Populist metaphorical utterances[i]

John Keating and Belén Soria

Introduction

Populism has been the focus of many recent studies in political science (see Bonikovski and Gidron, 2016), and it has been conceptualised either as a strategy of political mobilisation (Weyland, 2001), an ideology (Mudde, 2004) or a form of political discourse (Bonikovski and Gidron, 2016). The most widely cited definition is given by Mudde (2004, p. 544), who claims that *populism* is a "thin-centred ideology" that involves a confrontation between the *pure people*, seen as the legitimate source of sovereignty, and the *corrupt elites*. However, as Aslanidis (2016) argues, the definition of populism as a thin ideology is vague and difficult to apply:

> First, the very notion of thinness is conceptually spurious; second, this position entails significant methodological inconsistencies in the framework of its proponents; and third, its essentialist connotations erect insurmountable obstacles with regard to classification and measurement. (Aslanidis, 2016, p. 89)

A study of the different approaches to the concept of populism shows that, in spite of disagreements, it is generally agreed that the core idea of populism involves an anti-elite discourse in the name of noble sovereign people. Thus, we will follow Bonikovski and Gidron (2016) in arguing that, although there are several approaches to the notion of populism, a minimal discursive definition is possible and will thus make the case for "the analytical advantages of the most minimal, discursive definition of populism that treats the phenomenon as an attribute of political claims" (Bonikovski and Gidron, 2016, p. 7).

We will use the term 'populist claim' to refer to any political claim that promotes or is consistent with a binary worldview confronting the morally superior people (and the politicians speaking on their behalf) to certain immoral (and, thus, illegitimate) political or economic powers. Following Laclau (2005) and the proponents of frame theory (Snow *et al.*, 1986; Snow and Benford, 1988), Aslanidis (2016) conceives of populism as a discursive frame rather than as an ideology or a strategy. The idea of a frame can be used to describe populist discourse as:

> the systematic dissemination of a frame that diagnoses reality as problematic because 'corrupt elites' have unjustly usurped the sovereign authority of the 'noble People' and maintains that the solution to the problem resides in the righteous political mobilization of the latter in order to regain power. (Aslanidis, 2016, p. 99)

In our opinion, an account of populism should provide an explanation of how the

populist binary worldview is constructed through discourse and, more particularly, through metaphorical discourse. Using Romero and Soria (2016)'s notion of metaphorical *ad hoc* concept construction, we aim to account for the role of novel metaphor in populist discourse. We hypothesise that populist speakers metaphorically present elites from a certain perspective which highlights some of their (negative) aspects and suppresses others (which might be positive). Elites, their attitude towards noble people, their behaviour or their policies, are metaphorically conceptualised as something else. This reconceptualisation allows the speaker to assign certain properties to these entities, their attitudes, etc. which locate them in an unethical position consistent with the populist frame.

In addition, we aim to see if, despite getting their content from the more specific right- or left-wing populist values, there are characteristics of populism common to both. Specifically, we will determine if there are regularities in the metaphorical *ad hoc* conceptualisation of their populist worldviews, regardless of whether they are right-wing or left-wing. As Bonikovski and Gidron (2016, p. 7) say, "[j]ust who the elites are varies across context, as do the boundaries of 'the people', but the binary structure of populist claims is largely invariant." Our interest, then, is not to analyse the particular left-wing or right-wing ideological elements in the utterances of populist speakers but the organisation of their respective ideological elements as part of the populist frame. If this is confirmed, it can be taken as evidence supporting Aslanidis's view of populism as a discursive frame rather than an ideology.

Our study will focus on debates in the European Parliament (EP). Given that European politicians participate in political debates in different languages, we have decided to focus on utterances in English and Spanish, and we have selected one speaker for each language: Nigel Farage (from UKIP in Britain) and Pablo Iglesias (from Podemos in Spain). They represent right-wing and left-wing populism in contemporary Europe, respectively. We assumed that these two leaders would exhibit populist claims since they are often labelled as "populist", not only in the popular press, but in other scholarly research on UKIP (Abedi and Lundberg, 2009; Bossetta, 2017) and Podemos (Kioupkiolis, 2016; Ramiro and Gomez, 2017). In their political positions, these two choices were ideal for controlling contextual variables as much as possible: Both were leaders of their respective parties and associated with them to an unusually high degree. This is an important variable because, although the EP is an international stage, it allows politicians (particularly those from opposition parties at home) to address a domestic audience.

Both the Farage and Iglesias corpora were retrieved from the EP website[ii]. The corpus begins with the first plenary debate of the eighth EP (01/07/2014). Though Farage had been elected to the EP before this, the 2014 elections saw Pablo Iglesias elected to the Parliament for the first time, and so this was a natural lower diachronic limit for both corpora. For the Farage corpus, the cut-off date was chosen arbitrarily on the basis of our working deadline for conducting corpus analysis (26/04/2017). For Iglesias, this

was dictated by his resignation from the EP to stand in Spanish national elections (27/10/2015).

Only contributions from parliamentary plenary sessions were chosen, to control the variables which different addressees would introduce (i.e., in non-plenary sessions of parliamentary groups). Of these plenary debates, only spoken contributions were included, with written contributions excluded to avoid the variables which distinct modes might introduce. The final data set consists of a corpus of 22,698 words for Farage and 6,020 words for Iglesias. Using the identification criteria outlined in the next section, we extracted 30 novel metaphorical utterances from Iglesias's corpus and 95 from Farage's. Examples were extracted manually, as our analysis of novel metaphorical utterances precludes computer assisted tagging. We believe that, although the disparity in corpora sizes, cut-off dates and tagged examples might be of concern in a quantitative study, it is not a problem in a qualitative study such as this one. Speaker's meaning often depends on inference and, as Baker and Levon (2015, p. 232) argue, one of the strengths of qualitative analysis is "its ability to uncover the implicit representations that emerge" which escape a corpus-based quantitative analysis.

The rest of the chapter has the following structure. In the following section, we explain Romero and Soria's pragmatic approach to metaphor and use it to account for how the speaker's meaning is constructed in the interpretation of populist metaphorical utterances. Then, we analyse a selection of metaphors evidenced in Iglesias's and Farage's utterances, where populist oppositions are metaphorically conveyed. In the final section, we summarise our findings.

The Role of Metaphor in EU Populist Discourse

Metaphor and political discourse

There are many studies on metaphor. Some focus on the interpretation of metaphorical utterances (Richards, 1936; Black, 1954/5; Grice, 1975; Lakoff and Johnson, 1980; Indurkhya, 1986; Sperber and Wilson, 1986/95; Romero and Soria, 1997/8, 2007; Gentnerand Wolf, 2000; Leporeand Stone, 2015) and some have been applied to the analysis of political discourse (Charteris-Black, 2005; Chilton and Ilyin, 1993; Musolff, 2012). Each of these approaches to metaphor makes their own contribution to the field. Richards' (1936) and Black's (1954/5) seminal works provided us with the mapping approach to metaphor which is generally accepted by conceptual metaphor theory (CMT) (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). In CMT, the interpretation of metaphor is not a two-stage process as in the traditional view of metaphor as particularised conversational implicature (Grice, 1975). Other theorists working on the effects of utterance interpretation (Carston, 2002; Recanati, 2004) also oppose metaphorical interpretation in two stages, and defend that *ad hoc* concepts[iii] arise and affect "what is said" (or "explicature" in relevance-theoretic terms). However, they reject the view of metaphor

as mapping and argue for the view of metaphor as loosening. By contrast, Romero and Soria (2007, 2014) advocate the view of metaphor as mapping (rather than as loosening), whilst also accepting that the interpretative effects of metaphorical utterances affect what is said rather than implicatures. In our opinion, this is the approach that can be of use to our analysis of novel metaphorical utterances in populist discourse.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has focused on the systematic (or ready-made) metaphorical concepts that can be identified in a corpus. In particular, Charteris-Black (2005) applies it to political discourse and calls it "Critical Metaphor Analysis". However, we agree with Musolff when he says that "[…] cognitive metaphor analysis needs to be complemented by a pragmatic, specifically relevance-oriented approach to be fruitful for CDA" (2012, p. 302).

Thus, drawing on Romero and Soria's (2014, 2016) pragmatic approach to metaphor, we claim that the interpretative effects of novel metaphorical utterances affect "what is said" and can be an essential conceptual part of the claims made by speakers. In their view, metaphorical conceptualisation is contextually determined and they focus on the study of metaphorical interpretation of utterances rather than on the study of what Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 53) call "literal metaphors". In interpreting novel metaphorical utterances, a metaphorical context is constructed. This metaphorical context is a cognitive structure in relation to the topic talked about that is constructed *ad hoc* by the mapping of some relational properties from a source domain. From this metaphorical context, some words acquire a provisional meaning with which they contribute to the propositions intentionally conveyed by the speaker. These propositions are metaphorical and with them a metaphorically grounded claim can be made.

The construction of the metaphorical context in the interpretation of novel metaphorical utterances often requires a source domain which is also constructed in an *ad hoc* manner. In this way, a very *ad hoc* portrayal of the source domain allows a very rich *ad hoc* and specific metaphorical characterisation of the target. The evidence[iv] provided by the speaker about the *ad hoc* source domain guides the hearer's construction of the mapping as intended. This is consistent with Musolff (2012, p. 305), who claims that, "depending on the context of use, the source domain content can vary almost indefinitely" and that "the mapping process is the product of discourse."

This pragmatic approach to metaphor allows us to argue that the interpretation of metaphorical utterances involves cognising the target through a mapping from a semantic domain that serves as a lens with which to focus on certain types of features of the target. Through metaphorical political discourse, speakers can assign prominence to certain aspects of social phenomena, political or economic situations, politicians, etc. In this way, metaphor provides a tool to help construct a certain worldview. Through the *ad hoc* cognitive structure created by the interpretation of metaphorical utterances, hearers entertain this worldview and, even if they disagree, a new conceptualisation

becomes a part of the interlocutors' common ground. If the speaker succeeds in conveying her metaphorically grounded claims and the hearer disagrees, he can negate them but his disagreement does not preclude his entertaining of the metaphorical reconceptualisation in the way intended. Metaphorical conceptualisations can be contested. In this sense, negative metaphorical utterances may be of use in argumentation and, more particularly, in political argumentation. In addition, we suggest that they are useful to populist politicians in their construction of the binary worldview within the populist frame.

Populist metaphorical utterances

Following Romero and Soria's pragmatic approach, we can analyse populist metaphorical utterances and explain their role in the populist frame. We explain and illustrate this approach using the following utterance by Iglesias:

(1) [At the EP (16/09/2014), as part of the debate on the state of EU-Russia relations and the issue in Ukraine, Iglesias utters:] And the question we need to pose is if we should assume that European foreign policy is going to be a pawn on a chessboard manipulated by the United States or if we are going to be serious enough to have a foreign policy of our own that does not put Europeans at risk.

To get the meaning intended by the speaker of (1), the hearer must, among other things, align the EU's role in the world with a pawn on a chessboard and the US with someone dictating to the player how to move that pawn. From this alignment, some *ad hoc* conceptualisation of the game of chess allows a particular description of the EU's role in the world. As we will see, the metaphorical conceptualisation that results from this process partially substantiates the populist frame.

According to Romero and Soria (1997/8, 2005), the metaphorical mechanism is triggered both by a *contextual abnormality*, produced when using a linguistic expression in an abnormal linguistic or extralinguistic context; and a *conceptual contrast*, produced when identifying one concept as a source domain and another concept as the target domain. In (1), there is a contextual abnormality since the EU's role in the world is not the kind of thing we can categorise as a pawn on a chessboard according to our ready-made conceptual system. In addition, the concept PAWN ON A CHESSBOARD MOVED BY A CONTROLLED PLAYER is identified as the source domain (from which to describe the topic Iglesias is talking about) and EU'S ROLE IN THE WORLD as the target domain. Both target and source are already complex concepts generated in the particular context. These identification criteria of the metaphorical utterance (1) trigger the metaphorical mechanism which links two different domains, a source domain (D_s) and a target domain (D_t), in order to see the latter as the former. Following Romero and Soria (2016:161-2), we represent each domain by a set of terms which make up its vocabulary

(V) and a set of structural constraints (S) which specify how these terms are related to the information associated with the concept. The link between domains can be specified with a mapping, *M*, from D_s to D_t. In Table 1, we can see the domains involved in (1).

A PAWN ON A CHESSBOARD MOVED BY A CONTROLLED PLAYER	EU'S ROLE IN THE WORLD
$D_s = <V_s, S_s>$	$D_t = <V_t, S_t>$
$V_s=$ {'piece, 'pawn', 'king', 'queen', 'chess', 'chessboard', 'move', 'play', 'risk', etc.}	$V_t=$ {'Europe', 'union', 'council', 'manipulate', 'US', 'policy', 'world', etc.}
$S_s =$ [1_s] Chess is a zero-sum game played on a chessboard with 16 pieces for each of the two players, [2_s] The pieces are one king, one queen, two rooks, two knights, two bishops, and eight pawns, **[3_s] It is illegal for a player to follow advice from other sources of information (a person, a computer, etc.),** [4_s] Pieces are used to attack and capture the opponent's pieces, [5_s] Each player tries to immobilise the opponent's king, **[6_s] The pawn is the weakest piece on the board,** **[7_s] Pawns are often risked by the player to capture other opponent's pieces,** [8_s] A game can end in a draw, etc.	$S_t =$ [1_t] EU is a political and economic union of 28 member states with a strong role in world relations, [2_t] The EU is one of the largest trade powers in the world, [3_t] The EU and the US dominate political and military international relations, [4_t] The EU and the US have a good bilateral diplomatic relationship. [5_t] There are no border and immigration controls among EU member states, [6_t] The EU provides foreign aid, etc.

Table 1 Representation of source and target domains

To interpret Iglesias's utterance (1) we must find a structural alignment of consistent one-to-one correspondences between these domains. This alignment (e.g. chessboard → world) allows the selection and coherent partial mapping from D_s to D_t. Iglesias's utterance invites us to relevantly align the world with a chessboard and the role of Europe in the world with that of a pawn on a chessboard. On transforming some structural constraints of D_s, we come across other structural constraints only in terms of the target domain. A restructured D_t or metaphorical target domain (D_t^M) results from this mapping, as we can see in Table 2.

Restructured D_t or D_t^M: EU'S ROLE IN THE WORLD AS A PAWN ON A CHESSBOARD MOVED BY A CONTROLLED PLAYER
[1_t^M] The EU has a weak role in foreign relations, (new, coming from 6_s and downplaying 1_t-3_t) **[2_t^M]** The EU is unscrupulously risked by the US in geopolitical conflicts, (new, coming from 7_s) **[3_t^M]**The EU illegitimately follows advice from the US, (new, coming from 3_s)

Table 2 EU'S ROLE IN THE WORLD AS A PAWN ON A CHESSBOARD MOVED BY A CONTROLLED PLAYER

In utterance interpretation, mappings have two inferential requirements: coherence and relevance. Transfer is allowed from D_s to D_t only if the transformed information of D_s does not make our conception of D_t incoherent. If the union of the transformation of the structural constraints of D_s with part of the information of D_t is consistent, then the structural constraints of D_s have been coherently transformed by means of a partial function into structural constraints of D_t. Furthermore, the mapping is guided by relevance (Romero and Soria 2014), that is, by the hearer's attempt to maximise the speaker's intended cognitive effects at the least possible effort (Sperber and Wilson 1986/95). The mapping for (1) generates a metaphorically restructured conception of the EU'S ROLE IN THE WORLD AS A PAWN ON A CHESSBOARD MOVED BY A CONTROLLED PLAYER, characterised by the structural constraints of D_t^M in Table 2. Several coherent mappings are possible and the one constructed is guided by the search for relevance. Target domain information is downplayed by their alignment with the selected features in the source domain. For example, the conceptualisation of European foreign policy as the weakest piece on the chessboard (coming from [6_s]) downplays the target domain assumption that the EU has a strong role in the world (e.g. [1_t]-[4_t]). When Iglesias presents the US as "manipulating" (rather than simply moving) the pawn on the chessboard, the EU is conceptualised as having a weak role (the EU´s foreign policy is a weak piece). Through this metaphorical conceptualisation, Iglesias can raise the question of whether the EU should take a passive role in letting the US make decisions that should legitimately be made by Europeans, assuming that both the EU and the US have a dominant role and equal status in international affairs (as we can see in [3_t] and [4_t]). The question is if the European people should assume the EU elites' passive attitude. By this rhetorical question, Iglesias is expressing his attitude of rejection towards the EU´s passivity. [1_t^M], [2_t^M] and [3_t^M] can be considered as new information added to D_t from D_s, from [6_s], [7_s] and [3_s] respectively. Some similarities are created in the production and interpretation of novel metaphorical utterances if they contribute to communicating the speaker's intended cognitive effects. Since, in novel metaphorical utterances,[v] the context of interpretation changes, the meanings associated with the terms metaphorically used change, too. The mapping process ultimately results in a metaphorically restructured target domain which allows the hearer to associate metaphorical *ad hoc* concepts with the vehicles of the metaphor (the terms from the

source domain expressed by the speaker in his metaphorical utterance e.g. 'pawn', 'chessboard', 'risk') in the way intended by the speaker. They represent metaphorical provisional meanings which contribute to the proposition intended by Iglesias with utterance (1). The metaphorical context is constructed in the process of utterance interpretation and is guided by the search of the cognitive effects that justify our processing effort (Romero and Soria, 2014). Only the transformations that make the speaker's utterance relevant will be entertained as part of the interpretation process.

With this metaphorical utterance, Iglesias is conceptualising the EU as having no actual role in the important decisions on foreign policy. This role has been usurped by the US and the passive attitude of the EU elites should be diagnosed as problematic as the passive attitude of a chess player that lets another person move the pieces for him. By means of this, the structural constraints [3t] and [4t] are downplayed and [3t^{M}] is introduced.

This is an example of how metaphor can contribute to the construction of the populist frame. With metaphorical utterance (1), Iglesias contributes to the diagnosis of reality as problematic because control has been illegitimately taken by some abusive power (the US) and this has been facilitated by corrupt elites (the EU). This diagnosis justifies his demand for anti-elitist political mobilisation.

Left-wing and Right-wing populist metaphorical utterances in the EU

In this section, we analyse a selection of utterances used by the left-wing populist leader Pablo Iglesias and the right-wing populist leader Nigel Farage to explore if their metaphorical conceptualisations contribute to the construction of their worldviews (regardless of whether they are left-wing or right-wing) within a populist frame. We explore how the metaphorical *ad hoc* concepts that form part of the meaning intentionally conveyed by both leaders contribute to a populist frame that, as Aslanidis (2016, p. 99) says, "(…) diagnoses reality as problematic because 'corrupt elites' have unjustly usurped the sovereign authority of the 'noble people'."

Pablo Iglesias's populist metaphorical utterances

Iglesias metaphorically substantiates the populist frame in the EP by opposing the democratic legitimacy of noble people to the usurpation of power by corrupt elites. In particular, we find that metaphor has a role in the following populist oppositions:

  (i)   European self-government in opposition to US abusive power;
  (ii) National sovereignty of southern and eastern European peoples in opposition to the Troika's abusive austerity policy;
  (iii) Non-European noble people in need of asylum in opposition to EU rights-

abusing policy.

Iglesias's utterance (1) exemplifies opposition (i). In Table 3 below, we simplify the representation of the mapping needed to interpret (1) and we follow this type of simplified representation for the analysis of the following metaphorical utterances.

D_s	Relevant mapped features	D_t
A PAWN ON A CHESSBOARD MOVED BY A CONTROLLED PLAYER	• The piece with the weakest role in game of chess • Usually put to risk or killed to capture pieces of opponents • It is illegal for a player to follow advice	EU'S ROLE IN THE WORLD
Restructured D_t: EU'S ROLE IN THE WORLD AS A PAWN ON A CHESSBOARD		
• The EU has a weak role in world relations • The EU is unscrupulously risked by the US in geopolitical conflicts • The EU illegitimately follows advice from the US		

Table 3 EU'S ROLE IN THE WORLD AS A PAWN ON A CHESSBOARD

Iglesias's populist claim in the EP depends on this metaphorical conceptualisation of the US as usurper of the sovereignty of noble European people.

Opposition (ii) can be exemplified by Iglesias's utterance (2):

(2) [At the EP (01/07/2014) as part of the sessions on the election of the president of the EP, Iglesias utters:] The expropriation of sovereignty and submission of the government to financial elites threaten the present and the future of Europe. (…) But I suppose you are aware that there is no Europe without its southern peoples, just as there is none without its eastern peoples, also subject to the harsh conditions of the Troika, whose policy threatens to destroy the European project (…). But there is another way, there is an alternative to the policies of impoverishment and the kidnapping of sovereignty. (…) This Parliament must express the democratic legitimacy of the origin that brings us together: the voice of citizens, and not the arrangements between elites.

In (2), EUROPEAN POLITICAL AND FINANCIAL ELITES (TROIKA) are metaphorically represented as EXPROPRIATORS or as KIDNAPPERS OF SOVEREIGNTY. Iglesias makes the metaphorically grounded populist claim that the national sovereignty of southern European countries (noble people of Greece, Spain and Italy) has been usurped by the

Troika's austerity policies.

An example of opposition (iii) is the metaphorical utterance (3):

(3) [As part of the conclusions of the European Council (15/10/2015), Iglesias utters:] The refugee crisis is not resolved with police. It is solved with a responsible policy. Stop playing chess with the peoples of the Mediterranean. Work for peace instead of fomenting wars. Help people who are fleeing from horror. Do not keep destroying the dignity of Europe, Mr. Juncker.

In (3), the European authorities (represented by Juncker on this occasion) are presented as a select few putting pieces on a chessboard and encouraging attacks on noble people, refugees, coming from the other side of the Mediterranean Sea.

D_s	Relevant mapped features	D_t
PLAYERS OF CHESS	• Players of chess set the pieces on a chessboard knowing that many will be sacrificed • Players of chess try to prevent opponents' pieces from moving ahead in their part of the chessboard	EU AUTHORITIES
Restructured D_t: EU AUTHORITIES AS PLAYERS OF CHESS		
• EU authorities encourage conflicts knowing that many noble people will be sacrificed or abused in different ways • EU authorities try to prevent refugees from entering EU territory in their attempt to escape from the conflict		

Table 4 EU AUTHORITIES AS PLAYERS OF CHESS

The restructured target domain EU AUTHORITIES AS PLAYERS OF CHESS, which is generated *ad hoc* in the interpretation process, provides us with the metaphorical context from which to interpret Iglesias's utterance (3).

Although CHESS is part of the source domain in both utterances (1) and (3), different mappings are triggered and different contents are intentionally communicated by these utterances. This can be taken as evidence that a pragmatic approach to metaphor is needed to account for the metaphorical meaning conveyed by the speaker. Coherence and relevance are inferential requirements for the mappings involved in the interpretation of each utterance. In each case hearers are able to derive a coherent restructured target domain intended by the speaker whose utterance, as Sperber and

Wilson (1986/95:156) argue for all verbal utterances[vi], conveys its presumption of relevance.

Another example of opposition (iii) is Iglesias's use of a quotation from a poem by Julio Herrera:

> (4) [At the EP (12/03/2015) as part of the sessions on the Human Rights council in NATO, Iglesias quotes a poem by Julio Herrera:] "I am not a migratory bird / that on a whim left its dwelling / upon the arrival of adverse seasons: / I am a castaway from an unsettled country / that an infamous pirate plunged into the seas of misery."

Iglesias metaphorically describes the refugees crossing the Mediterranean Sea as noble people by a mapping from the source domain CASTAWAY PLUNGED BY AN INFAMOUS PIRATE rather than from MIGRATORY BIRD THAT ON A WHIM LEFT ITS DWELLING UPON THE ARRIVAL OF ADVERSE SEASONS. In this example, there are two metaphorical mappings: one of them is used to make an affirmative assertion, the other to make a negative one.

Taking into account that certain conceptualisations can be "(…) meta-represented by speaker as being someone else's believed reality" (Chilton, 2004, p. 54), we can hypothesise that this is what happens in cases of negative populist metaphorical utterances. For example, we can say that, with the quotation in (4), Iglesias implicitly attributes to the European authorities the metaphorical conceptualisation of REFUGEE AS MIGRATORY BIRD THAT ON A WHIM LEFT THEIR DWELLING UPON THE ARRIVAL OF ADVERSE SEASONS. In cases like this, a populist speaker attributes a thought to an elite entity, by meta-representing an elite worldview metaphorically reconceptualised within the populist frame. This metaphorical claim is attributed and contested simultaneously by the populist speaker with a negative metaphorical utterance "I am not a migratory bird". Contestation is reinforced with the affirmative metaphorical utterance "I am a castaway from an unsettled country that an infamous pirate plunged into the seas of misery." Both contribute to the populist frame.

Sometimes, the metaphorical conceptualisation attributed to the elites is rather conventional as in the description of REFUGEES ARRIVAL AS A PLAGUE or AS AN INVASION, and they are also contested. For example, in (5):

> (5) [23/09/2015 as part of the debate on the conclusions of the European Council, Iglesias utters:] To talk about "plague", to talk about "invasion" (…) is an offense to this House and democracy. Whoever talks about human beings in this way deserves just one label and, even if it is a strong word, I am going to say it: you are trash, (…).

Iglesias protests against these metaphorical conceptualisations.

A myriad of other source domains (e.g. MASTERS GIVING ORDERS TO DOGS WILLING TO COMPLY WITH THEM) are used by Iglesias to represent EU authorities within the populist frame. Space, however, limits us here.

Nigel Farage's populist metaphorical utterances

Farage substantiates the populist frame via the following populist oppositions:

(i) The noble people, usually Britain and the British, or Farage himself, in opposition to the elites of the European Union's political institutions;

(ii) National sovereignty of European member states in opposition to the anti-democratic policies of the EU.

A frequent source domain he uses to describe the EU within the populist frame is ORGANISED RELIGION, as in (6):

(6) [In a State of the Union debate, (Strasbourg, 14/09/16) Farage utters:] If you were to think of this building as a temple, Mr. Verhofstadt is the high priest, a fanatic. (…) If you stick to the dogma of saying that for reciprocal tariff-free access to the single market we must maintain the free movement of people, then you will inevitably drive us towards no deal.

Several related metaphorical conceptualisations are involved: THE EP BUILDING AS TEMPLE, MEP VERHOFSTADT (a prominent Belgian MEP in favour of further EU integration and leader of the parliamentary group 'Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe' [vii]) AS A FANATICAL HIGH-PRIEST, and THE EU'S BREXIT NEGOTIATION TACTICS AS DOGMA. Table 5 illustrates some of the mapped features of the second, as a case of opposition (i)

D$_s$	Relevant mapped features	D$_t$
A FANATICAL HIGH PRIEST	• Leads worship in the temple • Is the highest authority in the temple • Will do anything to support his blind and extreme beliefs • Can punish sinners	MEP VERHOFSTADT
Restructured D$_t$ MEP VERHOFSTADT AS FANATICAL HIGH PRIEST		

	• Verhofstadt leads worship for the EU in the European Parliament
	• Verhofstadt is the highest authority in the EP
	• Verhofstadt will do anything to support his blind and extreme belief in the EU
	• Verhofstadt can punish members transgressing divine EU law

Table 5 MEP VERHOFSTADT AS FANATICAL HIGH PRIEST

This metaphorical conceptualisation denigrates Verhofstadt, as a fanatic, precluding the possibility that he will negotiate in a rational manner, and downplays the fact that Verhofstadt is also an elected representative in a democratic institution.

As we can see in Table 6, utterance (6) also exemplifies opposition (ii) via the populist claim that the EU's Brexit negotiation position is based on blind belief in the EU project, and blind obedience to authority rather than reason and willingness to compromise and democratic principles.

DOGMA	• Policy based on blind belief rather than reason • Imposed by authorities in a certain religious cult	EU'S BREXIT NEGOTIATION TACTICS
Restructured D$_t$ EU'S BREXIT NEGOTIATION TACTICS AS DOGMA		
• The EU's Brexit negotiation tactics are based on blind belief in the EU project rather than on reason • The EU's Brexit negotiation tactics are imposed by the authorities in the European cult		

Table 6 EU'S BREXIT NEGOTIATION TACTICS AS DOGMA

Brexit is also metaphorically conceptualised by Farage in the populist frame. A good example is:

(7) [In negotiations with the UK following its notification that it intends to withdraw from the European Union (Strasbourg, 5/04/17), Farage utters:] President, it may have taken nine months – a pretty full gestation – but be in no doubt that last Wednesday was a great historic day when the United Kingdom announced that we were going to become an independent, self-governing, democratic nation once again, an act that has been cheered by hundreds of millions of people all over the world.

D_s	Relevant mapped features	D_t
PREGNANCY	• Pregnancy is a natural and necessary process • Pregnancy is physically, emotionally and mentally demanding • Giving birth is painful • Birth of a child is a joyful occasion • Parents should be congratulated	POST-REFERENDUM BREXIT PROCESS
Restructured D_t: POST-REFERENDUM BREXIT PROCESS AS PREGNANCY		
• Brexit process was a natural and necessary process • Brexit process was physically, emotionally and mentally demanding • Birth of Brexit-Britain was a joyful occasion • Farage and his followers should be congratulated		

Table 7 POST-REFERENDUM BREXIT PROCESS AS PREGNANCY

The vehicle of the metaphor, the nine-month gestation, describes the nine-month delay between the Brexit referendum result and the British government's triggering of article 50, thereby starting the legal process of leaving the EU. The structural constraints of the source domain implicitly divide the Brexit process into three stages: conception (the Brexit referendum), pregnancy (the post-referendum process in Britain) and birth (the triggering of article 50).

Farage had campaigned for Britain to leave the EU for his entire political career and so the metaphorical ad-hoc conceptualisation POST-REFERENDUM BREXIT PROCESS AS PREGNANCY conceptualises Farage and his followers as a parent who should be congratulated and positions them in the populist frame as representing the noble people.

Metaphorically, it is not just the birth of any child but the birth of a child whose birth is "cheered by hundreds of millions of people all over the world", and which signalled that "we were going to become an independent, self-governing, democratic nation once again." The explicit metaphor BREXIT PROCESS AS PREGNANCY creates the context of interpretation in which the rest of the utterance can also be interpreted metaphorically. Thus, as an extension of the first metaphor we can construe the highly ad-hoc conceptualisation of BREXIT AS NEWBORN CHILD CELEBRATED BY MILLIONS.

D_s	Relevant mapped features	D_t
NEWBORN CHILD CELEBRATED BY MILLIONS	• Birth of a relevant child is celebrated by millions of citizens (in a kingdom or religious community) because he/she is important for the future of that social group. • The child will grow up to be independent, self-governing.	BRITAIN UNDER THE BREXIT PROCESS
Restructured D_t: BRITAIN UNDER THE BREXIT PROCESS AS NEWBORN CHILD CELEBRATED BY MILLIONS		
• Brexit-Britain is celebrated by millions around the world because it is important for the future of democracy. • Newborn Britain will grow up to be independent, self-governing.		

Table 8 BRITAIN UNDER THE BREXIT PROCESS AS NEWBORN CHILD CELEBRATED BY MILLIONS

Here, even the target domain BREXIT is highly *ad hoc as* it seems to signify not only the Brexit process but also post-EU Britain. There are only very particular types of births which are celebrated by millions, namely royal births and religious births (i.e. the birth of Jesus), and the two are already analogically associated in quite complex ways (i.e. the birth of Jesus is depicted as the birth of a king, and kings have been seen to rule by divine right). Both the royal and the religious associations would be highly resonant for the British public, particularly Farage's conservative audience. BREXIT AS CHILD will grow to become an independent, self-governing and democratic nation, a prognostic populist claim presupposing as its diagnosis that Britain, under EU elites, is none of these things.

Another metaphorical utterance using a religious source domain is (8).

(8) [In a debate over the situation in Hungary (Brussels, 24/04/17), Farage, addressing Victor Orbán, Prime Minister of Hungary, utters:] You are not the leader of a nation, and these people will go on interfering in the lives of Hungarian people, and you will never be forgiven. You are a sinner in their eyes.

Just as with Iglesias's utterances (4) and (5), Farage's metaphorical utterance (8) is used to contest an alleged elite metaphorical thought. This time the metaphorical content is contested ironically rather than by means of negation. Metaphor combines with irony to convey the meaning intended by the populist speaker. The metaphorical

conceptualisation involved in this utterance (VICTOR ORBÁN AS SINNER) contributes to Farage's populist opposition (ii), by attributing to the elites the conceptualisation of the democratically elected representatives of the noble people as sinners. Victor Orbán, the rightful representative of noble Hungarian people, is seen as a sinner for disagreeing with the EU´s refugee policy, but just "in their [the elite's] eyes". With this expression, Farage is making it clear that this is a metaphorical thought he does not endorse, it is ironical. In the echoic account by Wilson and Sperber (2012, pp. 128-129), irony is defined as "a subtype of attributive use in which the speaker's primary intention is not to provide information about the content of an attributed thought, but to convey her own attitude or reaction to that thought". Following this account, we can identify Farage's utterance as ironical since his primary intention is not to assert that Victor Orbán is not the democratically elected Hungarian leader. Rather, he is conveying his negative attitude or reaction to the alleged fact that Europeans authorities are "interfering in the lives of Hungarian people" and, by doing this, Victor Orbán is being unjustly treated as a sinner.

D_s	Relevant mapped features	D_t
SINNER	- Has committed a sin, an immoral act - Can be punished by religious authorities - Can be punished by God	VICTOR ORBÁN
Restructured Dt: VICTOR ORBÁN AS SINNER		
- Victor Orbán committed the immoral act of disagreeing with EU's refugee quota - Victor Orbán can be punished by the authorities in the European cult for transgressing the European refugee policy		

Table 9 VICTOR ORBÁN AS SINNER

Curiously enough, the issue of refugees is used by both right and left-wing populist speakers in the EP. Whilst in (8), Farage uses the issue to depict EU authorities as the elite usurping the sovereignty of noble people (Hungarians), in (3) and (4), Iglesias uses the issue to depict the EU authorities as the elite attacking noble people (refugees). Though the populist frame is the same in these utterances, it is substantiated differently according to ideological point of view.

Other metaphors used by Farage to position concepts in the populist frame include EP AS BULLY BOYS, EP AS CHILDREN, and GOLDMAN SACHS AS BIG BOYS. These metaphors depict European Parliamentary politics as a playground in which Britain is bullied by the EU (NOBLE PEOPLE abused by ELITES) and the EP is under the influence of GOLDMAN SACHS AS BIG BOYS (undermining the sovereignty of the NOBLE PEOPLE). Farage draws on domains of history (TURKEY'S REFUGEE POLICY AS VIKING INVASION

OF BRITAIN), literature (DAVID CAMERON AS OLIVER TWIST) and war (UKIP SUPPORTERS AS PEOPLE'S ARMY), to name just a few, consistently using metaphorical ad-hoc concepts to create worldviews according to the populist frame.

Conclusion

We have argued that novel metaphor is used by both left- and right-wing populist speakers (Iglesias and Farage). A pragmatic account of metaphor is used to explain how the meaning intended by these populist speakers is derived from the interpretation of their novel metaphorical utterances. An analysis of novel metaphorical utterances in populist discourse reveals that *ad hoc* metaphorical conceptualisations are often found in the construction of the anti-elitist worldview that substantiates the populist frame. Regardless of their particular proposals, they diagnose a problematic reality by presenting a partially metaphorical worldview where the established powers are described as usurpers of sovereignty of noble people. This analysis also reveals that sometimes they use metaphorical conceptualisations as attributed thoughts that they contest. Negative and ironical metaphors may have a specific role in these cases. Although we have not made a comprehensive study to test if this is peculiar of populist discourse or even of political discourse more generally, we think it would be a promising topic for future research.

References

Abedi, A. and Lundberg, T. C. (2009). Doomed to failure? UKIP and the organisational challenges facing right-wing populist anti-political establishment parties. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 62(1), 72-87.

Aslanidis, P. (2016). Is populism an ideology? A refutation and a new perspective. *Political Studies*, 64(16), 88-104.

Baker, P. and Levon, E. (2015). Picking the right cherries? A comparison of corpus-based and qualitative analyses of news articles about masculinity. *Discourse and Communication*, 9(2): 221-236.

Barsalou, L. W. (1983). Ad hoc Categories. *Memories and Cognition*, 11, 211-227.

Black, M. (1954/5). Metaphor. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 55, 273-294.

Bonikowski, B. and Gidron, N. (2016). Multiple traditions in populism research: Towards a theoretical synthesis. *APSA Comparative Newsletter*, 26(2), 7-14.

Bossetta, M. (2017). Fighting fire with fire: Mainstream adoption of the populist political style in the 2014 Europe debates between Nick Clegg and Nigel Farage. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 19(4), 715-734.

Carston, R. (2002). *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice.* London and New York: Routledge.

Chilton, P and Ilyin, M. (1993). Metaphor in political discourse: the case of the 'common European house'. *Discourse and Society*, 4(1), 7-31.

Forceville, C. (2008). Metaphor in pictures and multimodal representations. In Gibbs, R.W. (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought (pp. 462-482). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gentner, D. and Wolf, P. (2000). Metaphor and knowledge change. In Dietrich, E. and Markman, A. (Eds.) *Cognitive Dynamics: Conceptual Change in Humans and Machines* (pp. 295-342). Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole and J. L. Morgan (Eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.

Indurkhya, B. (1986). Constrained Semantic Transference: A Formal Theory of Metaphors. *Synthese*, 68(3), 515-551.

Kioupkiolis, A. (2016). Podemos: the ambiguous promises of left-wing populism in contemporary Spain. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 21(2), 99-120.

Laclau, E. (2005). *On populist reason*. London: Verso.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by.* Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Lepore, E. and Stone, M. (2015). *Imagination and convention: Distinguishing grammar and inference in language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mudde, C. (2004). The populist zeitgeist. *Government and opposition*, 39(4), 542-556.

Musolff, A. (2012). The study of metaphor as part of critical discourse analysis. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 9(3), 301-310.

Ramiro, L. and Gomez, R. (2017). Radical-left populism during the great recession: Podemos and its competition with the established radical left. *Political Studies*, 65 (1_suppl), 108-126.

Recanati, F. (2004). *Literal meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, I. A. (1936). *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. London: Oxford University Press.

Romero, E. and Soria, B. (1997/8). Stylistic analysis and novel metaphor. *Pragmalingüística*, 5/6,373-389.

Romero, E. and Soria, B. (2005). Cognitive metaphor theory revisited. *Journal of Literary Semantics,* 34(1), 1-20.

Romero, E. and Soria, B. (2007). A view of novel metaphor in the light of Recanati's Proposals. In M. J. Frápolli(Ed.), *Saying, Meaning and Referring. Essays on François Recanati's Philosophy of Language* (pp. 145-159). Basignstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Romero, E. and Soria, B. (2014). Relevance theory and metaphor. *Linguagemem (Dis)curso*, 14(3), 489-509.

Romero, E. and Soria, B. (2016). Against Lepore and Stone's sceptic account of metaphorical meaning. *Croatian Journal of Philosophy,* 16(2), 145-172.

Snow, D. A. and Benford, R. D. (1988). Ideology, frame resonance and participant mobilization. *International Social Movement Research*, 1(1), 197-217.

Snow, D. A., Rochford, E. B., Worden, S.K and Benford, R.D. (1986). Frame alignments processes, micromobilization and movement participation. *American Sociological Review,* 51(4), 464-481.

Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1986/95). *Relevance: Communication and cognition.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Weyland, K. (2001). Clarifying a contested concept: Populism in the study of Latin American politics. *Comparative Politics*, 34(1), 1-22.

Wilson, D. and Sperber. D. (2012). Explaining irony. Meaning and Relevance. (pp. 123-145). Cambridge: CUP.

---

[i] Belén Soria's research for this chapter was supported by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness, EXCELENCIA program, project FFI2016-79317-P. We thank the reviewers of this volume for their insightful comments, which improved the quality of our chapter. We are also very grateful to Esther Romero for suggestions on an earlier draft.

[ii] http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/es/home.html

[iii] The term "*ad hoc* concept" was first used by Barsalou (1983, p. 214), who argued that they are usually not thought of by most people.

[iv] This evidence can be provided by means of linguistic, non-linguistic or multimodal cues (see Forceville (2008) for an explanation of metaphorical meanings conveyed in these different ways).

[v] As indicated by the reviewers of our paper, some readers might understand that this is not exactly a 100% novel metaphor, given that politics is often described in terms of the game metaphor, in particular chess. Following Lakoff and Johnson's (1980: 53) terminology, we can say that creative metaphors can be one of the following three types: unsystematic novel uses of an expression, instances of an unused part of a "literal metaphor" or extensions of the used part of a "literal metaphor". Here, we use the term "novel metaphor" in a general sense to cover the three types of what they call "imaginative (or non-literal) metaphor" (1980, p. 53) without distinguishing the subtypes. For us, metaphorical utterances of any of these types demand a non-literal interpretation and thus are called "novel" (see Romero and Soria, 2005).

[vi] In Sperber and Wilson (1986/95: 156) words, "(…) an act of ostensive communication automatically communicates a *presumption of relevance*."

[vii] http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meps/en/97058/GUY_VERHOFSTADT_home.html