, there needs to be an explanation of the politico-religious nature of the concept of the Khilafah as being part of the Islamic history; second, some space should be provided for revealing the identity of the discourse participants under investigation.

To begin with, the Khilafah is a fundamentally Islamic term with a long, convoluted history in the Muslim World. Immediately after the death of Muhammad (the Prophet of Muslims), the concept of the Khilafah began to materialize under certain religious and political circumstances which Ágoston and Masters (2009) succinctly recount:

When the Prophet Muhammad died in 632 C.E., the Muslim community chose as his successor Abu Bakr, the Prophet’s father-in-law and one of his first converts. While it was understood that he lacked any prophetic abilities, Abu Bakr was nevertheless chosen to head the political community that the Prophet had founded. As this was a new office, the Muslims were hesitant to use older titles such as king or sheikh, and so they called him simply Khalifat Rasul Allah, the "successor to the Prophet of God." That title was eventually shortened to Khalifa, or caliph in its English form. From that time until the 13th century, this title was used for the political leader of the Muslim community. (Ágoston & Masters, 2009, p. 114)

From the above account, it seems that the Khilafah has an essentially politico-religious nature. Any socio-historical analysis of the concept cannot dispense with these two contextual aspects of religion and politics.

Considering such a politico-religious nature, Adam (2001) underscores the Sunni-Islam conception of the Khilafah and its close bearing on the shari’ah (Islamic law):

The Khilafah is an essential element in the teaching of Islamic political thought and the formation of the Islamic State. Historically, its importance has been proved by the Khilafah of the Prophet himself in Medina and some others such as the four rightly-guided caliphs, the Umayyads, the Abbassids and the Ottomans. It has been the nature of the Sunni conception of Khilafah that it closely relates to the shari’ah (Islamic law). (Adam, 2001, p. 20)

Here, there seems to be a conceptually significant status of the Khilafah in the Sunni Islamic world on religious and political grounds. Religiously, the Khilafah is inseparably associated with the Muslims’ Prophet and his succeeding four “rightly-guided caliphs,” who reign religiously supreme in the minds and hearts of (Sunni) Muslims. This religious status of the Khilafah may explain the aptness of the conceptual metaphor THE KHILAFAH IS A WAR TARGET, which has been frequently realized in the text with the expression the Khilafah functioning as an object of
destruction, e.g., "Unfortunately, after the destruction of the Khilafah, Islam became absent from the realm of life" (2000, p. 1). Obviously, the metaphorical representation of the Khilafah as being a target in a war enables Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir to raise religious passions in favour of the Khilafah on the part of those Muslim readers in the West, and simultaneously specify the enemies of the Khilafah State, and thus of Islam as a religion.

Further, at the political level, the same metaphor, THE KILFAH IS A WAR TARGET, can be explained against the background of secularism versus religiosity. Drawing on this conceptual metaphor, Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir adopted authorial antagonism towards Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (1881-1938) – the first President of Turkey as a Republic – whose secularist policies contributed to the transformation from the Ottoman Caliphate into the secularist nation-state of Turkey. Such a radically politico-religious transformation came in the aftermath of the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in World War I. Thereafter, the Kemalist version of Western secularism had the sole aim of removing religion from "the public sphere" (Kuru, 2008, p. 102). Elaborating on the anti-religion "Kemalist discourse," Çarmıklı (2011) stresses Mustafa Kemal's antagonism towards Islam in general and the Caliphate State in particular:

Mustafa Kemal attempted to create an "imaginary," a set of national myths, rituals and symbols to replace those of Islam, with the aim of lessening the need for religion, to undermine its importance in public life. This extreme interpretation of secularism was a part of the fundamental basis of change both for the nation as a whole. God was to be replaced by the "Nation," symbolized by the iconic status of Atatürk, as the source of sovereignty and as the object of worship. In order to limit the importance of and increase the state's control over Islam, Atatürk abolished the Caliphate and replaced the Sultan with the National Grand Assembly that passed decrees under his guidance. (Çarmıklı, 2011, p. 141)

Thus, back again to the metaphor, THE KILFAH IS A WAR TARGET, this may explain why, in their text, Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir have conceptualized the Khilafah as a target in a war, where Mustafa Kemal, alongside the Kufar (non-Muslim infidels), represents the essential source-domain element of the "enemy." Indeed, the present discursive hostility towards Mustafa Kemal is nothing but a continuity of the long historical conflict that began when the Atatürk government rejected the Islam-politics fusion established by the Ottomans and replaced it with a policy of wholesale secularization. That policy, known as "laiklik," followed the French model of "laïcité," whose aim was the complete separation of religion and politics in Turkish society (Rear, 2014, p. 1).

Indeed, the concept of the Khilafah derives its historical significance from its status as being "one of the essential components in Islamic thought"; and, as a corollary of it, the concept has been "extensively debated within Muslim society" (Adam et al., 2014, p. 1253). Arguably, the history of the Khilafah is associated with the "golden Islamic era starting from the period of early Islam conveyed by the prophet Muhammad ... until the era of the Ottoman Caliphate in Constantinople" (Adam et al., 2014, p. 1254). Crucially, such a historical value of the Khilafah can better explain the conceptual metaphor THE KILFAH IS A RELIC, drawn upon by Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir. As discussed earlier in the preceding subsection, the source domain RELIC has been linguistically indexed by the lexical items "re-establish" and "re-establishment." Here, the authors utilize the aspect of pastness inherent in the source RELIC, which embodies the historical traces of the early Khilafah State, including many and various cultural remaining artefacts in the Muslim and Western Worlds of today.

The same historical meaning invested with the Khilafah can sufficiently explain the emergence of the conceptual metaphor THE KILFAH IS AN INTERRUPTED ACTIVITY. As demonstrated earlier, such a conceptual metaphor is linguistically realized in a number of word-forms – "resumption," "resume," and "resuming" – which signify the historical discontinuity of the Khilafah State. Here, the authors tend to accentuate the conceptual correlation between the past and the present, which can readily be projected on the history of the Khilafah State and present-day Muslims without a Khilafah. This may well explain why the source domain INTERRUPTED ACTIVITY is rhetorically apt to the authors' call for the return of the Khilafah and changing its current status of being unfavourably interrupted.

Now, it is time to tackle the second strand of the socio-historical analysis, i.e., the discourse participants. Towards the end of the book under analysis, the authors – who label themselves "Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir" – provide the readers with a self-introducing statement under the title "The Experience of Hizb ut-Tahrir":

Hizb ut-Tahrir is an Islamic political party that has established itself upon the Aqeeda (creed) of Islam. Its aim is to resume the Islamic way of life through establishing the Khilafah and then carry Islam to the rest of the world through Da'wah (proselytism) and Jihad. For this noble goal, she has taken the Method of Muhammad (saw) as her Method. (2000, p. 123, my underlining)

Most interesting about the above self-statement are the underlined terms which evoke almost the same patterns of the conceptual source domains drawn upon by the authors in writing this book: INTERRUPTED ACTIVITY, BUILDING, and STRATEGIC PLANNING. It is only through such source domains that the authors made their abstract target domains concrete and clear enough: ISLAMIC WAY OF LIFE, THE KILFAH, and PROPHETIC TRADITION. However, as the micro analysis has already demonstrated, all these sources and target domains have been systematically employed to elucidate the complexities of the concept of the Khilafah. In a sense, the interactive
mappings of the source-target domains reflect how Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir think of themselves as well as of their message to all worldwide Muslims. First, their aim is to resume the interrupted Islamic way of life; second, this aim necessitates the establishment of the Khilafah as a ruling system; third, towards the fulfillment of this “noble” aim, the Prophet’s Method should be followed – a matter of metaphorical coherence in the text.

Thus, one may explain the need for the conceptual metaphors employed by the authors by means of the latter’s religious aim or alternatively Islamist agenda; but, besides having a religious aim, Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir also have a political aim. This is clear from the opening sentence in the statement: “Hizb ut-Tahrir is an Islamic political party.” Indeed, Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir derive their politics from the Islamic concept of the Khilafah State. According to one distinguished Member of Hizb ut-Tahrir, Abdul Qadeem Zalloom (1988), the Khilafah State is the unique end-product of Islam:

Islam has made this State the Khilafah State and made it of a distinct form and a unique structure that differs from the structure of all the States in the world. It is different in its pillars upon which it is established, in the structures that it is formed of, in its constitution and laws that are taken from the Book of Allah … and the Sunnah of His Messenger … which are obligatory for the Khilafah. (Zalloom, 1988, p. 11)

Zalloom’s argument should explain why Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir have resorted to the conceptual metaphor THE KHALIFAH IS A BUILDING. The metaphor can easily be used in the process of concretizing the distinctive politics of the Khilafah as a structure with its own “constitution and laws”; a structure whose foundations are what Muslims believed to be the Book of Allah (the Qur'an) and the tradition of the Muslims’ Prophet (the Sunnah).

It is worth mentioning that, when they decided to write the present book, the authors (Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir) had a particular audience in mind:

This book, written with the needs of Muslims in Britain and the Western World in mind, has been issued by Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir in Britain. The book explains the need for Muslims to realize that Islam has laid down a precise, detailed and practical method that they should adopt in their quest for the Khilafah’s return. (2000, p. 3)

The above statement is part of the introduction to the book under analysis; it is made with an explicit authorial account of the target audience. Perhaps, more than any other part in the book, the statement can adequately explain the conceptual metaphor RE-ESTABLISHING THE KHALIFAH IS STRATEGIC PLANNING. Such a metaphor has been represented by the linguistic terms “method” and “methodology,” which can be described as being prestigious or at least admirable. Apparently, these terms draw a novel analogy between the activity of re-establishing the Khilafah and the process of making strategic plans (for the future). To a Western audience, the former activity of re-establishing the Khilafah is far less familiar than the latter process of making strategic plans. Put simply, compared to an Arab-Muslim audience; a Western audience would have very limited access to the discourses on the Khilafah and their foundational Arabic sources of the Qur'an and the Sunnah. Additionally, the process of strategic planning is part and parcel of the discourse of the Enlightenment, which might conceivably be by far most appealing to this kind of audience, compared, for instance, to the least appealing clerical discourse of the Middle Ages.

6. Conclusion: Findings and Implications

The present study has explored the metaphorical representation of the Khilafah (Caliphate) as tackled from the Sunni-Muslim perspective of Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir in their collectively authored book The Method to Re-establish the Khilafah and Resume the Islamic Way of Life (2000). The book targets the Muslims in Britain and the Western World. Its aim is to facilitate such an audience’s comprehension of the concept of the Khilafah despite the all too heavily loaded religious and political meanings of the concept in Islamic history. So ideologically complex is the concept of the Khilafah that its metaphorical coding would pose a real challenge to the analyst, who is required to know not only the cognitive and linguistic meanings of the metaphors of the concept but also the socio-historical context of the discourse in which those metaphors have emerged. Towards meeting this challenge, the study followed the integrated approach of Critical Metaphor Analysis (Charteris-Black, 2004), which synergizes the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) and the context-based explanatory framework methodologically employed in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Consequently, with the same Western-Muslim audience in mind, the well-integrated approach of Critical Metaphor Analysis has been adopted towards investigating the metaphorical representation of the cognitively and historically complex concept of the Khilafah in the present research data.

Indeed, the current study’s main finding is the revelation of Hizb ut-Tahrir Members’ metaphorical conceptualization of the Khilafah as the key precept in their text. Five conceptual metaphors constituted the Khilafah representation: (1) RE-ESTABLISHING THE KHALIFAH IS STRATEGIC PLANNING, (2) THE KHALIFAH IS A BUILDING, (3) THE KHALIFAH IS A RELIC, (4) THE KHALIFAH IS AN INTERRUPTED ACTIVITY, and (5) THE KHALIFAH IS A WAR TARGET. The Critical-Metaphor-Analysis approach has been applied to these five metaphors at two complementary stages of analysis: (1) at the micro-analysis stage, the metaphorical linguistic expressions associated with the search term “Khilafah” in the data have been identified, then the conceptual metaphors underlying these
linguistic expressions have been interpreted; (2) at the macro-analysis stage, the broad socio-historical context of the Khilafah conceptual metaphors, drawn upon by the discourse participants at stake, has been explained. In what follows, I summarize the findings of the micro-macro analysis of each metaphor aside and then discuss the implications arising from these findings.

The first conceptual metaphor (RE/ESTABLISHING THE KHALIFAH IS STRATEGIC PLANNING) has been linguistically realized in the use of the words "method" and "methodology" in the text. It is through such a structural metaphor that the authors conceptualized the tradition of the Muslims' Prophet in establishing the Islamic State in Medina (622 CE [1 A.H.]) as being the model to be followed for the establishment of the modern Khilafah. As demonstrated in the analysis section above, such a conceptualization is prestigious as it tends to project the source-domain STRATEGIC PLANNING as being part of the Enlightenment discourse in the West onto the target domain RE/ESTABLISHING THE KHALIFAH as being part of the discourse of political Islam. Further, the authors capitalized on the elements "planners" and "plan" from the same source domain in a way that renders the current Muslim Khilafah seekers serious and well-informed about their efforts and goals towards re-establishing the Khilafah. Thus, eventually, with the analogy drawn between those Muslim Khilafah seekers and strategic planners, the whole project of the Khilafah establishment becomes more modernized and enlightened.

The second conceptual metaphor (THE KHALIFAH IS A BUILDING) has been consistently realized in the word forms "establish," "establishing," and "establishment." Again, this is a structural kind of metaphor, whose conceptual mappings are so rich as to provide the Khilafah target domain with a highly concrete framework: the Khilafah ruling system takes the form of "building structure"; the world Muslims of today are viewed as being the active builders of the modern Khilafah State, and finally the good faith of those Muslims is conceived of as being the strong foundations of the building. Also, as the macro analysis manifested, the source domain BUILDING makes out a good case for the conceptualization of the Khilafah as a political structure with Islamic laws and constitution, which can govern the Muslim society, and not a mere religious practice in Islam.

The third conceptual metaphor (THE KHALIFAH IS A RELIC) has been linguistically cued through the word-forms "re-establish" and "re-establishment," both of which are morphologically marked with the prefix re-, and thus semantically denote the existence of a past Khilafah. As discussed in the analysis section, in this case, the conceptual entailment "to re-establish is to re-build" interestingly arises with the source domain RELIC, which affords the target KHALIFAH a past status. Hence this kind of metaphor is essentially ontological, and it follows that such an element of postness may stress the historical essence of the concept of the Khilafah. Indeed, the macro analysis of the metaphor THE KHALIFAH IS A RELIC has already emphasized the authors' keenest interest in recalling the glorious past of the Khilafah and its historical traces, and thus it offered a broad mental space for the readers to go back in time to the golden era of the Khilafah dating from the early Medina State established by Muhammad till the Ottoman Empire in Constantinople.

Almost the same meaning, yet with more pragmatic implications, has been demonstrated in the fourth conceptual metaphor (THE KHALIFAH IS AN INTERRUPTED ACTIVITY), where the word forms "resumption," "resume," and "resuming" represented the historical discontinuity of the Khilafah State. As already shown in the analysis, in their conceptualization of the Khilafah as being an interrupted activity, the authors have relied on their conservative knowledge that the Khilafah State is currently dysfunctional. Thus, like the preceding conceptual metaphor, the present metaphor is ontological in that it defines such a politically dysfunctional status of the Khilafah. Here, as demonstrated earlier, there seems to be a pragmatic force intended by the metaphor producers: a call for today's Muslims in Britain and the Western World to change the dysfunctional status of the Khilafah, which would yield the non-interrupted activity of resuming the Islamic way of life, as already stated in the book title.

The last conceptual metaphor (THE KHALIFAH IS A WAR TARGET) has been linguistically evoked by the word forms "destruction" and "destroyed." Indeed, both micro- and macro-analyses have teased out the structural mappings holding between the source WAR TARGET and the target THE KHALIFAH. It is through these structural mappings that the authors highlighted three ideologically significant aspects: (1) the attackers of the Khilafah State, explicitly named the "Kuffar" (non-Muslim infidels) and "Mustafa Kemal Atatürk"; (2) the war destructive effect of dismantling the Shari'ah, or Islamic law; and (3) the defeat resulting in the ending of the Khilafah State. The authors' conceptualization of the Khilafah as a target in the war was explained against the socio-historical background of the Atatürk government, which, immediately after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire in World War I, transformed the Islamic Caliphate in Constantinople into the nation-state of Turkey. This nation-state followed the secularist French model of laïcité; the model was borrowed to separate religion from politics in Turkish society.

Indeed, the foregoing outline offers a summary of the general answer to the overall research question in the present study: What is the metaphorical representation of the concept of the Khilafah in the text of Hizb ut-Tahrir Members? Notwithstanding this, we need to demonstrate how the relevant sub-questions have been answered throughout the analysis section. In answer to the first sub-question of what the dominant conceptual metaphors underlying the concept of the Khilafah are in the text of Hizb ut-Tahrir Members, it is noticed that the analysis has revealed that the target concept THE KHALIFAH had five significant source domains: STRATEGIC PLANNING,
BUILDING, RELIC, INTERRUPTED ACTIVITY, and WAR TARGET. Each of these source domains has contributed in a way to the overall message about the concept of the Khilafah as being conceptualized by Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir. The finding has the important implication of metaphor-induced coherence, which may be phrased as such: In order for the overall structure of the attacked Khilafah to be re-/built and for its active role in resuming the Islamic way of life to obtain, the well-established Method of the Muslims' Prophet must be followed.

Answering the second sub-question of what kinds of conceptual mapping are involved in these metaphorical representations, the analysis focused on the different source mappings projected onto the target domain THE KHLAFAH in the research data. In this connection, the analysis has shown two types of source-domain mapping, structural and ontological, based on the different cognitive functions associated with the conceptual metaphors referred to earlier. The target domains RE-/ESTABLISH THE KHLAFAH and THE KHLAFAH were demonstrated to be structured through the rich set of mappings activated by the source domains STRATEGIC PLANNING, BUILDING, and WAR TARGET. It is through these conceptual mappings that the readers may potentially conceptualize the re-/establishment of the Khilafah as a well-planned undertaking adopted by serious, well-informed seekers and the Khilafah itself as construction of laws and constitution, sustained and maintained by today's Muslims in the West, and finally as a target of the attack – the last being a historical framework that specified the Khilafah enemies.

Quite related to the above finding of the Khilafah structural mappings is the implication that the authors (Hizb ut-Tahrir Members) have also drawn on ontological source domains in the conceptualization of the target THE KHLAFAH. Very prominently, as shown in the analysis, the two source domains RELIC and INTERRUPTED ACTIVITY have imparted a two-part historical status to the concept of THE KHLAFAH: the first status consisted in the past Khilafah over centuries of the golden Islamic era and the present cultural remnants of such a Khilafah; the second status had to do with the Khilafah as being a discontinued activity that needs to be resumed. This implication can be said to have some bearing on the coming finding of the socio-historical explanation of the Khilafah metaphors dominant in the research data.

The macro analysis of the Khilafah metaphors can be considered an adequate answer to the third and last sub-question of how such metaphorical representations could be explained in the socio-political context of the Islamic Khilafah. At this level of analysis, the discourse participants of Hizb ut-Tahrir Members and their target audience of Muslims in both Britain and the Western World have been brought into the analytic focus relative to the conceptual metaphors under investigation. This constituted a critical reading of the socio-historical context of the discourse wherein these conceptual metaphors have been activated or cued at the linguistic level. For example, as emphasized earlier, a macro-analytic focus on the target audience consuming the Khilafah discourse paid attention to their appeal to the metaphorical linguistic expressions of "method" and "methodology"; those terms are prestigiously associated with the discourse of logistics and its implications of guided planning as opposed to the discourse of the Middle Ages whose implications are the clergy and the church. This explained why Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir have consciously drawn on the conceptual metaphor RE-/ESTABLISHING THE KHLAFAH IS STRATEGIC PLANNING.

Also, an account of the history of the Khilafah and its rival concepts of secularism and Kemalism has been utilized in the explanation of the metaphor THE KHLAFAH IS A WAR TARGET. This should not go too far from the analytic focus on the politico-religious nature of the Khilafah, which has contributed to the full explanation of the conceptual metaphors THE KHLAFAH IS A BUILDING, THE KHLAFAH IS A RELIC, and THE KHLAFAH IS AN INTERRUPTED ACTIVITY. The first conceptual metaphor with its source domain BUILDING may be taken as an example here. The analysis focused on the knowledge about the nature of the Khilafah as both (1) deriving its legal and constitutional system from the two main sources of the Qur’an as well as the Prophetic Sunnah in Islam and (2) taking the political form of a state that governed Muslim and non-Muslim subjects – the Khilafah State. This knowledge explained why the source BUILDING, and the conceptual mappings it offers, would best enable the readers to conceptualize the political and religious structure of the Khilafah. Following the teaching of Islam, the Muslims’ Prophet and his followers had once set up such a structure; and now today’s Muslims, following the same teachings, should continue in a way that re-establishes the same structure.

As such, it can be said that without a proper socio-historical explanation of the context of the Khilafah discourse as being produced by Members of Hizb ut-Tahrir in their analyzed text, the conceptual metaphors (identified, described, and interpreted) would not have been fully understood as a discursive practice that is intended to communicate with the target audience about the call for the return of the Islamic Khilafah State.
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