

# Contents

<i>List of Tables and Figures</i>	vii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ix
<i>Notes on the Contributors</i>	x
1 Analysing Conceptual Metaphors in Political Language <i>Kathleen Ahrens</i>	1
<b>Part I Gender and Conceptual Metaphors in Political Speeches</b>	<b>7</b>
2 Metaphor, Politics and Gender: a Case Study from Germany <i>Veronika Koller and Elena Semino</i>	9
3 Metaphor, Politics and Gender: a Case Study from Italy <i>Elena Semino and Veronika Koller</i>	36
4 Gender versus Politics: When Conceptual Models Collide in the US Senate <i>Kathleen Ahrens and Sophia Yat Mei Lee</i>	62
5 <i>Non una donna in politica, ma una donna politica:</i> Women's Political Language in an Italian Context <i>Gill Philip</i>	83
6 The Metaphorical Construction of Ireland <i>Encarnación Hidalgo Tenorio</i>	112
<b>Part II Gender and Conceptual Metaphors in Political Debates</b>	<b>137</b>
7 Metaphor and Gender in British Parliamentary Debates <i>Jonathan Charteris-Black</i>	139
8 Sex Differences in the Usage of Spatial Metaphors: a Case Study of Political Language <i>Anatol Stefanowitsch and Juliana Goschler</i>	166

9	Conceptual Metaphors of Family in Political Debates in the USA <i>Karen L. Adams</i>	184
<b>Part III Women in Gendered Conceptual Metaphors</b>		<b>207</b>
10	Gender, War and Body Politics: a Critical Multimodal Analysis of Metaphor in Advertising <i>Michelle M. Lazar</i>	209
11	Power as a Conceptual Metaphor of Gender Inequality? Comparing Dutch and Spanish Politics <i>Petra Meier and Emanuela Lombardo</i>	235
12	Gendered Metaphors of Women in Power: the Case of Hillary Clinton as Madonna, Unruly Woman, Bitch and Witch <i>Elvin T. Lim</i>	254
	<i>Index</i>	270

## 1

# Analysing Conceptual Metaphors in Political Language

*Kathleen Ahrens*

*Hong Kong Baptist University and National Taiwan University*

The past two decades have seen an increase in the number of women serving in high-level political positions in countries throughout the world. Yet, to date, there has been no contrastive examination of the metaphorical language men and women use in the political arena. This is particularly relevant in light of research that argues that men and women use conversation rituals differently in the workplace: women to engage, men to win (Tannen 1994/2001; Holmes and Stubbe 2003), and that business media discourse involves *WAR* metaphors, which are regarded as a ‘masculinizing force on both discourse as well as on related social practices’ (Koller 2004: 172). If men and women are using language differently in the workplace, and the language of business has inherently masculine metaphors, what type of conceptual metaphors do women use when they participate in political office? Do they adopt the conceptual metaphors used by the majority (i.e. the men) as seems to happen in much of business discourse, or do they highlight their differences with their male colleagues by using conceptual metaphors that reflect their own perspectives on life and on the political situations as they see it? Or, as Cameron (2007) and Koller and Semino (this volume) suggest, do men and women exhibit certain patterns of linguistic behaviour which may make them appear as either masculine or feminine?

The first eight chapters in this volume examine linguistic data (cf. Charteris-Black 2004, 2005) from five countries (Great Britain, Germany, Italy, Ireland and the United States) to determine to what extent the conceptual metaphors used by women with political power differ from, or remain the same as, those of men. These eight chapters have been divided into two sections: the five chapters in Part I examine the conceptual metaphors that politicians themselves use when speaking to their

## 2 Politics, Gender and Conceptual Metaphors

colleagues and their constituents; the three chapters in Part II look at the conceptual metaphors used by men and women in political debates in Great Britain, Germany and the United States. Part III discusses data that talk about women: how women are politicised in beauty advertisements in Singapore, how a leading US female senator is viewed by the pundits, and how women are portrayed in policy statements that have to do with women's rights in the Netherlands and Spain. All authors base their analyses on linguistic data that they collected for the purpose of the study. While the studies in the first two parts take both a quantitative and qualitative approach to the data presented, the studies in the last part are primarily qualitatively based.

In 'Metaphor, Politics and Gender: a Case Study from Germany', Koller and Semino work with a corpus of interviews and speeches given by the current and former German chancellors, Angela Merkel and Gerhard Schröder, and examine the number of metaphor tokens, metaphor types, as well as metaphoric type-token ratio and metaphor density per 1000 words, in addition to qualitative analyses of the metaphors used. Koller and Semino demonstrate through these analyses that Merkel uses metaphor in a formulaic manner, and that Schröder has a more pronounced use of WAR metaphors. In the conclusion, they argue against a monocausal explanation of gender-driven language use, noting that political party and other contextual information may also influence their results. In 'Metaphor, Politics and Gender: a Case Study from Italy', Semino and Koller run similar analyses on the Italian prime minister, Silvio Berlusconi, and on Emma Bonino, a prominent parliament member and former European commissioner for health and consumer protection. Semino and Koller point out that the differences in the metaphors used can be attributed to a range of factors, including: political orientation, goals, topics discussed, institutional roles and national audiences, as well as in the ways each politician strategically uses language associated with masculinity and femininity to reach his or her respective goals.

In 'Gender versus Politics: When Conceptual Models Collide', Ahrens and Lee take a different approach to the issue of metaphor analysis. They look at the lexemes associated with the two overarching conceptual metaphors of the two major US political parties to determine if male or female senators use lexemes associated with one metaphor model more than the other. They find that gender does not drive either lexical choice or collocation patterns in speeches that occur on the US Senate floor. The chapter '*Non una donna in politica, ma una donna politica*: Women's Political Language in an Italian Context', by Gill Philip,

also takes an innovative approach to metaphor analysis. She looks at the speeches, press interviews and press releases of five Italian women ministers from mid-2006 to mid-2007. She then extracts the low-frequency content words, groups those words into semantically related categories, and determines whether these groupings fit the criteria for metaphorical source domains. Once this has been done, consistent mappings which indicate the presence of metaphor themes are identified. Philip finds that in the few instances when feminine themes occur, they are related either to the ministerial remit or the influence of journalists. She thus concludes that the metaphors used by female political leaders in Italy do not differ greatly from those of male politicians.

In contrast to the previous four chapters, Hidalgo Tenorio, in her chapter 'The Metaphorical Construction of Ireland', provides evidence that the Irish president, Mary McAleese, uses metaphorical expressions twice as often as the Irish prime minister, Bertie Ahern. In addition, Hidalgo Tenorio argues that the five key domains are different for these two politicians, with Ahern focusing on information-oriented language and McAleese using people-oriented language. Although Hidalgo Tenorio acknowledges the influence of background, party loyalty and political role, she does see a clear influence of gender coming through in the choice of metaphors and language chosen by McAleese.

The next three chapters all look at debates by politicians. In 'Metaphor and Gender in British Parliamentary Debates', Charteris-Black concludes that male Members of Parliament (MPs) in the British House of Commons use more metaphors than females, especially metaphors having to do with the concepts of health/illness and light/dark. He also notes that female MPs tend to use metaphors to make ethical appeals (although metaphor does not necessarily figure in the rhetoric of all female MPs), while male MPs tend to use metaphor to make an emotional appeal. Experienced female MPs employ metaphor more than inexperienced female MPs – though not as much as experienced male MPs which suggests that metaphor is a rhetorical skill that develops over time as female MPs familiarise themselves with the discourse norms of the House of Commons. In 'Sex Differences in the Usage of Spatial Metaphors: a Case Study of Political Language', Stefanowitsch and Goschler test whether spatial metaphors are used more frequently by men as compared with women parliamentarians in debates in the German Bundestag (the German parliament), based on the assumption that men are better at certain aspects of spatialization than women. However, they do not find evidence to support this hypothesis, as there is no discernible

#### 4 *Politics, Gender and Conceptual Metaphors*

difference in spatial metaphor use. Adams, in 'Conceptual Metaphors of Family in Political Debates in the USA', also does not find evidence that female candidates differ from male candidates in the way they use family metaphors in debates at the local, state or national level in the United States.

Thus, to sum up the findings from the first two parts, only two out of eight studies conclude that men and women use metaphors differently. In the British parliament, male MPs use more metaphors than female MPs, and they use them differently (Charteris-Black), while the Irish president, Mary McAleese, uses more metaphors than the Irish prime minister, Bertie Ahern (Hidalgo Tenorio). However, the chapters in the third part, which look at how women are discussed by politicians or pundits or viewed by advertisers, paint a somewhat different picture as women are stereotyped by the metaphors that are used to describe them.

In Lazar's chapter on 'Gender, War and Body Politics: a Critical Multimodal Analysis of Metaphor in Advertising', she argues that advertisements for female beauty products are based on a model of political confrontation, with the area of battle being the female body, leading to alienation of the self. In addition, women's 'fight' for beauty also refers to metaphors that relate to securing political rights and challenging the status quo. The irony, of course, is that women are now empowered to 'fight' what is perceived as 'deadly' about their own bodies. Meier and Lombardo, in their chapter 'Power as a Conceptual Metaphor of Gender Inequality? Comparing Dutch and Spanish Politics', examine how 'power' is conceptualised in Dutch and Spanish policy documents having to do with the issue of gender inequality in politics, and how conceptual metaphors are employed to describe 'power'. They find that there is no obvious difference in terms of the conceptualisation of power between Dutch and Spanish policies, even though there are historical differences between the two countries concerning women in politics. In both cases, male power over women emerges as a taboo: it is not explicitly discussed as a problem. The invisible unstated norm of male political power suggests the perpetuation of imbalanced gender relations in political decision-making. Lastly, in Lim's chapter, 'Gendered Metaphors of Women in Power: the Case of Hillary Clinton as Madonna, Unruly Woman, Bitch and Witch', he points out that gendered metaphors have been used to attack Hillary Clinton, especially as she has moved beyond the role of First Lady to the arguably more powerful roles of Senator and Democratic presidential contender.

The chapters in this volume do not paint a uniform picture of gender and metaphor in the political realm. Some men use both femininity and masculinity to their advantage (the Italian prime minister, Silvio Berlusconi, discussed in Semino and Koller, comes to mind), and while some women use femininity and what can be construed as feminine metaphors (such as Mary McAleese discussed in Hidalgo Tenorio's chapter), other women do not (for example, Hazel Blears as discussed in Charteris-Black). Moreover, it can sometimes be difficult to detect differences in how men and women use metaphors (as the chapters by Ahrens and Lee, and Stefanowitsch and Goschler point out). However, the use of metaphor to stereotype women can be seen in the way Hillary Clinton is portrayed by her critics.

Thus, though it is possible to find gendered use of metaphors, it is also possible to find many situations in which there are no discernible differences. In short, it seems that in this modern era, both male and female politicians may choose to use femininity and masculinity when it suits their purpose. Moreover, this ability to make the most of the perceived advantages of either gender's traits can be seen through the variety and range of conceptual metaphors politicians employ as they strive to persuade people of their plans and appeal to constituents for support.

## References

- Cameron, L. 2007. 'Patterns of Metaphor Use in Reconciliation Talk'. *Discourse and Society*, 18 (2): 197–222.
- Charteris-Black, J. 2004. *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Basingstoke, Hampshire, UK/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, J. 2005. *Politicians and Rhetoric: the Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Holmes, J. and M. Stubbe. 2003. *Power and Politeness in the Workplace: a Sociolinguistic Analysis of Talk at Work*. London: Pearson.
- Koller, V. 2004. *Metaphor and Gender in Business Media Discourse: a Critical Cognitive Study*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tannen, D. 1994/2001. *Talking from 9 to 5: How Women's and Men's Conversational Styles Affect Who Gets Heard, Who Gets Credit, and What Gets Done at Work*. New York: William Morrow.



# Index

- Adams, Gerry 125  
 advertisements 4, 210–11, 222–3,  
 225, 227–32  
 affiliations, political 175  
 ageing 213, 215, 221, 223, 233  
 Aggression 44, 54, 56, 85, 213, 221,  
 223  
   aggressors 104, 214–15  
 Ahern, Bertie vii, 3–4, 117–19,  
 122–4, 126, 128–30, 133  
 Alexander, Lamar 67  
 Amsterdam 33–4, 61, 81, 111, 135,  
 164, 182–3, 233, 253  
 Asia 133, 227, 230–1  
 Australia 228, 230–1  
 AUTHORITY 38, 63–5, 78, 116  
 authority, moral 63
- BATTLE 95, 100–1, 104–5, 213, 220,  
 226  
 BEAUTIFICATION 211–12, 225–6  
 beauty 4, 114, 210–13, 216–18, 221,  
 225–6, 228, 232–3  
   practices 210–11, 226  
 Beauty Queen 255, 258, 260  
 Beckett, Margaret 146, 148–9, 155,  
 159, 161  
 benchmarking fallacy 253  
 Berlusconi, Silvio 36–47, 49–58,  
 83  
 bind, double 29, 255–7, 259–60,  
 263, 266  
 Bindi, Rosy 86, 90, 94, 106, 109  
 BIRTH 95–8, 103  
 BITCH 4, 254, 258, 262–3  
 Blair, Tony 139, 143, 145, 152–3,  
 159, 169  
 Blears, Hazel 5, 142, 146, 151–3,  
 155–7, 160  
 BNC (British National Corpus)  
 68–9, 74–5, 80, 115, 134  
 bodies, women's 210, 213, 215–16,  
 219, 226  
 body 4, 14, 32, 44, 79, 91–3, 95,  
 103, 110, 124, 209–10, 212–16,  
 218–20, 226  
 BODY 44, 212, 214–15  
 BODY PARTS 91–3, 95, 104, 110, 126  
 BODY BEAUTIFUL 212–13  
 body politics vi, 4, 182, 209–10, 257  
 Bonino, Emma 2, 36–44, 47–50,  
 52–7  
 BOON 188, 205, 259  
 Boxer, Barbara 67  
 BRANDS 212, 219–21, 225  
 British 126, 139  
   House of Commons 3  
   parliamentary debates 3, 139,  
   144, 146, 157  
   political discourse 26  
 British National Corpus *see* BNC  
 Brown, Gordon 139  
 BUILDING 117–18, 125, 133  
 Bush, George 66, 81, 197–8, 204  
 BUSINESS 44, 104–5, 126
- Cameron, David 29  
 candidates viii, 64, 76, 80, 83, 139,  
 146, 159–61, 164, 173, 184–91,  
 193–203, 205–6, 243, 251, 260–1  
   extracting metaphor source domain  
   88  
   party 185, 195, 201  
   third-party 185–6  
 CANDIDATES 197, 201–2  
 care  
   child 79  
   health 71–2, 76, 79  
 Celtic Tiger 114, 122–4  
 children 37–8, 91, 114, 116,  
 129–30, 165, 187–90, 192–4, 205,  
 259  
 Chilton, Paul 20, 32, 62, 81, 118,  
 135, 140–1, 164  
 China 20, 94, 104, 107, 227–30, 232  
 Cienki, Alan 64, 77, 80–1, 184, 206

- Clinton, Bill 64, 66, 75, 145, 199, 204
- Clinton, Hillary vi, vii, 4, 5, 67, 70, 73–5, 200, 254–69
- CO-CAMPAIGNER 197, 199, 206
- CO-CANDIDATE 197, 199, 203
- CO-PUBLIC SERVANT 197–8
- CO-STRATEGIST 197–9
- coalition 18, 37, 41, 53, 83  
centre-left 37–8
- cognition 140, 178–9
- cognitive preferences 166–8, 179–80
- collocational patterns 70–3, 77, 79–80
- colour 124, 211, 219, 225
- conceptual metaphor models 62, 75
- conceptual metaphor theory 12, 14, 29, 34, 36, 63, 117, 140, 211, 253
- conceptual models 62, 64–5, 68, 75–8
- conceptualisations 14, 166, 209–10, 212, 216–19, 224, 235–6, 247
- concordancing 92–3, 105–6, 170
- CONSTRUCTION 48, 118
- consumers 212–14, 221, 225–6
- CONTAINER 16, 126
- Contemporary Theory of Metaphor 34, 182
- corpora 64, 66–7, 77, 86–7, 89–90, 96, 103, 105, 109, 170
- corpus 15, 17, 28–32, 39–40, 58–60, 66, 69–70, 80, 86–90, 95–6, 109, 117–18, 120–2, 170–3, 179–80, 185  
analysis 89, 172, 176  
approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis 5, 33, 81, 110, 135, 164, 206  
linguistics x, xii, 135, 183, 253  
of speeches 65, 85
- critical discourse analysis x–xi, 33–4, 136
- critical frame analysis 235, 239–40, 253
- Critical Metaphor Analysis x, 119
- cultures 13, 32, 120, 122, 167, 179–80
- DARK 148–50, 152–3, 157, 162
- De Valera, Éamon 114–16, 136
- DEATH 95–7
- decision-making 241–4, 247, 252
- DEFENCE 104–5, 214, 220
- Democrats 63–4, 66, 68–9, 71–2, 77, 79, 187–8, 192–3, 196, 198–200, 202–3
- DESTINATIONS 19–20, 23, 127–8, 143, 151, 156
- discourse xi–1, 9–10, 12–13, 32, 34–5, 44, 61, 67, 87–8, 105–6, 110–12, 154–5, 164, 240, 245–8, 252
- Dole, Elizabeth 67
- domains 54–5, 87–8, 104, 143, 147–8, 155, 167, 173, 180–1, 209–12, 217–18, 220–1, 225–6  
abstract 166–7, 171  
metaphorical source 3, 88  
potential source 90, 92–3, 97–8, 100, 102–3  
source 12, 16–19, 21, 23–4, 27, 44–57, 63, 65, 77, 79, 85, 88–90, 92–3, 97–106, 109, 121, 126, 129, 147, 151, 153–4, 162–3, 167, 170, 209, 258  
target 12, 44–7, 63, 106, 109, 120–1, 126, 131, 170, 201, 209, 258, 267
- DOMESTICITY 91–2, 101, 103
- DREAM 44
- Dutch 236, 243–4, 251–2
- ECONOMY 87, 92, 95–6, 128
- elections 25, 27, 38, 53, 55, 64, 66, 73, 76, 84, 153, 159, 186, 236, 250
- EMOTIONS 95, 98
- empathy 28, 63–6, 78, 156
- EMPATHY 63
- empowerment 182, 210, 218, 245, 248  
women's 245
- enemies 55, 100, 114, 211–16, 220, 223
- ENEMIES 212, 214–15
- enemisation 213, 233

- energy 160, 214–15  
 ENTITY 127–8, 212
- family 4, 100, 104, 117–18, 120, 124, 140, 188  
 FAMILY 100, 117–18, 120  
 FARMING LAND 126, 128  
 FEEDING 100, 103  
 FEELINGS 66, 79, 95, 97, 140, 155  
 female viii, 3, 9, 29, 42, 49, 66, 68–71, 79, 84, 100, 112, 114, 139, 162–3, 186  
   candidates 4, 139, 146, 185–6, 191, 195–6, 200, 202–3  
   Democrats 69–70  
   family members 198–9, 203  
   politicians 5, 19, 36, 39, 106–7, 139, 200, 243–4, 249  
   Republicans 69–70  
 female MPs 3–4, 139, 144, 149–51, 155, 157  
   experienced 148–50, 157, 159  
   less experienced 148, 150  
 feminine 1, 9–10, 13, 28–30, 38, 84–5, 97–9, 103, 145, 157, 195, 259, 267  
   traits 28, 84–5, 254–5  
 femininity 2, 5, 13–14, 28–9, 36, 55–7, 84, 255, 259–60  
   empowered 218, 226  
 feminism 114, 183, 216, 218, 234, 246, 253, 259, 267–8  
 fight 4, 24–5, 99–100, 104–5, 211, 213, 215, 218, 220  
 FIGHTERS 212, 216–18  
 fighting 25–7, 100, 104, 212, 216–18  
 FIGHTING 212, 216, 218  
 First Lady 4, 254, 257–9, 267  
   *see also* Clinton, Hillary  
 floor, senate 2, 67, 75–7  
 floor speeches 66, 68, 70  
 FIRE 100–3  
 food ix, 92, 144, 159, 161  
 FOOD PREPARATION 85, 91–3, 101–3, 106  
 FOOTBALL 49, 53, 57  
 force 55, 71–2, 74, 76, 78–80, 127, 131, 266  
 France 18, 110, 228–32
- frequency 17, 65, 68–9, 75–7, 80, 89, 96, 130, 139, 150, 172–3, 176, 184, 201, 203, 252
- GARDENING 101–3, 147  
 GDR (German Democratic Republic) 11, 168–9, 181  
 gender v, x–xi, 2–3, 9–10, 13–15, 27–30, 33–6, 61–3, 118, 144–5, 148, 164–5, 179, 203, 260–2  
   cultural 178–9  
   equality xi, 235–7, 240–1, 244, 248–9, 253  
   identities 9, 13–14, 17, 210  
   inequality vi, 4, 235–6, 238–41, 243, 245–9  
   metaphors 261  
   roles 85, 179  
 Generative Metaphor 136, 165  
 German 18, 20, 30–1, 40, 181–2  
   politicians 16, 30  
 German Democratic Republic  
   *see* GDR  
 Germany x, xii–2, 9, 20, 35, 108, 168, 228–30, 232  
 glass ceiling 132, 242, 247, 252, 267  
 Gonne, Maud 114  
 Graham, Lindsey 67, 72  
 GROWTH 87, 128, 156, 243
- Hain, Peter 141–3, 146, 148–9, 153–4, 156, 158, 160  
 Harman, Harriet 146, 148, 151, 153, 155, 157–60  
 HEALTH viii, 44, 88, 91–3, 95–6, 101–3, 147–8, 154, 157, 163  
 HOME 115, 121  
 HOMELAND 120–1, 129  
 Hong Kong iii, 122, 227–9  
 House of Representatives 79, 185–6, 188, 190, 192, 194, 203–4  
 husband 11, 187–8, 193, 199–200  
 Hutchison, Kay Bailey 67  
 Hyde, Douglas 115  
 hypernym 65–6, 77
- ideational metafunction 12, 14  
 ideology xi, 12, 45, 68, 118–19, 141, 143, 156–7, 175, 203, 259

- ILLNESS 101–3  
 IMPRISONMENT 101–2, 104  
 India 94, 104, 108, 227, 230  
 intensification 19, 21, 28–9, 32  
 intensity 65, 78, 80  
 interviews 2, 9–10, 15–17, 19, 22, 24–9, 31–2, 36, 39, 56, 58, 60, 86, 109, 200, 263  
 INVASION 104  
 Iraq 41, 66, 224  
 Ireland 1, 113–17, 120–33  
 Irish 114–16, 122–3, 131, 133  
 politics 115, 133  
 Italian  
 corpus 39–40, 57  
 politicians 16, 36  
 politics 37, 41, 43, 53, 57  
 senate 58  
 women ministers 3, 85, 90  
 women politicians 84  
 Italy v, xi, 1–3, 20, 30, 36–8, 41, 44, 46–7, 49, 51, 56–7, 83, 90, 93–4, 97, 104, 108, 110  
 Jenninger, Philipp 33  
 Johnson, Alan 142, 146, 154, 158, 160  
 JOURNEY 12, 17, 19, 21, 32, 40, 44, 116, 118, 120, 126–7, 142, 147–8, 154, 162  
 Kennedy, Edward Moore 66, 67  
 Kerry, John 66, 67, 198, 204  
 keywords vii, 17–19, 22, 27–8, 32, 40, 42, 70–1, 77, 88–90, 100, 102, 105–6, 109, 120, 146–7, 240, 242–3, 251  
 kitchen sink 261–2  
 Lakoff, George 20, 62–4, 73, 75, 107, 116–18, 140, 166, 184, 224, 267  
 Lakoff and Johnson 12, 19, 23, 36, 79, 109, 117, 166, 209, 211, 235, 240, 267  
 Lakoff and Turner 48, 112, 147, 166  
 LAND 120, 121, 132  
 language  
 metaphorical 1, 87, 166–8, 170–1, 180  
 scripted 23, 27, 28, 109  
 LANGUAGE 116  
 Lanzillotta, Linda 86, 98, 109  
 legitimisation 140, 143, 240, 246  
 lemmas 16, 25, 87, 92, 97–8, 100, 104, 106  
 lexemes 2, 16–17, 22, 24, 62, 64–6, 70, 75–8, 80, 221  
 lexical frequency patterns 75–7, 81  
 lesbian 107, 191, 264  
 liberalisms 38, 260, 265  
 liberty 113, 169, 172  
 likeability 254–5, 257  
 LIGHT vii, 3, 118, 147–8, 152–4, 157, 162  
 Madonna 4, 254–5, 258–9, 260  
 male 69–70, 79, 185  
 candidates viii, 4, 154, 158, 186, 188, 191–5, 198, 202–3  
 Democrats 67–70, 192  
 MPs 3, 139, 148–50, 153–5, 157  
 politicians 3, 5, 9, 30, 36, 148, 157  
 Republicans 67–70, 75  
 Senators 2, 68–70, 74, 77  
 mappings, metaphorical 52, 93, 96, 98, 110, 120, 166, 168, 179  
 Markiewicz, Constance 113–14  
 masculine 1, 9, 10, 13, 29–30, 39, 56, 85, 97–9, 103, 144–5, 151, 157, 179, 254–5, 267  
 masculinity 2, 5, 13–14, 36, 55–7, 256  
 hegemonic 12, 33, 164, 210  
 mastery 187–9, 192–7, 201–2  
 McAleese, Mary vii, 3–5, 113, 117–22, 124, 126–33  
 McCain, John vii, 66–7, 70, 73–5, 255, 266  
 Melandri, Giovanna 86, 94, 101, 103, 109  
 Members of Parliament *see* MPs  
 Merkel, Angela 2, 9–11, 15–16, 18–19, 21–2, 24, 26–9, 31–3, 36, 39, 54

## metaphor

- analysis 2–3, 29, 62, 211
  - density 2, 17, 21, 24, 50
  - identification 90, 171
  - linguistics 94, 99, 103, 119, 166
  - sources 104, 106
  - targets 93, 94, 99, 106
  - themes 3, 85, 90, 92–6, 103–6, 109
- metaphoric type-token ratio (mTTR)  
2, 17, 21, 24, 27, 50
- metaphoricity 40, 90, 106
- metaphors
- conventional 49, 122, 125, 147, 150, 157
  - feminine 5, 96
  - gendered 4, 10, 13, 254–5
  - masculine 1, 85, 105, 110, 144, 257
  - primary 14, 16, 63
  - role of 140, 143–4, 156
  - spatial v, 3, 167–80
- militarisation 210, 226
- minister, prime 36–7, 53, 55, 62, 120, 125–6, 133–4, 139, 209
- MONOCONC 187, 203
- MORALITY 63–4
- mother 85, 114, 130, 191–2, 198, 258–9
- MOTION 20, 127, 170–2, 174, 179
- MOVEMENT 44, 99, 127, 151
- MPs (Members of Parliament) 3, 62, 84, 139, 146, 148, 153, 176, 179, 236–8, 246, 251
- Murkowski, Lisa 67
- NATION 115–16, 118, 121, 125, 133
- NATIVE BIRTH 189, 195–6, 202
- NATURAL DISASTERS 91–3, 103
- NATURE 40, 44, 45
- NAUTICAL 102
- Netherlands 2, 236, 238
- New Labour 10, 23, 139, 151–3, 157, 169
- New York Times* 114, 197–9, 204, 205, 256
- NP (Nurturant Parent) vii, 63–5, 69, 71, 73–6, 78
- lexemes 68–76

- NUCLEAR FAMILY 184, 187–97, 201–5
- Nurturant Parent *see* NP

Obama, Barack 70, 73–5, 256–7, 260, 262

office, political 1, 10, 185, 190

ORGANISM 95, 116, 126, 128–9

orientation, political 2, 36, 55

parents 48–9, 115–16, 124, 188, 202, 265

parliamentary debates 139, 148, 168, 173, 241, 251–2

## parties

left-wing 45–6, 238

right-wing 37

pathos 140–2, 150, 154, 156

PERSON vii, 95, 118, 120, 126–7, 129–30

PLANTS viii, 48, 101–2, 116, 128, 131, 148, 154–5, 163

## policy

documents 235–6, 239–40, 246–8, 252

frame 239–41

texts 235–6, 238–41, 243, 249, 252

## political

communication viii, 140–1, 146, 152, 156

debates vi, 2, 4, 137, 185, 201, 245, 248

discourse x, xi, 10, 12, 20, 27, 29, 42–3, 46, 49, 54, 147, 157, 233

ideology 168–9, 172, 174, 177–8, 184, 202

language v, x, 1–3, 81, 109, 168

parties 2, 37–8, 53, 62–3, 66, 71–2, 75, 166, 184, 192, 251

speeches v, x, 7, 62, 122, 241

Pollastrini, Barbara 86, 100, 109

power

- conceptualisation of 236, 245, 247–9

- distribution of 242–3, 252

- gendered metaphors of 258

- representation of 247

POWERFUL ALLIES 212, 219–21, 224

press releases 3, 85–6, 102, 106, 109

problem–solution schema 210–12

- PRODUCTS 212, 220, 221, 233  
 prognosis 239–40  
 pugilists 216–17, 261
- qualitative analysis 9, 19, 29, 50, 211  
 quantitative analysis 29, 83
- Radical movement 38, 42, 55, 59  
 RELIGION 40, 91, 101–2, 145  
 Republican Party 63–4, 190  
 Republicans 63–79, 185, 187–8, 192, 196–8, 201, 203, 257  
 RESCUERS 212, 220, 224  
 rhetoric, political 140, 142, 184  
 rights 71–80, 100, 212, 216, 218  
   civil 38, 55, 71–2, 79  
   women's 2, 151, 251, 259  
 Robinson, Mary 117, 134  
 ROMANCE 88  
 ROOTS 47–9, 102, 116, 163, 196
- saboteur 212, 215  
 Schröder, Gerhard 2, 9–10, 15, 30–1, 36  
 self-aestheticisation 210  
 self-legitimation 143  
 senate 62, 66–8, 73, 75–6, 79–80, 185–6, 192, 205, 238, 254, 256  
 senators 4, 62–80, 254, 258  
 sex differences 167–8, 177  
 SF (Strict Father) 63–5, 75, 78  
   lexemes vii, 68–76  
 Short, Clare 146, 148, 150, 155, 159, 161–3  
 Singapore 2, 122, 209  
 SLEEP 44  
 Social Democrats *see* SPD  
 Socialist Party 238, 243, 246, 251  
 Socialists 172, 174–5, 238  
 Spain x, xi, 2, 149, 236, 238, 242, 245  
 Spanish texts 241–4, 251–2  
 SPD (Social Democrats) 10–12, 19, 169–75
- SPORTS vii, 28, 49–51, 53, 55–7, 85, 140  
 STRENGTH 63–5, 78–9, 93, 125, 226, 263  
 Strict Father *see* SF  
 SUBMISSION 95, 97  
 synonyms 87–8, 241–2
- TARGET 216, 219  
 target domains *see* domains, target  
 TIGER 121–4, 126  
 Thatcher, Margaret 148, 159, 255  
 TOOLS 92, 94, 98–9, 102–3  
 transcripts 172, 181, 204  
 TREE 116
- under-representation 242, 245–7  
 United States v, x, xi, 2, 4, 44, 64, 66, 169, 184–6, 198, 202  
 unruly women vi, 4, 254–6, 258, 260–4
- VEHICLE 116  
 VIOLENCE 90, 95, 100  
 VISION 40, 44, 47, 92, 98–9  
 visual images 131, 211, 215, 219
- Wales 142, 154, 158, 160  
 WAR x, 17, 19, 24, 26–7, 40, 44, 88, 90, 95, 98, 100, 102–5, 211–12, 223, 225–6  
 WARFARE 209–20, 213, 219, 225  
 WARRIORS 85, 212, 214, 216–17, 219, 223–6  
 WEAPONS 220–1, 262  
 WEATHER 101–3  
 WINDOWS 93, 131  
 WITCH vi, 4, 254, 258, 262–5  
 Wmatrix 117, 119  
 WordNet 65, 77  
 WordSmith Tools 16, 40, 89, 109, 117, 120
- Yeats, W. B. 114

