**הערות כלליות**

1. השתדלתי להתייחס לכל ההערות של שלושת הסוקרים.

2. היות והמאמר נשען על תיאוריית המטפורה הקונספטואלית של לקוף וג'ונסון, הגדרתי את תחום היעד ואת תחום המקור והתייחסתי לתחומים אלה בניתוח המטפורות לאורך כל המאמר.

3. הוספתי שאלות מחקר בתקציר והסברתי כיצד ערפאת ממשיג את הצד הישראלי ואת הצד הפלסטיני.

4. בתקציר התייחסתי לעובדה שערפאת נשען על מטפורות מקראיות ומטפורות הקשורות למיתוס המעטים מול הרבים המושרש עמוק בתרבות היהודית כדי להוכיח שבסופו של דבר העם הפלסטיני ינצח במאבקו נגד הכיבוש הישראלי כפי שיוסבר בהרחבה בגוף המאמר.

5. צמצמתי את המבוא בצורה משמעותית. הפרדתי בין המבוא לבין הרקע התיאורטי והמתודולוגיה. במתודולוגיה ציינתי את מגבלות המחקר ואת תאריך האחזור של המטפורות מתוך האינטרנט.

The revised paper uses conventional headings such as Introduction, Literature Review, Data and Methodology, Data Analysis, Discussion and Conclusion. The sections have now been numbered accordingly, with sub-sections as relevant. The introduction has been abridged and separated from the literature review.

**התייחסות להערות הסוקרים של המאמר**

**Reviewer: 1**

Introduction: I recommend reducing the length of the introduction. You can briefly explain the broader political context behind the paper, its research aims, and the research questions.

The introduction has been significantly shortened, in line with the reviewers’ recommendations. After the summary, the introduction only refers to the points recommended by the reviewer—the research topic, the research goals, the thesis on which the paper is based, and the research questions addressed in the paper.

Additionally, please provide references when making claims such as "Many in Israel's left have criticized the emphasis..." (p.7).

The revised paper now includes a reference for the claim that “Many on Israel's left have criticized the emphasis...” (p.7).

Theoretical and Methodological Framework: Consider summarizing the theoretical and methodological framework within which your paper operates. Your readers may already have some background knowledge in this area. Also, it would be helpful to provide a clearer explanation of the methodology used for detecting and categorizing metaphors (e.g., MIP).

The theoretical and methodological framework has been summarized in the revised paper to provide a clearer explanation of the methodology employed for detecting and categorizing metaphors. A clearer explanation of the methodology used for detecting and categorizing metaphors (e.g. MIP) has been included in the revised paper.

Analysis: The analysis procedure appears sound. However, I suggest removing the overall discussion on each source frame and incorporating it into the literature review section.

The overall discussion on each source domain has been moved to the findings section.

Please ensure that you consistently include references in your text, as there are instances where citations seems to be missing.

Thank you for this recommendation. Additional references have been included where required in the revised paper.

**Reviewer: 2**

The text gives an overview to the use of metaphors of Arafat. This is interesting, but in my opinion, the findings are heroicised to a certain extent instead of being placed in the context of the findings of broad political communication research. Only from such a comparison could the special characteristics of Arafat's use of metaphors be made plausible.

I have focused on the unique characteristics of the metaphors employed in Arafat's political discourse.

I have listed the source domains through which the metaphors in the findings were conceptualized. In the conclusion section, a broad paragraph has been added describing the source domains employed by Arafat and how Arafat employed these source domains mainly to conceptualize the Israelis, but also the Palestinians.

"Arafat’s use of metaphor in his political discourse has distinct rhetorical characteristics that can be identified" (p. 2) - Compared to what - world wide political communication? 'Arabic' discourses? Former Palestinian leaders "may make Arafat’s messages more understandable to his audience" ->  Speculative, if

No indications/evidence is given for it.

The word “distinct” has been removed from the revised paper. The intended meaning is that Arafat’s use of metaphors has clear rhetorical characteristics that help him convey his messages.

Comparisons with the Holocaust (p. 4, 6) are often found in political communication (also in German discourse and also among right-wing populists of various nations). And it is not clear to me why Arafat's case is not also about a strategic analogy-building, in which the suffering of the Palestinian population is compared with that of the Jews in Germany.

השוואות עם השואה (עמ' 4, 6) נמצאות לא פעם בתקשורת הפוליטית (גם בשיח הגרמני וגם בקרב ימניים פופוליסטים של עמים שונים).

ולא ברור לי מדוע המקרה של ערפאת אינו עוסק גם בבניית אנלוגיה אסטרטגית, שבה משווים את הסבל של האוכלוסייה הפלסטינית לזה של היהודים בגרמניה.

The introduction is far too long and is heavily overloaded with theses, methodological brief references, also redundant (z.B. 4, 6)

The introduction has been significantly shortened, in line with the reviewers’ recommendations. After the summary, the introduction only refers to the points recommended by the reviewer—the research topic, the research goals, the thesis on which the paper is based, and the research questions addressed in the paper.

The double messages rhetoric" (6) - I don't understand the particular here. Above all, it seems to me that this is less about metaphors and much more about more complex (presumably well-known) religious narratives that are used as a framework to interpret the current situation. But this happens everywhere where political and religious ideolgical elements are combined: e.g. also among conservative Christian politicians. Similar "The simple-message rhetoric. (6)

What is unique about the rhetoric of Arafat’s double messages is that through a Holocaust-related metaphor, Arafat disguises his true message, although he means it implicitly. This is not obvious because many political figures prefer to express their opinions overtly, even if they is particularly difficult (see section 4.2.7.1).

Arafat does not directly compare the behavior of the Israelis toward the Palestinians to that of the Nazis, though he does intend to imply it.

The data basis is still quite unclear: what are the selection criteria of the collection of speeches and newspaper texts? Are there differences between protocols/paraphrases of speeches in newspaper textes ("secundary orality") and/or were the original protocols of speeches available? Were the speeches transcribed (if so, how)? The total number of interviews analysed should be mentioned in the main text, not in a footnote.

In selecting the data, the authors sought to encompass all of Arafat’s political discourse, which includes speeches and interviews taken from the internet and political discourse taken from print media. The bulk of Arafat’s political discourse can be found in four print newspapers: Al-Quds, Al-Ayam, Al-Haya Al-Jadida, and Al-Sha’ab.

Some of Arafat’s speeches found on the internet were recordings, and some were in text format. Details regarding the limitations of the study have been added to the methodology section—one of the limitations relates to the fact that Arafat’s written speeches that were published in print media have not been published on the internet, and therefore it was not possible for the authors to verify political speeches quoted in a newspaper either with a transcript or a recording of the speech itself. The examples provided in the paper were translated into English from Arabic by a professional native English-speaking translator and editor. The total number of interviews has been noted in the main body of the revised paper.

**Reviewer: 3**  
The abstract is too long and some parts could be summarized in ways that the reader has a clearer idea of what the author is trying to do.

This recommendation has been implemented in the revised paper, and the abstract has been summarized.

The introduction contains data and comments that should be moved to the discussion paragraph. In the introduction, the author should go through the general premises, hypotheses, and structure of the paper. Research questions and research gaps should also be stated clearly in the introduction and then repeated in the methodological paragraph

.

The introduction has been significantly shortened, in line with the reviewers’ recommendations. After the summary, the introduction only refers to the points recommended by the reviewer—the research topic, the research goals, the thesis on which the paper is based, and the research questions addressed in the paper.

This sentence from the abstract should be reformulated "It was very important to address the concepts of "conceptual metaphor," CDA theory, and the term "topos", as these concepts describe and clarify how Arafat sharpened his overt and covert messages in a positive way and refrained from expressly equating the behavior of the Israeli government towards the Palestinians with the behavior of the Nazis towards the Jews during the Holocaust, even if that was his intention".

I have reformulated this sentence and moved it to the Introduction:

*It was very important to address the concepts of critical discourse analysis theory and conceptual metaphors, in particular the concept of source domains and target domains (Lakoff 1980) to explore how Arafat employed emotional manipulation to influence public opinion. Furthermore, some theoretical background concerning the rhetorical concept of topos has been included, since there is a strong relationship between this and how Arafat expresses his criticism of the Israeli government, as is extensively discussed below. One of the limitations of this study is that the few of Arafat’s political speeches have been published on the internet. Another limitation is reflected in the fact that, although a relatively large number of media interviews with Arafat have been published on the internet, a significant number of these are relatively short.*

Sections devoted to theoretical framework and methodology should be signalled as such in the title of paragraphs (2. for instance, introduces the notion of discourse).

חלקים המוקדשים למסגרת ולמתודולוגיה תיאורטית צריכים להיות מסומנים ככאלה בכותרת הפסקאות (2. למשל, מציג את המושג שיח).

This recommendation has been addressed and implemented in the revised paper.

The author should clarify the amount of data analyzed, where it was retrieved and how. A table would be helpful. Also, it is not clear how the author categorized the metaphors (page 14).

על המחבר להבהיר את כמות הנתונים שנותחו, היכן הם אוחזרו וכיצד. שולחן יעזור. כמו כן, לא ברור כיצד סיווג המחבר את המטאפורות (עמוד 14).

The amount of data analyzed has now been noted in the revised paper. The retrieval date of the metaphors and details of how they were retrieved has also been recorded. A clear explanation has been added to the methodological chapter regarding how the metaphors were categorized. The retrieval date of the metaphors has also been noted.