

**UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ**

1285

**METAPHORS IN THE DESCRIPTIONS OF  
U.S. - SOVIET/RUSSIAN SUMMITS  
IN *NEWSWEEK* AND *NOVOJE VREMJA***

**A Pro Gradu Thesis**

**by**

**Kirsi Talvitie**

**Department of English**

**1999**

HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA  
ENGLANNIN KIELEN LAITOS

Kirsi Talvitie  
METAPHORS IN THE DESCRIPTIONS OF U.S. - SOVIET/RUSSIAN SUMMITS  
IN *NEWSWEEK* AND *NOVOJE VREMJA*

Pro gradu - tutkielma  
Englantilainen filologia  
Tammikuu 1999

102 sivua

Politiikan retoriikan tutkimus on uudessa nousussa. Tutkimuksessa tärkeällä sijalla ovat politiikan retoriikassa esiintyvät metaforat. Tutkielman tarkoituksena on selvittää, millaisia metaforia amerikkalainen aikakauslehti *Newsweek* sekä venäläinen *Novoje vremja* käyttävät kuvaillessaan neljää Yhdysvaltain ja Neuvostoliiton/Venäjän välistä huippukokousta vuosina 1987-1997. Materiaali koostuu yhdeksästä *Newsweekin* ja yhdeksästä *Novoje vremjan* artikkelista kerätystä 258 yksittäisestä metaforasta. Tutkielmassa vastataan kysymyksiin: 1) Millaisia eroja metaforien käytössä ilmenee eri huippukokouksia kuvattaessa? 2) Millaisia eroja metaforien käytössä ilmenee lehtien välillä? Lähtökohtana tutkimukselle on metaforan keskeisyys ihmisen ajattelussa ja toiminnassa. Koska tutkielmassa pyritään selvittämään metaforien määrien vaihtelua neljän kokouksen sekä kahden eri lehden välillä, käytetään siinä kvalitatiivisen analyysin lisäksi kvantitatiivisia menetelmiä.

Tutkimuksessa artikkeleista kerätyt 258 metaforaa luokiteltiin lähdealueensa mukaan neljään perusmetaforakategoriaan: kaupankäynti-, sota-, urheilu- ja teatterimetaforiin. Huippukokousten välisiä eroja selvitetään tarkastelemalla kokousten kuvailujen sisältämien perusmetaforien käyttöä erikseen *Newsweekissä* ja *Novoje vremjassa*. Lehtien välillä ilmeneviä eroja metaforien käytössä tutkitaan rinnastamalla lehtien kuvaukset kustakin kokouksesta.

Metaforien käytössä ilmenee vaihtelua eri huippukokousten kuvailujen välillä. Erot koskevat kuitenkin vain kolmea vähemmän käytettyä perusmetaforakategoriaa, sillä kummassakin lehdessä eniten käytetty metaforatyyppe hallitsee kuvailtaessa jokaista neljästä kokouksesta. *Newsweek* suosii kokouksia selostaessaan kaupankäyntimetaforia; *Novoje vremjassa* käytetään eniten sotametaforia. Urheilu- ja teatterimetaforien osuus käytetyistä perusmetaforista vaihtelee lehdissä kokouksesta riippuen. Samaa huippukokousta kuvataan lehdissä eri metaforin. Historialliset ja kulttuurilliset syyt selittävät sekä kaupankäyntimetaforan yleisyyttä *Newsweekissä* että sotametaforien runsautta *Novoje vremjassa*. Eri metaforatyyppeien käytössä ilmenevien vaihtelujen voidaan tulkita kuvastavan maailmanpolitiikassa ja suurvaltojen välisissä suhteissa tapahtuneita muutoksia.

Metafora liittyy uuden ja oudon johonkin tuttuun ja selkeään; se auttaa luomaan johdonmukaisia tulkintoja. Selkeyden kääntöpuolena toimii metaforan valikoivuus: korostaessaan tiettyjä piirteitä ja ratkaisumalleja metafora häivyttää ne näkökulmat ja yksityiskohdat, joita se ei pysty rakenteellaan selittämään. Metaforien käyttöä ei tule eikä voi välttää, mutta niiden toiminnan logiikkaan voi yrittää perehtyä paremmin.

Asiasanat: metaphor. summit. American. Russian. *Newsweek*. *Novoje vremja*

## CONTENTS

<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2 THEORY OF METAPHOR</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Classic theories of metaphor	8
2.1.1 Rhetorical theory of metaphor	8
2.1.2 Substitution theory of metaphor	9
2.1.3 Comparison theory of metaphor	10
2.2 Semantic theories	11
2.2.1 Interaction theory	12
2.2.2 Perspectival theory	13
2.3 Cognitive metaphor theories	14
2.3.1 Literal vs. metaphorical interpretation	15
2.3.1.1 Traditional view	15
2.3.1.2 Evidence against the traditional view	17
2.3.2 Conceptual metaphor	19
2.3.2.1 Lakoff and Johnson's theory	19
2.3.2.2 Lakoff's revisions	23
<b>3 POWER OF METAPHOR</b>	<b>26</b>
3.1 Positive status of metaphor	26
3.2 Problematic nature of metaphor	31
<b>4 METAPHORS IN POLITICAL RHETORIC</b>	<b>34</b>
4.1 Studies on metaphor use in domestic politics	34
4.2 Studies on metaphor use in foreign politics	37
<b>5 RESEARCH DESIGN</b>	<b>43</b>
5.1 View on metaphor	43
5.2 Data collection	44
5.3 Methods of analysis	48

<b>6 RESULTS</b>	54
6.1 Basic metaphors	54
6.1.1 <b>The summit is doing business</b>	55
6.1.2 <b>The summit is war</b>	58
6.1.3 <b>The summit is a sport-game</b>	60
6.1.4 <b>The summit is theatre</b>	66
6.2 Basic metaphors by magazine	68
6.2.1 Basic metaphors in <i>Newsweek</i>	68
6.2.2 Basic metaphors in <i>Novoje vremja</i>	70
6.3 Basic metaphors by summit	72
6.3.1 Basic metaphors in the description of the 1987 summit	72
6.3.2 Basic metaphors in the description of the 1989 summit	73
6.3.3 Basic metaphors in the description of the 1992 summit	74
6.3.4 Basic metaphors in the description of the 1997 summit	76
<b>7 DISCUSSION</b>	78
7.1 <b>The summit is doing business</b> in <i>Newsweek</i> and <i>Novoje vremja</i>	78
7.2 <b>The summit is war</b> in <i>Newsweek</i> and <i>Novoje vremja</i>	80
7.3 <b>The summit is a sport-game</b> in <i>Newsweek</i> and <i>Novoje vremja</i>	82
7.4 <b>The summit is theatre</b> in <i>Newsweek</i> and <i>Novoje vremja</i>	84
<b>8 CONCLUSION</b>	86

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The history of research on metaphor is long and intricate. Metaphor has attracted the attention of the most significant philosophers from Aristotle to Nietzsche and continues to interest scientists and specialists in most diverse areas of expertise. By common definition put originally forward by Aristotle, and by etymology<sup>1</sup>, metaphor is a transfer of meaning. Elaboration of the idea of transfer - what is transferred and how - is the basic question in the many approaches to metaphor.

Traditionally metaphor is treated as a transfer of words, a rhetorical device used for decorating the language. A more modern view on metaphor regards it as a fundamental constituent of language. It is generally seen as a transfer of concepts between domains or semantic fields, an instance of a cognitive process. Moreover, recent research has suggested that metaphor is conceptually based and that it structures much of our worldly experience. The idea of metaphor as a conceptual structure that affects the way we think, what we experience, and what we do every day has been developed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and applied by a number of researchers in various disciplines, especially in the field of cognitive linguistics.

In particular, increasing attention has been paid to the use of metaphor in politics and the media. There are three complementary reasons for this. First, the abstract nature of politics increases the use of metaphors. Second, news reports contain a lot of metaphors because journalistic limits on time and space require simple and efficient expression of complex ideas. Third, the potential impact of political metaphors employed by the media affects the lives of large numbers of people. Researchers have studied, for example, the metaphors employed in the context of Italian (Semino and Masci 1996), Russian (Baranov and Karaulov 1991, 1994), and American (Lakoff 1995, Adamson et al. 1996) domestic politics. Within foreign policy discourse, much of investigation into metaphor has concentrated on the metaphors used in discussing peacekeeping and war (Rohrer 1991, Lakoff 1992, Spellman and Holyoak 1992, Voss et al. 1992, Pancake 1993, Jansen and Sabo 1994, Rohrer 1995, and Kuusisto 1998).

---

<sup>1</sup> The word *metaphor* derives from the Greek *metapherein* "to transfer"; *meta* meaning "over" and *pherein* "to carry". *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*.

However, little attention has focused on news reporting on a very salient dimension of world politics: the relations between the United States and Russia in the post-Cold War era. More than a decade ago, So (1987) conducted a case study on the metaphors American journalists used to depict the 1985 summit between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union. His findings indicate that the metaphors American journalists employed in their descriptions of the summit mostly belonged to three major domains: war, business, and sport-game. The most frequently used metaphor was "the summit is like a war." So (1987:626) attributed this to the real-life tensions between the two superpowers. Indeed, at the time rivalry that had dominated world politics and coloured virtually every dimension of political, economic, and social life for over forty years after World War II was still ongoing.

Nevertheless, the end of the Cold War at the turn of the decade marked a turning point in international politics, a historical breakpoint just like World War I and II that set in motion major transformations in world politics. Yet it appears that there remains a certain amount of tension between the two superpowers also in the 1990s. Top-level summits reflect the state of affairs between the superpowers very well and offer an interesting topic of research. Therefore, the present study aimed at modifying and extending So's (1987) investigation in selected ways.

The purpose of the study was to investigate the metaphors used to describe summits between the leaders of the USA and the Soviet Union/Russia in an American magazine *Newsweek* and a Russian magazine *Novoje vremja*. The study focused on the metaphorical descriptions of the summits held in 1987, 1989, 1992, and 1997. The four summits were chosen because they took place in very different political contexts and represented the changing character of the superpower relations. The more pragmatic reason was the high frequency of metaphor use in the articles commenting on the summits. The span of the articles covered a very interesting period in world history and a diachronic analysis of the articles portrayed the development of the relations and changes in them. The study aimed at finding out what kind of changes, if any, took place in the metaphorical descriptions of the summits over the years. Another research aim was to investigate whether there

existed any differences in the use of metaphors to describe the summits between *Newsweek* and *Novoje vreme*.

In the present study, I first examine some major theories of metaphor in general. Traditional theories of substitution and comparison are followed by modern linguistic and cognitive approaches to metaphor. In this way the perspective shifts from the level of words to the level of conception. Special attention is paid to theories that recognize the cognitive import of metaphor and concentrate on metaphor as a conceptual process. Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) theory constitutes the core of the theoretical review of the study. Next, I will discuss some of the ways in which metaphor gives insight and aids comprehension, as well as some of the problems connected with the use of metaphor. Before turning to the actual research project, I will also summarise the findings of some previous studies concerned with the use of metaphor in political discourse that are relevant for the purposes of the present study.

Chapter 5 includes description of the view on metaphor adopted in the study, the way in which the material for the study was gathered, what kind of data were used, and explanation and illustration of the methods of analysing the data. Chapter 6 then describes the major types of metaphors identified in the given articles and explores their cognitive implications. It also discusses the differences in the metaphorical descriptions of respective summits, as well as attempts to provide an answer to the second research question concerning the differences in the use of metaphors between *Newsweek* and *Novoje vreme*. The findings are summarised in chapter 7, which also includes investigation into the underlying reasons and possible explanations for the use of certain metaphors in the descriptions of the summits and the differences between the two magazines. The chapter also contrasts the results of the study with those from previous studies. Finally, the inadequacies and limitations of the study are commented in chapter 8, which also considers the significance of the results gained and recommendations for future research.

## 2 THEORY OF METAPHOR

The study of metaphor has origins in a philosophical and rhetorical tradition. In the course of the centuries it has gradually become a central concept in a wide circle of disciplines. This chapter opens with a look at three classic theories of metaphor - the rhetorical, substitution, and comparison theories - and continues with a brief introduction to some of the most fundamental semantic theories of metaphor. The final part of the chapter is devoted to cognitive metaphor theories which are of special significance for the forthcoming analysis.

### 2.1 Classic theories of metaphor

The history of metaphor dates back to ancient Greece. The first section provides us with a perspective on the problem of metaphor in the field of classical rhetoric. This is done for an obvious reason: it is simply impossible to write about metaphor without mentioning Aristotle and his crucial contribution to the study of metaphor. After all, in the words of Ricoeur (1978:3), "it is [Aristotle] who actually defined metaphor for the entire subsequent history of Western thought."

Next we examine two traditional theories of metaphor that have been heavily under attack for some time but have still managed to hold their position as a starting-point for any estimable study of metaphor: the substitution and the comparison view. Both theories derive their origin from Aristotle's innovative ideas on metaphor. The account of the comparison theory of metaphor also includes a short commentary on a certain type of comparison closely related to metaphor: the simile. The discussion on the inadequacies of the traditional views on metaphor is by no means exhaustive - it is nothing but a brief summary of their major shortcomings. The section closes with a concise consideration of the changed status of metaphor in the academic world.

#### 2.1.1 Rhetorical theory of metaphor

In the classical period, metaphor was considered to belong to the realm of rhetoric. Ricoeur (1978:10-11) points out that many philosophers judged rhetoric dangerous and condemned it because for them it was a technique that gave anyone who



mastered it the power to persuade and manipulate their fellow men. Plato, for instance, disapproves of rhetoric and regards it as an art of illusion and deception.

Aristotle, Plato's most prominent pupil, is of a different opinion. Aristotle (*Poetics* 1459 a 5-7) endorses metaphor and values the ability to use it as "the greatest thing by far" and "a sign of genius". According to Aristotle (*Rhetoric* 1410 b 14-15), the virtue of metaphor lies in its ability to surprise by combining elements that have not been put together before for "it is from metaphor that we can best get hold of something fresh."

In the first articulated account of metaphor, Aristotle (*Poetics* 1457 b 6-9) states that "metaphor consists in giving the thing a name that belongs to something else; the transference being either from genus to species, or from species to genus, or from species to species, or on grounds of analogy." Ricoeur (1978:16-19) draws attention to three significant features of this definition. The definition indicates, firstly, a word-centred approach to metaphor. Secondly, it suggests that metaphor is an example of deviant use of language. The third significant implication is the idea of substitution, which will be discussed further in the following section.

### 2.1.2 Substitution theory of metaphor

Aristotle's definition of metaphor is founded on the substitution theory of metaphor. In this view, a metaphorical expression is used in place of an equivalent literal expression. Therefore, in most cases it is possible to produce a literal paraphrase of a metaphor.

The transposition is generally seen being motivated by two reasons (Black 1962:33; Mooij 1976:13). Firstly, in some cases there is no exact literal word for a certain idea and an extension of a concept, that is, a metaphorical word, is used in order to fill a gap in the vocabulary. The process of reading new meanings into old words is called catachresis. Black (1962:33) provides an example of catachresis serving a genuine need: orange as a fruit gave the name to the colour 'orange'. Secondly, metaphor is employed for stylistic purposes, to give pleasure to readers. In other words, it is used as a decoration.

### 2.1.3 Comparison theory of metaphor

Metaphor is often looked as a shortened or implicit comparison and thus likened to simile<sup>2</sup>. The *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (s.v. Metaphor) contains the following definition: "A metaphor...is an elliptical simile, that is, a collapsed comparison from which 'like' or 'as' has been omitted, for convenience or for heightened interest." The close relation between simile and metaphor is mentioned also by Aristotle in *Rhetoric* (1406 b 20): "The simile also is a metaphor; the difference is but slight."

The two terms 'comparison' and 'simile' are often used interchangeably, which may cause confusion. Levinson (1983:155) points out a difference between them. Using his examples, the comparison *Encyclopedias are like dictionaries* is true and represents literal similarity, whereas the simile *Encyclopedias are like gold mines* is literally false and an instance of figurative similarity. The corresponding metaphor in this case is *Encyclopedias are gold mines*. Clearly, metaphor is closer to simile than to comparison. The reason is quite simple: in comparison the two things compared come from the same sphere, whereas simile juxtaposes, like metaphor, things from two different domains.

In his case against the comparison theory, Levinson (1983:154) remarks that not every metaphor can be derived from a simile by deletion of the predicate of similarity (*is like, is similar to, etc.*). Moreover, Black (1962:37) attacks the comparison view by claiming that in some cases "metaphor creates the similarity" rather than "formulates some similarity antecedently existing." The same idea has been expressed by Camac and Glucksberg (1984:445) who argue that the relation between the vehicle and the topic does not pre-exist but people create it when they use metaphors. Similarly, Martin and Harré (1982:90) reject the comparison view on the grounds that by treating metaphor as the merely ornamental comparison of similars it fails to identify the most interesting sort of metaphors: those that enable us to see similarities in what have previously been regarded as dissimilars.

---

<sup>2</sup> Simile is a figure of speech comparing two unlike things on the basis of their similarities, which is often introduced by 'like' or 'as'.

All in all, the substitution and comparison theories of metaphor have lost much of their support during the past decades. They have been criticized (Black 1962:37; Ricoeur 1978:44), among other things, for concentrating on the word as the unit of reference. Consequently, metaphor is seen as a deviation from ordinary language use and it is not credited for its own capacities and accomplishments. Modern research (Kittay 1987:4) has strongly challenged also the idea of metaphor appearing as ornament or comparison for the reason that it requires a conception of mind as a "passive receptacle of perceptions."

The status of metaphor has remained low throughout Western intellectual history until recent times. Cohen (1979:3), for instance, mentions that in the seventeenth century English positivists Thomas Hobbes and John Locke regarded metaphor as "frivolous and inessential, if not dangerous and logically perverse." Van Brabant (1986:395) explains that, according to this view, metaphors lack any connection with facts of the world and therefore have little capacity to transmit useful knowledge about the world. As a result, intellectuals were to rid themselves of using metaphors and other linguistic tropes. In the nineteenth century metaphor received appreciation among romanticists but its revival was soon suppressed by such twentieth century schools of thought as logical positivism, behaviourism, taxonomic and transformational linguistics. Nevertheless, a radical change occurred at the end of the 1970s and the attitude toward metaphor improved significantly. Nowadays the respectability and significance of metaphor is acknowledged all round, which has further increased research on it from various viewpoints and in different areas from philosophy, cognitive sciences, and education to the study of mass media and literature.

## 2.2 Semantic metaphor theories

In semantic metaphor theories, metaphor is analysed within the framework of a sentence. Metaphor is no longer treated as a case of substitution or comparison of isolated words but a complex linguistic phenomenon able to yield true insights about reality. In this view, metaphor consists of two components that give metaphor its irreducible meaning as a result of their interplay.

### 2.2.1 Interaction theory

The pioneer in the field was Richards (1936:90), who, first of all, denounces Aristotle's claim about the exceptionality of the use of metaphor. In fact, he declares that instead of being a divergence from ordinary language use, metaphor is the "omnipresent principle of all its free action" and that all language is "vitaly metaphorical."

Further Richards (1936:93) characterizes metaphor in the following fashion: "When we use a metaphor we have two thoughts of different things active together and supported by a single word, or phrase, whose meaning is a resultant of their interaction." The interaction between the ideas takes place because of their common characteristics and as a result we can describe one idea through the characteristics of another. However, Richards (1936:125) remarks that a shared characteristic does not always equal resemblance, for the mind "can connect any two ideas in an indefinitely large number of different ways."

Richards (1936:96) names the underlying idea the 'tenor' and the idea through which the first one is comprehended the 'vehicle'. He stresses (1936:100) that the metaphorical meaning is richer than the meaning of either the tenor or the vehicle taken separately. Therefore, metaphor is not the vehicle alone but the whole made up of the two halves.

Black (1962, 1979) developed Richard's ideas further and called the theory an interaction theory of metaphor. Black (1962:39-40) regards metaphor as a filter or a lens, through which characteristics ('associated commonplaces' in his terminology) of the vehicle ('the subsidiary subject') transfer on to the tenor ('the principal subject'). As the principal subject is "seen through" the subsidiary subject, the "metaphor suppresses some details, emphasizes others - in short, organizes our view of" the principal subject. For instance, in Black's (1962:41) famous example *Man is a wolf* transfer of the associated commonplaces of the subsidiary subject ('wolf') on to the principal subject ('man') emphasizes the cruel and aggressive characteristics of man.

In the interaction view, metaphor has cognitive content which, according to Black (1962:46), cannot be stated "in 'plain language'" because a literal paraphrase "fails to be a translation because it fails to give the insight that the metaphor did." Black (1962:236-237) notes that by bringing two separate domains into cognitive and emotional relation metaphor enables us to notice things that otherwise would be overlooked, to see things in a new way. Black (1979:39) also believes that some metaphors can function as "cognitive instruments" and as such permit us to see aspects of reality that they themselves help to constitute.

### 2.2.2 Perspectival theory

Kittay (1987:13-14) named her version of the interaction view a perspectival theory because of the function metaphor serves: "to provide a perspective from which to gain an understanding of that which is metaphorically portrayed." Nonetheless, the first person to use the image of a perspective to describe metaphor was Burke (1969:503-504; italics original): "A metaphor tells us something about one character considered from the point of view of another character. And to consider A from the point of view of B is, of course, to use B as a *perspective* upon A."

In her perspectival theory, Kittay modified and elaborated some of the salient features of Black's interactionism. Therefore, instead of associated commonplaces Kittay (1987:31-33) chooses to talk about semantic fields that consist of "terms which cover some specifiable conceptual ground and which bear certain relations of affinity and contrast to one other." Moreover, both the vehicle and the topic are elements of semantic fields, not only the vehicle (subsidiary subject). Kittay's understanding of metaphorical transfer process resembles Black's filtering procedure (which he at a later stage called 'projection'). However, the two views differ in what is being transferred. Black (1962) considers the metaphorical transfer of meaning as a shift of a set of subsidiary predicates on to the principal subject, while Kittay (1987) regards it as a shift of relations across different domains.

Kittay's (1987) views come very close to the cognitive metaphor theory. She claims (1987:14) that metaphor has a distinctively cognitive role, because in the transfer process we make use of one domain to gain an understanding of another domain. Further, Kittay (1987:39) suggests that "the cognitive force of metaphor comes

...from a (re)conceptualization of information that is already available to us." Nonetheless, Kittay (1987:15) does not regard metaphor as a purely cognitive process of metaphorical transfer, rather she emphasizes the significance of the linguistic aspect of metaphor because the structure of metaphor is available to us only in a linguistically articulated system. In the end, she regards (1987:90) metaphor as "the linguistic realization of a leap of thought from one domain to another."

### 2.3 Cognitive metaphor theories

Cognitive metaphor theories see metaphor as having basically a conceptual rather than a rhetorical function in language. They focus on metaphor as a cognitive device and stress that the actual metaphorical process takes place within the mind. Surface language does provide context for the interpretation but it is not of primary interest. There is a shift of emphasis from the semantic properties of words to cognitive processes, from recognising metaphors to interpreting them.

Cognitive metaphor theorists maintain that metaphors contribute a lot to our understanding of the world. In their account, metaphor is an instrument of thought that conveys information. Therefore, metaphors need to be treated in the context of their utterance just like any form of language use. In this way cognitive metaphor theorists show that metaphor is also a matter of pragmatics. Indeed, despite Black's (1962:30) initial claim that metaphor is a term of semantics, he later wrote in parentheses: "There is...a sense of 'metaphor' that belongs to 'pragmatics' rather than to 'semantics' - and this sense may be the one most deserving of attention." At this point cognitive metaphor theorists also go beyond the realm of linguistics in its strictest, traditional sense because, according to them, it is necessary to invoke extralinguistic knowledge to account for metaphors. Thus, in this view metaphors are features of language use rather than features of language per se.

One disputable point among cognitive metaphor theorists is the question whether it is possible to make a distinction between literal and metaphorical language and, consequently, between literal and metaphorical interpretation of an expression. Some theorists differentiate between metaphors and ordinary language, and maintain that different cognitive mechanisms are used to process them, others presume that all language is metaphorical and that metaphors and literal sentences

are processed using the same or very similar cognitive machinery. The first of the following sections deals with the postulates of these conflicting views as well as introduces a certain general term of the study of metaphor: 'dead metaphor'.

The second section approaches the notion of metaphorical thinking from a rather different viewpoint. Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) theory is pathbreaking as for them metaphor is not a matter of language but of thought processes. They argue that the human conceptual structure is metaphorical in nature and that metaphorical concepts systematically structure our thoughts, attitudes and actions. In short, their main concern is the conceptual nature of metaphor. In addition to their joint work, the second section addresses the amendments Lakoff (1987, 1990) has subsequently made to the theory. Again, the emphasis is on those features of the theory that are relevant for the present study.

### 2.3.1 Literal vs. metaphorical interpretation

#### 2.3.1.1 Traditional view

Mac Cormac (1985) represents the school of thought among cognitive metaphor theorists that defends the existence of literal language as distinct from metaphorical language. According to Mac Cormac (1985:33-34), metaphors can be recognized on the basis of the semantic conceptual anomaly they create. Mac Cormac (1985:76) asserts that the anomaly can be traced to the differences and similarities between the semantic markers of the referents of the metaphor. The difference between literal and metaphorical expressions is in that when we deal with literal language we do not have to consider the semantic markers associated with words as we have to when we are confronted with a metaphor. Therefore, Mac Cormac's (1985:76) basic premise is that there are cognitive differences between consideration of metaphors and consideration of literal language.

Mac Cormac's (1985) approach on the separation of literal from metaphorical language finds support in traditional theories provided by such transformational linguists as Chomsky (1964, 1965) and Katz (1964) and such speech act theorists as Austin (1962) and Searle (1969, 1979a, 1979b). According to Verbrugge (1977:370), these scholars assume that the interpretation of literal sentences is straightforward and analytic, while a special multistep process must be invoked for

interpreting metaphors and other forms of deviant language (e.g. irony, metonymy, synecdoche, euphemism).

The multistep model of comprehending metaphors has been further developed, for example, by Clark and Lucy (1975), Davidson (1979), Miller (1979), and Janus and Bever (1985). The model suggests that metaphors are processed via sequential operations. A reader/writer is said to derive a literal interpretation of an utterance first and compare it against contextual information. Only after recognizing the literal interpretation as false or anomalous the reader/writer then attempts a metaphorical reading. Supporters of transformational linguistics see metaphors violating certain selection restriction rules, while proponents of the speech act theory draw on Grice's (1975) cooperative principle. According to Grice's theory, speakers are expected to follow certain conversational maxims and the apparent violation of the truth maxim automatically triggers a search for an alternative nonliteral meaning. In terms of the speech act theory (Searle 1979a:114), "where an utterance is defective if taken literally, look for an utterance meaning that differs from sentence meaning." In other words, the semantic analysis must detect an anomaly or violation of a cooperative maxim in order for a metaphorical interpretation to be attempted.

The traditional way to account for metaphor comprehension after the rejection of the "false" literal interpretation that metaphor produces is to treat metaphor as abbreviated simile. The view has been defended by Miller (1979) who regards comparison as the basic process underlying metaphor comprehension. Miller (1979:248) asserts that "the grounds for a metaphor...can be formulated as relations of similitude that can be expressed as comparison statements." Another scholar in favour of transforming metaphor into simile is Davidson (1979) who uses truth value to distinguish between literal and metaphorical interpretations. According to Davidson (1979:39), the transformation generates a true interpretation of the metaphor: "The most obvious semantic difference between simile and metaphor is that all similes are true and most metaphors are false. The earth is like a floor...but it is not a floor." In the end, the model advanced by Davidson and Miller seems to be a revised version of the comparison theory of metaphor. Some of the inadequacies of that theory have already been discussed from a philosophical point of view (see p.10) but there is also psycholinguistic evidence against it, some of which is presented in the following.



### 2.3.1.2 Evidence against the traditional view

The multistep model of metaphor comprehension has two major implications. First, it assumes that literal meaning has unconditional priority over nonliteral meaning and that it is always attempted first. The second important implication follows from the first. Because metaphor comprehension is viewed as a default process that follows a failure to derive a literal meaning, metaphorical interpretation is seen to require more and different inferential work compared to literal comprehension and, thus, take more time.

However, several findings are inconsistent with these assumptions. The assumption that metaphorical interpretation occurs only as a secondary stage appears to contradict with Keysar's (1989) two tests that indicate that metaphorical meanings are evaluated simultaneously with literal meaning. Gibbs (1983, 1985, 1990) presents analogous findings for different types of nonliteral speech such as indirect requests and idioms. Moreover, Glucksberg et al. (1982) found in their experiments that metaphorical meanings are computed even when the task requires only literal interpretation. These studies lend support to the conclusion that the construction of a metaphorical meaning does not require a semantic anomaly, nor a violation of the rules of conversation.

Several studies provide evidence also against the second claim about the extra effort involved in metaphorical comprehension of nonliteral expressions. For example, the data presented by Harris (1976), Inhoff et al. (1984), Ortony et al. (1978), Pollio et al. (1984), and Shinjo and Myers (1987) indicate that when context provides sufficient information comprehension of metaphorical sentences does not take longer than comprehension of comparable literal sentences. Further, in their class-inclusion theory of metaphor comprehension, Glucksberg and Keysar (1990) propose that simile "potentially poses a more difficult comprehension problem" than metaphor. Their notion is consistent with Johnson's (1996) two reaction time studies, in which metaphor sentences were comprehended significantly faster than corresponding simile sentences.

Ortony (1986:347) calls the comparison approach to metaphor comprehension reductionist and blames it for evading the issue. In his view, the strategy of

translating metaphors to similarity statements does not work because these similarity statements are themselves metaphorical. Therefore, instead of solving the problem of metaphor comprehension, the method leads to circularity. Fraser (1979) makes a similar point in his study of the interpretation of novel metaphors. As for the traditional notion of truth as a method of separating literal from metaphorical meaning, Keysar (1989, 1994) argues on the basis of his experiments that when readers evaluate the truth of sentences they appear to employ a pragmatic measure of truth that includes metaphorical as well as literal truth. That is to say, people interpret metaphorical sentences as either true or false. The idea of pragmatic truth receives further support from findings reported by Glucksberg et al. (1982) with regard to such existential quantifiers for metaphors as *some* and *all*. Similarly, Mac Cormac (1985:30) notes that metaphors "possess a fluidity with respect to truth and falsehood" and proposes that "a many-valued rather than a two-valued logic can better explain metaphors."

In summary, in the light of recent psycholinguistic research it seems justified to claim that neither the stage model nor the transformation of metaphor into simile do not adequately describe the way people actually use figurative language. Instead, an increasing amount of research, some of which has been recorded above, has given reason to conclude that metaphorical and literal interpretations might be functionally equivalent in comprehension. In other words, the cognitive mechanisms required for comprehending metaphors and literal expressions seem to be either the same or very similar. This assumption has been further supported by studies that examine the effect of the context on metaphor comprehension (Gildea and Glucksberg 1983, Gerrig and Healy 1983, Keysar 1994).

Rumelhart (1979) has come to a similar conclusion from a rather different starting point, as his main concern is the role of metaphor in language acquisition. On the basis of theoretical considerations of the language acquisition process and empirical observations of the language of children, he argues (1979:78-79) that there are no fundamentally different comprehension processes for literal and metaphorical language. Equally, Sadock (1979), arguing from a linguistic perspective, believes that there is no rational basis for a sharp distinction between the literal and the metaphorical. Rather, metaphoricity is a dimension along which statements can vary. Similarly, van Brabant (1986), and Shinjo and Myers (1987) suggest that

metaphor occupies a space on a continuum between the literal and the metaphorical and that many words are open to a variety of interpretations.

Kittay (1987) approaches the issue from a slightly different viewpoint, namely, the perspective of historical development of language. Therefore, she relativizes (1987:22) the distinction between literal and figurative language by remarking that it exists but is "relative to a given synchronic moment in a given language community". By this she means that some expressions that we today find literal have, nevertheless, metaphorical origins. This applies especially to metaphors referred to as dead metaphors, such as *eye of a needle* and *foot of a mountain*, which have become part of ordinary, literal vocabulary and are therefore not normally regarded as metaphors at all.

The question whether dead metaphors retain their metaphorical status when their metaphoric basis is no longer active is debatable. Verbrugge (1977:386) illustrates the issue in the following way: "We now speak of 'chair legs' without activating the original metaphoric domain (people's legs), but the metaphor was very much alive to the Victorians who insisted that, in all modesty, chair legs ought to be covered by 'skirts' which extended to the floor." Backman (1991:20) points out, however, that in special contexts it is possible to 'reactivate' the metaphoric basis of dead metaphors by extension: "We started at the *foot of the mountain* and by the evening we had reached her *knee*." Lakoff and Johnson (1980:54) add that mountain climbers also speak of the *shoulder* of a mountain and of *conquering, fighting*, and even *being killed by* a mountain. For this reason, Backman (1991:20) suggests that instead of referring to dead metaphors it would be more appropriate to call this kind of linguistic expressions 'sleeping metaphors'.

### 2.3.2 Conceptual metaphor

#### 2.3.2.1 Lakoff and Johnson's theory

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) have adopted a slightly different approach to the issue of separating the literal from the metaphorical. In *Metaphors We Live By* (1980), they argue that all language is metaphorical since our language reflects our conceptual system which is largely metaphorical in nature. Their theory is supported

by a careful analysis of an impressive set of data containing hundreds of metaphorical expressions. The analysis proves the systematicity of our use of metaphor and the undeniable role metaphor plays in structuring our understanding and reality.

For Lakoff and Johnson (1980) metaphor is not a matter of language but of thought processes. Therefore they are not interested in metaphors as linguistic expressions but as concepts behind the expressions. They do not even attempt to provide an adequate definition for metaphor but describe (1980:5) the use of it as "understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another." Moreover, metaphors form systems, within which concepts are understood through other concepts and through which they guide our thinking. Because of the fundamentally metaphorical nature of our ordinary conceptual system, also the concepts that structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people are all metaphorical. In other words, metaphorical concepts structure not only our thoughts but also the actions we perform. In Lakoff and Johnson's terms, they are metaphors we live by.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) believe that metaphors are grounded in experience, that they have experiential bases. Central to their theory of experiential realism is also the argument that our conceptual system is in constant interaction with our physical, cultural, and interpersonal environment. Therefore, metaphors do not simply come out of nothing each time we use them. On the contrary, they are built out of basic human concepts arising from bodily interaction with the environment: standing upright, being in a containing space, moving from one point to another.

In their study, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) use the term 'conceptual' metaphor when discussing metaphors which are part of our ordinary conceptual system and therefore reflected in our everyday language. The conceptual nature of the metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR, for instance, is reflected in such everyday expressions provided by Lakoff and Johnson (1980:4; italics original) as 'Your claims were *indefensible*', 'He *attacked every weak point* in my argument', and 'I've never *won* an argument with him'. These metaphorical concepts are so basic to our normal way of thinking that they are normally not viewed as metaphorical at all and, consequently, tend to go unnoticed. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:51) stress,

however, that using them still means experiencing the situation in a metaphorically structured way.

The definition of conceptual metaphors resembles that of dead metaphors. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:54-55), nevertheless, separate the two by the systematicity of their use. To put it briefly, dead metaphors are isolated idiosyncratic expressions that are not used systematically and are, therefore, marginal in our thought and in our language. In contrast, conceptual metaphors are reflections of systematic metaphorical concepts that structure our thoughts and actions.

An important feature of the systematicity of metaphorical concepts is that it makes it possible to comprehend one thing in terms of another and also to instantly understand new metaphors produced by extending and elaborating conceptual metaphors. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:12-13) stress, however, that metaphorical structuring is always only partial. In case the structuring were total, one concept would actually be the other and not just understood in its terms.

A second important feature of the systematicity follows directly from the partial nature of metaphorical concepts and concerns the way metaphor tends to highlight some details of a concept while backgrounding or concealing others. Therefore, Lakoff and Johnson (1980:10) warn that focusing on one aspect of a concept may hide its other aspects which are not coherent with the particular metaphor. For instance, the metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR mentioned above highlights the hostile aspect of arguing and downplays its cooperative aspect. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:91-92) suggest that different aspects of the concept can be focused on in detail by using different metaphors. Thus, the conventional metaphor ARGUMENT IS A JOURNEY is used when there is need to highlight the goal, direction, or progress of an argument (e.g. Do you *follow* my argument? When we *get to the next point*,..). Equally, the ARGUMENT IS A CONTAINER metaphor emphasises the content of an argument (e.g. Your argument doesn't have much *content*. You won't *find* that idea *in* his argument). The implications of this particular feature of highlighting and hiding will be discussed in more detail below (see p.31-32).

The third consequential feature of the systematicity is coherence. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:19-20) point out that, on the one hand, there is internal coherence

among metaphorical concepts, mainly because of their experiential bases. The role of the experiential basis is important also in understanding metaphors which do not fit together because they are based on different kinds of experience. On the other hand, Lakoff and Johnson (1980:22-24) suggest that there is also external coherence that links metaphorical concepts to the values of a given culture. In principle, this notion would entail different cultures to produce different kinds of metaphors to express the same phenomenon. In practice, however, all cultures and subcultures share certain basic values and, at most, give the values different priorities.

Lakoff and Johnson's (1980:7-9; *italics original*) example of a metaphorical concept typical of modern Western culture is the concept TIME IS MONEY, which underlies such expressions as 'You're *wasting* my time', 'How do you *spend* your time these days?' and 'I've *invested* a lot of time in her'. We do not just talk about time in terms of money, we actually act as if time was money and conceive of time that way. This shows, for instance, in our custom to pay people for their work by the hour, week or year. In our culture time is money also in many other ways: telephone message units, hotel room rates, yearly budgets, interest on loans, and paying your debt to society by "serving time." Lakoff and Johnson (1980:8) note that these practices have arisen in modern industrialised societies and do not exist in all cultures.

Additionally, Lakoff has studied in cooperation with Kövecses (1987) the conceptualisation of anger in American English and found that "heat" metaphors, especially the "hot fluid in a container" metaphor, are central in the metaphorical system of anger in English. In a follow-up study Kövecses (1995) investigates anger metaphors in Chinese, Japanese, and Hungarian with an initial hypothesis that they would be radically different from those in English. Surprisingly, however, speakers of these languages that belong to other than the Indo-European family use roughly the same metaphors in their expressions of anger. Kövecses (1995:143) attributes the cross-cultural similarities to similarities in the human body and its functioning in anger and points out that the differences he detected concerning the causal and the expressive aspects of anger probably arose as a result of certain culture-specific concepts. Therefore, he concludes (1995:143) that expression seems to be dependent on cultural values. Yu (1995) reports similar

findings in his comparison of the metaphorical expressions of anger and happiness in English and Chinese.

Yet another interesting comparison is provided by van Brabant (1986:407-408) concerning the metaphorical structuring of argumentation in English and among the Fang of Gabon. As pointed out above (p.20), in Western culture people often experience arguing as a war, among the Fang, however, argumentation is not correlated with warfare but with skilful woodworking. Besides, for these forest exploiters the conceptualisation of arguing as woodworking is so common that they do not notice it, nor regard it as metaphorical.

All in all, Lakoff and Johnson's thesis about the pervasiveness of metaphor in everyday life, not only in our language, but in our thought and action has become widely acknowledged and has had an enormous impact on the study of the use of metaphor. Their premises have been accepted as a basis for a wide range of studies in a variety of fields, for instance, in organisation science (e.g. Chia 1996, Doving 1996, Inns and Jones 1996, Marshak 1996), cognitive psychology (e.g. Gentner and Gentner 1983), and cognitive linguistics (e.g. Nelson 1986, So 1987, Rohrer 1991, Sweetser 1992, Chilton and Ilyin 1993, Jansen and Sabo 1994, Rohrer 1995, Adamson et al. 1996, Semino and Masci 1996, Kuusisto 1998).

#### 2.3.2.2 Lakoff's revisions

Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) theory of metaphor is revolutionary in the sense that it does not even attempt to answer the question of what metaphor is. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) do not describe the terms involved or ideas interacting in metaphor, nor do they discuss the dynamics involved in its production and interpretation. This is because their account is a theory of the use of metaphor. Later on, nevertheless, they have developed their views, especially Lakoff has been active in this respect. He has, for instance, complemented (1990) the original theory by providing a model of what is really involved in a metaphor.

Lakoff's (1990) starting point is familiar from his joint work with Johnson (1980): metaphor involves understanding one domain of experience in terms of another domain of experience. Consider the following examples provided by Lakoff (1990:47; italics original):

- (1) Look *how far we 've come*.
- (2) It's been *a long, bumpy road*.
- (3) We're may have to *go our separate ways*.
- (4) The relationship isn't *going anywhere*.

In these everyday English expressions love is depicted as a certain kind of journey. To be precise, the expressions are not necessarily about love but can readily be understood as such. Examples like this show that what is involved is not just conventional language but a conventional mode of thought, the underlying conceptual metaphor being LOVE IS A JOURNEY.

What is new is Lakoff's (1990:48) suggestion that metaphor can be understood as a mapping from a certain source domain to a certain target domain. The mapping is tightly structured and there are two kinds of correspondences between the source domain and the target domain. First, there are ontological correspondences, according to which elements in the target domain correspond systematically to elements in the source domain. For instance, when thinking about love in terms of a journey, lovers correspond ontologically to travellers, while their love relationship corresponds to a vehicle, their common goals to their common destinations on the journey, and their difficulties to obstacles to travel. Second, the mapping includes epistemic correspondences, in which knowledge about the source domain is mapped onto knowledge about the target domain. Such correspondences then permit us to reason about the target domain (in this particular case, love) using the knowledge we use to reason about the source domain (in this case, journeys).

Therefore, to follow Lakoff's (1990:48-49) example, we have a story of two travellers travelling somewhere in a vehicle until it hits some obstacle and gets stuck. The travellers have a limited number of alternatives for action:

1. They can try to get the vehicle moving again, either by fixing it or getting it past the obstacle that stopped it.
2. They can remain in the vehicle and give up on getting to their destinations.
3. They can abandon the vehicle.

By mapping the ontological and epistemic correspondences from the source domain of journeys to the target domain of love we can retell the story in the following fashion: Two lovers pursue their common goals together until they encounter some difficulty in the relationship. Their options are limited.



1. They can try to do something about the relationship so that it will allow them to continue pursuing their goals.
2. They can leave the relationship as it is and give up on pursuing their goals.
3. They can abandon the relationship.

In both cases, the second alternative is the one taking the least effort but it also prevents the travellers/lovers from getting to their common destinations/goals.

Lakoff (1990:49-50) stresses that metaphor does not constitute of any particular word or expression. Rather, it is a mode of thought, defined by a systematic ontological and epistemic mapping across conceptual domains, from a source to a target domain. The mapping is then reflected in different linguistic expressions. In other words, the examples given do not constitute different metaphors, rather we have one love-as-journey metaphor that is realised in many different linguistic expressions. The conceptual love-as-journey metaphor also explains why sentences like ‘We can’t turn back now’ and ‘We’re at a crossroads’ are automatically and effortlessly understood as being about love, although none of the individual words they contain are about love. Moreover, we are able to instantly understand new and imaginative extensions of the mapping because the metaphorical correspondences between the domains are already part of our conceptual system.

The human conceptualising capacity - including the role of metaphor in it - is actually one of Lakoff’s main research interests. In his voluminous work *Women, fire and dangerous things*, Lakoff (1987:302-303) suggests that some kinds of experiences - for instance, our vertical orientation, the nature of our bodies as containers and as wholes with parts, our ability to sense hot and cold - are structured preconceptually in our mind. A great many of our domains of experience do not, however, have a preconceptual structure of their own. In these domains we import such structure via metaphor. That is to say, metaphor provides us with a means for comprehending different kinds of experience. To quote Lakoff (1987:303), our ability to comprehend experience via metaphor is “one of the great imaginative triumphs of the human mind.” Indeed, metaphor plays a fundamental role in our thinking. The following chapter is devoted to the potential metaphor possesses, nevertheless, not forgetting the dangers it presents.

### 3 POWER OF METAPHOR

The cognitive model of metaphorical processes and, more precisely, the heuristic possibilities of metaphors direct attention to their role in our thought and action. It has become a commonplace that metaphor affects the way we perceive the world. Moreover, metaphor is not confined to our ordinary, everyday reasoning but extends to all kinds of intellectual pursuit. Specifically, metaphor seems to play an important role in scientific discovery and in the formulation and transmission of new theories. In addition to structuring our concepts, it appears that metaphor has the power to prescribe our mode of behaviour. One of the aspects of metaphor important in this respect is that it always frames our understanding and directs our actions in a partial way. In the following, section 2.3.3.1 will focus on the ways metaphor advances knowledge and understanding with particular attention to metaphors referred to as basic metaphors. Section 2.3.3.2 will, then, concentrate on the more dubious aspects of metaphor, namely, its transparency in the sense that we are typically not aware of our metaphorical thoughts, its tendency to highlight certain interpretations at the expense of others and the consequences of this strategy for our behaviour.

#### 3.1 Positive status of metaphor

The present section describes some of the ways metaphor can give insight and aid comprehension. In doing this, the section deals with the inherent strengths of metaphor, that is, the way it helps us to make sense of the world and, in essence, its role in the creation of knowledge. The positive power of metaphor derives from a number of sources. These sources are explicated in the following.

To begin with, Mooij (1976:14) points out that metaphors are powerful tools when describing new situations. Moreover, Mac Cormac (1985:9) argues that metaphors are necessary in describing the unknown. Petrie (1979:439) suggests that as bridges between the known and the unknown metaphors permit the understanding of new concepts and thus enhance learning. Barrett and Cooperrider (1990:223) illustrate this using the case of a science student able to understand the structure of the atom through the metaphor 'the atom is a solar system'.

Besides assimilating the unknown, metaphors have the power to alter existing pre-conceptions, to put familiar things into new light. In Mooij's (1976:16) words, they "contribute to an insight in what is already (all too) well-known." In a similar vein, Black (1962:237) mentions that metaphors help us "notice what otherwise would be overlooked" and "see new connections." To quote Barrett and Cooperrider (1990:222), metaphors are an "invitation to see the world anew" and as such they encourage different ways of thinking. Finally, Perelman (1982:124) establishes that "philosophic thought, and perhaps all creative thought, cannot do without [metaphors]."

By providing new, alternative ways of seeing metaphors enable us to understand the same thing from different points of view. This ability is an important skill in problem solving. This is illustrated by Gentner and Gentner's (1983) example of two ways of metaphorically understanding electricity: as a fluid and as a crowd made up of individual electrons. Both conceptualisations are needed to solve problems in electrical circuitry correctly because using only one of them causes problems that the other conceptualisation could solve. Therefore, in addition to learning alternative conceptualisations for concepts, one has to know which metaphor to use in which situation. Lakoff (1987:306) points out that this applies especially in the field of science where there are conceptualisations that are more correct than others. In other areas of life, for example, when dealing with our emotions, there are no standards for correctness.

Lakoff (1987:305) also emphasises that the way in which we conceptualise areas of experience depends on the nature of the subject area. For instance, we have many ways of making sense of abstract areas of experience that do not have a preconceptual structure of their own, such as the domains of thought and emotion. Therefore, as pointed out above (p.21), we have several metaphorical models for comprehending the concept of argument. Similarly, Lakoff and Kövecses's (1985) case study shows that the same is true regarding anger. Moreover, the results of Fainsilber and Ortony's study (1987) confirm that metaphors are central in the description of emotional states in general.

Yet another way in which metaphor can foster understanding is to use it deliberately as an investigative tool. Several sources, most notably in the fields of cognitive sciences (e.g. Boyd 1979, Gentner 1982) and organisation science (e.g. Morgan

1986, Clegg and Gray 1996, Dunford and Palmer 1996, Inns and Jones 1996, Oswick and Grant 1996), cite the usefulness of metaphor as a creative tool for research and analysis. Inns and Jones (1996:111) list the four main functions of metaphor relevant to conducting research in the social sciences: to compactly convey ideas, to enable people to see beyond their existing conceptual frameworks, to serve as a starting point for theory development, and to offer the researcher access to participants' interpretations of situations as they are revealed through participants' use of metaphors.

Moreover, within organisation science there is a branch of research that uses metaphor specifically to diagnose organisational problems and then to construct solutions to these problems that can improve the organisation's performance (e.g. Smith and Eisenberg 1987, Srivastva and Barrett 1988, Sackmann 1989, Barrett and Cooperrider 1990, Marshak 1996). Metaphor is used as an analytical tool also in studying its significance in social and political reasoning (e.g. Schön 1979, Nelson 1986, Baranov 1991, Lakoff 1992, Chilton and Ilyin 1993, Jansen and Sabo 1994, Lakoff 1995, Rigotti 1995, Semino and Masci 1996, Kuusisto 1998).

Nonetheless, the importance of metaphor for science is not restricted to its applicability as a device for research and analysis. Its significance is much greater than that. For one thing, Martin and Harré (1982:101) argue that metaphors are useful in scientific theory-making because they enable scientists to refer to theoretical entities. In addition to the role of catachresis, metaphor is accredited with explanatory power in scientific reasoning. For instance, Gentner's (1982) model of structure mappings between domains suggests that scientific analogies and complex metaphors can have genuine effects on a person's conception of a domain. Boyd (1979:360-364) goes even further by proposing that some metaphors actually constitute scientific theories and that metaphors are necessary for the transmission of new scientific concepts. The role of metaphor in scientific thinking has been discussed also by Kuhn (1979), Cetina (1995), Holton (1995), and Montuschi (1995).

In scientific reasoning a special role is played by metaphors referred to as basic metaphors (or master metaphors). They allow the conceptualization of one idea by analogy with another conception system. Basic metaphors form networks, within which single metaphors are organized and new metaphors are born.

Correspondingly, Schön (1979:267) distinguishes between 'deep' and 'surface' metaphors. The notion of basic metaphor resembles also Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) idea of conceptual metaphor. Lakoff and Johnson (1980), and more pronouncedly Lakoff (1990:49), do not, however, refer to single metaphors organised around the basic metaphor as metaphors at all but simply regard them as linguistic expressions of conceptual metaphors.

There are still other terms used to describe basic metaphors. For instance, in Black's terminology they are called conceptual archetypes or, simpler, archetypes. By an archetype Black (1962:241) means "a systematic repertoire of ideas by means of which a given thinker describes, by analogical extension, some domain to which those ideas do not immediately and literally apply." Mac Cormac (1985:47-48) reserves the term 'basic metaphor' for metaphors that underlie an entire theory or a discipline and calls metaphors with an insight more limited in scope and function 'conveyance metaphors'. Finally, all the different definitions and designations have been inspired by Pepper's (1942) theory of world hypotheses by which four distinct world views, or root metaphors, are claimed to have stood the test of time in Western intellectual history: formism, mechanism, organism, and contextualism.

Basic metaphors have become a useful tool in various fields of research. The best-known basic metaphor is the computational metaphor (Boyd 1979:360, Mac Cormac 1985:19, Podkolzina 1992:95, Elgin 1995:63, Leuven 1995), in which human brain is seen as a computing machine, similar to a computer. As a result, the human mind is described using terms associated with computers and computer programs. In fact, the computer metaphor is so prevalent that Boyd (1979:360) considers the exploration of analogies, or similarities, between men and computational devices "the most important single factor influencing postbehaviorist cognitive psychology." Arutiunova (1990:15) mentions that linguists are familiar with several basic metaphors that provide the key to understanding language and language systems, for instance, the organism metaphor (as in *dead* and *living languages*) and the family metaphor (as in *parent* and *sister languages*). Further, Sweetser (1992) contends that English language abounds with basic metaphors for language and communication.

Yet another area of research filled with basic metaphors is organisation science. For example, in Smith and Eisenberg's study (1987) a root-metaphor analysis was used to illuminate an organizational conflict. Similarly, Srivastva and Barrett (1988), Dunn (1990), Dunford and Palmer (1996), and Marshak (1996) examine the characteristics and organisational implications of root metaphors. The notion of root metaphors has found support also in modern religious studies. According to Tracy (1979:89), it has been established that all major religions depend on certain root metaphors. Tracy (1979:90) further reports that metaphors are central to the study of religious phenomena in another way, as such religions as Christianity, Judaism, and Islam are all "religions of the book' - books which codify root metaphors through various linguistic and generic strategies."

Podkolzina (1992:95) notes that basic metaphors are used very often in scientific research but they occur frequently in all kinds of discourse. Therefore, in our everyday reasoning we constantly understand more abstract and complex domains in terms of more concrete or simpler domains of experience. These basic levels of experience that we rely in our everyday thoughts and actions on are grounded in our direct bodily experience of vision, upright orientation, movement, and so on. In addition, basic metaphors may also be communicated to us by our culture. The notion of argument as war, for example, is widely used despite the fact that very few of its users have had direct, personal experience of war. It is, nonetheless, a very productive basic metaphor which includes armies, attacks, allies, adversaries, strategies, manoeuvrings, breakthroughs, victories, and defeats. We all make use of it when we talk about defending our ideas, demolishing our opponent's claims, and trying to win an argument.

As Lakoff (1990:50) points out, these metaphorical correspondences exist as part of our conceptual system and, therefore, we do not have to map our knowledge of the source domain on to the target domain each and every time we use conceptual basic metaphors. As a result, we use them automatically and effortlessly. Their constant and unconscious use is also part of their power. It is very difficult to question, or even notice, everyday basic metaphors when we continually make use of them in our ordinary reasoning and behaviour. The basic metaphors through which we conceptualise a situation are, however, central to the courses of action that we consider and therefore it is crucial to identify them. To quote Dunn

(1990:14), basic metaphors are often "buried deep in the idiom and tend to act subliminally in our conceptual faculties."

### 3.2 Problematic nature of metaphor

There can be little dispute about the utility of metaphor in our thinking. Nevertheless, its use is not without problems. In fact, there are a number of reasons why we should pay particular attention to the metaphors we use ourselves and the metaphors we encounter in our everyday discourse in order not to let them lead us astray. First, we are normally not aware of our metaphorical concepts. Second, metaphor always offers only a partial explanation of a situation. Third, metaphor guides our actions on the basis of the partial explanation of the situation. The present section will now focus on each of these points respectively.

First of all, Lakoff and Johnson (1980:3) argue that our conceptual system is something that we are not aware of, most actions being more or less automatic. This is actually the starting point for their research because, as they see it, language is a tool for making cognitive processes explicit and it is the systematicity of linguistic evidence that proves the metaphorical nature of our conceptual system. A case in point in demonstrating our lack of awareness of an underlying metaphor is our way of talking about argument as war. It is a metaphor we are hardly ever conscious of, yet it is an ordinary way for us to talk about an argument.

Backman (1991:23) shares Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) view about the metaphorical nature of our cognition and offers the following explanation for our unawareness of underlying metaphors: "We are so used to metaphoricity that much of language appears to be ritual and routine and most of the time we feel we are just using widely accepted formulas." Mac Cormac (1985:14) adds that the familiarity of conventional metaphors may beguile us into taking them literally and thus mislead us. In his view (1985:53), dead metaphors are especially dangerous in this respect.

The second reason for caution follows from the power of metaphor to simultaneously emphasise and obscure certain aspects of a concept and thus direct our perception of it. First of all, Black (1962:42) notes that metaphor organises aspects of a concept in a certain way. Similarly, Morgan (1986:13) sees that metaphor always produces one-sided insight. Schön (1979:256) proposes that

certain metaphors may result in a sort of cognitive myopia, in which some aspects of a situation are emphasised at the expense of other, possibly equal important, ones. For Burke (1969:503-505) the selectiveness of metaphor is part of its definition because for him one metaphor offers one perspective, one viewpoint or one point of comparison and ignores all the others. Equally, Lakoff and Johnson (1980:10) regard this feature of metaphor as a direct consequence of its systematicity (see p.21).

Reddy (1979) presents a case of how a certain metaphorical concept affects the way we perceive human communication. In the well-known 'conduit metaphor' language is seen as a carrier of object-like ideas from the sender (the speaker) to the receiver (the hearer). However, Reddy (1979:308-309) points out that the metaphor is essentially inaccurate and misleading because it entails that words and sentences have meanings in themselves and in so doing it ignores the integral role of a receiver's cognitive activity in defining their meanings. In short, the conduit metaphor provides only a partial understanding of what human communication is and, thus, distorts our perception of it.

In addition to directing our attention to one interpretation of a concept or a situation, metaphor may lead us to attribute characteristics of one concept to another which in fact does not have them. Mac Cormac (1985:17) asserts that this is a common phenomenon in all metaphorical transfers and particularly prevalent in cases of metaphorical personification, that is, when a physical object is seen as a person. Doving (1996) provides a case study of projecting human properties and abilities onto organisations and suggests that such anthropomorphic metaphors can be of considerable use in organisation science. His concern is, however, that they may also result in forcing irrelevant information upon organisational setting and that they might be either inappropriate or redundant for organisational research.

The third problem with the use of metaphor is closely related to its tendency to direct our perception of a concept or a situation. The point is that in addition to its descriptive function, that is, 'framing' a situation or 'setting the problem', metaphor has what Schön (1979:254) has termed a 'generative' quality. This means that metaphor generates certain entailments among which is a solution coherent with those aspects of the problem the metaphor highlights. According to Nelson (1986:17), this ability to generate solutions to problems is the basis of metaphor's



power to direct action. To put it another way, metaphors do not simply describe an external reality; they also help constitute that reality and guide our future actions. Such actions will, of course, fit the metaphor and, hence, reinforce its power to make experience coherent. It is in this sense, as Lakoff and Johnson (1980:156) put it, that "metaphors can be self-fulfilling prophecies."

A case in point is Schön's (1979) account of the metaphors present in social policy planning. Schön (1979:255) argues that the way we talk about social problems often depends on metaphors that generate their own solutions to the problems. Nonetheless, we should be wary of such metaphors because more often than not they fail to present an objective characterisation of the problem situation. For this reason Schön (1979:255) asserts that "the essential difficulties in social policy have more to do with problem setting than with problems solving." Consequently, Schön's (1979:256) primary concern is not that we think metaphorically about social problems but that we are not aware of the generative quality metaphor has. At worst this may lead to a situation in which metaphors dangerously control the way we construct the world we live in.

Schön's (1979:270) remedy for the problem is a process of frame restructuring, which involves the design of a new problem-setting metaphor. Annas (1995) has reached a similar conclusion in his analysis of the debate on American health care reform. He says that any meaningful progress in reforming the medical care system will require a new metaphoric framework that provides a new way to think about health itself. Annas (1995) proposes that the two predominant metaphors of American medicine, the military and market metaphors, should be replaced by the ecologic metaphor. If applied to health care, the ecologic metaphor could have a profound influence on the way the debate about reform is conducted. It could, for instance, help people confront and accept limits, value nature, and emphasise the quality of life.

## 4 METAPHORS IN POLITICAL RHETORIC

This chapter describes the findings of some specific studies concerned with the use of metaphors in political rhetoric or for political purposes. In particular, attention is paid to the metaphors employed in the media because of their potential impact on the way in which large numbers of people conceive of the reality they live in. Also, as was pointed out above (p.27), the abstract nature of a subject tends to ensure several metaphorical models for the subject. This implies that the very nature of politics increases the use of metaphor. Furthermore, according to Lakoff and Johnson (1980:236), metaphors matter more in the areas of politics and economics because by hiding certain aspects of reality political and economic metaphors can constrain our lives. A good deal of the chapter is devoted to studies that focus on the metaphors used in international politics, especially those used in reasoning about the 1991 Persian Gulf War. However, the chapter starts with the introduction of certain studies that concentrate on the metaphors employed in domestic politics.

### 4.1 Studies on metaphor use in domestic politics

To begin with, Lakoff (1995) studies a specific issue in American domestic politics: the metaphor systems that underlie liberal and conservative policies, especially their moral values. He argues that liberals are unable to deal effectively with conservatism because they have no unified language to counter the consciously constructed conservative rhetoric. That is to say, while "conservatives have carefully coined terms and images and repeated them until they have entered the popular lexicon, liberals have not done the same." Lakoff (1995) concludes that vital political reasoning is done using metaphors for morality and, for this reason, social research should no longer ignore empirical research on conceptual systems within cognitive linguistics.

In a related study, Adamson et al. (1996) analyse Republican political commentator Rush Limbaugh's use of metaphor in his book, *The Way Things Ought To Be*. In his rhetoric, Limbaugh employs different metaphors to depict liberals as aggressors and threats to American society and their policies as the reason for America's moral decline. Limbaugh's metaphors cohere in his theory of human nature and a vision of a society built around the traditional nuclear

family. Briefly, Limbaugh believes that Capitalism and the American way of life are both part of God's final design and in accordance with human nature, while socialism and liberalism are not. While finding his message repulsive, Adamson et al. (1996) claim that Limbaugh's rhetoric is "brilliantly constructed in its use of culturally entrenched metaphors, which resonate with the emotional feelings of his listeners and readers."

Another account of a politician's use of metaphor originates in Italy. Semino and Masci (1996) examine the metaphors recurring in the discourse of Italy's former Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi and find that metaphor was an important tool in his attempt to achieve his political objectives. Semino and Masci (1996) locate three dominant metaphors in Berlusconi's rhetoric: the football metaphor, war metaphors, and biblical metaphors. They attest (1996:266) that the wide appeal of Berlusconi's political language is partly explained by the conventional nature of his choice of metaphors and the way he creatively extends and mixes them to achieve his goals. Moreover, Berlusconi's consistent use of a set of metaphors introduced a new type of populist and heterogeneous political discourse in Italy.

Baranov (1991:190) reports a more direct mode of using metaphors for political manipulation. In his account of the role of ideology in the formulation of political metaphors, Baranov discusses Lenin's attempt to advance the industrialisation of the country by merging the organism metaphor deeply rooted in Russian thinking with the mechanism metaphor. The combination of these two logically contradictory metaphorical models resulted in political discourse full of stylistic monsters. Today both metaphors are frequently used in Russian political discourse. In conclusion, Baranov (1991:191) remarks that political debate requires skilful manipulation of appropriate metaphorical models.

Chilton and Ilyin (1993) deal with a particular metaphor in modern European political discourse: the metaphor of house. The metaphor is not new. In her study of the repertory of the house metaphor in classical political thought, Rigotti (1995:419) argues that it has been frequently used in the political field ever since Plato and Aristotle. The metaphor of house is prevalent also in the Bible. Further, Chilton and Ilyin (1993:7-8) note that the metaphor of building communism was "the key political formula in the discourse and ideology of the Soviet system in all its years of existence." The metaphor also became to mark the political transition in

Europe as the then Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev introduced its new version, that of the 'common European house', during his visit to France in October 1985. For Chilton and Ilyin (1993:8) the significance of this metaphor lies in that it challenged the Cold War discourse structures that at the time still shaped the European continent. Indeed, the 'European house' metaphor soon replaced the 'iron curtain' metaphor coined by former British Prime Minister Winston Churchill almost half a century earlier.

Additionally, Chilton and Ilyin (1993) discuss the cross-cultural differences in the concept of house which made it possible for different political actors to justify their policies by stressing those metaphorical entailments that corresponded with their specific purposes. As an illustration of the differences, Chilton and Ilyin (1993:14) explain that for Russian speakers the concept of house is associated with an idea of a building containing a large number of individual apartments, whereas English, French, and German speakers typically understand house as a single-family separate structure. Chilton and Ilyin (1993:28) speculate that while Gorbachev's motive for using the house metaphor may initially have been no more than to suggest increasing international communication and cooperation, it transformed in other national discourses sparking off a debate about the geopolitical divisions in the continent and, thus, contributed to German unification and the unravelling of the Soviet empire. In this respect, the house metaphor truly played a leading role in redefining the future shape of Europe.

In another cross-cultural investigation into political metaphors, Rohrer (1991) studies the metaphors used in press accounts of three peacemaking attempts in Central and Latin America from 1967 to 1987. Rohrer (1991) suggests that the metaphors used in the discourse of international politics commonly depict a nation as a person. Consequently, regional peace is understood as an object that can be manipulated and constructed by those in power or, alternatively, as the stakes in a gambling contest, to be won or lost by political players. In the study, the press metaphors for peace were cross-culturally similar, although there appeared some differences in what aspects of peace were highlighted. A further analysis of politicians' spoken metaphors found significant variation from the press metaphors. Rohrer (1991) concludes that peace is understood differently by political professionals and by the public.

#### 4.2 Studies on metaphor use in foreign politics

In the arena of foreign policy, researchers have mainly investigated the significance of metaphor in portrayals of war, particularly the 1991 Persian Gulf War. This is exemplified by studies conducted by Lakoff (1992), Spellman and Holyoak (1992), Voss et al. (1992), Pancake (1993), Jansen and Sabo (1994), Rohrer (1995), and Kuusisto (1998). Among these, Rohrer (1995) investigates the metaphors used by President Bush to conceptualise the situation in the Gulf prior to the war, while Voss et al. (1992) examine those identified in the U.S. Senate debate on the crisis. Further, Pancake (1993) concentrates on the metaphors the media employed to report the Gulf War and although Lakoff (1992) does not specify his sources, his examples seem to contain references to all the aforementioned parties. Jansen and Sabo (1994) study the mixing of sport and war metaphors in electronic and print news media with special emphasis on the way they reflect and reinforce hegemonic masculinity. Kuusisto (1998), in turn, investigates the metaphors used by various French, British, and American foreign policy actors in their reasoning about the Persian Gulf War, as well as the war in Bosnia. Last, Spellman and Holyoak's (1992) study focuses on the conceptual mappings created by comparisons between the Persian Gulf crisis and World War II.

Lakoff (1992) and Rohrer (1995) stress the fundamental role of the basic metaphor NATION IS A PERSON and a related metonymy RULER STANDS FOR THE NATION in our reasoning about the Gulf crisis. Along with two other metaphors under which moral actions are conceived as commercial transactions and justice as the balancing of the moral books, these metaphors allow us to understand the conflict as a just war to settle moral accounts. Lakoff (1992:466-467) and Kuusisto (1998:119-122) show how foreign policy experts employ the scenario of a just war by depicting the crisis in terms of a classic fairy tale. The fairy tale metaphor unequivocally casts Saddam Hussein as an inherently evil and vicious villain, Kuwait as an innocent victim, and America as a courageous hero who rescues the victim and defeats and punishes the villain for moral rather than venal reasons.

Alternatively, Lakoff (1992:471) asserts that while the fairy tale metaphor portrays the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait as a violent crime - murder, theft, or rape, the American plans for war are reported in terms of rational calculation. This leads to

another metaphor, according to which international politics is business and war in the Gulf is justified on economic grounds. Lakoff (1992:464-471) and Kuusisto (1998:125-128) argue that applying the business metaphor to the situation in the Persian Gulf makes the war a matter of cost-benefit analysis, in which political actions are understood as business transactions, rationality as profit maximisation, and, finally, military action as legitimate action to ensure the international community's well-being.

Additionally, Lakoff (1992:471-472) and Kuusisto (1998:122-125, 129-132) point out that the Gulf War can be seen akin to a game, such as chess, roulette or poker, or a sport, such as football, basketball or boxing. As the classic fairy tale metaphor, the sports/game metaphor defines a clear winner and loser, and a clear end to the game. The metaphor also stresses the importance of adhering to the rules of the game and fair play. In the context of the Gulf crisis, Hussein is the player who continuously cheats, breaks the rules, and disturbs the other players, as well as attempts to bribe or blackmail them. The metaphor suggests that the Western team has no option but to take up Hussein's challenge, make him show his cards, and call his bluff.

In fact, as Kuusisto (1998:118) argues, all the three aforementioned basic metaphors yield similar practical inferences about what the United States and the world community ought to do in response to the Iraqi invasion. While the game metaphor requires giving the well-prepared and motivated Western team a chance to beat Hussein's team in a match of the century, the logic of the fairy tale metaphor calls for the heroes to take out their super weapons and destroy the monster in a fierce battle in the final chapter of the storybook. Similarly, the business metaphor emphasises the need for a rapid and forceful solution to the conflict because failing to stop Hussein would result in disastrous economic consequences. Given the extent to which the economies of most nations in the world depend on foreign oil, it did not take the world community long to understand that the best way to ensure a better tomorrow was to accept the necessary costs of entering the war. In brief, the basic metaphors drawn from the domains of fairy tales, business, and games that were used to frame the Persian Gulf crisis all recommend intervening in the situation in the area and taking immediate action against Iraq.

In her study, Kuusisto (1998:133-148) contrasts the metaphors French, British, and American foreign policy experts used to depict the 1991 Persian Gulf War with those used to portray the war in Bosnia in 1992-1995. The four basic metaphors for the Bosnian war liken it to a terrible tragedy, a horrible nightmare, a disastrous natural catastrophe, and a treacherous bog. Kuusisto (1998:133) suggests that these metaphors, like the ones used for the Gulf War, highlight some aspects of reality while concealing other aspects. They also appeal to our emotions and reason and bring a distant war closer to our everyday lives. Most importantly, however, these metaphors do not only help us understand what has already happened, they also guide our attitudes and reactions, and in this way steer our future actions.

To illustrate Kuusisto's (1998:146) arguments, the metaphors used to describe the 1991 Gulf crisis highlight all the good and positive consequences of fighting the war against Hussein, such as the glory of winning the war. The metaphors employed to depict the war in Bosnia, again, draw attention to all the negative and problematic aspects of military involvement in the crisis, such as the horror of unnecessary American, French, or British deaths. Moreover, the metaphors used to frame the Gulf crisis background the concrete and irreversible damage caused by military action as well as the complexity of the situation. In contrast, the metaphors for the Bosnian war fail to recognise the universal responsibility to help people in danger and the importance of preventing chaos. Therefore, while the metaphors employed to depict the pre-war situation in the Persian Gulf sanction military involvement, the ones used to describe the war in former Yugoslavia urge us to keep away from the conflict, to maintain distance from it, and to restrict ourselves to sympathising and providing relief.

In conclusion, Kuusisto (1998:132) points out that, on the one hand, metaphors are natural and necessary because without them it would be quite impossible for us to understand distant and unfamiliar things that we cannot directly observe or perceive. On the other hand, by highlighting and concealing certain aspects of reality metaphors automatically distort our interpretations and simplify our outlooks. Moreover, metaphors that are selected to frame a situation tend to start realising and reinforcing each other and in this way emphasise the necessity of a solution coherent with the metaphor.

Kuusisto (1998:147-148) further observes that in addition to affecting attitudes and decisions in the West, the metaphors most likely directed action also on the opposing side. Therefore, when Hussein understood that in the West he was being portrayed as a monster and that all his actions would be interpreted against this background, his only concern became to strengthen his position at home. Similarly, when the Serbs, the Croats, and the Muslims in former Yugoslavia realised that the war between them was framed as a nightmarish cataclysm that the West did not want to interfere with, there was nothing to stop them from committing most barbarous and inhuman atrocities. Of course, it has to be noted that both Hussein and presidents Milosevic, Tadjman, and Izetbegovic had their own metaphor systems that they actively used to justify their own actions among their people. Kuusisto's (1998:132-133) point is that the metaphors the French, British, and American foreign policy experts employed in their accounts of the two most violent international crises of the decade were in no way inherent in the crises, nor were they the only ones possible. Rather, they were selected and adhered to because they provided a unified and systematic explanation of the situation, as well as sanctioned a solution coherent with their own logic.

The 1991 Gulf crisis was remarkable in many respects. For one thing, it was the first multilateral UN peacekeeping operation of its scope since the Korean War. Also, it received more attention in the media than any international conflict before or since. Consequently, Pancake (1993) proposes that the metaphors in which the American people read about the war partly determined their acceptance and support for it. Likewise, Rohrer (1995) sees that President Bush's attempt to persuade the public to share his understanding of the crisis was, for the most part, successful. The practical outcome of accepting his metaphors and the understandings they generated was then the 1991 war in the Persian Gulf.

Taken together, the findings stated above concerning the use of metaphor in the depiction of the Persian Gulf War agree with Nelson's (1986:21) assertion that the repeated use of certain metaphors in the media creates coherence in perspective and appropriate action. Nelson (1986:18) explains that when metaphors are used in mass communication, their potential impact is even stronger than in ordinary reasoning, not only because the media reaches such a broad audience, but also because "Western culture as a whole claims 'objectivism' as the basis of their journalistic practices." Nelson (1986:17) also mentions that metaphors abound in



the media because they enable journalists to efficiently express complex ideas by associating them with common images or experiences.

Nelson (1986) illustrates her points by studying the metaphorical descriptions of the world economy in the *New York Times*, the *Guardian*, and the *Worker's World* in 1982 and 1986. Nelson (1986:19) finds that the differences detected between the metaphorical treatments of the economy "correspond to the political and economic orientations of the newspapers that use them." Therefore, the metaphors used by the mainstream *New York Times* reflect American culture's dominant values and suggest capitalist economy. In contrast, the leftist publications have different priorities reflected in alternative metaphors and, consequently, employ metaphors which emphasise the faults of the system as it exists. In addition, the emphasis of the metaphors changes as social realities change. On the basis of her study, Nelson (1986:21) claims that the newspaper's choice of metaphors reflects its ideological bend and influences public understanding and subsequent action. She demands (1986:24) that the public should be made aware of the subtle yet powerful means, such as the use of metaphors, that the media employs to shape our political perspectives.

So (1987) confirms Nelson's (1986:17) assumption about the extensiveness of the metaphor use in American printed media on the part of *New York Times*, *Time*, and *Newsweek*. So's (1987) main objective is to investigate the metaphors that these papers used to depict the U.S. - Soviet summit held in Geneva in 1985. He also compares the frequency of metaphor use between reports in the two weekly magazines and different kinds of news writing in *New York Times* by dividing the length of the story with the number of identified metaphors.

So's (1987:624-625) most important finding is that among the many metaphors American journalists used to frame the summit, most belong to three major domains: war, business, and sport-game. As for the relative frequencies of the metaphor types, war metaphors are used most frequently, business metaphors second and sport-game metaphors third most frequently. It is worth noting that the relative frequencies of the three major metaphor types are the same in all three sources. Comparing different kinds of news writing, So (1987:625) finds that editorial in *New York Times* is the kind of writing most-filled with metaphors. Next

is the feature story in *Time* and *Newsweek*, then commentary, news analysis, and letter-to-the-editor in *New York Times*. The proportion of metaphors in the straight news category is low. In conclusion, So (1987:625-626) suggests that journalists should reconsider the types of metaphors they use in their descriptions of the summits in order not to create a hostile and competitive conception of them among the public.

## 5 RESEARCH DESIGN

The main purpose of the study was to analyse the metaphors *Newsweek* and *Novoje vreme* employed in their descriptions of four summits between the heads of the United States and the Soviet Union/Russia in 1987-1997. More specifically, the following questions were posed: 1) What differences, if any, exist in the metaphorical descriptions of the summits held in different years? 2) What differences, if any, occur in the metaphorical descriptions of summits between *Newsweek* and *Novoje vreme*? Finding answers to these questions required counting the frequencies of the metaphors used to describe the different aspects of the summits in the two magazines. Clearly, conducting quantitative work on such a complex subject as metaphor is not without methodological difficulties. The present chapter aims to clarify the process of data analysis by considering some of these difficulties. The first of the following sections concentrates on the view of metaphor adopted in this study. The second section explicates how the material for the study was gathered, while the third section comments on the methods of analysing the data.

### 5.1 View on metaphor

Most semantic metaphor theories recognise the cognitive significance of metaphor. Nevertheless, they mainly concentrate on identifying metaphors and studying the mechanics of the interaction process. There have also been attempts to formalise the interaction theory by using the framework of semantic features. Such models have been put forward, for example, by Katz and Fodor (1964) and componential analysts such as Nida (1975a, 1975b) and Tversky (1977). The utilization of these models has not, however, been without problems (see Lyons 1968:470-481, Verbrugge 1977:368, Levinson 1983:150-151) and therefore they were neither explicated, nor applied in this study.

Instead, the emphasis in the present study was on cognitive metaphor theories because they focus on the more interesting aspect of metaphor: the interpretation and consequences of metaphor. The study adopted the basic claims of Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) theory and the notion of conceptual metaphor, or basic metaphor, occupied a central position in the analysis. Lakoff's (1990) model of metaphorical

correspondences between two conceptual domains was applied in the process of identifying and analysing the summit metaphors located in *Newsweek* and *Novoje vremja*. The study paid special attention to the cognitive implications of talking about the domain of summits in terms of certain other domains. The potential explanations and consequences of this strategy were also addressed.

## 5.2 Data collection

As mentioned above, the sources of data were an American magazine *Newsweek* and a Russian magazine *Novoje vremja*. In the first phase, all articles directly related to all summits between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union/Russia in the ten-year period between 1987 and 1997 in the two magazines were carefully read. The first choice concerned the summits to be included in the study. The following criteria were applied. First, the summits should cover different phases of the superpower relations in the ten-year period. Secondly, there should be enough material in the two magazines focusing directly on the different aspects of the summits.

The second phase in the collection of the data concerned the choice of articles. As one of the main goals of the study was to compare the frequency of metaphor use between *Newsweek* and *Novoje vremja*, a point was made to include an equal number of articles from each magazine to make the comparison more valid. The articles also needed to deal with the summits themselves, not the relations between the superpowers in general or any other specific aspect of the relations. A high frequency of metaphor use was yet another factor taken into consideration in the process of selecting the articles for the study.

The final data for the study consisted of eighteen articles discussing four Russo-American summits held in 1987, 1989, 1992 and 1997. Only straight news features were included, while all other kind of articles - editorials, letters-to-the-editor, commentaries, news analyses, columns, interviews - were discarded. It needs to be noted, however, that articles in both *Newsweek* and *Novoje vremja* do not go under the heading of straight news stories in the strictest sense of the definition as besides objective reporting on the summits they contain analysis, comments, and opinions. In fact, So (1987:625) describes the reports in *Newsweek* as standing in between

straight news and commentary/analysis/letter and therefore reflecting the "story-telling characteristic of the feature articles - not too 'dry' and not too opinionated."

The first summit, the metaphorical description of which was analysed in this study, was held in Washington in December 1987 between General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan. The two leaders had met already twice: in 1985 in Geneva and in 1986 in Reykjavik. On both occasions Gorbachev's unprecedented initiative and co-operativeness had amazed the Americans but the first arms-reduction treaty between the leaders was yet to be signed. Both sides had great hopes on Gorbachev's first visit to the United States and, indeed, the summit came up to expectations as the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) agreement was signed after a tough round of talks. From each magazine one article prior and two articles after the summit in consecutive issues were included in the study data.

In the second summit analysed in the study, Gorbachev met President George Bush in very special circumstances. The negotiations were held, firstly, aboard warships anchored off the island nation of Malta in the middle of a fierce winter storm. Also, the political context of the summit was rather turbulent because the revolutionary reforms initiated by Gorbachev had led to a great political upheaval both in the Soviet Union and in the whole of Eastern Europe. The Berlin Wall had come down only three weeks before the meeting and the communist monolith was on the brink of eventual collapse. As a result of the summit the superpowers agreed on the agenda for the next summit to be held in the United States the following summer and promised not to interfere with changes in Eastern Europe. The summit marked a turn from a bipolar power system to a new era of freedom in world politics. The data concerning this particular meeting consisted of three articles from both magazines. The data from *Newsweek* included one article prior and two articles after the summit and the data from *Novoje vremja* two articles prior and one article after the summit.

By the third summit examined in the study in February 1992 the Soviet Union had already passed into history. In the summit Russian president B.N. Yeltsin met George Bush for the first time as a representative of independent Russia at Camp David. In the eyes of the U.S. administration, Yeltsin did not equal with

Gorbachev as a political leader and despite his historic disarmament proposals, strong doubts about his character and his political survival remained. In addition to arms-control, the two presidents discussed economic assistance to Yeltsin's reforms and proclaimed a new friendship between the countries. By accepting relief aid from its former adversary Russia indirectly submitted to the leading role of the United States in world politics. The 1992 data consisted of two articles from both magazines. Those included from *Newsweek* were from issues published immediately prior and after the summit, whereas the data from *Novoje vremja* consisted of two separate articles from one issue published after the meeting.

The fourth summit between U.S. and Russian leaders relevant to this study was held in Helsinki in March 1997. The summit was a meeting of two recuperating presidents, Yeltsin who had gone through a multiple by-pass surgery a few months earlier and Bill Clinton who was confined to a wheelchair after a recent knee operation. In his second term of office Yeltsin had succeeded in stabilizing his position but Russia had clearly continued to lose its political clout. Once again the summit resulted in an arms-control deal. This time, however, the most important item on the agenda was the inevitable expansion of NATO to include at least three former Soviet satellites. The expansion debate which brought about only an agreement to disagree was a perfect example of Russia's waning influence. Only two articles covering the summit were included in the study: one article from *Newsweek* and one from *Novoje vremja*.

Table 1 summarises the dates, locations, and participants of the summits included in the research, as well as the main point on their agenda. Table 1 shows also the pages of the issues of *Newsweek* (*NW* in Table 1 and hereafter in references, followed by abbreviated date and page numbers) and *Novoje vremja* (*NV* in Table 1 and hereafter in references, followed by issue and page numbers) analysed in the study.

Table 1. Information about the summits and primary data sources.

Time	Location	Participants	Agenda	Articles
8-10 December, 1987	Washington, USA	Gorbachev, Reagan	INF-treaty	<i>NW</i> 7 Dec, pp.8-11, 14 Dec, pp.9-15, 21 Dec, pp.10-17; <i>NV</i> № 49, pp.3-5, № 50, pp.3-7, № 51, pp.3-7
2-3 December, 1989	Malta	Gorbachev, Bush	agenda for the 1990 summit	<i>NW</i> 13 Nov, pp.10-11, 11 Dec, pp.11-14, 18 Dec, pp.20-22; <i>NV</i> № 46, pp.6-8, № 49, pp.12-14, № 50, pp.5-9
1 February, 1992	Camp David, USA	Yeltsin, Bush	economic relief to Russia	<i>NW</i> 3 Feb, pp.12-13, 10 Feb, pp.10-11; <i>NV</i> № 6, pp.4-7, 30-31
20-21 March, 1997	Helsinki, Finland	Yeltsin, Clinton	NATO expansion	<i>NW</i> 31 March, pp.14-16; <i>NV</i> № 12, pp.22-24

Certain trends with regard to the treatment of the summits in the two magazines became apparent in the process of selecting articles for the study. Firstly, it seemed that with time the magazines lost some of their early interest in the summits. This showed in the decreasing number of pages devoted to the summits. For example, the reports on the 1987 summit included in the study data took up sixteen pages in *Newsweek* and thirteen in *Novoje vremja*, while the coverage of the 1997 summit took up three pages in both magazines. The difference concerned the amount of both pre- and post-summit speculation in the magazines. In the 1980s, there appeared several special features on the outcomes and significance of the summits in *Newsweek* and *Novoje vremja* but in the 1990s this kind of information was often provided within articles that did not deal exclusively with the summits but had a wider scope.

Secondly, shifts in attitude towards the summits showed in the style of reporting on the summits. It appeared that the descriptions in the 1980s went into the details of the meetings, while the reports on the summits held in the 1990s concentrated on macroscopic issues and were slightly more general in

nature. The reason for these changes obviously lies in the significant improvement of the superpower relations during Gorbachev's leadership. As the tension between the United States and the Soviet Union/Russia continued to lessen and the meetings between the heads of the two states became regular, the summits soon wore off novelty and, consequently, received less attention in the media.

The third trend revealed in the reading of the articles was that the two magazines covered very similar topics, although often from directly opposite points of view. As a rule, the summit articles in *Newsweek* were straightforward and to the point, whereas those in *Novoje vremja* were often more verbose and gave space also to wider issues, for example, the relations between the superpowers in general. However, the similarity of coverage increased with time for as years went by the articles in *Novoje vremja* began to resemble more and more those in *Newsweek*. The change concerned not only the content but also the form of the articles. The articles in *Novoje vremja* clearly changed more during the ten-year period in question than those in *Newsweek*.

### 5.3 Methods of analysis

The view that the study took on metaphor has been explicated elsewhere (p. 43-44) and will not be dwelled upon here. However, it is appropriate to remind the reader that even though the present study is founded on the idea of metaphor as a cognitive phenomenon rather than a mere linguistic feature, finding answers to the two research questions - 1) What differences, if any, exist in the metaphorical descriptions of the summits held in different years? 2) What differences, if any, occur in the metaphorical descriptions of summits between *Newsweek* and *Novoje vremja*? - required a quantitative analysis of metaphors. Therefore, in the codifying process they were identified as linguistic units represented by a single word or a pair of words.

Another point worth mentioning in this connection is that it is not always without difficulty to draw a line between metaphors and non-metaphors. For example, the English verb 'to offer' and its Russian equivalent 'предложить' can both be



interpreted either as a synonym for the verb 'to suggest' or metaphorically as an act of making a business proposal. In this study, the decision whether a word or a phrase was used metaphorically was made on the basis of its relationship with its context. From this followed that exactly the same expressions could be interpreted either metaphorically or non-metaphorically, depending on the particular context. The researcher's own judgement was crucial in the process of identifying metaphors.

As to the extent of conventionality of the metaphors, dead metaphors were treated in the same way as less conventional metaphors. This was done for three obvious reasons. First, it has been documented (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:54, Backman 1991:20) that dead metaphors can easily become activated by extension. In addition, Baranov and Karaulov (1994:xiii) report on the basis of their study that this happens particularly often in political discourse. Second, especially in political texts it is not always clear whether the cognitive model behind the dead metaphor is active or not. This is illustrated by Baranov and Karaulov's (1994:xiii) example closely related to the sphere of interest of the present study. A former Soviet diplomat commented on the Geneva summit in an interview in 1985 with the following phrase: "It was a fierce fight in which a victory was won." (*"Пришлось выдержать жестокий бой, но победа достигнута."*) On the one hand, the phrase can be regarded as an instance of dead metaphor since in one of its many meanings the Russian noun 'бой' ('fight') is a synonym for 'dispute' or 'debate', equally the Russian noun 'победа' ('victory') can be understood as 'reaching an agreement'. On the other hand, it is possible that the diplomat in question did, in fact, conceive the talks as military operations and the opposing side at the negotiations as an adversary which should be 'wiped out from the face of the earth'. The third reason for including dead metaphors in the analysis is that, according to Baranov and Karaulov (1994:xiii), even conventional metaphors have culturally shaped concepts (e.g. *Time is money*) behind them which become activated in finding solutions to problematic situations.

The articles included in the study were carefully read several times in order to locate relevant metaphors used to describe the summits, the United States, the Soviet Union/Russia, and the participants of the summits. However, only the metaphors in the news texts proper were included in the study, whereas those in captions,

headlines, and subheadings were discarded. Within the news texts only the summit-related metaphors were covered, while all the numerous other metaphors related to the superpower relations in general or any other specific aspect of the relations, for example, trade or human rights questions, were disregarded. The metaphors in quotations were included in the study. Because one of the objectives of the study was to compare the frequency of occurrence of different metaphors, exact repetitions of the same expression were counted as separate instances in the coding process.

The analysis of the data utilised the concept of basic metaphors. Once identified, each metaphor was categorised according to the source domain they were drawn from. In the process the source domains were mapped to the target domain of summits. The ontological correspondences between the entities of the domains were established and knowledge about the source domains was applied to the summit scenario. Among the many metaphors used to describe the summits, most belonged to four major source domains: business, war, sports, and theatre. These four main types of metaphors represented the four basic metaphors used to frame the summits: **The summit is doing business**, **The summit is war**, **The summit is a sport-game**, and **The summit is theatre**. There were instances of using other types of metaphors to describe the summits as well, for example, metaphors drawn from the domains of weather, journey, mechanics, and human body. The analysis, however, focused on the four most frequently used basic metaphors mentioned above. The ontological and epistemic correspondences between the domains of business, war, sports, and theatre and the domain of summits will be looked upon in connection with the introduction of the four basic metaphors in chapter 6.

The following excerpts from *Newsweek* and *Novoje vremja* illustrate the coding process of the metaphors according to their source domain. The metaphors taken into the analysis are marked in the text according to the basic metaphor category they belong to as follows: italics equal the category of business, underlining equals the category of war, boldface the category of sports, and underlined italics the category of theatre. The first excerpt is from an article published in *Newsweek* two weeks after the 1987 summit commenting on the outcomes of that summit and predicting agenda for the 1988 summit in Moscow:

The main goal in Moscow will be to reach agreement on a 50 percent reduction of long-range nuclear weapons. Negotiators completed the outline of that *deal* last week, although reams of fine print remain unwritten. The principal obstacle, however, will again be Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), the program known as Star Wars. Last week the superpowers deliberately fudged the SDI question, agreeing to disagree. The resolution they left for later. Reagan portrayed the maneuver as a victory; he said it "resolves" the SDI issue, allowing the United States to "go forward with our research and development." He added: "And then, after a certain point...we will deploy." The Soviets didn't see it that way; there was no sign that they would accept the deployment of weapons in space. By **finessing** the question, Reagan and Gorbachev put off the day of reckoning on Star Wars, and for each it was **a gamble**. Reagan **bet** that SDI would survive on its accumulated momentum, while the Soviets **calculated** that it would die at the hands of Congress or a new administration. (*NW*, 21 Dec 1987, p.10)

In the analysis, the noun 'deal' was interpreted as a business transaction between the superpowers, the reaching of which has involved *bargaining* and making *offers* and *counteroffers*, probably also *compromises* from either sides. The nouns 'maneuver' and 'victory' were included under the heading of war metaphors since both belong to the vocabulary of war-like battle. In this kind of *struggle* the superpowers have their *positions* and use their *strategies* and *tactics* to win the *adversary*. The next metaphor taken into the analysis was the verb 'to finesse'. The expression is drawn from the domain of card games and was therefore included in the sport-game category together with the last three metaphors that were interpreted as metaphors related to gambling.

In addition to the marked instances of metaphor, the first excerpt includes several other metaphors, for example, one used in reference to the preparations for the 1988 summit (the idea of an *obstacle* as part of the basic metaphor **The summit is a journey**). Moreover, Reagan's ambitious missile-defense system SDI, the program better known by its metaphorical name *Star Wars*, is being treated in the passage as a living creature which may either *survive* or *die*, in the latter case *at the hands of Congress or a new administration*, which is an example of a metonymy. As shown, different metaphors abound in the excerpt but the present study dealt only with those that were, first, directly related to the summits and, secondly, drawn from the source domains of business, war, sports, and theatre.

The process of classifying individual metaphors according to the domain they were drawn from was not always without difficulty. For example, the English expression *adversary* and its Russian equivalent *противник* could be classified as metaphors drawn either from the domain of sports (as a synonym for ‘rival’) or from the domain of war (as a synonym for ‘enemy’). In ambiguous cases like this the decision was made on the basis of the context the particular metaphor appeared in. For instance, the expressions *partner* and *партнер* were systematically codified as metaphors drawn from the domain of business. The exception to the rule appeared in the following extract: ”Что поделаешь, для танго нужны двое, и чем больше спотыкается партнер, тем больше к нему приходится принаравливать.” (‘What is there to do, it takes two to tango and the more your partner stumbles, the more you have to adapt yourself.’) (NV 49, 1987, p. 4). In this particular case, the noun *партнер* was regarded as a metaphor drawn from the domain of dance and classified as a sports metaphor. The question of ambiguity in relation to the source domain will be addressed in a more detailed analysis below (see p.63-64).

The following passage from *Novoje vremja* demonstrates the tendency of the same type of metaphors to cluster together. The excerpt, which comments on the 1992 meeting between Yeltsin and Bush, offers an example of the way a certain metaphor, in this particular case one related to theatre, extends over a whole passage:

На минувшей неделе в Москве, Вашингтоне и Нью-Йорке был сыгран новый *акт* политической *драмы* под названием ”Прощай, оружие”. На требовательный вкус эксперта-разоруженца этот *акт* показался несколько скомканным и сумбурным, словно участники торопились выдвинуть все отложенные и просроченные инициативы, опасаясь, что вот-вот опустится *занавес*.  
 (‘Last week a new *act* of the political *drama* ”Farewell to arms” was played in Moscow, Washington and New York. The *act* struck as somewhat hasty and chaotic to the taste of an arms-control expert, it was as if the participants had hurried to bring forward all the postponed and overdue motions in a fear that *the curtain* would fall any moment.’)  
 (*Novoje vremja* 6, 1992, p.30)

In this study, all the single references were counted as separate instances. Most metaphors included in the data, however, appeared more or less scattered.

Finally, in order to identify the differences in the metaphorical descriptions, firstly, between different summits and, secondly, between the two magazines, the distribution of metaphors was statistically analysed by year the summits were held in and by name of the magazine. The association of these nominally scaled variables was tested with a chi-square test. Because of the small number of cases, the Monte Carlo Estimate of significance was used to increase the reliability of the significance.

## 6 RESULTS

The study investigated the types of metaphor *Newsweek* and *Novoje vremja* used to describe four Russo-American top-level summits in 1987-1997. More specifically, the study attempted to find differences in the use of metaphors, firstly, between descriptions of summits held in different years and, secondly, between the two magazines. In the following section 6.1 will introduce the major types of metaphors *Newsweek* and *Novoje vremja* employed in their illustrations of the summits. Section 6.2 will focus on the differences in the metaphorical descriptions of summits through the years by examining the use of metaphors separately in *Newsweek* and in *Novoje vremja*, whereas section 6.3 will deal with the differences between the two magazines by juxtaposing their descriptions of respective summits.

### 6.1 Basic metaphors

The research material constituted of a total of 258 individual metaphors, which appeared in nine articles of *Newsweek* and nine articles of *Novoje vremja*. These metaphors represented four basic metaphors which were used to frame the summits: **The summit is doing business**, **The summit is war**, **The summit is a sport-game**, and **The summit is theatre**. Table 2 shows the frequencies of use of these basic metaphors. In the following, the four basic metaphor categories and the cognitive implications of using them are elaborated in order of frequency.

Table 2. Basic metaphors in the description of the summits.

Source domain	Total	
	%	f
Business	33.3	86
War	29.5	76
Sports	21.7	56
Theatre	15.5	40
<b>Total</b>	100.0	258

### 6.1.1 The summit is doing business

First and foremost, summits were described using metaphors related to business. **The summit is doing business** was the most frequently used basic metaphor, as every third (33.3 %) of the individual metaphors classified, that is, 86 metaphors, belonged to this category (Table 2). The mapping of the source domain of business to the target domain of summits yielded, for instance, the following ontological correspondences: the participants of the summits corresponded to businessmen, the talks to business meetings, and the signing of the treaties and accords to doing deals. Therefore, under the business metaphor, the summits were viewed as business meetings between *partners* who made each other *offers* to reach a profitable *deal*. The negotiations were characterised as a process of *trade* which involved making *concessions* and *compromises*.

In *Newsweek* business terms were used, for example, in the following connections:

- (1) "We are ready to do *business* with [Reagan]" (*NW*, 14 Dec 1987, p.15).
- (2) More artful dodging on Star Wars may seem to be a reasonable *cost of closing the deal* (*NW*, 21 Dec 1987, p.17).
- (3) Bush had other interesting ideas for helping perestroika, but most will require intensive *bargaining* (*NW*, 11 Dec 1989, p.13).
- (4) Bush and Yeltsin will probably *negotiate a trade-off* (*NW*, 10 Feb 1992, p.11).
- (5) [Clinton and Yeltsin] cut an arms-control *deal* (*NW*, 31 March 1997, p.14).

*Novoje vremja* (49, 1987, p.5) referred to the signing of a new arms-control agreement in the following manner:

- (1) У партнёров по переговорам появляется -- готовности к *уступкам и компромиссам* ('The partners are willing to make *concessions* and *compromises*').

Other examples of metaphors drawn from the domain of business in *Novoje vremja* were:

- (2) В нынешней обстановке самым "безопасным" стали бы предложения в области контроля над вооружениями ('In the present situation the "safest" offer would be one in the area of arms control') (*NV* 49, 1989, p.12).
- (3) В конце концов лидер России заявил, что партнерство с США и НАТО ему важнее ('In the end the Russian leader declared that partnership with the U.S. and NATO is more important') (*NV* 12, 1997, p.23).

Likening the summits to normal business meetings involving such commercial activities as buying, selling, making investments, pursuing profits, and avoiding losses makes them more tangible to people. It is easy to understand what the negotiators are trying to achieve in the summits: the main motive for the bargaining is to maximise economic profits. Also, failure in the negotiations means economic loss. Decisions and moves are always made on grounds of profitability, not because of generosity or politeness. The goals are very concrete and the actions follow the cold laws of economics systematically. Borrowing the terms and the reasoning from a sphere people in business-oriented societies are familiar with helps them to comprehend the negotiators' activities and the course of the negotiations better.

Using the metaphorical model of doing business in the description of summits also creates an impression of both sides planning their course of action rationally in order to make financially profitable decisions at the meetings. For one thing, the negotiators need to know enough about their trading partner and their merchandise. Furthermore, they have to consider not only the risks and possible profits of their investments but also the economic trends and possible future changes in the sector. Probably the most important piece of information they need to have, however, is the value of what they are going to sell and what they are going to buy. When dealing with such diverse issues as limiting the number of sea-launched ballistic missiles, liberalising Jewish emigration, or expanding NATO to Eastern Europe, the exact value of each action is not self-evident but needs to be rationally calculated.



In his study of the use of metaphors in the justification of the Persian Gulf War, Lakoff (1992) compares efficient political management to efficient political management and suggests that policymakers should follow well-run business organisations in keeping a careful tally of the costs and gains of their decisions. To solve the problem with the value of political decisions, Lakoff (1992:464, 468-469) introduces a cost-benefit analysis metaphor, within which the political "gains" achieved through a certain policy are weighed against its "costs". The cost-benefit analysis metaphor presupposes a causal commerce system which makes qualitative effects of actions quantitative and thus comparable with each other. In this way, the system allows portraying political actions as commercial transactions with costs and gains. In some cases the profits and losses of the actions become clear immediately after the transaction, but often the negotiators make long-range investments, the final outcomes of which appear only later. Nevertheless, applying ideas from economics to political actions makes it possible to measure the profitability of each action and decision. The cost-benefit analysis metaphor seems to be active also in the depiction of the summits in business terms, as some of the negotiators' actions are seen as *offers* and some as *concessions*.

The utilisation of "commercial" metaphors also reflects the pattern of thought, according to which everything, including world politics, is nothing but business with the ultimate purpose of protecting one's own interests even at the cost of the opposing side. One of the basic assumptions behind this approach is that relations between the two superpowers are trade connections which should be managed accordingly. In other words, in an effort to maintain the association, to guarantee a flow of profits, and to avoid financial risks the relation with the opposing side should be respectful, yet firm and analytic.

The problem with borrowing terms and ideas from business is that of oversimplification. Kuusisto (1998:128) sees that turning world politics into business obscures the moral problems and non-material losses related to political decisions and their consequences. Moreover, the use of business vocabulary overemphasises the rationality of political decision-making because often decisions are made and actions taken in uncertain circumstances without having all the necessary information about the opposing side or the terms and consequences of the actions.

### 6.1.2 The summit is war

The top-level meetings between Soviet/Russian and U.S. leaders were also characterised by terms related to war. Table 2 shows that 76 individual occurrences of the war metaphor made **The summit is war** the second most frequently used basic metaphor (29.5 %). When the summits were presented in the context of war, the two superpowers corresponded ontologically to enemies, the working meetings between the participants to a series of battles, and the outcome of the summits to an unambiguous victory or defeat. As a result of the mapping, the participants were described as *allies*, *adversaries*, and *antagonists* who had their own *tactics* or *strategies* to *win* the opposing side and to *gain victory*. The activities of the negotiating parties were equated with *operations* or *maneuvers* aimed at *breaking through enemy lines*.

The articles in *Newsweek* contained among others the following instances of the use of the war metaphor:

- (1) The Soviet *advance men* who came to Washington to prepare the summit. (*NW*, 14 Dec 1987, p.15).
- (2) The Soviets also *gave no ground* on Afghanistan (*NW*, 21 Dec 1987, p.16).
- (3) The Soviets made *a tactical retreat* (*NW*, 21 Dec 1987, p.17).
- (4) The president -- had planned to begin with something of *a pre-emptive strike* (*NW*, 11 Dec 1989, p.10).
- (5) ... another example of Russian *capitulation* (*NW*, 31 March 1997, p.16).

The following war metaphors appeared in *Novoje vremja*:

- (1) У партнеров по переговорам является куда больше свободы *маневра* ('The negotiating partners have more freedom to *maneuver*') (*NV* 49, 1987, p.5).
- (2) шансы на *прорыв* в советско-американских отношениях ('chances of *breakthrough* in Russo-American relations') (*NV* 50, 1987, p.7).

- (3) *стратегический выход* в ядерном разоружении (*'strategic withdrawal with regard to nuclear disarmament'*) (NV 50, 1989, p.7).
- (4) Российская административная элита тщательно готовилась к *сражению* (*'the Russian administrative elite prepared carefully for a battle'*) (NV 12, 1997, p.23).

Given the history of the Russo-American relations, it is not so surprising that the summits were often framed as a war. It should be borne in mind that as late as in 1983 during his first term of office as the president of the United States Ronald Reagan referred to the Soviet Union as the 'evil empire'. Moreover, it took till 1992 before Russia and the United States officially declared that they no longer regarded each other as a potential enemy. One further explanation for the frequent use of war metaphors in the characterisation of the summits may lie in the primary goal of most of the summits, which was to limit the arms race between the Soviet Union/Russia and the United States. According to this hypothesis, the goal of the negotiations may have advanced the portrayal of the summits themselves as a war.

War metaphors hold a very strong position in political discourse. Studies attest to the frequency of their use, for instance, in modern Russian parliamentary discourse (Baranov and Karaulov 1991, 1994, Vinogradov 1994), the discourse of Italy's former Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi (Semino and Masci 1996), Republican political commentator Rush Limbaugh's rhetoric (Adamson et al. 1996) as well as former U.S. presidents' declarations against drugs (Elwood 1995). In addition, Lakoff (1992) discusses the connection between politics and war with a special focus on the famous definition of war by Prussian general Karl von Clausewitz: "War is politics pursued by other means", which is a parallel metaphor to the underlying idea of the war metaphor *politics is war*.

The view that metaphors guide our thinking needs to be taken seriously especially in connection with the use of war metaphors as the cognitive implications of talking about politics in terms of war are not altogether constructive. Lakoff and Johnson's (1980:10) warning about focusing on one aspect of a concept at the expense of others is particularly relevant at this point. It seems that the two most worrying connotations of presenting summits as war-like battles are, firstly, the idea of two

opposing sides as definite enemies to each other and, secondly, the goal of unconditional destruction of the enemy as the only acceptable result of the battle.

Baranov and Karaulov (1991:15) point out that metaphors play a very important role in the process of making political decisions as they produce the alternatives for settling a conflict situation. The war metaphor, however, allows no alternatives: the opponent is an enemy and should be destroyed both morally and physically. Vinogradov (1994:71) also observes that extreme 'metaphorical militarism' affects human conscience and orientates people to battle and destruction instead of peace and search of agreement. Indeed, concentrating on the bellicose and hostile aspects of the summits may obscure the aspect of cooperation and mutual enhancement. There are more positive ways to depict the summits between the two superpowers.

### 6.1.3 The summit is a sport-game

The third basic metaphor used in the material was **The summit is a sport-game**, which was utilised a total of 56 times (21.7 %). In the mapping of the sports domain to the domain of summits, the heads of the two superpowers corresponded to captains of two opposing teams and their summit agenda to their game plan. Similarly, a successful move in the talks corresponded to scoring a goal and a failure to losing a set or a game. Thus, the basic metaphor allowed the illustration of the summits as sports meetings with two *teams playing* against each other. In various *rounds* the *rivals* tried to *score points* and *win the game*.

*Newsweek* used the sports metaphor, for example, in the following expressions:

- (1) the White House *game plan* (*NW*, 7 Dec 1987, p.11).
- (2) At the unique joint press conference after *the final round* of talks on Sunday (*NW*, 11 Dec 1989, p.12).
- (3) [Yeltsin] is trying to join *the winning team* (*NW*, 10 Feb 1992, p.10).
- (4) Yeltsin's proposal to enlarge the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) *scored a neat rhetorical point* (*NW*, 10 Feb 1992, p.11).
- (5) Albright *played hardball* by walking out of her meeting with Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov (*NW*, 31 March, p.15).

In *Novoje vremja* sport-game metaphors were utilised in the following fashion:

- (1) Новая советская внешнеполитическая команда показала, что...  
(‘The new Soviet foreign policy *team* showed that...’) (*NV* 49, 1987, p.4)
- (2) Состязание президентов завершилось, скорее, в пользу Клинтона. По очкам. (‘Rather the *match* between the presidents ended in Clinton’s advantage. *By points.*’) (*NV* 12, 1997, p.22)

Although most of the ”sporting” metaphors were related to sports and games in general, there was one sport that stood out as an especially frequent source of metaphorisation: boxing. In *Novoje vremja* metaphors related to boxing were used in the depiction of the 1987 summit in Washington, for instance, *два борца на ринге* (‘two boxers in a ring’) (*NV* 50, 1987, p.7). In *Newsweek* they were used to characterise the 1992 summit (*[Yeltsin] throws in the towel* (*NW*, 10 Feb 1992, p.10)) and the 1997 summit (*the presummit sparring* (*NW*, 31 March 1997, p.16)).

Apart from boxing metaphors, *Newsweek* employed three chess metaphors (*Bush began to play his extraordinary opening gambit* (*NW*, 11 Dec 1989, p.10), *Yeltsin’s gambits* (*NW*, 10 Feb 1992, p.10) and *stalemated negotiators* (*NW*, 21 Dec 1987, p.16)) and two more general metaphorical references to board games (*Verification remains a problem across the board* (*NW*, 14 Dec 1987, p.15) and *Moscow wants across-the-board cuts* (*NW*, 10 Feb 1992, p.10)). Furthermore, in its depiction of the 1987 summit *Newsweek* utilised one metaphor related to cricket (*the Soviets stonewalled* (*NW*, 21 Dec 1987, p.16)), one related to wrestling (*It’s a big job to wrestle one of these [treaties] to the ground* (*NW*, 21 Dec 1987, p.16)), and two metaphors related to card games (*by finessing the question* (*NW*, 21 Dec 1987, p.10) and *a possible scenario for finessing the issue* (*NW*, 21 Dec 1987, p.15)).

*Novoje vremja*, again, employed one metaphor drawn from the domain of dance (*чем больше спотыкается партнер* (‘the more your *partner* stumbles’) (*NV* 49,

1987, p.4)) and two card game metaphors (*Накануне встречи в верхах "иранскую карту" с большим усердием разыгрывала российская пресса.* ('Russian press played zealously with the "Iran card" on the eve of the summit') (NV 12, 1997, p.24) and *то... скорее играет ему на руку* ('that will more likely play into his hands') (NV 12, 1997, p.23)). Somewhat surprisingly, no metaphors drawn from the domain of chess or any other specific sport occurred in *Novoje vremja*.

For reasons specified below (p.64-65), also metaphors related to gambling were included in the category of sport-game metaphors. While there appeared only one gambling metaphor in *Novoje vremja* (*слишком великие ставки* ('too high stakes') (NV 49, 1989, p.14)), there were a total of nine of them in *Newsweek*, all but one of which were used to describe the 1987 meeting (e.g. *Reagan and Gorbachev put off the day of reckoning on Star Wars, and for each it was a gamble. Reagan bet that...* (NW, 21 Dec 1987, p.10)).

Previous studies (e.g. Baranov and Karaulov 1991, 1994, Jansen and Sabo 1994, Semino and Masci 1996) have recorded that the sports metaphor is widely used in political contexts. Semino and Masci (1996:250) list some of the cognitive implications of structuring the domain of politics around the domain of sports. The first implication follows from the power of metaphor to project new additional properties from the source domain to the target domain. According to Semino and Masci (1996:250-251), the sports metaphor and allusions to team sports, in particular, take advantage of the positive connotations of sports by drawing on such values as national unity and co-operation. Another basic function is that of simplification. The juxtaposition of politics and sports presents politics as a game between two clearly distinct teams with an unproblematic goal of winning. The outcome of the match is unambiguous: a victory or a defeat. Moreover, Semino and Masci (1996:251) see that sport metaphors bring "warmth and excitement" to the domain of politics that many perceive as rather distant and alien and, in this way, turn politics into a "spectator sport".

In addition to Semino and Masci (1996), the implications of the sports metaphor have been discussed, for example, by Embler (1972), Gozzi (1990), Lakoff (1992),

Ching (1993), Jansen and Sabo (1994), and Kuusisto (1998). Among these, Ching (1993) studies the game metaphor as an underlying metaphor for life in American society. In a similar vein, Gozzi (1990:292) remarks that the game metaphor has become so compelling that nowadays people tend to use it without reflection. Lakoff (1992:471) elaborates the list of the components of the sport-game idea by adding to it, for instance, strategic thinking, preparedness, the glory of winning, and the shame of losing.

Kuusisto (1998:130) writes about the recreational aspect of sports and games, playing for fun and for excitement. This aspect includes the enjoyment of following a struggle between two well-trained athletes or teams, the joy of participation, and the excitement of competing. Playing is wholesome recreation and social action, as everyone is invited to take part but no one is obligated to nothing but following the rules and rituals connected with the game. At the same time, Kuusisto (1998:130-131) points out that often the more positive side of sports gives way to serious rivalry. At that point the noble ideas associated with competing - faster, higher, and further - turn into tears, rage, and humiliation. When beating the opponent becomes the only goal, the dangers facing the people involved in the battle, their pains and sufferings lose significance.

The portrayal of the summits in terms of sport and game does raise the question about winning and losing. Is it possible to say which side wins and which loses in a summit? Competing is part of human nature and, as stated above, summit meetings, like any political activities, resemble sports contests in many respects. The meetings between the heads of states are comparable to matches of elite athletes or teams, the best of the best. In these top-level competitions physical fitness does not suffice by itself, the participants also need to be mentally prepared to outdo their opponent. Moreover, high-quality equipment as well as expert aides may be of decisive help. Of course, depiction of a summit as a boxing contest conveys a particularly vivid image of the process of negotiating.

There is also a link between sports and war metaphors as some specific metaphors could belong to either category. For example, the expressions *a major change in arms-control tactics* (*NW*, 10 Feb 1992, p.10) and *президент со своей командой* ('*the president with his team/squad*') (*NV* 50, 1989, p.9) could be seen as

ambiguous between sports and war metaphors. The connections and ambiguities are possible, on the one hand, because the parallels pointed out above between sports and summit meetings (two distinct sides, the goal of winning, strategic thinking, and so on) exist also between the domains of sports and war. On the other hand, there are also such conventional metaphors as *war is sports* and *sports is war*. The fact that the domains of sport and war often stand in a metaphorical relationship has been noted also by Lakoff (1992), Jansen and Sabo (1994), and Semino and Masci (1996). In the present study decisions about the proper classification of ambiguous individual metaphors were made on the basis of the context they appeared in and, in consequence, ultimately on the basis of the researcher's interpretation. Therefore, of the examples given above the former was included in the category of war metaphors and the latter in the category of sports metaphors.

While discussing the metaphor *war is sports*, Lakoff (1992:471-472) remarks: "It has long been noted that we understand war as a competitive game like chess, or as a sport, like football or boxing... There is a long tradition in the West of training military officers in team sports and chess." Interestingly enough, the material of the present study includes clear references to two of the three sports Lakoff mentions: chess and boxing, which serves as another example of the intertwinement of the domains of war, sports, and politics.

In his study, Lakoff (1992:469) considers gambling in connection with the cost-benefit analysis metaphor and the business metaphor. In his account, it is natural to see risky actions metaphorically as gambles because of the causal commerce metaphor, which allows one to add up the positive and negative effects of actions, the gains and the costs. Therefore, in order to achieve certain gains, there are "stakes" than one can "lose". Lakoff makes a valid point when he mentions that the metaphorical nature of *risks are gambles* often goes unnoticed because the metaphor is so common in our everyday thought.

While agreeing with Lakoff on the close relation between business and gambling, in this study the latter is, however, seen as one aspect of the domain of sports, following Embler's (1972) and Kuusisto's (1998) example. Kuusisto (1998:123) remarks that the difference between taking risks in business and in games is that in business people ultimately deal with real money, whereas in games they handle only



fake money or, in case of gambling, chips representing real money. On the one hand, including gambling as one of the components of the game-idea presents it as an enjoyable leisure-time activity with the main purpose of spending time with friends and having fun. On the other hand, gambling is surrounded by an air of mystery, even danger. Kuusisto (1998:123), for instance, associates gambling with the glamour of casinos, fast cars, beautiful women, and rich men, as well as with dirty money and dark corners of smoky gambling dens. The gambling metaphors in the depiction of the summits can therefore be interpreted mirroring either suspense or suspicion, in other words, the excitement caused by dealing with an equal partner or the unpredictable nature of superpower relations and risks involved. It is worth noting that there were nine gambling metaphors in *Newsweek* but only one in *Novoje vremja*.

In her analysis of the game metaphor, Kuusisto (1998:123-124) distinguishes between good and bad players. To put it briefly, in gambling, as well as in card or board games, good players adhere to the rules of the game and earn other players' respect with their skill and intelligence. Conversely, bad players take unnecessary risks, play for too high stakes, and try to bend the rules and bluff in a situation in which everyone is aware of their bad hand. While good players know when to stop playing and collect their winnings, bad players keep losing game after game. Sometimes the excitement of the game may blind even the good players and make them forget realities, probabilities, and the norms of civilised behaviour and, thus, drive them to destruction and shame. However, players caught cheating may be expelled from the game and refused the right to take part in it. It is also wise not stake anything too important or valuable, alternatively, however, refusing to play is considered a sign of cowardice and stinginess.

As stated above, the idea of playing evokes an image of something fun and exciting but still harmless: it is possible to "make a risky move" or to "stake everything on one card" and then "lose everything" only to start the game over or to join another one. Herein lies one of the dangers of framing political decisions as moves in a game: the actions taken lose their irreversibility. After all, there is always a new distribution of cards or a new round or set to be played in the game. To summarise, the game metaphor makes the risks appear smaller and obscures the finality of the decisions and actions.

#### 6.1.4 The summit is theatre

The fourth basic metaphor was **The summit is theatre**, which included also metaphors associated with music. Table 2 shows that a total of 40 metaphors, or 15.5 % of all metaphors, belonged to this category. Ontologically, the participants of the summits corresponded to actors and other performers and their negotiations to their performance on the stage, while a joint press conference at the end of a successful summit corresponded to an encore in front of an applauding audience. Accordingly, theatre and music metaphors were used to describe the *roles* the negotiators *played* in different *scenes* and *settings* and the *dramatic*, *tragic*, or even *comical tones* of the negotiations.

The following theatre metaphors appeared in *Newsweek*:

- (1) Last week American officials raised a possible *scenario* for finessing the issue (*NW*, 14 Dec 1987, p.15).
- (2) By now the arms-control process is fairly well *choreographed* (*NW*, 13 Nov 1989, p.10).
- (3) Bush *set the stage* for the Malta summit (*NW*, 18 Dec 1989, p.22).
- (4) There have been more *scenic* meetings (*NW*, 31 March 1997, p.14).

*Novoje vremja* employed, for instance, the following expressions containing theatre metaphors:

- (1) один из младших участников тех *драматических* переговоров ('one of the youngest participants of those *dramatic* negotiations') (*NV* 49, 1987, p.4).
- (2) *Трагедия* Рейкьявика состояла именно в этом ('It was exactly this what made Reykjavik a *tragedy*') (*NV* 50, 1989, p.7).
- (3) Результаты *шоу* "Борис-Билл" также были откомментированы весьма спокойно ('Also the results of the "*Boris & Bill*" *show* were commented rather calmly') (*NV* 12, 1997, p.24).

There were four instances of "musical" metaphors in *Novoje vremja* (e.g. *Мы жаждали дуэта* ('We longed for a *duet*') (*NV* 51, 1987, p.4) and *что*

говорилось, в какой тональности ('what was discussed, in which key') (*NV* 51, 1987, p.4)) but only one in *Newsweek* (*Yeltsin plans to set this tone* (*NW*, 3 Feb 1989, p.13)).

Describing the summits through "theatrical" metaphors brings out the spectacular nature of the meetings. Indeed, to a certain degree summits are all a big show with the action taking place on the stage and the audience sitting in their places in the auditorium. Like plays, summits have a definite script, the crucial scenes of which make them anything from melancholy tragedies to hilarious comedies and musicals. Considering the implications of the theatre metaphor, Kuusisto (1998:135-136) mentions that the audience come to the theatre to follow the actors' performances and to empathise with the heroes of the play but are, however, not allowed to adopt the role of the director or the scenarist and thus change the course of the play. The lack of spectators' influence is further stressed by the fact even though the audience may learn something from watching the play, the characters in the play do not seem to. In consequence, the same show is being performed again and again. Similarly, the heads of the two superpowers meet each other almost yearly to discuss mostly the same issues, the only thing changing being the names of the participants.

Because of the mere observer role of the summit audience, it would be quite possible to carry on negotiations and sign accords behind the scenes and simply inform people about the agreements reached afterwards. Most of the work gets done in privacy anyway. However, the publicity of the summits has its purpose, just as Aleksandr Pumpjanskij, a correspondent of *Novoje vremja*, remarks: "People are used to personifying politics and they believe their eyes rather than their ears" (*NV* 50, 1987, p.3). As a result, summits offer an arena for the negotiators to pose and make the agreements reached look good for them and their country. Besides, there is often a domestic benefit attached to summits, especially in cases where the leader has more prestige abroad than at home or when domestic disputes cause trouble. The louder the applause, the smaller the problems at home appear. In short, theatrical metaphors are of help in shaping people's images of the summits and their participants.

## 6.2 Basic metaphors by magazine

One of the objectives of the study was to analyse the differences that took place in the metaphorical descriptions of the four summits during the ten year period. The present section will concentrate on these differences by examining the use of the four aforementioned basic metaphor categories in the portrayal of the respective summits separately in *Newsweek* and in *Novoje vremja*.

### 6.2.1 Basic metaphors in *Newsweek*

The nine articles in *Newsweek* relevant to the study included 131 individual metaphors describing the summits, which were classified into the four basic metaphor categories. Differences between the four summits were statistically significant ( $\chi^2 = 19.10$ ,  $df = 9$ ,  $p = .023$ ). Table 3 shows the frequencies of use of the basic metaphors in the descriptions of the respective summits in *Newsweek*.

Table 3. Basic metaphors in *Newsweek* by summit.

	Summit							
	1987		1989		1992		1997	
Source domain	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f
Business	41.3	33	46.2	6	47.4	9	31.6	6
War	28.8	23	15.4	2	5.3	1	26.3	5
Sports	25.0	20	15.4	2	36.8	7	10.5	2
Theatre	5.0	4	23.1	3	10.5	2	31.6	6
<b>Total</b>	100.0	80	100.0	13	100.0	19	100.0	19

Table 3 shows that the domain of business was clearly the source used most often in the metaphorical descriptions of the summits. Only in the depiction of the 1997 summit did *Newsweek* employ as many metaphors related to theatre than to trade. The proportion of business metaphors was truly remarkable, especially in the characterisation of summits held in 1989 and 1992, when almost every other metaphor used was related to commerce.

The proportion of war metaphors varied a lot during the years. In the characterisation of the 1987 meeting between Reagan and Gorbachev more than

every fourth metaphor was drawn from the domain of war. Later on its prevalence decreased significantly: in the depiction of the 1989 summit only 15.4 % of the classified metaphors were related to war. The low point of using war metaphors was reached in 1992, when there appeared only one metaphor related to war in *Newsweek* to depict the 1992 summit at Camp David. In these two years war metaphors were used least prevalently in comparison with the other three basic metaphor categories. In the description of the 1997 meeting in Helsinki the proportion of war metaphors jumped to 26.3 %, not far from the peak level of the 1987 summit. However, even then the war metaphor was only the third most frequently used basic metaphor after business and theatre metaphors.

Table 3 indicates that differences in the use of the sports metaphor were notable in *Newsweek*. When the magazine framed the first of the four meetings in 1987 every fourth metaphor came from the world of sports and games. Two years later in the portrayal of the 1989 summit in Malta the proportion of this basic metaphor category decreased to 15.4 %. The downward trend did not, however, last, as in the characterisation of the Camp David summit in 1992 the sport-game metaphor was used in 36,8 % of the recorded cases, which made it the second most frequently used basic metaphor that year. The revival was, nevertheless, only temporary, for the proportion dropped again when describing the 1997 summit in Helsinki, at which point no more than 10.5 % of all classified metaphors were related to sports.

The use of theatre metaphors was at its lowest level in the description of the 1987 summit between Gorbachev and Reagan but increased noticeably later on. Indeed, by the 1989 summit at Camp David the frequency of this basic metaphor had multiplied from 5.0 % to 23.1 %. The peak level was reached in the depiction of the Helsinki summit in 1997, when the occurrence rate of the theatre metaphor was as high as that of the business metaphor, 31.6 %. However, the rise was not stable since in the depiction of the 1992 summit the frequency of the theatre metaphor dipped again to 10.5 %.

It appears that while the prevalence of the business metaphor remained constant through the years, there were significant variations in the occurrence rate of the

other three basic metaphors in *Newsweek*. For example, the frequency of the war metaphor varied between 5.3 % in framing the Camp David summit in 1992 and 28.8 % in the description of the 1987 meeting in Washington. Table 3 shows that similar changes concerned the use of the sports metaphor and the theatre metaphor. Moreover, the two latter mentioned basic metaphors seem to stand in a special relation to each other as they appear to peak and plummet in turn. For instance, in the characterisation of the 1987 summit in Washington the proportions of sporting and theatrical metaphors were 25.0 % and 5.0 %, respectively, whereas in the portrayal of the 1989 meeting in Malta their respective percentages were 15.4 % and 23.1 %. Further, in the depiction of the 1992 summit at Camp David the frequency of the sports metaphor was 36.8 % and that of the theatre metaphor 10.5 %, while five years later the percentages turned round: 10.5 % for sports metaphors and 31.6 % for theatre metaphors.

#### 6.2.2 Basic metaphors in *Novoje vremja*

In the nine articles on the four summits analysed in the study there were 127 instances of metaphor in *Novoje vremja* that were classified according to the aforementioned four basic metaphors. The differences between different summits were not statistically significant and therefore the four basic metaphor categories will be discussed not only in relation to their frequency in different summits but also in relation to their average frequency. Table 4 shows the frequency of use of each basic metaphor in the descriptions of the different summits separately and on average.

Table 4. Basic metaphors in *Novoje vremja* by summit.

	Summit								Total	
	1987		1989		1992		1997			
Source domain	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f
Business	22.7	10	34.2	13	25.0	4	17.2	5	25.2	32
War	25.0	11	39.5	15	37.5	6	44.8	13	35.4	45
Sport	27.3	12	10.5	4	12.5	2	24.1	7	19.7	25
Theatre	25.0	11	15.8	6	25.0	4	13.8	4	19.7	25
<b>Total</b>	100.0	44	100.0	38	100.0	16	100.0	29	100.0	127

In *Novoje vremja*, **The summit is war** was the most frequently used basic metaphor in the portrayals of the summits included in the study. On average more than every third metaphor used to describe the summits was related to war. The proportion of war metaphors was smaller only in the description of the 1987 summit in Washington as this particular summit was characterised using all four basic metaphors practically as regularly. In the description of all the other summits, the metaphor of war was by far the most prevalently used type of basic metaphor. Table 4 shows that the proportion of war metaphors was as high as 44.8 % in the portrayal of the 1997 summit. This means that almost every second metaphor used to describe the summit in Helsinki was connected with war.

As to the metaphors related to business, they were the second most frequently used type of metaphor in the depiction of the summits. On average every fourth metaphor had business as its source domain. Apart from the 1987 summit, the proportion of the metaphors related to business decreased steadily from 34.2 % in the description of the 1989 summit to 17.2 % in 1997.

Some 20 % of all metaphors used to depict the summits in *Novoje vremja* were related to sports. The proportion of sports metaphors varied from year to year quite considerably. In framing the 1987 summit in *Novoje vremja* the sports metaphor was the most frequently used basic metaphor category, albeit with the smallest margin possible. In the description of the 1989 summit it was, however, least favoured of all four basic metaphors. Its proportion increased slightly from 1989 to 1992 and significantly, almost by 50 %, from 1992 to 1997, which made the category the second most widely used in the depiction of the Helsinki summit.

On average every fifth metaphor used in *Novoje vremja* was connected with theatre. Table 4 displays that the proportion of this particular basic metaphor was as high as 25.0 % in the portrayal of the 1987 and 1992 summits, 15.8 % in the description of the meeting held in 1989 and 13.8 % in the characterisation of the Helsinki summit. As to the relative frequencies of theatrical metaphors, except for the 1992 summit they were always among the two least extensively used basic metaphor types.

Overall, *Novoje vremja* tended to use metaphors drawn from the domain of war most often in its coverages of the four summits. The metaphor of business was the second most prevalent basic metaphor. In the nine articles included in the study, there were as many metaphors related to sports as to theatre. On average every fifth metaphor in the material was connected with sports and every fifth with theatre, although the proportions of these basic metaphors varied quite a lot in the descriptions of the different summits.

### 6.3 Basic metaphors by summit

It is often thought that the types of metaphors used reflect the culture the users are embedded in. Since Russian and American societies differ to a great deal from one another, it can safely be assumed that also their cultures differ. Without going into the question whether there exists a ‘Russian culture’ or an ‘American culture’, it can, however, be hypothesised that there are some differences in the use of metaphor between *Newsweek* and *Novoje vremja*. In the following, the use of the four basic metaphors **The summit is doing business**, **The summit is war**, **The summit is a sport-game**, and **The summit is theatre** will be analysed in descriptions of each of the four summits with an emphasis on comparison between the two magazines.

#### 6.3.1 Basic metaphors in the description of the 1987 summit

There appeared a total of 124 individual metaphors in the description of the 1987 summit between Gorbachev and Reagan in *Newsweek* and *Novoje vremja*. The three articles included in the study from *Newsweek* contained almost two thirds of them, that is, 80 metaphors; in the three articles from *Novoje vremja* there were 44 occurrences of metaphor. Table 5 shows the frequencies of use of the four basic metaphors in the description of the 1987 summit in the two magazines.



Table 5. Basic metaphors in description of the 1987 summit.

Source domain	<i>Newsweek</i>		<i>Novoje vremja</i>	
	%	f	%	f
Business	41.3	33	22.7	10
War	28.8	23	25.0	11
Sports	25.0	20	27.3	12
Theatre	5.0	4	25.0	11
<b>Total</b>	100.0	80	100.0	44

Table 5 shows that the basic metaphor **The summit is doing business** was dominant in the metaphorical description of the 1987 summit in *Newsweek*. War and sports metaphors were the second most frequently used metaphors, while the use of the theatre metaphor was almost minimal. In *Novoje vremja* the frequencies of all four basic metaphors were in effect the same.

As to the differences in the description of the 1987 meeting between the two magazines, the proportion of business metaphors was almost twice as big in *Newsweek* as in *Novoje vremja*. Also, the percentage of metaphors related to war was greater in *Newsweek* than in *Novoje vremja* but only by a very small margin. *Novoje vremja* used sports as a source domain slightly more often than *Newsweek* but the difference was practically non-existent. However, the difference in the use of theatre metaphors between the two magazines was notable as there appeared five times as many metaphors that went under the heading of theatre in *Novoje vremja* as in *Newsweek*. The differences between the two magazines in the description of the Washington summit were statistically significant ( $\chi^2 = 12.40$ ,  $df = 3$ ,  $p = .005$ ).

### 6.3.2 Basic metaphors in the description of the 1989 summit

The 1989 meeting at Malta between Gorbachev and Bush was described using 51 metaphors belonging to the categories of the four basic metaphors. Every three out of four metaphors appeared in *Novoje vremja* as there were 38 occurrences of metaphor in the three articles in *Novoje vremja* but only 13 in the three articles in *Newsweek*. Because of the limited number of metaphors in *Newsweek*, the differences in the description of the 1989 summit between the two magazines

were not statistically significant. Nevertheless, discussion about the relative frequencies of the four basic metaphors and differences between the two magazines follows. Table 6 shows the frequencies of the metaphors drawn from the domains of business, war, sports, and theatre in the portrayal of the summit.

Table 6. Basic metaphors in description of the 1989 summit.

Source domain	<i>Newsweek</i>		<i>Novoje vremja</i>	
	%	f	%	f
Business	46.2	6	34.2	13
War	15.4	2	39.5	15
Sports	15.4	2	10.5	4
Theatre	23.1	3	15.8	6
<b>Total</b>	100.0	13	100.0	38

Table 6 shows that in *Newsweek* the business metaphor was employed twice as often as the next most prevalent basic metaphor, which was **The summit is theatre**. The proportions of war and sports metaphors were the same: 15.4 %. In *Novoje vremja* the most frequent basic metaphor was **The summit is war**, with **The summit is doing business** as a close second. The frequencies of the business metaphor and the war metaphor were more than twice the frequency of theatre metaphors, which, in turn, were used slightly more often than metaphors related to sports.

A comparison of the relative frequencies of metaphors revealed that *Newsweek* was more prone to describe the summit by using metaphors drawn from the domain of business than *Novoje vremja*. Table 6 also shows that the proportion of war metaphors was considerably bigger in *Novoje vremja* than in *Newsweek*. In fact, the use of war as a source domain was so frequent in *Novoje vremja* that also the proportions of metaphors related to sports and theatre were smaller in *Novoje vremja* than in *Newsweek*.

### 6.3.3 Basic metaphors in the description of the 1992 summit

The metaphorical portrayal of the 1992 summit held at Camp David included only 35 metaphors, of which 19 appeared in *Newsweek* and 16 in *Novoje*

*vremja*. The low number of metaphors resulted in small quantitative differences between different basic metaphor categories and between the magazines. Therefore the results concerning this particular summit should be interpreted with special caution. The 1992 material consisted of two articles from both magazines. The frequencies of the four basic metaphors are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Basic metaphors in description of the 1992 summit.

Source domain	<i>Newsweek</i>		<i>Novoje vremja</i>	
	%	f	%	f
Business	47.4	9	25.0	4
War	5.3	1	37.5	6
Sports	36.8	7	12.5	2
Theatre	10.5	2	25.0	4
<b>Total</b>	100.0	19	100.0	16

Table 7 indicates that in *Newsweek* nine of the 19 classified metaphors were related to business. Sports served as a source domain in seven cases, theatre twice and war only once. In *Newsweek* differences in the use of the basic metaphor categories were, nevertheless, rather distinct when compared to the frequencies of use in *Novoje vremja*, in which metaphors divided into the categories more evenly. The most frequently used basic metaphor in *Novoje vremja* was **The summit is war**. Business metaphors and theatre metaphors were used equally often: both represented 25.0 % of the metaphors classified. In *Novoje vremja* the least frequently used source domain was sports.

Even though the quantitative differences were small, one point does seem to stand out: *Newsweek* employed more business metaphors than *Novoje vremja*, which, in turn, used metaphors drawn from the source domain of war more frequently than *Newsweek*. Table 7 shows also that the sports metaphor appeared almost three times as often in *Newsweek* as in *Novoje vremja* and that the theatre metaphor was more than twice as frequent in *Novoje vremja* as in *Newsweek*. The differences in the metaphorical description of the 1992 summit between the two magazines were statistically significant ( $\chi^2 = 8.75$ ,  $df = 3$ ,  $p = .038$ ).

#### 6.3.4 Basic metaphors in the description of the 1997 summit

The 1997 data consisted of only two articles: one article from *Newsweek* and one from *Novoje vremja*. The frequency of metaphor use in the depiction of the Helsinki summit was, however, fairly high as there appeared a total of 48 metaphors relevant to the study in the two articles. The article in *Newsweek* contained 19 individual metaphors and the article in *Novoje vremja* as many as 29 metaphors. Table 8 shows the frequencies of use of the four basic metaphors.

Table 8. Basic metaphors in description of the 1997 summit.

Source domain	<i>Newsweek</i>		<i>Novoje vremja</i>	
	%	f	%	f
Business	31.6	6	17.2	5
War	26.3	5	44.8	13
Sports	10.5	2	24.1	7
Theatre	31.6	6	13.8	4
<b>Total</b>	100.0	19	100.0	29

In *Newsweek* the Helsinki summit was described using mainly business, theatre, and war metaphors. As to the proportions of the basic metaphor categories, the Clinton-Yeltsin meeting was portrayed as often in the context of business meetings as in terms of theatre: taken together these metaphors represented almost two thirds of all metaphors. War was used as a source domain almost as frequently as business and theatre. Table 8 shows that the remaining fourth basic metaphor **The summit is a sport-game** was less common for only about every tenth metaphor in the articles included in the study was related to sports.

*Novoje vremja* employed mostly metaphors drawn from the domain of war. The proportion of war metaphors in 1997 was as high as 44.8 %. The second most frequent basic metaphor category in the description of the summit was that of sports. Table 8 indicates that the business metaphor and the theatre metaphor were used less frequently, the proportions in *Novoje vremja* were 17.2 % and 13.8 %, respectively.

Differences in the use of metaphor between *Newsweek* and *Novoje vremja* in the depiction of the Helsinki meeting were noticeable in all four basic metaphor categories. Firstly, the proportion of business metaphors was considerably bigger in *Newsweek*, as was the proportion of war metaphors in *Novoje vremja*. The frequency of the sports metaphor was higher in *Novoje vremja* than in *Newsweek*. Lastly, the percentage of the theatre metaphor in *Newsweek* was higher than in *Novoje vremja*. The differences were, however, not statistically significant.

## 7 DISCUSSION

The preceding analysis revealed certain trends in the use of metaphor in the description of the four top-level summits between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union/Russia in *Newsweek* and *Novoje vremja*. The purpose of the present chapter is to summarise the findings and the major cognitive implications of using the four basic metaphors, as well as to consider underlying reasons and possible explanations for their use in the descriptions of the four summits and the differences between the two magazines. Simultaneously, the results of the study are compared with those from previous studies.

### 7.1 The summit is doing business in *Newsweek* and *Novoje vremja*

**The summit is doing business** was the most prevalent basic metaphor in *Newsweek* in the descriptions of all the summits included in the study. The extensiveness of the use of business-related metaphors suggests rational approach to foreign policy. Lakoff (1992:470) observes that in economics it is common to see a rational person as someone who acts in his own self-interest, that is, to increase his own wealth. In a similar pattern, rational foreign policy actors are seen as acting to maximise their government's profits. Also, according to this principle, the actions taken in the meetings are rational as long as the resultant gains exceed the costs. In this way the summits become a matter of political cost-benefit calculation. Notable here is that the superpowers' policies are examined in terms of political gains and costs. Morality is mostly absent from the equation, it appears only when there is a political cost to acting immorally or a political gain from acting morally.

The abundance of metaphors drawn from the sphere of business also implies that U.S. relations to the Soviet Union/Russia are regarded as trade relations. Both nations have something to sell to their business partner as long as the price is right. Again, the merchandise has, for the most part, political value. One could even see that the two superpowers are engaged in commerce simply to ensure their peaceful relations, to strengthen the alliance between them. The partnership between the superpowers really took off only in the final years of

the Cold War, which also shows when comparing the results of this study with those obtained by So (1987).

In So's (1987) study, the business metaphor is only the second most popular metaphor type that *Newsweek* employed to depict the 1985 U.S. - Soviet summit. In the portrayal of the 1987 summit, however, it became the most frequently used basic metaphor. In the characterisations of the summits held in 1989 and 1992, the use of the business metaphor increased still further and in these years almost every other metaphor in *Newsweek* was related to trade. In the description of the 1997 summit, nevertheless, their proportion dropped to 31.6 %, which may be interpreted as reflecting Russia's declining market value, that is to say, Russia's diminishing power in the arena of international politics.

Other studies (Lakoff 1992, Lakoff 1995, Kuusisto 1998) have attested to the high frequency of business metaphors in American political rhetoric. Also, both Lakoff (1992) and Kuusisto (1998) believe that the business metaphor played an essential role in the justification of the 1991 Gulf War. At this point it is worthwhile to remind the reader about Lakoff and Johnson's (1980:22, see p.22) claim that metaphors are often culture-based. It seems plausible to assume that the conspicuous use of business metaphors probably reflects the entrepreneurial spirit deeply rooted in American culture. Economic liberty is a cultural value in the U.S. and basically one of the cornerstones of American society. In fact, Hunt (1987) writes that the promotion of liberty is one of the core ideas that have moulded American diplomacy and foreign policy ever since the eighteenth century. From a historic perspective, economic liberty is therefore one of the driving forces behind American foreign-policy ideology. The cultural approach seems to offer an adequate explanation for the high frequency of metaphors drawn from the domain of business in *Newsweek*.

Baranov and Karaulov (1991, 1994) include the business metaphor in their list of the basic metaphors used in modern Russian parliamentary discourse. In *Novoje vremja* this particular metaphor category was the second most frequently used type of metaphor. The frequency of the business metaphor reached its peak in the description of the 1989 summit when 34.2 % of the metaphors classified went under the heading of business. However, the

proportion of this particular basic metaphor dropped significantly and reached its lowest level at 17.2 % in the description of the Helsinki summit. In other words, by 1997 the frequency of the business metaphor had decreased almost by one half from the portrayal of the 1989 meeting.

One probable cause for the decrease is the increased frustration felt in Russia because of the painstaking transition to a free market economy at the turn of the decade. The initial fascination of Western ideas did not last too long but gave way to a more traditional approach. That is to say, the value of economic liberty that is so firmly established in American culture did not take root as such in Russia. At least, it does not seem to have become embedded in the thinking of the journalists commenting on the Russo-American summits for *Novoje vremja*.

## 7.2 The summit is war in *Newsweek* and *Novoje vremja*

The frequency of the war metaphor in *Novoje vremja* was remarkably high and it did not seem to decrease with time. On the contrary, in the descriptions of the 1997 summit, the last one included in the study, the war metaphor was more popular than ever before. The major cognitive connotation of the war metaphor is the idea of two definite enemies aiming at destroying each other both morally and physically. If Lakoff and Johnson (1980:10) see that the argument-as-war metaphor highlights the hostile aspect of arguing and downplays its cooperative aspect, the same surely applies to summits. Specifically, Baranov and Karaulov (1991:15, see p.60) worry about the role the metaphor of war plays in making political decisions. The use of military terms and inference patterns most certainly limits the number of possible alternatives to settle a conflict.

The prevalence of war metaphors in Russian political discourse has been confirmed also by Vinogradov (1994:70). Moreover, the finding is supported by Baranov and Karaulov's (1991, 1994) studies, according to which war metaphors represent one of the most frequently used metaphor type in modern Russian parliamentary discourse. In Baranov's estimate (1991:189), some 30 % of all metaphors in Russian political discourse are war metaphors.



Baranov (1991:190) asserts that to a great extent the pervasiveness of the war metaphor is explained by the impact of Stalin and Lenin on Russian political thinking. For instance, in Stalin's speeches and articles the proportion of war metaphors was as high as 90-95 %. The militarization of political thinking took place for ideological reasons. Vinogradov (1994:70) points out that conceptual militarism was induced by the communist ideology and its theory of class struggle and was reinforced by the historical circumstances of revolution, wars, and terror. In her study of metaphor in Lenin's writings, Zhiteneva (1982:40-41) confirms Lenin's active use of war-related vocabulary and phraseology and argues that it was in keeping with the period of violent social movements and the need to activate people in class struggle.

War metaphors are frequent not only in Russian but also in American political discourse. For instance, Adamson et al. (1996) show how Rush Limbaugh, a Republican political commentator, uses the politics-as-war metaphor to conceptualise the way in which he sees the liberal left movement as attacking society. Also, Elwood (1995) discusses the use of the war metaphor in former presidents' declarations against drugs. Moreover, the use of war metaphors is not confined to politics. Wilson (1992:892), for example, claims that military metaphors dominate the business world. Further, Ingrosso (1993:12) and Annas (1995) provide evidence of the pervasiveness of the war metaphor in medicine. Likewise, Jansen and Sabo (1994:4-5) report that the language of war is frequently used in the sport industry and sport media. Overall, Kuusisto (1998:39) notes that when there are several alternative metaphors to describe a situation, the hostile metaphors tend to be chosen instead of the more conciliatory ones.

However, in contrast to the constantly high proportion of the war metaphor in *Novoje vremja*, the frequency of their use appeared to be on the decrease in *Newsweek*. This particular finding is, in fact, congruent with So's (1987) study, in which the war metaphor is by far the most frequently used basic metaphor in the metaphorical description of the 1985 meeting in *Newsweek*. Then, in the portrayal of the first summit included in the present study, that held in 1987, the proportion of war metaphors was smaller than that of the business metaphor. The decrease continued steadily and, as a result, in 1989 and 1992 the war

metaphor became the least frequently used basic metaphor, albeit in 1989 together with the sports metaphor.

One explanation for the downward trend of the use of the war metaphor could be the lessened tension and the improved political relationship between the superpowers, which, however, did not show in the articles in *Novoje vremja*. Perhaps the decrease is better explained by the elevated status of the U.S. as the only first-rate power in the post-Cold War world after the Soviet Union fragmented and its principal heir Russia was seen to lose political and military might. In its present state, Russia is not considered as big a threat to world peace as the Soviet Union, which has, however, had an opposite effect on the metaphorisation of political discourse in Russia. Rather than decrease the use of metaphors related to war, the sense of vulnerability felt there has given even more reason to continue the rhetorical tradition of posing politics as war.

There was one exception to the decreasing use of the war metaphor in *Newsweek*: the proportion of war metaphors in the metaphorical portrayal of the 1997 summit was as high as 26.3 %. This specific finding most probably does not signal a change in the U.S. attitude toward Russia but simply reflects the particular political situation at the time. The Russians and the Americans came to the Helsinki meeting with diametrically opposed views on the most important item on the summit agenda: the eastward expansion of NATO. The debate about the expansion had begun weeks earlier and got more and more intense as the summit approached. It is possible that the expansion dispute temporarily brought back hostile attitudes toward the Soviet Union and what was previously perceived as the Soviet military and ideological threat to the free world.

### **7.3 The summit is a sport-game in *Newsweek* and *Novoje vremja***

Allusions to sports and games in the context of top-level summits bring forth an image of two distinct teams playing against each other with an unproblematic goal of winning. In this way the use of sports and games as a source domain simplifies the purpose, course, and outcomes of the meetings, as well as politics in general. Another basic implication of the sports/game metaphor concerns the

gravity of the summit issues. That is to say, while portraying the decisions made and actions taken in the summits as moves in a game or rounds in a sports event highlights the positive connotations of games and sports, it simultaneously conceals the seriousness and irreversibility of the actions. Similarly, such a portrayal backgrounds the risks involved.

The findings concerning the use of the sports metaphor in the descriptions of the summits are consistent with the results gained in other studies. Baranov and Karaulov (1991, 1994), for instance, report that sports and games are frequently used as metaphorical models for modern Russian political reality. Also, So (1987) observes that the metaphor of sport-game is the third most frequently used basic metaphor in the description of the 1985 summit in *Newsweek*. There are still other studies that provide evidence of the prevalence of the sports metaphor in American political rhetoric. For example, Lakoff (1992), Jansen and Sabo (1994), and Kuusisto (1998) see that this particular metaphor was exploited especially in the United States to justify the Gulf War. Furthermore, Taylor (as quoted by Jansen and Sabo 1994:3) claims that sports metaphors have been used in U.S. politics at least since the Civil War. Jansen and Sabo (1994:3) also mention that during his presidency Richard Nixon mixed football and political metaphors to the extent that by the time he resigned, football imagery had become the root metaphor of American political discourse.

The frequency of sports and game metaphors was slightly higher in *Newsweek* than in *Novoje vremja*. In both magazines they were used particularly often in the description of the 1987 summit. The metaphors used had, however, different connotations as in *Newsweek* they were mostly related to gambling and in *Novoje vremja* to boxing.

This particular finding agrees with two other results gained in the study, namely that *Newsweek* tended to use a lot of metaphors drawn from the domain of business, while in *Novoje vremja* the most prevalent basic metaphor was **The summit is war**. Firstly, as has been discussed above (p.64-65), aside from being close to the world of sports, gambling can be seen belonging to the domain of business, which is the way Lakoff (1992) dealt with it in his analysis of the metaphor system used to justify the 1991 war in the Persian Gulf. Secondly,

boxing is undoubtedly one of the sports, if not the one sport, that most parallels war. This seems a convincing explanation, on the one hand, for the use of gambling metaphors in *Newsweek* and, on the other hand, for the prevalence of boxing metaphors in *Novoje vremja*.

With the exception of the depiction of the 1987 summit, in which all four basic metaphors were represented as often, the proportion of sports and game metaphors was on the increase in *Novoje vremja* as their use was greatest in the depiction of the last summit included in the study. In contrast, in *Newsweek* the proportion of metaphors drawn from the domain of sports reached its highest level in 1992 and was at its lowest level in the portrayal of the 1997 summit. The extensive use of the sports metaphor in the depiction of the Helsinki meeting in *Novoje vremja* may be the outcome of Russia's weak bargaining position, which seems to have resulted in a number of card game metaphors. In addition, the low number of sports metaphors in *Newsweek* in the depiction of this particular summit was partly caused by the absence of gambling metaphors, which may be seen as another indication of Russia's diminished political power.

#### **7.4 The summit is theatre in *Newsweek* and *Novoje vremja***

The use of terminology and phraseology that belong to the world of theatre in the description of the summits emphasises the histrionic aspect of the meetings. It adds drama to the summits, and in doing so it probably also increases general interest in them. Naturally, the participants of the summits make the most of their moment in the spotlight. The summits provide their participants with an opportunity to stir up positive publicity, to improve their image both abroad and at home. Furthermore, the symbolism attached to summits and impressive press photos may serve a purpose in another way. For example, for Russia in its present state, weakened and in the middle of a difficult transition period, the summits represent a symbolical recognition of the nation's superpower status.

Other studies have recorded the application of the theatre metaphor in political rhetoric. First of all, So (1987:625) mentions that the theatre metaphor was the fourth metaphor category that American journalists used to depict the 1985 meeting between Reagan and Gorbachev in Geneva. Second, Baranov and

Karaulov (1991, 1994) regard it as one of the source domains in modern Russian parliamentary discourse. Further, Kuusisto (1998:134-136) notes that American, French, and British foreign policy actors used the metaphor of tragedy in their accounts of the war in Bosnia in order to stress the horror of the war and the importance of maintaining distance from it.

Metaphors drawn from the domain of theatre were used particularly often in *Novoje vremja* when describing the summits held in 1987 and 1992 and in *Newsweek* when portraying the meeting held in 1997. It appears that their proportion depended on the participants' negotiating positions and external circumstances of the meetings. In the 1987 meeting, the spotlight was on Gorbachev and the new thinking he represented, which in *Novoje vremja* was seen to bring dramatic changes to the superpower relations. Likewise, the description of the 1992 summit between Clinton and Yeltsin at Camp David contained a cluster of theatre metaphors which made the summit look like a dramatic play in which Yeltsin played the lead with his radical disarmament proposals.

At the time of the 1989 meeting at Malta between Bush and Gorbachev the status quo that had existed in Eastern Europe for over forty years was crumbling. These extraordinary circumstances evoked, however, a surprisingly small number of summit metaphors related to theatre. Nonetheless, *Newsweek* was even more prone to use the theatre metaphor when describing the summit held in 1997. There are some possible explanations of why Americans found the Helsinki summit especially theatrical. Firstly, the state of health of both the presidents may have made the summit seem particularly dramatic. Secondly and thirdly, the argument about the expansion of NATO and the apparent weakness of the Russian side at the negotiating table may have had the same effect.

## 7 CONCLUSION

The primary purpose of the study was to examine the metaphors used in *Newsweek* and *Novoje vremja* to describe four top-level summits between the USA and Soviet Union/Russia in 1987-1997. The study was premised on the assumption that there would appear differences in the way in which issues, participants, and outcomes of the summits were framed, firstly, between different summits and, secondly, between the two magazines. The centrality and significance of metaphor in our everyday thought and action constituted the core assumption upon which the study was founded.

The results showed that *Newsweek* favoured the business metaphor in its descriptions of the summits, whereas *Novoje vremja* tended to employ a lot of metaphors drawn from the domain of war. The other two major source domains that the magazines used were sports and theatre. As expected, the descriptions changed somewhat over the years. However, in both magazines the most frequently used metaphor type maintained its prevalence in depictions of all the four summits. That is to say, the changes concerned only the frequencies of use of the three other major basic metaphors.

The differences in the metaphorical portrayals of respective summits were examined separately in *Newsweek* and *Novoje vremja*. The findings indicate that the summits were framed differently in the two magazines. For instance, in *Newsweek* the 1997 summit in Helsinki was described drawing as often on the domain of business as on the domain of theatre. The sports metaphor, again, was the least popular basic metaphor category. In contrast, in its portrayal of the same summit *Novoje vremja* employed a lot of sports metaphors but very few of its metaphors were related to theatre. Similar differences were found in the portrayals of the three other summits.

The greatest difference between the magazines concerned the most frequently used basic metaphor category, which was the business metaphor in *Newsweek* and the war metaphor in *Novoje vremja*. In *Newsweek* the proportion of war metaphors was highest in the depiction of the 1987 summit and then decreased

steadily over the years, although its use peaked again in the depiction of the final summit included in the study. Similarly, the use of the business metaphor was on the decrease in *Novoje vremja*. The proportions of the sports metaphor and the theatre metaphor varied a lot in the descriptions of different summits in both magazines.

The consistency in the use of the most extensively used basic metaphor type in the magazines can probably be explained by cultural and historical reasons. Business is a prominent institution in American society, and it is customary for American foreign policy experts to understand international relations in terms of trade. Also, as a result of historical circumstances the conceptual frame of the war metaphor is deeply entrenched in Soviet and Russian political culture.

The variations in the use of different metaphor categories can be interpreted as reflections of actual changes in international politics. Indeed, the ten-year period from 1987 to 1997 witnessed a series of unprecedented changes, the most momentous of which was the surprising collapse of communist rule in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. No lesser change was the disintegration of the Soviet Union itself in December 1991. Its principal heir Russia suffered from long-neglected domestic problems, which decreased her political might internationally. Russia's loss of superpower status, consequently, left the U.S. as the only first-rate power in the world. These historical transformations help to explain, for instance, the decrease in the use of the war metaphor in *Newsweek*, as well as its unchanging prevalence in *Novoje vremja*. In fact, both the variations in the descriptions of different summits and the differences between the two magazines can be seen mirroring real-life changes in the superpower relations.

The results of this study are in substantial agreement with previous studies on the use of metaphors in political discourse. To begin with, the findings are generally in line with the results from So's (1987) study of the metaphors that *Newsweek* and two other American publications employed to describe the 1985 summit. The only exception is that in his study the war metaphor is the most frequently used and the business metaphor the second most frequently used basic metaphor category, whereas the present study produced converse results.

Also, the results are consistent with Baranov and Karaulov's (1991, 1994) data in two ways. First, they confirm the prevalence of the war metaphor in Russian political discourse. Second, like Baranov and Karaulov's (1991, 1994) findings, the results provide evidence of at least three other metaphorical models - business, sports, and theatre - for comprehending Russian politics. In addition, the inferences drawn from the data seem to parallel other researchers' conclusions that the metaphors used in political discourse reflect political realities as they are seen from particular perspectives.

There were several limitations to the present study. One important limitation concerns the very concept of metaphor and, consequently, the process of their recognition. Since there exist no objective criteria for identifying metaphors, the final decision whether a word or a phrase was used metaphorically always relied on the researcher's subjective interpretation. Another limitation is that also the categorisation of the identified metaphors depended on the researcher's personal view. The process was further complicated by certain metaphors that could belong to two different basic metaphor categories. Also, the relatively small number of metaphors identified prevents us from making any incontestable critical conclusions, especially because of the two limitations mentioned above. The study would most probably have produced more informative results concerning the changes in the superpower relations if the data had included summits held in the early 1980s or the 1970s.

Finally, it should be pointed out that the present study does not reproach the use of metaphor, nor does it recommend that we should avoid using metaphor. Rather it stresses the importance of paying attention to the metaphors that we use ourselves and the metaphors we encounter in our everyday discourse. It is essential that we understand that metaphor always produces a biased interpretation of a situation and directs our thought and actions accordingly.

Future research should explore the use of metaphor in a range of different contexts. The metaphors used in political deliberations deserve particular consideration because failure to recognise their presence and operation can have pernicious and misleading effects. This study focused on the metaphorical descriptions of four summits between two superpowers. Research examining the metaphors used to describe international relations in general would also be informative. Moreover, it



would be useful to investigate the metaphors that individual politicians use to frame certain political issues. Within international politics, future research should be directed toward cross-cultural differences in the entailments that political metaphors have.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamson, T., G. Johnson, T. Rohrer, and H. Lam 1996. Metaphors we ought not live by: Rush Limbaugh in the age of cognitive science. [<http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~rohrer/rush.htm>].
- Annas, G.J. 1995. Reframing the debate on health care reform by replacing our metaphors. [*The New England Journal of Medicine* 332/1995, <http://www.nejm.org/content/1995/0332/0011/0744.asp>].
- Aristotle 1946. *The works of Aristotle*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Arutiunova, N.D. 1990. Metafora i diskurs, in Arutiunova and Zhurinskaia (eds.)1990, 5-32.
- Arutiunova, N.D. and M.A. Zhurinskaia (eds.) 1990. *Teoriia metafory*. Moscow: Progress.
- Austin, J.L. 1964. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Backman, G. 1991. *Meaning by metaphor: an exploration of metaphor with a metaphoric reading of two short stories by Stephen Crane*. Doctoral thesis. University of Uppsala.
- Baranov, A.N. 1991. Oчерk kognitivnoi teorii metafory, in Baranov and Karaulov (eds.) 1991, 184-193.
- Baranov, A.N. and Iu.N. Karaulov (eds.) 1991. *Russkaia politicheskaia metafora*. Moscow: Institut russkogo iazyka.
- Baranov, A.N. and Iu.N. Karaulov 1994. *Slovar' russkikh politicheskikh metafor*. Moscow: Pomovskii i partnery.

- Barrett, F.J. and D.L. Cooperrider 1990. Generative metaphor intervention: a new approach for working with systems divided by conflict and caught in defensive perception, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 26, 219-239.
- Black, M. 1962. *Models and metaphors*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Black, M. 1979. More about metaphor, in Ortony (ed.) 1979, 19-43.
- Boyd, R. 1979. Metaphor and theory change: what is "metaphor" a metaphor for? In Ortony (ed.) 1979, 356-408.
- Burke, K. 1969. *A grammar of motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Camac, M.K. and S. Glucksberg 1984. Metaphors do not use associations between concepts, they are used to create them, *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 13, 443-455.
- Cetina, K.K. 1995. Metaphors in the scientific laboratory: why are they there and what do they do? In Radman (ed.) 1995, 329-349.
- Chia, R. 1996. Metaphors and metaphorization in organizational analysis: thinking beyond the thinkable, in Grant and Osrick (eds.) 1996, 127-145.
- Chilton, P. and M. Ilyin 1993. Metaphor in political discourse: the case of the 'common European house', *Discourse and Society* 4, 7-31.
- Ching, M.K.L. 1993. Games and play: pervasive metaphors in American life. [*Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 8/1993, <http://citd.scar.utoronto.ca/Metaphor/8.1.43.html>].
- Chomsky, N. 1964. Degrees of grammaticalness, in Fodor and Katz (eds.) 1964, 384-389.

- Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Clark, H. and P. Lucy 1975. Understanding what is meant from what is said: a study in conversationally conveyed requests, *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behaviour* 12, 335-359.
- Clegg, S.R. and J.T. Gray 1996. Metaphors in organization research: of embedded embryos, paradigms and powerful people, in Grant and Oswick (eds.) 1996, 74-93.
- Cohen, T. 1979. Metaphor and the cultivation of intimacy, in Sacks (ed.) 1979, 1-10.
- Cole, P. and J.L. Morgan (eds.) 1975. *Syntax and semantics 3: speech acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Davidson, D. 1979. What metaphors mean, in Sacks (ed.) 1979, 29-45.
- Doving, E. 1996. In the image of man: organizational action, competence and learning, in Grant and Oswick (eds.) 1996, 127-145.
- Dunford, R. and I. Palmer 1996. Metaphors in popular management discourse: the case of corporate restructuring, in Grant and Oswick (eds.) 1996, 95-109.
- Dunn, S. 1990. Root metaphor in the old and new industrial relations, *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 28, 1-31.
- Elgin, C.Z. 1995. Metaphor and reference, in Radman (ed.) 1995, 53-72.
- Elwood, W.N. 1995. Declaring war on the home front: metaphor, presidents, and the war on drugs. [*Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 10/1995, [http:// citd.scar.utoronto.ca/Metaphor/10.2.93.html](http://citd.scar.utoronto.ca/Metaphor/10.2.93.html)].

Embler, W. 1972. Metaphor of the game, *Et cetera* 29, 387-399.

*The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* 1967. New York: Macmillan and Free Press.

Fainsilber, L. and A. Ortony 1987. Metaphorical uses of language in the expression of emotions. [*Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 2/1987, <http://citd.scar.utoronto.ca/Metaphor/2.4.239.html>].

Fodor, J.A. and J.J. Katz (eds.) 1964. *The structure of language: readings in the philosophy of language*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Fraser, B. 1979. The interpretation of novel metaphors, in Ortony (ed.) 1979, 172-185.

Gentner, D. 1982. Are scientific analogies metaphors? In Miall (ed.) 1982, 106-132.

Gentner, D. and D.R. Gentner 1983. Flowing waters or teeming crowds: mental models of electricity, in Gentner and Stevens (eds.) 1983, 99-129.

Gentner D. and A.L. Stevens (eds.) 1983. *Mental models*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Gerrig, R. and A.F. Healy 1983. Dual processes in understanding: comprehension and appreciation, *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 9, 667-675.

Gibbs, R. 1983. Do people always process the literal meanings of indirect requests? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 9, 524-533.

Gibbs, R. 1985. On the process of understanding idioms, *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 14, 465-472.

- Gibbs, R. 1990. Psycholinguistic studies on the conceptual basis of idiomaticity, *Cognitive Linguistics* 1-4, 417-451.
- Gildea, P. and S. Glucksberg 1983. On understanding metaphor: the role of context, *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behaviour* 22, 577-590.
- Glucksberg, S., P. Gildea, and H.G. Bookin 1982. On understanding metaphor: can people ignore metaphors? *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behaviour* 21, 85-98.
- Glucksberg, S. and B. Keysar 1990. Understanding metaphorical comparisons: beyond similarity, *Psycholinguistic Review* 97, 3-18.
- Gozzi, R. 1990. Is life a game? Notes on a master metaphor, *Et cetera* 47, 291-293.
- Grant, D. and C. Oswick (eds.) 1996. *Metaphor and organizations*. London: Sage.
- Graudina, L.K. and E.N. Shirjaev (eds.) 1994. *Kul'tura parlamentskoi rechi*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Grice, H.P. 1975. Logic and conversation, in Cole and Morgan (eds.) 1975, 41-58.
- Harris, R. 1976. Comprehension of metaphor: a test of a two-stage processing model, *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society* 8, 321-324.
- Holland, D. and N. Quinn (eds.) 1987. *Cultural models in language and thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holton, G. 1995. Metaphors in science and education, in Radman (ed.) 1995, 259-288.

- Hunt, M.H. 1987. *Ideology and U.S. foreign policy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ingrosso, M. 1993. Becoming sensitive to health; effectiveness and learning in health education and promotion, *Archives of Hellenic Medicine* 10, 11-27.
- Inhoff, A. W., S.D. Lima, and P. J. Carroll 1984. Contextual effects on metaphor comprehension in reading, *Memory and Cognition* 12, 558-567.
- Inns, D.E. and P.J. Jones 1996. Metaphor in organization theory: following in the footsteps of the poet? In Grant and Osrick (eds.) 1996, 110-126.
- Jansen, S.C. and D. Sabo 1994. The sport/war metaphor: hegemonic masculinity, the Persian gulf war and the new world order, *Sociology of Sport Journal* 11, 1-17.
- Janus, R. and T.G. Bever 1985. Processing of metaphoric language: an investigation of the three-stage model of metaphor comprehension, *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 14, 473-487.
- Johnson, A.T. 1996. Comprehension of metaphors and similes: a reaction time study. [*Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 11/1996, <http://citd.scar.utoronto.ca/Metaphor/11.2.145.html>].
- Katz, J.J. 1964. Semi-sentences, in Fodor and Katz (eds.) 1964, 400-416.
- Katz, J.J. and J.A. Fodor 1964. The structure of a semantic theory, in Fodor and Katz (eds.) 1964, 479-518.
- Keysar, B 1989. On the functional equivalence of literal and metaphorical interpretations in discourse, *Journal of Memory and Language* 28, 375-385.

- Keysar, B. 1994. Discourse context effects: metaphorical and literal interpretations, *Discourse Processes* 18, 247-269.
- Kittay, E.F. 1987. *Metaphor: its cognitive force and linguistic structure*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kuhn, T.S. 1979. Metaphor in science, Ortony (ed.) 1979, 409-419.
- Kuusisto, R. 1998. *Oikeutettu sota ja julma teurastus?: läntisten suurvaltajohtajien sotaretoriikkaa Persianlahdella ja Bosniassa*. Helsinki: Like.
- Kövecses, Z. 1995. The "container" metaphor of anger in English, Chinese, Japanese and Hungarian, in Radman (ed.) 1995, 117-145.
- Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, fire, and dangerous things: what categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. 1990. The invariance hypothesis: is abstract reason based on image-schemas? *Cognitive Linguistics* 1, 39-74.
- Lakoff, G. 1992. Metaphor and war: the metaphor system used to justify war in the gulf, in Pütz (ed.) 1992, 463-481.
- Lakoff, G. 1995. Metaphor, morality, and politics. [<http://www.wvcd.org/issues/Lakoff.html#CODA>].
- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. and Z. Kövecses 1987. The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English, in Holland and Quinn (eds.) 1987, 195-221.
- Leuven, K.U. 1995. The brain problem: the computer metaphor as a solution. [<http://michotte.psy.kuleuven.ac.be/~peterd/metaphor.html>].



- Levinson, S.C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J. 1968. *Introduction to theoretical linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mac Cormac, E.R. 1985. *A cognitive theory of metaphor*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Marshak, R.J. 1996. Metaphors, metaphoric fields and organizational change, in Grant and Oswick (eds.) 1996, 147-165.
- Martin, J and R. Harré 1982. Metaphor in science, in Miall (ed.) 1982, 89-105.
- Miall, D.S. (ed.) 1982. *Metaphor: problems and perspectives*. Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Press.
- Miller, G.A. 1979. Images and models, similes and metaphors, in Ortony (ed.) 1979, 202-250.
- Montuschi, E. 1995. What is wrong with talking of metaphors in science? In Radman (ed.) 1995, 309-327.
- Mooij, J.J.A. 1976. *A study of metaphor*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Morgan, G. 1986. *Images of organization*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Nelson, N.L. 1986. Metaphor and the media, in Thomas (ed.) 1990, 17-24.
- Nida, E.A. 1975a. *Componential analysis of meaning: an introduction to semantic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Nida, E.A. 1975b. *Exploring semantic structures*. Munich: Fink.

- Ortony, A. (ed.) 1979. *Metaphor and thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ortony, A. 1986. Some problems for models of metaphor comprehension and their developmental implications, *Communication and Cognition* 19, 347-366.
- Ortony, A., D.L. Schallert, R.E. Reynolds, and S.J. Andos 1978. Interpreting metaphors and idioms: some effects of context on comprehension, *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behaviour* 17, 465-477.
- Oswick, C. and D. Grant 1996. The organization of metaphors and the metaphors of organization: where are we and where do we go from here? In Grant and Oswick (eds.) 1996, 213-226.
- Pancake, A.S. 1993. Taken by storm: the exploitation of metaphor in the Persian gulf war. [*Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 8/1993, <http://citd.scar.utoronto.ca/Metaphor/8.4.281.html>].
- Pepper, S.C. 1942. *World hypotheses*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Perelman, C. 1982. *The realm of rhetoric*. Notre Dame: The University of Notre Dame Press.
- Petrie, H.G. 1979. Metaphor and learning, in Ortony (ed.) 1979, 438-461.
- Podkolzina, T.A. 1992. Metafora i tipologija terminosistem, *Filologicheskie Nauki* 3, 90-100.
- Pollio, H.R., M.S. Fabrizi, A. Sills, and M.K. Smith 1984. Need metaphoric comprehension take longer than literal comprehension? *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 13, 195-214.

- Pütz, M.(ed.) 1992. *Thirty years of linguistic evolution*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Radman, Z. (ed.) 1995. *From a metaphorical point of view: a multidisciplinary approach to the cognitive content of metaphor*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Reddy, M. 1979. The conduit metaphor, in Ortony (ed.) 1979, 284-324.
- Richards, I.A. 1936. *The philosophy of rhetoric*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ricoeur, P. 1978. *The rule of metaphor: multi-disciplinary studies of the creation of meaning in language*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Rigotti, F. 1995. The house as metaphor, in Radman (ed.) 1995, 419-445.
- Rohrer, T. 1991. To plow the sea: metaphors for regional peace in Latin America. [*Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 6/1991, <http://citd.scar.utoronto.ca/Metaphor/6.3.163.html>].
- Rohrer, T. 1995. The metaphorical logic of (political) rape: the new wor(l)d order. [<http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~rohrer/brhtml.htm>].
- Rumelhart, D.E. 1979. Some problems with the notion of literal meanings, in Ortony (ed.) 1979, 78-90.
- Sackmann, S. 1989. The role of metaphor in organization transformation, *Human Relations* 42, 463-485.
- Sacks, S. (ed.) 1979. *On metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Sadock, J.M. 1979. Figurative speech and linguistics, in Ortony (ed.) 1979, 46-63.
- Schön, D.A. 1979. Generative metaphor: a perspective on problem-setting in social policy, in Ortony (ed.) 1979, 254-283.
- Searle, J.R. 1969. *Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J.R. 1979a. *Expression and meaning: studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J.R. 1979b. Metaphor, in Ortony (ed.) 1979, 92-123.
- Semino, E. and M. Masci 1996. Politics is football: metaphor in the discourse of Silvio Berlusconi in Italy, *Discourse and Society* 7, 243-269.
- Shaw, R. and J. Bransford (eds.) 1977. *Perceiving, acting, and knowing: toward an ecological psychology*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Shinjo, M. and J.L. Myers 1987. The role of context in metaphor comprehension, *Journal of Memory and Language* 26, 226-241.
- Smith, R.C. and E.M. Eisenberg 1987. Conflict at Disneyland: a root-metaphor analysis, *Communication Monographs* 54, 367-380.
- So, C.Y.K. 1987. The summit as war: how journalists use metaphors, *Journalism Quarterly* 64, 623-626.
- Spellman, B. and K. Holyoak 1992. If Saddam is Hitler then who is George Bush? Analogical mapping between systems of social roles, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 913-933.

- Srivastva, S. and F.J. Barrett 1988. The transforming nature of metaphors in group development: a study in group theory, *Human Relations* 41, 31-64.
- Sweetser, E.E. 1992. English metaphors for language: motivations, conventions, and creativity, *Poetics Today* 13, 705-724.
- Taylor, L.A. 1991. Nationalism, the state, war and sport: the problem of using women as patriotic symbols. Paper presented at the meeting of the North American Society for the Study of Sport, Milwaukee, WI, November, 1991.
- Thomas, S. (ed.) 1990. *Studies in communication: communication and culture*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Tracy, D. 1979. Metaphor and religion: the test case of Christian texts, in Sacks (ed.) 1979, 89-104.
- Tversky, A. 1977. Features of similarity, *Psychological Review* 84, 327-352.
- van Brabant, K. 1986. The crosscultural study of metaphor: towards a theoretical and practical analysis of figurative speech, *Communication and Cognition* 19, 395-434.
- Verbrugge, R.R. 1977. Resemblances in language and perceptions, in Shaw and Bransford (eds.) 1977, 365-389.
- Vinogradov, S.I. 1994. Vyzritel'nye sredstva v parlamentskoi rechi, in Gaudina and Shirjaev (eds.) 1994, 66-77.
- Voss, J.F., J. Kennet, J. Wiley, and T.Y.E. Schooler 1992. Experts at debate: the use of metaphor in the U.S. Senate Debate on the Gulf Crisis. [*Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 7/1992, <http://citd.scar.utoronto.ca/Metaphor/7.3.197.html>].

Wilson, F. 1992. Language, technology, gender, and power, *Human Relations* 45, 883-904.

Yu, N. 1995. Metaphorical expressions of anger and happiness in English and Chinese. [*Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 10/1995, <http://citd.scar.utoronto.ca/Metaphor/10.2.59.html>].

Zhiteneva, L.I. 1982. Metafora v gazetnoi publitsistike V.I. Lenina, *Russkaia Rech'* 2, 39-43.