

SopioTotibadze

GENDERED METAPHORS IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Abstract

Metaphor can be seen as one of the most essential and sufficient tools at politicians disposal, as it is based on the sub-conscious associations of the listener and is used to stir their emotions (Charteris-Black, 2014). Moreover, metaphors are not only used to influence the audience, they also help the linguists to sketch the image of a political leader, depending on what types of metaphors the latter employes.

This paper aims to analyse the political discourse of four British Prime Ministers and seeks out to answer the following questions: (1) do politician women reveal the same pattern of choice when employing metaphors as their male counterparts, and (2) are there gender-related differences between the sets of metaphors chosen by male and female politicians. Finally, the paper determines the probable reasons behind the choice of metaphors by female politicians to investigate the increase of masculinity in their speech.

The study has shown that most frequently used metaphors in the researched speeches are from the domain of war, health building and journey, which are habitual for a masculine speech (Mio, 1997; Flannery, 2001; Philip, 2009; Friedman, 1987). Interestingly, the reasons behind these choices can be that Britain is a masculine culture (Hofstede, 1991), as well as women in male-driven professions still feel the urge to opt for the masculine speech strategies, in order to avoid the social gender prejudice.

Key words: gender, metaphor, sociolinguistics, political discourse.

Introduction

Public spheres like politics and the media consider the ability to communicate ideas properly and persuasively to be crucial for successful communication. While nowadays trust in the media has become a more difficult commodity to gain than ever, political leaders face the need to employ special

linguistic or non-linguistic tools in their speeches, in order to achieve their ultimate goal - that is to build trust in and gain empathy with their possible voters. As claimed by Charteris-Black (2014), rhetoric remains to be the indivisible part of politics. In addition, only thoroughly planned and chosen words that fit the speaker's needs together with refined and corresponding body language can ensure both the success of the delivered speech and, most importantly, the positive effect on the target audience. Charters-Black also reflects back on Aristotelian and Platonic traditions, which, according to him, still survive and are deeply interwoven with the public spheres, including politics. He defines rhetoric as the arts of presenting the truth in a way that persuades the audience and meets the needs of the speakers. Moreover, the branch of rhetoric that is employed in politics is considered to be deliberative, placing an emphasis on attracting the voters and aiming at the future benefits of the speaker (2014).

Based on this, it is often suggested by linguists that language can offer invaluable insight into the intentions and, even more, can construct a psychological portrait of a speaker. Nowadays, due to its high importance, immense attention is drawn to the role of the gender in the speechmaking process, as linguists often claim that men and women command language differently. More precisely, whilst women see the act of speaking as a means of establishing personal relationships, men use language as a tool to obtain and convey information (Holmes, 1995). In addition, a handful of researchers interested in gender studies claim that female and male speaking styles also vary because of the social attitudes towards the masculine and feminine roles in the society (Crespi, 2003; Merchant, 2012). For instance, in a public space like politics, men are considered to be more dominant, therefore, the masculine way of speaking (such as being assertive, competitive, aggressive, interruptive, confrontational, direct, autonomous, dominating, task-oriented (Holmes, 2006)) is largely considered to be an appropriate style. On the contrary, women are believed to be naturally empathetic, less prone to interruptions, more skilled in turn-taking, polite and less confrontational or direct. Unlike men, they tend to use powerless speech forms like tag questions, hedges, apologies, forms of politeness, etc. (Mills, 2003). Not surprisingly, women seem to be negatively assessed, and are claimed to sound unconvincing whilst using feminine speech strategies in a male dominant sphere. Therefore, despite the undesirable nature of masculine speech strategies, women tend to opt for them when exposed to the male dominated public spaces.

One of the ways to successfully communicate a hidden message is by employing powerful stylistic devices, for instance, tropes like allusion, allegory, irony, metonymy, and metaphors. According to Charteris-Black, Aristotle in *Poetics* proposes the definition of metaphor as something that consists in giving the thing a name that belongs to something else. Thus, metaphor is used to link two notions that are not usually considered as related or which do not naturally evoke each other positively. Therefore, one of the most prominent features of metaphor is that on the basis of one idea, notion or thought, the listener can explore the limitless ways of understanding another notion that is not obviously connected to it (2014). Strikingly, the role of metaphor and other stylistic devices as effective persuasive tools in politics have been known for a long time too. For instance, it is believed that metaphors make it easier for people to “grasp the meaning of political events and feel a part of the process” (Mio, 1997, p. 130). In addition, metaphors are parts of the prevailing notions of information-processing models of public knowledge of politics. However, contemplating the significance of metaphor for political discourse, Mio admits the equivocal and contradictory character of the studies aiming at exploring this issue. Interestingly, the author advises future scholars to focus on the situations in which metaphors are effective which would lead to hiding some aspects of political discourse whilst revealing many of its interesting moments (1997).

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) suggest that metaphors play a colossal role in our everyday lives. Based on their research, the shape of a human’s brain is structured in a way that people think through metaphors, stressing the approach that a metaphor is not simply a trope or a linguistic device, but a core conceptual part of human brain. Therefore, it is not surprising that scientists (Charteris-Black, Chilton, Lakoff, etc.) suggest that metaphors take up a vast amount of attention in political rhetoric as the speakers try to trigger emotional associations in their listeners and possible voters by carefully selected words. However, it is important to be aware of the fact that a wide cultural and background knowledge is required in order to properly decode the metaphor suggested by the speaker.

Additionally, in her insightful study of discourse and gender, Koller explores the way metaphor positions men and women and how it can evoke socio-cognitive representations of gender social domains (Koller, 2004). On the other hand, as the previous studies have shown (Shaw, 2002; Jones, 2016; Rusieshvili-Cartledge, 2017), women tend to use more masculine ways of speaking when it comes to public spheres like politics. Therefore, there still remains a significant gap when it comes to

the usage of metaphors by female and male politicians and this sparked the interest to investigate whether the two sexes reveal gender-specific differences when employing metaphors in their narrative or they actually follow the tendency of opting for a more masculine way of speaking. In this specific case, it is interesting to explore whether female politicians choose the metaphors that are most commonly employed by males.

The relevance of this research lies in the fact that it aims to contribute to the existing research in the field and, at the same time, add new data to already known facts about this issue. Specifically, the paper investigates whether female politicians show the same trend as men when employing metaphors in their speech. More precisely, the paper will focus on two main research questions (1) whether politician women reveal the same pattern of choice when employing metaphors as their male counterparts, and later (2) will investigate whether there are gender-related differences between the sets of metaphors chosen by male and female politicians. Finally, the paper will determine the probable reasons behind the choice of metaphors by female politicians to investigate the increase of masculinity in their speech. To achieve answers to the above-mentioned research avenues speeches delivered by four British Prime Ministers (two female and two male) will be explored and metaphors employed by them will be compared and contrasted. Metaphors will be identified and grouped according to their belonging to a certain source domain. Finally, metaphors will be analysed according to which gender they belong to (feminine or masculine) and whether there is a tendency emerging regarding the preference of certain gendered metaphors as employed by female and male politicians.

2. Metaphor in Politics

As claimed by Charteris-Black, metaphor is essential and at the same time highly sufficient in politics, being based on the emotional and sub-conscious associations, when uttered it calls up on the cultural or historical background knowledge of the listener. Implying the fact that the target audience is part of the culture and aware of the historical past of the country, correctly chosen metaphorical mapping can trigger emotional response and persuade the possible voters towards the goodwill of the politician (2014). Therefore, when correctly used, metaphor can be a powerful device in politics.

In spite of the fact that the frequent usage of this or that metaphor is very dependent on the current processes and the issues of the day, there are still several of them that keep their constancy. Chilton

(2004), when analyzing political discourse, claims that political concepts usually include conceptual metaphors of JOURNEY, like coming to a crossroads, moving ahead towards a better future, overcoming obstacles on the way, etc. Besides, according to the previous studies (Howe, 1988; Mio, 1997) metaphors of WARFARE, SPORT, NATURE, VIOLENCE and FAMILY are also repeatedly used in the political discourse. The popularity of SPORT metaphors can be explained by the positive mappings connected to it, e.g., TEAM, which helps the speaker create a bond between the voters and the political party and establishes the sense of a group or team. Furthermore, the aforementioned metaphor gives the politician a possibility to innocuously speak about winning and defeating the competitors, thus, other parties, scoring against them or hitting home runs. Therefore, by employing SPORT metaphors, especially those connected to the TEAM make the electorate believe that they themselves are actively involved in a campaign and are the important members of the team (Howe, 1988). WAR metaphors also let the leaders gain the victory and defeat the adversary, however, as Mio points out, these metaphors are strongly male in nature and exclude women (1997). However, unlike WAR metaphors, which, as mentioned above, usually entail winning over others, FAMILY metaphors often occur in the context of creating the sense of family and bringing people together (Ottati, 2014).

Interestingly, metaphors are not only used while describing certain political situations, but are also perfect devices in the process of sketching the image of a political leader, in order to strengthen or weaken their public image in society. For instance, calling Margaret Thatcher ‘The Iron Lady’ underlies her iron-like character, which for its part presents her strong personality - unusual for a woman. Gendered metaphors connected to Hillary Clinton sometimes help her to revise positively her role in society (Madonna), or, on the contrary, destroy her femininity and image (Witch, Bitch). However, some metaphors place her in a “double bind” (Unruly Woman) and it is up to the recipient’s attitude how it is decoded (Lim, 2009).

Thus, metaphor as an indivisible part of public speaking remains to be the core device in persuasive speech. Apart from giving the text a holistic touch and coherence, when properly encoded/decoded, it enables the speaker/listener to enhance the experience. Metaphor is key to both gaining attention and obtaining trust. Even more, it enables a speaker to stir and take control over people’s emotions and direct them in favour of their team. While, at first glance, skilled and clever politicians might seem to use familiar, even easy language and common metaphors, in reality they establish a common ground

and set of values with their audience, which in the end can be a powerful, even dangerous commodity for the opponents (Charteris- Black, 2014).

3. Metaphors in Politics and Gender

Although the twenty-first century brought about a number of changes regarding the way we think and perceive the world, gender-driven differences still remain to be striking. In spite of the fact that in most countries women are officially considered equal to men, the reality is still far from the ideal. Interestingly, nowadays women constantly challenge the stereotypical views about which professions are more suitable for them and sign up for the jobs that might seem to be more “acceptable” for their counterparts (Tannen, 1992). However, while doing so, in order to fit in certain standards and stereotypes accepted by their culture, they start adjusting to more masculine speech strategies and try to even sound like them (Holmes, 2006; Rusieshvili-Cartledge, 2017). While politician women try to please the gender-prejudiced public (which undoubtedly is an extremely difficult thing to do) and, at the same time, do their job, they create numerous opportunities for linguists to analyze their speeches and determine the socio-stylistic reasons behind their linguistic choices. As it is speculated that men and women perceive the world differently and use language accordingly (Holmes, 1995), researchers use language as a tool to determine the contrast between the two. Nowadays, when the political platform is being heavily “invaded” by women, interest in the analysis of their political speeches is increasing proportionally and, in fact, a lot of linguists (e.g., Lakoff, Charteris-Black, and Chilton) have channeled their work to analyze political discourse.

As already mentioned on numerous occasions, metaphor in the political speech-making process plays rather a significant role. Therefore, some gender related researches (Lim, 2009; Semino & Koller, 2009; Tenorio, 2009, etc.) are conducted to investigate the probable gender marked differences when politicians employ metaphors in their speeches. However, results are strikingly heterogeneous and keep generating mixed pictures. Dissimilar results in the studies of metaphors used by female and male politicians were explained differently. Some linguists argue that metaphors might not really be gender-marked and the differences or similarities in the choices depend on the political course of the party and their objectives, as well as the target audience (Koller & Semino, 2009). The comparative study of Irish female and male country leaders, on the other hand, proves that there is an obvious interference of gender when it comes to the choice of metaphors (Tenorio, 2009). Analyzing the British Parliamentary

debates, Charteris-Black (2009) observes that experience can be considered as a salient factor when using metaphors, consequently suggesting, based on the collected quantitative data, that males tend to use more metaphors than females and inexperienced women politicians try to avoid employing them in their speech.

Despite the fact that the linguists cannot univocally state that gender is a salient factor when analyzing metaphors, they cannot disagree with the fact that most of the languages are not inherently gender neutral and this might be visible through metaphors too (Mio, 1997; Baider and Gesuato, 2003; Philip, 2009). Specifically, so-called feminine metaphors connote the ideas that are primarily connected to the function of a woman in a domestic space/ family or a society, such as a child bearer, mother or a homemaker. Consequently, feminine metaphors include NURTURING (cooking, feeding, etc.) and other notions that as a cliché are associated with femininity (Friedman, 1987; Philip, 2009). On the other hand, masculine metaphors are comprised of the notions denoting historic roles ascribed to men, among which are HUNTING, WAR and, nowadays SPORT, operating machinery and using tools (Flannery, 2001).

As seen, most famous metaphors occurring in the political discourse (WAR, SPORT) are masculine in nature and show a high tendency to discriminate and exclude women (Mio, 1997), once again strengthening the argument that politics is a male-driven sphere and when part of it, women subconsciously or consciously use the metaphors that are associated with power and winning, rather than stressing their maternity and nurturing side of their essence. This way they avoid placing an emphasis on an empathetic side of a feminine character and stress their strong, man-like one in order to achieve political power.

Hofstede, who groups cultures into feminine and masculine, claims that different cultures can display a different index of masculinity/femininity and the gender-roles are correspondingly adjusted. For instance, more masculine cultures connote that both women and men hold tougher values, learn to be ambitious, competitive or assertive. On the other hand, the members of the feminine culture have more tender values. Thus, as suggested by the author, men in feminine cultures hold more feminine values than women in masculine cultures. According to the data proposed by Hofstede, the United Kingdom, which is selected in this thesis for exploration, scores quite high (66/100) in the masculinity index (MAS). Therefore, British culture is claimed to be more masculine in nature rather than feminine. This

score implies that both men and women are more focused on achievement and are driven by success and competition. In addition, women are more commonly accepted in man-driven workspaces, for instance in the subculture of politics.

4. Data and Methodology

The comparative study of speeches delivered by James Callaghan, Margaret Thatcher, David Cameron and Theresa May has been conducted to investigate (1) which domains of metaphors are mostly employed by them and (2) whether these metaphors are more characteristic of feminine or masculine type of speech. The analyzed corpus consists of about 37,000 words and is divided between the two female and two male PMs of the UK. The previous researches revealed that metaphors can be gender-marked, i.e. feminine or masculine. Their belonging to this or that gender, however, is determined by the nature of the tenor. More precisely, if the notion mapped to the metaphor is originally ascribed to the male sphere, the metaphor conformably is labeled as masculine (Mio, 1997; Flannery, 2001; Baider & Gesuato, 2003; Philip, 2009; Friedman, 1987). The abovementioned grouping of metaphors based on gender is used in this study as a starting point to determine to which gender the political speeches of James Callaghan, Margaret Thatcher, David Cameron and Theresa May are more characteristic of: male or female. As well as this, in the cases of the metaphors that are neither considered to be feminine nor masculine in nature, situations that metaphors describe, are further analyzed into being more passive or active. Specifically, the situations connected to the state or once lacking the agency are grouped as characteristic of female speech, whereas the situations connected to activity are considered as representatives of the male speech.

The UK was chosen as a country of the survey for the following reasons: First, it has a high masculinity index in his categorization of cultures by Hofstede (1991). In addition, the country practices democracy and, at first glance, there is no need of women mimicking male speech peculiarities. Further, throughout its history the UK has given birth to and still is producing influential female figures in politics. More importantly, the data are in English and easily accessible due to the country's political transparency.

Due to the fact that Britain (so far) has only had two female Prime Ministers, Margaret Thatcher and Theresa May, they were chosen for the research. However, in order to ensure the homogeneity of the

political issues and speeches, as well as the similar historical context, the preceding male Prime Ministers of the female PMs, thus James Callaghan and David Cameron, were chosen for comparison.

Additionally, political speeches delivered by the Prime Ministers are divided into three major parts: early career (before becoming the PM); middle career (after becoming the PM) and late career. Due to the reason that Theresa May has not been in the office for a long time, regrettably, in her case, the late career is impossible to analyse. As well as this, speeches delivered by the PMs are thematically selected. More precisely, speeches refer to more or less similar issues. This approach ensures that in all explored cases metaphors are determined by the similar topics, consequently making the research data more homogenous. Metaphors are manually and correspondingly analyzed.

5. Data and Results

The comparative study of four British Prime Ministers' discourse is based on a corpus of 36,628 words (Table 1-2). The data were evenly split between male (18,552) and female (18,076) politicians. In addition, the speeches were selected to cover more or less similar topics concerning education, inflation, crime and current issues. After manually identifying metaphors 598 metaphors in total surfaced from various domains.

Table 1. General description of the data

	Men	Women
Corpus Size/ Number of Words	18,552	18,076
Number of Metaphors	284	314
Metaphor Density (per 1,000 words)	15.3	17.4
Metaphor Density (%)	1.53	1.74

Table 2. Number of metaphors per Prime Minister

	James Callaghan	Margaret Thatcher	David Cameron	Theresa May
Corpus Size	10,455	9,933	8,097	8,143
Number of Metaphors	148	202	136	112
Metaphor Density (per 1,000 words)	14.15	20.3	16.7	13.75
Metaphor Density (%)	1.41	2.03	1.67	1.37

As shown in Tables 1 and 2, on the basis of the speeches selected for the study, Margaret Thatcher uses the highest number of metaphors in her discourse, specifically, 20.3 metaphors per 1,000 words in total (2.03%). Theresa May employs the least number of metaphors, more precisely, 13.75 per 1,000 words (1.37%). As for James Callaghan and David Cameron, both male Prime Ministers exploit approximately the same number of metaphors, 14.15 (1.41%) and 16.7 (1.67%), respectively. Interestingly, in difference to the previous study in this field by Charteris-Black (2009) that suggests that British women politicians, unlike men, avoid using metaphors in their narrative, according to this research, Margaret Thatcher uses the highest number of metaphors out of the four selected British Prime Ministers. On the other hand, Theresa May strengthens Charteris-Black's results as she indeed uses a significantly lower number of metaphors compared to male politicians selected for the study.

Table 3. Summary of most frequently used metaphors in the selected speeches.

Source Domain	Callaghan	Thatcher	Cameron	May
War	20	29	19	13
Journey	30	25	32	34
Health	8	15	3	0
Sport	6	1	2	0

Total	64	70	50	47
-------	----	----	----	----

Table 3 describes the most frequently surfaced metaphors in the selected speeches by four British Prime Ministers. Specifically, the analysis of the data has revealed that the most commonly employed metaphors come from the domain of WAR, JOURNEY, HEALTH and SPORT that, for their part, are considered to be masculine in nature. Interestingly, May usually follows the results put forward by Charteris-Black (2009) and uses the least amount of WAR metaphors (13) and does not employ any HEALTH or SPORT metaphors. However, quite surprisingly, she has the highest score regarding the usage of JOURNEY metaphors (34). On the other hand, Thatcher repeatedly exploits WAR and HEALTH metaphors and, in fact, scores the highest in this respect - 29 and 15, respectively. Callaghan mostly opts for JOURNEY metaphors and uses the most amount of SPORT metaphors (6) compared to other Prime Ministers, whereas Cameron does not reveal any preference for a particular type of metaphor and employs, more or less, all of them.

6. Discussions

The close discourse analysis reveals that the conceptual metaphors that usually underlie speeches delivered by the four politicians are drawn from the domain of WAR and JOURNEY. It is worth mentioning that the WAR metaphors frequently, but not always occur, with the preposition *for* rather than *against*. In other words, when the leaders discuss problematic issues the country is facing and they need the policies to be positively seen and evaluated by the nation, they activate WAR metaphors followed by preposition *for*. Thus, they create the sense of something worth fighting for, such as families, country, or freedom. On the other hand, using WAR metaphors together with the preposition *against* generates negative connotations, for instance, things that threaten Britain's independence, or even the national survival, therefore it needs to be dealt with immediately:

If you risk your life to fight for your country, we will honour you (David Cameron).

And that's why we are now taking still tougher action against knives and against guns (Margaret Thatcher).

In addition, metaphor usage in the selected speeches largely depends on the contrasts where the opponents (in the case of James Callaghan, the Labour party, in other cases the Conservative party) or social and economic problems are regularly seen as the enemies, competitors, cause of infections, threat and obstacles on the road, whereas they themselves and their parties appear to be the defenders of the country, healers or providers of adequate guidance on the road. Therefore, the contrasts based on metaphors are seen as crucial and serve the purpose of heightening the difference between the competitor parties.

Though being rarely presented in the speeches, some interesting metaphors, apart from the SEA and AUCTION metaphors have emerged from the analysis and are worth mentioning. More specifically, Cameron and May, in their speeches, mention a conventional metaphor 'beacon of hope' that is either mapped on to Parliament or Britain:

Let Britain be a beacon of hope (May)

Our parliament used to be a beacon to the world (David Cameron).

As argued by Charteris-Black (2014), the aforementioned metaphor is quite commonly employed in political discourse and serves the purpose of "social aspiration". More precisely, a beacon, according to the Macmillan Dictionary, is "a bright light or fire that shines in the dark and is used as a signal to warn people against danger or to show them the way". Therefore, when mapping Britain or the British Parliament onto the frame of a beacon, it activates the implications of fire (warmth, hope, purifying), light (seeing, knowing) and up (health, happiness). Thus, being a beacon to the world, Britain is presented in the role of the enlightener and provider of hope to the world.

Other striking metaphors that have been observed in the speeches are the MASTER and SERVANT/SLAVE metaphors:

To become the master of events and never again to be their slave (Callaghan).

The politicians are always their servant and never their masters (Cameron).

This country which I am privileged to serve... (Thatcher).

Apart from evoking sentimental feelings linked to imperial Britain that was one of the dominant powers in the world (Charteris-Black, 2005), the MASTER-SERVANT metaphor puts an emphasis on the power of people in the process of governing the country that, for its part, creates the sense of stewardship and of being involved in the governance of the country. As a result, people feel part of the political process. Further, the nation is perceived as the master, whilst the politicians are the servants/slaves serving their country. With this persuasive and powerful metaphor, people are tricked into believing that they have the power, when in reality, politicians are the ones who really govern the country.

The FAMILY metaphor is seldom employed in the speeches selected for this research. In fact, only Callaghan and Thatcher use such metaphors in their narrative and, interestingly, with two polar connotations:

What a wise parent would wish for their children, so the state must wish for all its children (Callaghan).

Inflation is the parent of unemployment (Thatcher).

On the one hand, Callaghan uses family metaphor in a positive way, suggesting that the country/ the government is a parent, whereas the nation is the child. In this way he activates a very productive string of entailments, such as home, warmth, protection and persuades his listeners into his compassion towards his nation. On the other hand, Thatcher connotes the negative associations of a parent as it is seen as the bearer and deliverer of the social problems that is spreading across Britain.

As for the HEALTH metaphors, they are scarcely scattered throughout the speeches. Moreover, they are not at all employed in Theresa May's speeches, which agrees with Charteris-Black's conclusion that women try to avoid health metaphors in their discourse (2009). However, the HEALTH metaphors

that have surfaced in this research usually are comprised of the word ‘recovery’. Moreover, Callaghan believes that “unemployment has become endemic”, whereas Cameron suggests that “self-belief is infectious” and needs to be spread in the country.

To return to the main research question of this paper, more precisely, whether the selected Prime Ministers of the UK employ more masculine metaphors or feminine, it has been previously claimed that metaphors from the source domain of WAR, SPORT and BUILDING are overtly masculine, therefore, undoubtedly belong to the more masculine speech types, than female.

HEALTH metaphors in this research are also grouped as masculine due to its historical context. More precisely, according to Bowman (2002), medicine has a long history of discriminating women from the sphere. Subsequently, as medicine is historically ascribed to be the profession for men rather than women, this paper treats HEALTH metaphors as representatives of more masculine than female speech.

As for the metaphors drawn from JOURNEY domain, that do not have consistent mapping of a certain gender, in order to determine whether they are more indicative of masculinity or femininity, the verbs and situations that metaphors describe are further grouped into ones denoting more active (masculine) or passive (feminine) settings. More precisely, those situations that have obvious agent fulfilling the action are treated as more characteristic of masculinity, whereas when the agent is absent, it is suggested to be more feminine in nature. Consequently, when the speaker presents himself/herself as the one leading the road, the action is handled as masculine. On the contrary, there are cases when, while describing a journey, the speaker states that they are following a certain road. As the process of following (and not leading) is a passive act, such metaphors are considered to be more feminine in nature.

Table 4a. Amount of most frequently used masculine and feminine journey metaphors

Journey Metaphors	James Callaghan	Margaret Thatcher	David Cameron	Theresa May
Lead the road/ the nation	+	+	+	+

Move forward/ different directions	+	-	+	+
Bring forward (the change)	+	+	+	-
Bring the country through the bad times	+	-	+	-
go down the road	+	+	+	+
Take a course/ go that way	-	+	+	+
Total amount of masculine journey metaphors	21	19	19	22
Total amount of feminine journey metaphors	9	6	13	12

Table 4b. Total amount of most frequently used feminine and masculine metaphors

Metaphors	James Callaghan	Margaret Thatcher	David Cameron	Theresa May
Masculine	55	64	37	35
Feminine	12	7	13	12

Table 4a reveals the most frequently exploited masculine metaphors in the speeches delivered by the four British PMs (+ is inserted in the corresponding cells if the JOURNEY metaphors are present in the speeches. Accordingly, - is inserted if the metaphor is absent from the selected speeches). Clearly, these metaphors are active in nature and often denote the process of leading the road or the nation, bringing people towards or through better times, thus, taking a sort of course. As for feminine metaphors that are rarely but still used in their narrative, are usually comprised of words that lack agency, such as a leap that the mankind has witnessed, a climb, a first/final step, or enemies and

problems that lie ahead. These words and phrases denote passive situations and, therefore, belong to the group of feminine metaphors.

I think its best days still lie ahead and I believe deeply in public service.

Yes it will be a steep climb. But the view from the summit will be worth it.

Yes, we have to put our faith in technologies. But that is not a giant leap. Just around the corner are new green technologies, unimaginable a decade ago, that can change the way we live, travel, work.

Table 4b further reveals that with regard to the number of metaphors drawn from the masculine and feminine source domains, masculine metaphors noticeably exceed the metaphors considered more feminine in nature. Strikingly, Thatcher is the one who uses the largest amount of masculine and least amount of feminine metaphors. In addition, apart from 9 feminine JOURNEY metaphors, and one FAMILY metaphor discussed above, Callaghan is the only PM in this research who employs 2 more feminine, more precisely FLOWER metaphors (hence number 12 in the table):

Industrial relations are human relations. They flourish best on a basis of mutual understanding, mutual respect and mutual recognition of rights and responsibilities.

...partnership will continue to flourish and prosper.

7. Conclusions

The spoken word in politics plays a crucial role and is employed extensively by politicians while persuading people to believe in the advantages of their leadership. Metaphors, being one of the prominent figures of speech, fulfill the linguistic purpose of “stirring up” people’s emotional and psychological systems and therefore help the politicians to better express their ideas and win the hearts of their voters. Moreover, metaphors can influence our attitudes and even values by transmitting negative or positive associations to “a metaphor’s target” with the help of “various source words”

(Charteris-Black, 2011). Thus, if exploited properly, metaphors can be dangerous “tools” at certain politicians’ disposal.

Based upon the assumption that previously more attention was paid to both general analysis of political discourse and studying the implications of metaphors exploited in narrative structures, this paper focuses on investigating gendered metaphors employed by politicians in their speeches selected for this study. More specifically, the thesis aimed at answering the following questions: (1) which metaphors are most commonly employed in British political discourse and (2) whether the most frequently used metaphors are more characteristic of female or male speech style, or in other words, whether the speeches indeed contain more female or masculine metaphors. Two female British Prime Ministers’ speeches were selected for the speech analysis and their two preceding male Prime Ministers’ speeches were employed as a basis for comparison. Metaphors were identified and later grouped according to (1) their source domains and (2) belonging to either masculine or feminine style. Taking into consideration that it is highly challenging to decide which of the gender metaphors are more characteristic, several points were taken into account. First, exploration of previous researches (Mio, 1997; Flannery, 2001; Philip, 2009; Friedman, 1987) in the field which were taken as a starting point revealed that WAR, SPORT, and BUILDING metaphors were classed as masculine based due to their historical associations with men-dominated space. By the same token, HEALTH metaphors, based on the acceptance of the fact that medicine has a long history of discriminating women from the field, were also considered to be representatives of masculine speech. Secondly, metaphors associated with family, flowers and nurturing, on the other hand, were classed as feminine. Finally, some metaphors, specifically JOURNEY metaphors, that were difficult to assign to a certain gender, were further analysed. More precisely, JOURNEY metaphors denoting actions and active situations were treated as masculine. On the contrary, the JOURNEY metaphors connoting passivity in the action and lacking the agency were grouped as feminine metaphors.

The collected data analysis highlighted that the selected British Prime Ministers indeed exploit a number of metaphors in their discourse. Most frequently used metaphors turned out to be connected to WAR, HEALTH, BUILDING and JOURNEY, whereas FAMILY metaphors were extremely rare. It is undoubtedly important to mention that the most commonly used metaphors that surfaced from the

comparative study came from the source domains that are suggested by the researchers to be habitual for masculine speech strategies (Mio, 1997; Flannery, 2001; Philip, 2009; Friedman, 1987).

Surprisingly, some of the analysis generates controversial pictures regarding the previous scholarship exploring similar issues. For instance, analysis of Margaret Thatcher's narrative provides a counter evidence of a case study by Charteris-Black (2009) of British Parliamentary Debates which suggests that women tend to avoid using metaphors in their speeches, especially HEALTH metaphors. In fact, as was revealed by this research, Thatcher uses the highest number of metaphors (20.3 per 1,000 words, 2.03%) and also, the highest number of HEALTH metaphors (15). On the other hand, the analysis of May's speeches reveals that she does not employ any HEALTH metaphors and generally tends to use the lowest number of metaphors (13.75 per 1,000 words, 1.37%).

Interestingly, the reasons behind the choices made by female politicians regarding exploiting more masculine metaphors, rather than female ones can be twofold. First, as already mentioned above, in the light of Hofstede's classification of cultures (1991), Great Britain scores high regarding the rate of masculinity. Thus, women in Britain must have more masculine values mirrored in their manner and way of speaking. It can also be assumed that because of being representatives of a masculine society, this trait is so deeply embedded in their nature, that women might not even be aware of their masculine linguistic choices and speech strategies. Secondly, despite the fact that Britain recognizes equality and women are not being differentiated or discriminated based on their gender, some professions still remain to be male-driven. Undoubtedly, politics is one of them. Therefore, women (consciously or unconsciously) try to adjust their narration accordingly, so they are not oppressed due to gender prejudices and can become successful in their professional career (Jones, 2016). Thus, linguistic choices made by female political figures classed as 'natural' for men, can be highly conditioned by the social attitudes towards their gender and women's roles accepted in society and may be considered to be one of the means of constructing their identity.

References:

- Baider, F. H., Gesuato, S. (2003). Masculinist Metaphors, Feminist research. *Metaphorik.de* 5. 6-35.
- Bowman, M. A., Frank, E., Allen, D. I. (2002). *Women in Medicine: Career and Life Management*. New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2009) Metaphor and gender in British parliamentary debates. In Ahrens, K., ed. *Politics, Gender and Conceptual Metaphor*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 139-165.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor* (2nd ed.). Basingstoke [etc.]: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2014). *Analysing political speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Crespi, I. (2003). *Gender socialization within the family: A study on adolescents and their parents in Great Britain*. Department of Sociology Catholic University of Milan.
- Flannery, M.C. 2001. 'Quilting: a Feminist Metaphor for Scientific Inquiry'. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7: 628-45.
- Friedman, S. (1987). Creativity and the Childbirth Metaphor: Gender Difference in Literary Discourse. *Feminist Studies*, 13(1), 49-82. doi:10.2307/3177835
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London [etc.]: McGraw-Hill.
- Holmes, J., (1995). *Women, men and politeness*. London: Longman.
- Holmes, J., (2006). *Gendered Talk at Work: Constructing Gender Identity through Workplace Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Howe, N. (1988). Metaphor in Contemporary American Political Discourse. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 3(2), 87-104.
- Jones, J.J. (2016). 'Talk "Like a Man": The Linguistic Styles of Hillary Clinton, 1992- 2013', *Perspectives on Politics*, 14(3), pp. 625-642

- Koller, V. (2004). *Metaphor and Gender in Business Media Discourse*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago [etc.]: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1993). The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. In Andrew Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and Thought* (second edition), Cambridge: At the University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1995). Metaphor, Morality, and Politics, or, Why Conservatives Have Left Liberals in the Dust. *Social Research*, 62 (2), 177-213.
- Lim, Elvin T. (2009). Gendered Metaphors of Women in Power: the Case of Hillary Clinton as Madonna, Unruly Woman, Bitch and Witch. In Ahrens, K., ed. *Politics, Gender and Conceptual Metaphors*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 224-269.
- Merchant, Karima, (2012). "How Men and Women Differ: Gender Differences in Communication Styles, Influence Tactics, and Leadership Styles" *CMC Senior Theses. Paper 513*. Retrieved from http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cmc_theses/513
- Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Mio, J. (1997). Metaphor and Politics. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 12(2), 113-133.
- Philip, G. (2009). *Non una donna in politica, ma una donna politica: Women's Political Language in an Italian Context*. In Ahrens, K., ed. *Politics, Gender and Conceptual Metaphors*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 83- 111.
- Rusieshvili-Cartledge, M. (2017). Face-attack in Georgian political discourse. Using examples from TV debates between female politicians during the pre-election campaign for the Parliamentary elections of 2012. In *Impoliteness in Media Discourse*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.
- Semino, E., Koller, V. (2009). Metaphor, Politics and Gender: a Case Study from Italy. In
- Shaw, S. (2002). *Language and gender in political debates in the House of Commons*. PhD thesis, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Tannen, D. (1992). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. London: Virago press
- Tenorio, E. H. (2009). The Metaphorical Construction of Ireland. In Ahrens, K., ed. *Politics, Gender and Conceptual Metaphors*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 112-136.

Author's email: sofiototibadze@yahoo.com

Author's biographical data:

The author of the article is a PhD student at Javakhishvili State University, currently working in Sociolinguistics on the issue of gender in English and Georgian fairytales. Her interests include translating both literary as well as scientific works. She has an extensive experience of teaching English to multi-level and exam-oriented classrooms. The author teaches at Tbilisi State University.